Interferrence of Hindi and English in the political discourse of Parliament of India

Janjić, Marijana

Doctoral thesis / Disertacija

2018

Degree Grantor / Ustanova koja je dodijelila akademski / stručni stupanj: **University of Zadar / Sveučilište u Zadru**

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:162:106407

Rights / Prava: In copyright/Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-09-22**

Sveučilište u Zadru
Universitas Studiorum
Jadertina | 1396 | 2002 |

Repository / Repozitorij:

University of Zadar Institutional Repository

SVEUČILIŠTE U ZADRU

POSLIJEDIPLOMSKI SVEUČILIŠNI STUDIJ
HUMANISTIČKE ZNANOSTI

Marijana Janjić

INTERFERRENCE OF HINDI AND ENGLISH IN THE POLITICAL DISCOURSE OF PARLIAMENET OF INDIA

Doktorski rad

Zadar, **2018.**

Marijana Janjić

INTERFERRENCE OF HINDI AND ENGLISH IN THE POLITICAL DISCOURSE OF PARLIAMENT OF INDIA

Doktorski rad

mentorica

dr. sc. Zdravka Matišić

redovita profesorica u miru

Zadar, **2018.**

SVEUČILIŠTE U ZADRU

TEMELJNA DOKUMENTACIJSKA KARTICA

I. Autor i studij

Ime i prezime: Marijana Janjić

Naziv studijskog programa: Poslijediplomski sveučilišni studij Humanističke znanosti

Mentorica: dr. sc. Zdravka Matišić, redovita profesorica u miru

Datum obrane: 26. 2. 2018.

Znanstveno područje i polje u kojem je postignut doktorat znanosti: humanističke znanosti, filologija

II. Doktorski rad

Naslov: Interferrence of Hindi and English in the political discourse of Parliament of India

UDK oznaka: 811.214.21'27:811.111

Broj stranica: 306

Broj slika/grafičkih prikaza/tablica: 33 tablice, 17 grafikona, 1 slika, 23 zemljovida

Broj bilježaka: 268

Broj korištenih bibliografskih jedinica i izvora: 298

Broj priloga: 9

Jezik rada: engleski

III. Stručna povjerenstva

Stručno povjerenstvo za ocjenu doktorskog rada:

1. izv. prof. dr. sc. Dunja Brozović Rončević, predsjednica

2. dr. sc. Zdravka Matišić, red. prof. u miru, članica

3. doc. dr. sc. Goran Kardaš, član

Stručno povjerenstvo za obranu doktorskog rada:

1. izv. prof. dr. sc. Dunja Brozović Rončević, predsjednica

2. dr. sc. Zdravka Matišić, red. prof. u miru, članica

3. doc. dr. sc. Goran Kardaš, član

UNIVERSITY OF ZADAR

BASIC DOCUMENTATION CARD

I. Author and study

Name and surname: Marijana Janjić

Name of the study programme: Postgraduate doctoral study in Humanities

Mentor: Professor (retired) Zdravka Matišić, PhD

Date of the defence: 26th February 2018

Scientific area and field in which the PhD is obtained: Humanities, philology

II. Doctoral dissertation

Title: Interferrence of Hindi and English in the political discourse of Parliament of India

UDC mark: 811.214.21'27:811.111

Number of pages: 306

Number of pictures/graphical representations/tables: 33 tables, 17 graphs, 1 picture, 23 maps

Number of notes: 268

Number of used bibliographic units and sources: 298

Number of appendices: 9

Language of the doctoral dissertation: English

III. Expert committees

Expert committee for the evaluation of the doctoral dissertation:

1. Associate Professor Dunja Brozović Rončević, PhD, chair
2. Professor (retired) Zdravka Matišić, PhD, member
3. Assistant Professor Goran Kardaš, PhD, member

Expert committee for the defence of the doctoral dissertation:

1. Associate Professor Dunja Brozović Rončević, PhD, chair
2. Professor (retired) Zdravka Matišić, PhD, member
3. Assistant Professor Goran Kardaš, PhD, member

Izjava o akademskoj čestitosti

Ja, **Marijana Janjić,** ovime izjavljujem da je moj **doktorski** rad pod naslovom **Interferrence of Hindi and English in the political discourse of Parliament of India** rezultat mojega vlastitog rada, da se temelji na mojim istraživanjima te da se oslanja na izvore i radove navedene u bilješkama i popisu literature. Ni jedan dio mojega rada nije napisan na nedopušten način, odnosno nije prepisan iz necitiranih radova i ne krši bilo čija autorska prava.

Izjavljujem da ni jedan dio ovoga rada nije iskorišten u kojem drugom radu pri bilo kojoj drugoj visokoškolskoj, znanstvenoj, obrazovnoj ili inoj ustanovi.

Sadržaj mojega rada u potpunosti odgovara sadržaju obranjenoga i nakon obrane uređenoga rada.

Zadar, 16. ožujka 2018.

Contents

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my mentor professor Zdravka Matišić for encouragement, time, experience, guidance and knowledge that have made this PhD thesis much better after its original idea and first draft were done.

I would also like to thank all the people who have been part of this experience and have helped make it better with their input as professionals. I owe my gratitude to their questions and suggestions as well as to the inspiration I found in their own work.

I also owe a lot to all the friends and family who were there whenever I needed them.

Thank you!

Note on transcription

The original materials are written in two scripts, English in Latin alphabet and Hindi in Devanagari. In the research, the Devanagari script had been transliterated into Latin in the following way:

1. short vowel is presented with a single vowel, ex. a,

2. long vowel is presented with a single vowel with a length sign above, ex. ā,

3. as a sign of nasalization a letter ṃ had been used throughout the data,

4. the palatal sibilant is given as ś and retroflex sibilant as ṣ,

5. as a sign of aspiration a letter h is written throughout data, ex. ch, jh, etc.,

6. retroflex consonants are written as ḍ, ḍh, etc.

English elements in Hindi text are noted down as they would have been in the source language, and not as they are noted in the script of a target language. The reason for that is that the written form of English elements had changed over decades as the stenographers changed, and secondly it would unnecessarily distract a reader.

List of abbreviations

↓ - EH interference boundary in the EH type 3

Ø – zero marker; absence of postposition

ADJ – adjective

ADV - adverb

AG - agentive

AUX – auxiliary

CNPT – Conjunctive Participle

CONJ – conjunction

COP – copula

CSDS - Center for the Study of Developing Societies

DEF – definite article

DEM - demonstrative pronoun

DET - determiner

DL – donor language

DOL – Department of Official Language

DRL – donor and receiver language

DUR - durative

E - English

EIC – East India Company

eH – Englishized Hindi

EH interference – transfer of linguistic features from English to Hindi

F – feminine

FUT – future

H - Hindi

hE - English speech with Hindi elements

HE interference – transfer of linguistic features from Hindi to English

IA – Indo-Aryan language(s)

IMP! - Imperative

INF - Infinitive

IPFV - imperfective

L1 – first language

L2 – second language

LS – Lok Sabha

LSH – Lok Sabha handbook for members

M – masculine

MHE - mixed Hindi-English

mIA – modern Indo-Aryan language(s)

MIA – middle Indo-Aryan language(s)

MP – member of Parliament

N?V? – noun or verb?

NEG – negation

NP – noun phrase

NOM – nominative

NUM – numeral

OIA – old Indo-Aryan language

OBL - oblique case

OBJ - object

OLA - Official Language Act

OLR - Official Language Rules

P. - Persian

PFV - perfective

PL – plural

POSS – possessive

POST - postposition

PRED - predicate

PREP – preposition

PRON - pronoun

PRS - present

PST – past

PTCP - participle

Q – interrogative

REL - relative

RL – receiver language

ROOT - root

S. - Sanskrit

SC - Scheduled castes

SG - singular

sH – Sanskritized Hindi

SH – standard Hindi

SOV – subject-object-verb order

ST - Scheduled tribes

SVO - subject-verb-object order

SUB - subject

SUBJ - subjunctive

VOC - vocative

Chapter 1:

Introduction

The idea that lies behind language contact is very simply: every time people meet, languages meet as well. After all, there are not two alike speakers in the world and thus each idiom is an exceptional linguistic output that meets half way between the others. In those meetings, the optimal communication outcome matters more than linguistic labels. In other words, an instance of successful communication requires a set of skills like speaking, listening, comprehension, anticipation etc. Thus, each time a person takes part in the communication process as a speaker or a listener, he or she balances those skills for an optimal result – understanding the speech of a speaker as thoroughly as possible and sending the information to the listener in the best conceivable form, to prevent misunderstanding. Ergo, to promote successful communication, languages go through a series of various changes every day in every communication act. In that process, some languages are favored, depending on socio-economic factors, as indicators of one's social prestige or status, or in another words, some language varieties carry more weight than others in terms of social power indicated through linguistic behavior. The situation in the Indian linguistic environment, as in any other, is in that sense predictable (see Chapter 3).

The Indian subcontinent is a vast socio-linguistic environment in which speakers of many languages live. Some of those varieties are higher on the social ladder and those that are not, try to imbibe their features, through borrowing, code-mixing and code-switching. It happens so that many speakers of modern Indian languages mix into their speech elements from English for various historical as well as socio-economic reasons. Some of those reasons are related to India's colonial past and India's relation with Great Britain, and some of them relate to the global trend in recent decades, the one that has set the English language as a global language foremost due to the influence of the American economy and culture as well as Indian immigrants in the USA. The topic of this research is those elements, which are seen as transfer of linguistic features from

English to Hindi. Hindi is an Indian language which has been developed into a standardized variety for more than two centuries; suggested as a language capable of connecting Indian nationals of different ethnic and linguistic backgrounds for more than a century, and for over 60 years propagated as an official language of India at the level of the union. The English-Hindi interference is of a bilateral type. Just as Hindi has left its mark on English spoken in India, English has left its mark on Hindi as well. The transfer of Hindi, or more broadly Indian, linguistic features to English has been studied under different names from various perspectives: Indianized English, Indian English, Hinglish, Babu English etc.[1] Similarly, one also talks about Hingrezī, Anglicized or Englishized Hindi[2] to describe transfer of English linguistic features to Hindi, on which this particular research is focused. In my opinion, it would be good to avoid confusion with such names, as well as the qualitative or derogative marking that is connected with some of them. Hence, I propose in this work to refer to the first type as **transfer of Hindi linguistic features to English**, henceforth **HE interference**, and similarly to the second one as **transfer of English linguistic features to Hindi**, from now **EH interference**. The spoken Hindi with EH interference is henceforward referred to as **eH speech** and spoken English with HE interference can be referred to as **hE speech**.

The primary questions that the research is interested in concern the rising or falling direction of the EH interference within the limits of the analyzed period, its linguistic qualities as well as the socio-linguistic implications which spring from the analysis of speakers and their identity as indicated by categories such as gender, age, education etc. India's independence was declared on August 15th 1947, however research is focused on the processes and results of EH interference in the period 1950-2010. The year 1950 was chosen as the opening year of the analysis since India's constitution came into force on January 26th 1950. On one side, since this research is also focused on socio-linguistic aspects of EH interference, the year 1950 seemed to be a good place to start looking into connections between interference as a natural outcome of any language contact and language policy as an organized and planned linguistic behavior supported and implemented by law and state institutions. On the other side, the year 2010 was chosen to be the ending year of

---

[1] See Hosali (1997, 2000), Kachru (1983 and later), Khubchandani (1969 and later), Prasad (2011), Sailaja (2009) and others.
[2] See Verma 1991, Kachru 1989, 1995, 2006, Borowiak 2007, 2012, etc.

the analysis as the year closest to the starting moment of the research (2012). As such, the year 2010 offers results that can be more or less understood as relevant for the contemporary situation. The scope of 60 years should also offer relevant results from both linguistic and socio-linguistic aspects.

As it would be a difficult task to follow EH interference in various types of discourse in standardized variety, the focus of research has been limited to the **political discourse** in India. Political discourse was chosen as a relevant type of discourse in the sense that it gets a lot of media attention and whenever media reports on politics, the language of political discourse filters in as well. Thus, it reaches an average language speaker very often and any language speaker is, in that sense, exposed to its influence, just as any language speaker today is exposed to the influence of language used in advertisements, news, magazines, internet, etc. Since it would be a time-consuming and probably impossible project to conduct research on the entirety of political discourse in India, this research has been narrowed down, having in mind certain prerequisites:

1) a bilingual environment that is controlled to an extent,

2) the availability of the material for the period 1950-2010,

3) a larger number of speakers of various backgrounds,

4) the opportunity to undertake a socio-linguistic analysis of data.

In the end, the institution that met all of the above prerequisites, and was as well relevant to a wider audience, was the central Parliament of India. Thus, the political debates of the Parliament had been chosen as a relevant material. The decision can be supported with following arguments:

1) Parliament is India's central political body and as such has members from every constituency within the Republic of India in its lower house, Lok Sabha,[3]

2) members of the Parliament (MPs) belong to different religious, educational, socio-economic, etc. backgrounds,

3) the availability of socio-linguistic data on MPs,

4) law regulates the use of languages in discussions and bills,

5) the predominant languages employed in the Parliament are English and Hindi,

---

[3]Representatives in the lower house, Lok Sabha, are elected on a first-past-the-post basis by single-member constituencies. The representatives in Rajya Sabha, the upper house, are elected by proportional representation from state assemblies. (Hewit & Rai 2010: 28).

6) the constancy of environmental premises does not depend on a researcher.

The language behavior as exhibited by Parliamentary members is interesting for several reasons. Firstly, because of the particular position English has in India, the position that Indian government gave to it and which the Parliament itself maintains. Article 120 of the Indian Constitution empowered the Parliament to switch from bilingual English-Hindi mode to monolingual Hindi mode after the first fifteen years from the commencement of the Constitution, which is to say in 1965.[4] That, however, had not happened for various socio-political reasons (see Chapter 2). Moreover, the position of English as a communication tool *par excellence* has been fixed since then with several amendments that guarantee its position, until all states and union territories of India reach a unanimous decision for an alternative parliamentary language. Here it is important to state that MPs act as active public figures. Since they are public figures, one often hears about them in media holding speeches or participating in public debates. Their language behavior is thus highly visible and correlated with non-linguistic features such as their age, gender, educational qualifications, economic situation, etc. As India is a multilingual country, MPs bring different linguistic varieties into the public space, and the way they manage their language behavior, whether it is Hindi, Bengali or any other, matters greatly as a sign of socially acceptable and desirable language behavior. Hindi speakers in Lok Sabha represent potential source of wide socio-linguistic influence not merely as contributors of political ideas but also as representatives of the particular language behavior. Due to their visibility in public space, their communication techniques as well as variations in their language behavior become potential source of language changes as their speech patterns can influence an average Hindi/modern Indian language speaker. If the language behavior does indeed follow the logic of a sieve, it would mean that EH interference finds its way to average Hindi speakers through media, along with other sources, and in that case Hindi speaking MPs and their language behavior can influence speech patterns more widely.

The Parliament is also interesting for this type of research since it is not just a bilingual space but also a multilingual one; the special provision of the Constitution in Article 120.1 allows the

---

[4] The article 120.2. reads as follows: "Unless Parliament by law otherwise provides, this article shall, after the expiration of a period of fifteen years from the commencement of this Constitution, have effect as if the words "or in English" were omitted therefrom."
Retrieved from: http://lawmin.nic.in/olwing/coi/coi-english/Const.Pock%202Pg.Rom8Fsss%289%29.pdf

use of any other Indian language by all those who are not comfortable with Hindi or English. In light of this, it is important to take into consideration the presence of translators in the Parliament, particularly those for Hindi and English, as they offer **simultaneous translation** at any given moment throughout the debate session. Further, the Parliament is a valuable source for such research as all communication rules (prohibited or allowed language behavior, turns in speaking, etc.) are not disturbed by the presence of a scholar interested in language behavior. Such **constancy of environmental premises** makes the Parliament similar to the controlled environment of a socio-linguistic experiment. The important difference between an experiment and Parliament lies in the fact that the premises of the parliamentary environment are controlled on its own, in other words, they are constant and their imposition does not depend on a researcher. Contrary to that, in an experiment, such as the interview, the researcher creates the environment that he/she first observes and then 'blends with' so he/she would become invisible in it as a new element. In several studies, it is possible to see, however, that the presence of a researcher restructures the environment, as the interviewees feel uncomfortable or awkward before resuming 'normal' behavior. The question that springs up from there is how to judge the normality of one's behavior in such cases as the presence of any new 'player' in the communication scenario, whether the person is a researcher or not, always changes the rules of communication even after acceptance of someone as a new member in it. The availability of an environment such as Parliament, where the immediate presence of a researcher is not necessary and, more importantly, where the speaker does not suspect that his/her words will be used as a primary material for linguistic research, should be seen as a great asset and advantage for socio-linguistic studies.

Another great advantage of taking up parliamentary political debates as a research material is the availability of reliable data for the intended research period, 1950-2010. As primarily **oral documents**, these documents were always aimed at the immediate audience present in the Lok Sabha. In this research, however, the written transcripts of these oral debates have been consulted for the analysis; these written transcripts are here synonymous with an **oral** mode of a language and not with the language's **written** standardized variety found in legal documents, newspapers, textbooks, or scientific texts, as the purpose of the notation is solely to preserve the spoken word. The second type of materials that are present in Lok Sabha are written documents i.e. written

speeches that were presented in Lok Sabha as written speeches and included in the archives as segment of raw material for a particular Lok Sabha session. Such documents were also included in the analysis, as the principle goal of the study is EH interference in general. The material in the Lok Sabha was abundant, and the reason for this is simple: the material is preserved in the archive of the Parliament's library.[5]

How have those texts been preserved and used in the research? The procedure of preserving parliamentary debates in India consists of typing speeches during Parliament's sessions. After that, the text undergoes corrector's checking for spelling mistakes, minor changes in the word order if necessary and the pagination. In that form, the unpublished version serves as the base of published proceedings. It is kept safely in the Parliament's library and can be consulted upon request. The parliament publishes the proceedings regularly and makes them available to parliamentary members as primary readers as well as to any interested individuals.[6] From the 1950 to the early 1980s, published proceedings were bilingual because speeches were published in the language(s) they were given. Thus, English, Hindi and Urdu were used for the publication of proceedings in a single edition.[7] In those editions, each Hindi and Urdu speech was followed by an English translation as a convenience for the majority of Lok Sabha members, who addressed the Parliament in English.[8] With the advent of the 1980s, the practice was changed; monolingual English and monolingual Hindi proceedings started coming out as separate editions. It other words, English speeches and speeches in other languages appear in Hindi translation for Hindi edition of the proceedings. Vice versa, Hindi speeches and those in other languages are present in English translation in the English edition of the same proceedings. Such practice, started in 1980s, continues until today.[9]

---

[5] For the same reason I believe there are written materials lying available in various archives, noted down as close as possible to the spoken word, waiting for linguists and other scholars to make use of them. An example would be the testimonies given by witnesses in court sessions. Personal letters, e-mails, diaries or telephone messages are another big treasure that should be analyzed.

[6] I have found proceedings in three public libraries. One can buy the proceedings at the Parliament's bookstand. Nowadays, with the introduction of Parliament's website, they can also be found in the online archive on the Lok Sabha's website: http://loksabha.nic.in/.

[7] Speeches in other languages were then and still are now published in translation, and are available for consulting in English and/or Hindi.

[8] In those proceedings, English speeches were not accompanied with Hindi or Urdu translation.

[9] Note that Urdu has disappeared as a relevant language from published proceedings.

Since the research is concentrated on the EH interference, it was important to read unpublished proceedings in order to learn about speaker's language behavior. My first approach was to consult unpublished proceedings for the entire period 1950-2010. However, I have discovered that it was not always possible, partially because of the strict rules of admission that Parliament's Library enacts. However, once I was able to compare published proceedings to the unpublished copies, I realized that the redactor's hand mostly touched upon spelling, which was not pertinent for this research, but also upon word order, which was. The later corrections were, on the other hand, rare and not of great importance for the topic as they were done in English speeches generally. Thus, I comfortably made use of published proceedings for the period 1950-1980, as in those proceedings speeches were published in original language. For the period 1980 to 2004 my sources were unpublished proceedings to which I had gained access for a short period in the Parliament Library. For the period after 2004, the unpublished proceedings were available on the Parliament's website (www.loksabha.nic.in). To test the degree of correspondence between the written and spoken versions in general, I transcribed several excerpts of the debates myself (see Appendix 1.1.). All of them correspond with the written formats found either in the Parliament's Library or on the Parliament's website.

As already mentioned, the principle goal of this research is to enrich the canon of socio-linguistic studies on Hindi with EH interference as its focus. The research has two intertwined subsections. The primarily sought information in this research is the linguistic quality of EH interference in its various modalities: lexical borrowing, grammatical borrowing, code-mixing and code-switching. The analysis focuses on the interference's direction in the period 1950-2010, its stability, and its characteristics. The second focus of the analysis is to better understand relevant social factors that influence it – who are the speakers in whose speech the EH interference appears, where do they come from and what the statistical analysis says about an average Hindi speaker in the Parliament. In the final pages (Chapter 6), reader will come across author's attempt to interpret all the data found in the study taking into consideration language policy, standardization of Hindi and particular socio-linguistic environment. That kind of interpretation is important since it gives an interesting perspective toward the compatibility of language behavior exhibited in Lok Sabha debates with officially pursued language policy and questions that are yet to be tackled.

In order to contextualize analyzed data fairly, first, an introduction to Indian multilingualism is given from the linguistic, historical, and socio-linguistic point of view in Chapter 3.[10] The critical analysis consists of linguistic (Chapter 4) and socio-linguistic analysis (Chapter 5) of material gathered from the parliamentary debates for the period 1950-2010. Additionally the Constitutional debates (1946-1949) were also taken into consideration to contextualize the language behavior in the first analyzed year of 1950 (see Appendix 3.1.). Those extra years, outside of the frame, should provide sufficient information on the effect that the formation of the Republic of India as an independent political entity had on Parliamentary representatives' use of language in one of the highest national political bodies. The analysis aims at the description of qualitative differences in the occurrences of EH interference; while the quantitative analysis is mostly employed in the second part of the research topic as to give a socio-linguistic overview of speakers and their non-linguistic features.

The data is further divided into two sub-periods to analyze two aspects of EH interference. In the first sub-period 1950-1995, with the additional four years (1946-1949), every fifth year is taken into account. It is important here to mention that every tenth year (1950, 1960, etc.) represents the primary material, whereas material collected for the 1955, 1965 etc. serves as the control point for the conclusions drawn from the primary data. In the second sub-period (2000-2010), material from each year was analyzed as primary data. The collected material was randomly chosen for any of the months during which Parliament was in session, and approximately 1000 pages of written material for each month in concern was checked (see Appendix 1.2.) for years that fall in to primary material and approximately 500 pages of written material for each month in concern for years that fall in to control material were checked. The subdivision of material should help determine differences in the EH interference when it is measured a) in longer time lapses, separated by a decade, as compared to b) the data collected for consecutive years, spanning shorter time lapses. In the thesis, those differences are referred to as **macro** and **micro changes** respectively. The decision to use the year 1995 as the cleavage point between the two sub-periods is based on the politico-economic changes in India in 1990s, on one hand, and on the method of analyzing data from even number of months in each sub-period, on the other. The chosen frame of research should offer a better diachronic perspective at the

---

[10] See also Appendix 2.1.

movement and tendency of EH interference in the period of 60 years, from 1950 to 2010. Observation from everyday experience of the researcher suggests that the tendency of EH interference for the said period has to be marked as an occurrence on the rise. The research will try to gain a deeper understanding of it and how it is related to any socio-linguistic factors.

The second part of the analysis is concentrated on analyzing information on parliamentary members who have exhibited particular linguistic features in their speech (Chapter 5). It is important to remember a few points here:

1) the situation (i.e., Parliament) remains the same and the speakers and their non-linguistic features change,

2) although the environment is bi/multilingual, not every participant in the communication is bi/multilingual,

3) the stability of the situation, fluctuation of time, and the corresponding social factors are the ones that make this study interesting.

The methods, which socio-linguistics employs in its fieldwork and research to gather information on one's speech, were the starting point in the process of material collection. Such fieldwork leans heavily on interviews and questionnaires of various types. Further, those methods rely on interviewer's presence or that of his/her assistants to collect the material from the speakers and to note it down at that very moment or record it on a device (Filipović 1986, Gumperz 1971a, Haugen 1950, 1956, Labov 1991, Poplack 1980, Trudgill 2000, Weinreich 1968, etc.). Speakers gave the gathered non-linguistic information voluntarily at the moment of activation of their membership in the Parliament. The members were given a frame (see Appendix 4.1.) according to which they supplied the following information: name, political affiliation, birthplace, educational qualifications, occupation and hobbies, addresses, etc. The information on speakers was treated statistically, following the work of Rodriguez and Shankar (2011) in their study on changing social composition of the Parliament. Their primary sources for statistical analysis was data collected by the Parliament itself as well as other institutes, such as Center for the Study of Developing Societies (CSDS). Their study, as well as all statistical data on socio-economic characteristics, reflects the situation in Parliament generally and has primarily been used as a model in the analysis undertaken in this research. The information on Parliament's composition in connection to socio-economic and political events of wider scope has been very useful and it is

employed in this study as well. The data was collected for Hindi speakers with elements of EH interference and for those whose speech patterns had been marked as EH 0 type to signify Hindi pattern in which no visible elements of English interference were found.[11] Thus, attained data is presented in several manners, in tables, graphs and maps. The data in tables and graphs shows the relative percentages of speakers with particular characteristics (age, gender, etc.). Maps show which part of India particular speakers present as members of Lok Sabha and at the same time their specific EH type. In that manner, it is possible to look for geographical distribution of particular speech patterns.

In Chapter 6, author summarizes results of the analysis and reviews them from the perspective of language policy and the broader socio-linguistic environment found in contemporary India. The features taken into consideration at that point are:

1) the multilingual nature of India,[12]
2) language policy on Hindi as a pan-Indian official language,[13]
3) language practices as can be observed in government documents,
4) historically attested linguistic and socio-linguistic changes in India.[14]

Within the multilingual sphere of the Indian subcontinent, one has to bear in mind the prestige-based perception of linguistic varieties that speakers carry with themselves into each communication act and through which the social hierarchy is re-established and re-confirmed. The socio-linguistic characteristics of contemporary Indian multilingualism, and of EH interference as well, according to some scholars, have their roots in the history of language behavior in the Indian subcontinent.[15] Thus, the question is whether the prestige associated with the **eH speech** opposes the active use of either monolingual Hindi or English and to inspect

---

[11] See Chapter 4 for broader definition of EH type categories in the study.

[12] In such multilingual environments, the language interference as a process and as an outcome is a part of every-day experience for many speakers. That context should be kept in mind when one draws conclusions on EH interference, eH speech and speakers.

[13] Language policy concerning Hindi is important because it had designed the spread of Sanskritized Hindi as an official language on the pan-Indian level of administration, media, etc. but in practice the proposal was not implemented as expected.

[14] The historical background provides the base necessary for the understanding of language behavior in contemporary India.

[15] See Chapter 3 and Appendix 2.2. and 2.3.

whether the prestige linked with it can indeed be correlated with the prestigious statuses of previous, historically confirmed language behaviors.

The cornerstones for such a contrastive analysis are already several assumptions of socio-linguistic studies:

1) the speaker uses language to build his or her 'public face', that is, as a symbol of identity, solidarity, and power,[16]

2) the speaker exhibits communicative competence to achieve his/her goal,[17]

3) language behavior is always purposeful.[18]

The question is to what extent the language behavior exhibited in parliamentary debates will be in consensus/contradiction with existing language policy. The results will be analyzed in the light of Trudgill's notion (1974 and later) of **'overt'** and **'covert' prestige** that linguistic varieties carry as a result of contradicting values attached to them by members of society. In this research, the differentiation between overt and covert prestige helps resolve the question of implemented bilingual code, such as eH in the environment which allows the use of a monolingual mode as per the speaker's choice.

To summarize the main points of the research, the analysis is undertaken to show the following aspects of EH interference:

1) the diachronic perspective of EH interference in the period 1950-2010,

2) on which levels, from phrase level to sentence level, EH interference occurs,

3) socio-linguistic characteristics of Hindi speakers with EH elements in the Parliament,

4) whether the EH interference visible in the Parliament is a part of larger trend,

5) whether the trend corresponds with official language policy and historically accepted and attested language behavior which includes the balance of socio-linguistic prestige.

Such implications leave plenty of space and questions for other scholars, not just on English-Hindi language contact and interference, but on any pair of languages on the Indian subcontinent,

---

[16]Trudgill (1983) discovered that British musicians often adopt pseudo-American accent in their songs although their audience is British. Rampton (1995) has come across the 'stylized Asian English', a variety that nobody speaks, but which teenage Punjabis adopt nevertheless as an identity marker.

[17]The term emphasizes speaker's competence to choose and apply the appropriate linguistic code to achieve a goal (Hymes 1974).

[18]The speaker has a goal that he/she tries to achieve using particular language behavior.

their contact and interference, particularly if one member of the said pair is English. In that sense, the research hopes to contribute to the field of Indian socio-linguistics, or at least to instigate a new wave of research in the field.

Chapter 2:

Language contact and socio-linguistic environment

2.1. Language contact and linguistic environment

Misunderstandings are always part of a communication process, no matter the effort that the participants invest in it to avoid them. To attain that optimality in communication, the speakers try to develop different strategies to ensure the continuation of communication in spite of obstacles. One such strategy is to bring languages closer and find a common ground. We can easily imagine, for example, a situation in which a person, a buyer, whose first language is A, tries to buy an item from a shopkeeper, whose first language is B, and neither of them knows a word of the other person's language variety.[19] What can they do? A buyer likes the item and wants to buy it, and a shopkeeper wants to sell it and make a little bit of profit. There are few solutions: 1) both of them know well or to some extent the third language C and can communicate in it, 2) a shopkeeper or a buyer will ask somebody to help them communicate in either language A or B, or 3) they will negotiate using all the skills that each of them has in their own repertoire, including body language, wit and vague awareness of existence of some words that the other side might understand. In the end, it is very likely that the buyer will go out of the shop with the newly acquired item and the shopkeeper will earn some money. If they choose the third option and continue meeting regularly, over a time they will develop a successful language code for interaction that can even become useful in communication with others in similar situations. It could very well start to include other situations and expand itself into a largely accepted and used variety.

Situations like the one described above occur frequently and can influence the occurrence of novel language codes as a result of interferences of several distinct language systems, pidgins and

---

[19] Language variety is employed throughout the thesis as a synonym for language, irrespective of the variety's social status as a dialect, official language etc.

creoles for example, or simply influence the shift within languages in contact without creating a third linguistic entity. Other non-linguistic factors such as politics, economy or power alignment have their share of influence in such formations as well. To put it very simply – languages change for these and other reasons.

With the 19th century, linguists discovered genetic affiliation between languages and at the same time became aware that not all changes, similarities, and differences in languages could be explained through the existence of such affiliations. The early discussions on linguistic borrowing and language contact, based on the metaphor of mix, mixture, and mixing, resonate with opposite views on the nature of language and its possibility to be 'mixed' as can be seen in Müller (*"Es gibt keine Mischsprache!"*, 1871)[20] or Schuchardt (*"Es gibt keine ungemischte Sprache!"*, 1884).[21] Those discussions gave birth to the new academic discipline known as linguistics of language contact or contact linguistics, a segment of a larger field of socio-linguistics; as such, the field of contact linguistics has been exploring various aspects of processes and results that ensue from language contact for over a century. Questions such as the extent of bilingualism, its definition, loss of language skills, or acquisition of a language have been raised and have led to new insights into languages as tools of communication.[22]

One of the important topics in contact linguistics until today is the question of separated or merged language systems in every bilingual or multilingual speaker, i.e. the question of linguistic interference. The term was coined by the Prague school of linguistics (cca. 1928 to cca. 1939) and popularized among American linguists by Weinreich. Over the decades its definitions have gone through a process of mutation. Thus, Haugen (1956) thought of it as the "overlapping of two languages." Weinreich (1968)[23] summarized it as "those instances of deviation from the norms of either language which occur in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language" and Mackey (1968) referred to it as "the use of features belonging to one language while speaking or writing another." In the early 1970s, studies on second language acquisition (SLA) introduced the new term 'inter-language' (Selinker 1972, Schumann 1974) in

---

[20] Haugen, 1956, Filipović, 1986.

[21] Ibid.

[22] Socio-linguistics cooperates with other linguistic sub-disciplines, such as psycho-linguistics, areal linguistics, diachronic linguistics, etc. The historical beginnings of contact linguistics as a discipline can be found outlined in Földes (2010), Filipović (1986), Hudson (2011), Trudgill (2000) and others.

[23] Cited by Filipović (1986) and Grosjean (2011).

order to avoid connotation of corrupt, error-ridden speech of a bilingual speaker that some thought was implied by the term 'interference'. Beardsmore (1982), similarly to Mackey, defines interference as the "observable features of one code used within the context of the other." From there we can assume that 'linguistic interference' can be understood as an umbrella-term for various linguistic processes and results of language contact, from lexical and grammatical borrowing to convergence and code-switching.

In this thesis, interference is understood in its older meaning as an umbrella-term for processes and results of language contact. The reason for it is very transparent as the research aims to analyze the general results and processes of English impact in collected Hindi data. From the perspective of the newest research in contact linguistics, those results and processes are heterogeneous and exhibit *differentia specifica*, none-the-less, all of them have a root in an assumed situation of language contact. The language contact as a base of any linguistic interference is taken to be a strong enough reason to outline every aspect of the process and results as the continuum of the one and same phenomenon. In recent studies, however, linguistic interference is referred to in a somewhat different light. According to Grosjean (2011), the development of studies on contact phenomena has pointed out the overwhelming broadness of the early definitions and therefore their impracticality for a finer, further description of the same phenomena. Grosjean (2011) thus excludes code-switching, code-mixing, and borrowing from its definition and sees linguistic interference as a separate product and process of language contact. Moreover, he distinguishes two types of interference as he understands it: the static interference and the dynamic interference. The first type refers to permanent traces of Language 1 (L1) on Language 2 (L2) that occur due to person's competence in L2, as for example a 'foreign' accent or constant misuse of certain syntactic structures. Dynamic interferences, on the other hand, are defined by Grosjean as accidental slips, a momentary 'trespassing' from one code into another. Further on, he suggests keeping the term interference only for the second, dynamic type, while the first type could be referred to as linguistic transfer. A similar distinction between constant and momentary types of interference can be found in Paradis (1993),[24] who named them as a) "competence interference" and b) "interference due to performance errors." Although the newer studies are interesting in their own right, this research, however, is aimed at the socio-linguistic

---

[24] As in Grosjean (2011).

aspect of EH interference that happens in an environment that allows the use of monolingual code, be it English or Hindi, the accidental nature of interference is not taken into account.[25]

For the interference to occur, as already stated, languages need not be in a genetic affiliation; although the closer the affiliation is the greater the chances of breaking 'smaller', 'less visible' rules are as speakers count on the 'backup' from the rules belonging to the system(s) best known to them (first language, mother tongue, etc.). Depending on the extent, nature, and medium of contact, the interference can result in unilateral or bilateral exchange of linguistic features.[26] On this, most scholars agree. On the other hand, many scholars disagree on the sources of linguistic interference that should, next to processes and results of the linguistic interference, constitute a legitimate object of study of contact linguistics. On the one side, it is suggested that the contact and interference occur in the individual speaker (Emeneau 1980, Weinreich 1968, etc.).[27] Thus, the individual speaker, the one who borrows from one language into another when occasions arise, becomes the 'object' that contact linguistics should consider in its analysis. However, some scholars look at it from an altogether different angle (as in Sankoff 2001), claiming that the individual speaker as a source of linguistic interference is of great importance for the studies on second language acquisition but not for socio-linguistics. According to them, socio-linguistics in general, and from it contact linguistics, should be focused on language contact as a historical phenomenon produced by a speech community (Ferguson and Gumperz 1960, Gumperz 1968) under the influence of social forces. Therefore, the group of speakers known as the 'speech community' should be the object of study when language contact is discussed.

The empirical results from field studies seem to confirm both hypotheses. If one analyzes the contact situation from the opening example, it includes two individuals in the communication act. The interference that springs up from it does indeed belong to an individual speaker, but the second person is necessary for the contact to take place. Therefore, the minimal requirement for language contact would be two interacting participants in a communication act. Only then and

---

[25] In all of the data, I analyzed, only one speaker I came across gave the impression of accidental slips from one code into another, due to his lesser competence in Hindi. All other speakers presented their speeches in a confident manner. Yet, since it is impossible to tell without a questionnaire whether the interference was accidental or not, this aspect of interference is not taken into analysis in this thesis.

[26] Filipović thus distinguishes the direct and indirect nature of interference to separate the sources of loanwords in his analysis of English loanwords in Serbo-Croatian. Interference can also be of a small or large range, passed on through speech or through media products.

[27] According to Földes (2010).

there can linguistic interference occur in at least one of the participants. Nevertheless, the produced innovations die out unless the group, that is the speech community, accepts them and works on their stabilization. Thus, it can be said that the linguistic interference appears when an individual speaker innovates and the speech community acknowledges those innovations.

According to Filipović (1986), innovations appear 1) if and when the speaker cannot separate two distinct language codes, 2) when a new unnamed product or technology appears in the sphere of speakers of a certain language variety, or 3) when the speaker wants to beautify his or her speech with fashionable phrases that can be recognized and categorized as elements of another language of prestige by others in the speech community. That the speech community has the role of acknowledger, the one who legitimizes the innovation, can be seen again in Filipović. He, like many others, defines the linguistic interference as a deviation from the norms of a language as experienced by speakers. The speakers and the speech community can be perceived as a dynamic fluctuating environment into which individual speakers bring elements from other linguistic environments that are then recognized as 'friendly' and 'desirable' or their opposites and treated as such. A bilingual or multilingual speaker, thus, juggles with the rules of various environments that he or she belongs to, striving to employ correct rules that will reap optimal results. Depending on the environmental background of other participants, the speaker is more or less successful, which can be measured by the amount of confusion and incomprehension that his or her speech produces in listeners. One should keep in mind that the recognition of those rules and successfulness in their employment is, however, not fixed but changeable.

From everything said so far, it is clear that a suitable environment is needed for the linguistic interference to spring as a process or to take root as a result. For that reason, in this thesis linguistic interference is understood as an altered use of language from a monolingual mode, the one that occurs in the bilingual or multilingual environment. The distinction of monolingual and bilingual or multilingual modes is borrowed from Grosjean (2011) who defines the latter one as a deviation or a regress from established rules of the monolingual system that governs a communication between at least two speakers that belong to the same language variety. Although linguistic interference occurs in the monolingual mode, such as when speakers employ different varieties of monolingual code, Grosjean puts it thusly: the person who is at least bilingual uses various language modes that can be associated with different points of a monolingual-bilingual

continuum, depending on the compatibility of modes of all participants in the communication act. The differentiation of modes helps us define linguistic interference as an umbrella-term for any linguistic variation that occurs in a multilingual (including bilingual) environment.

The changes on the 'body' of one or several languages are deeply influenced by the organizational model of a multilingual space. Thus linguistic hierarchy and socio-linguistic equality, reflected in social attitudes towards various language varieties present in the community or communities, influence processes and results of linguistic interference, creating a particular socio-linguistic environment. In that sense, speakers of a particular language variety can exercise greater influence on speakers of other varieties than vice versa, since they can maneuver a greater portion of social space to elevate their languages as the more important communication tools, and to subsume the others. From there it is possible to conclude that the results and processes of linguistic interference will differ from environment to environment, as the relations established within certain multilingual environments will be dissimilar to others. Those relations are, as socio-linguistics shows, grounded on mostly non-linguistically controlled forces, such as economic or other types of prestige, identity markers, explicit or implicit language policies, etc.; all of which merge into one entity surrounding the language in a process of crafting that language into a communication tool for a particular speech community. The importance of historical forces and non-linguistic factors for the outcomes of language contact have been emphasized by Thomason and Kaufman (1988), whose line of argument stipulates that under the right amount and combination of social pressure anything can happen to the language internally. Thus, when linguistic interference occurs, the results can be felt from a level of sub-word features, such as those of phonology or grammar, to the level of lexicon, on which it is usually more easily noticeable. On the level of syntax, the outcomes can take the shape of code mixing and code switching and can appear as slight alternations in syntactic frames.[28] It is important to remember that such changes can happen not only within one or two languages in contact. Moreover, they

---

[28] A good example from the Indian subcontinent would be the emergence of SOV order in English when spoken by some Indian speakers, as a result of the SOV order in other languages that they employ more frequently. Annamalai (2001: 180) also speaks of English syntactic influences found in modern Tamil, both in the spoken and written varieties.

can be spread, as evidence suggests, throughout larger multilingual environments known as a linguistic area.[29]

To summarize briefly, a number of factors that can be divided into two subgroups governs the characteristics of a linguistic environment: 1) linguistic factors and 2) non-linguistic factors. Out of their interactions, grow specific characteristics of each socio-linguistic environment, regardless of it being a monolingual, a bilingual, or a multilingual environment.

2.2. The processes and results of linguistic interference

Interference can be discussed as an occurrence that happens due to language contact which involves not just the participation of very different linguistic varieties but also very different conditions within which the initial contact and thereafter interference takes place. We can conclude that the results and outcomes may be very divergent as well. To summarize some of the plausible results and conditions, interference can connote language contact between:

1) different registers of singular language variety (ex. between dialects of Hindi or between formal and less formal stylistic registers of standardized Hindi),

2) different language varieties of a region that are in direct contact (between Tamil, Telugu and Kannada in southern India or between Hindi, Bengali and Gujarati in northern India),

3) different language varieties spoken in the same larger geographical area, which are not always in direct contact (Indian linguistic area),

4) several language varieties of a particular region and languages(s) which do not necessarily coexist in the same geographical region but are considered important (French/English and African languages, Portuguese and Indian languages or English and Indian languages).

Furthermore, according to the nature of contact, the interference can be classified as unidirectional or bidirectional, as well as direct or indirect, as Filipović (1986) has shown in his study on English influence on Serbo-Croatian. If the contact and interference are unidirectional, the roles given to languages can be identified as the one of exclusive donor language (DL) and

---

[29] See Emeneau (1956), Masica (1976), Kuiper (1968), etc.

the other as exclusive receiver language (RL). In the bidirectional interference those roles are interchangeable, that is to say that one language is at the same time donor and receiver (DRL).

The extensively debated Indian English (Hosali 2008, Sedlatschek 2009, etc.), thus, becomes just a fragment of a more elaborate picture governed by plurality of languages. All of those languages have participated in language contact as DL, RL or DLRs: Indian Englishes, Hindis, Tamils, Bengalis, etc., all of which modify their features in new surroundings, keeping old names and thus participating actively in language interference and language change. Thus, the linguistic entity known as Hindi or English in reality includes a number of various features (phonology, lexis, syntax, etc.) relevant in particular territories where speakers whose language habits have been formed by other linguistic entities speak those varieties.[30] Filipović further discussed that for the interference to occur, languages need not be in direct contact as the social position of particular linguistic varieties such as English or French today, Latin or Persian in earlier times, allows them to establish and exercise language contact as prestigious socio-linguistic varieties.[31]

It has already been stated that linguistic interference can be understood as an umbrella-term for various linguistic processes and results of language contact, from lexical and grammatical borrowing to convergence and code-switching. Borrowing has been widely studied and the theoretical and field oriented work is abundant. Newer studies have criticized the connotation of 'ownership' in the term 'borrowing'. They underline the dynamic character of the process that consists of exchangeable structures or word-forms between what we perceive to be two different and separate linguistic identities, irrespective of their status as dialects or languages. Thus Johanson (2002) refers to it as 'copying', while Matras (2009) prefers the term 'replication' to underline what he considers the most important aspect of code-mixing/code-switching – achievement of a communicative goal. Regardless of names given to the phenomenon, all linguists seem to agree that borrowing or code-mixing or copying can affect all language levels from phonology to syntax. Studies thus have attempted, among other things, to determine the frequency of the particular interfered linguistic material in the discourse, hoping that such hierarchy would reveal the underlying rules on the material languages mostly borrow (nouns,

---

[30] Abbi and Sharma (2014) show how Tibeto-Burman system and Austroasiatic system influence Hindi in Arunachal Pradesh and Meghalaya.

[31] The social aspect of such socio-linguistic situation on the Indian subcontinent will be discussed in Chapter 3.

adjectives, etc.). Most of the research, but not all, (Haugen 1950, Moravcsik 1978, Muysken 1981, Thomason & Kaufman 1988, Matras 2007, etc.) agree on the following order:

nouns> verbs> adjectives> adverbs, preposition, interjections

which according to Whitney (1881) as in Muysken and van Hout (1994) can be abstracted as

nouns> other parts of speech> suffixes > inflection > sounds.

However, as Matras (2009) and others point out not every case study confirms the above hierarchy. Singh's (1981) study on English elements in Hindi found a higher frequency for adjectives than for verbs, demonstrating the following order:

nouns> adjectives> verbs> prepositions.[32]

The frequencies and hierarchies have led some researchers to suggest the existence of constraints in interference; yet according to Matras (2009: 221), one should be cautious with generalizations on such constraints, as available examples show that speakers' desire to incorporate an element from another language can be a stronger condition than the structural compatibility. Hence, a willing speaker can disregard any typological incompatibilities if the communicative goal justifies in his/her eyes every tool available to achieve it.

The research on borrowing also includes differentiations such as content borrowing and pattern borrowing[33] (Matras and Sakel 2007, Haugen 1950), direct and indirect borrowing (Filipović 1986) and levels of integration of borrowed material (Filipović 1986, Poplack 1980). The studies describe: a) zero integration, b) compromise integration and c) complete integration of lexemes. The lexical analysis also tends to separate cultural loans for new cultural concepts and technological innovations that the language system adopts from the core forms where borrowed lexemes already have equivalents in the language system (Myers-Scotton 1993). Such research can help us analyze the process of rejection/accepting of new elements in other environments and it can be useful for a socio-linguistic analysis. Theories on borrowing have also raised questions of stability of particular interference types, strategies of language processing, interference of substratum and suprastratum, etc.

---

[32] As in Muysken and Hout 1994: 41.
[33] As extreme cases of pattern borrowing, linguistic areas demonstrate that the process can encompass many languages at the same time to develop similar grammatical traits.

Study of language contact also includes study of code-switching and code-mixing for which plenty of definitions, slightly different from one another, exists. The terminological confusion in the field is something that causes more damage than good for the interested researcher and reader. Trying to define the phenomenon, some researchers (Fishman 1965, Gumperz 1982, Hudson 2011, etc.) place more importance on whether the change of code coincides with the switch of a communicative situation from one language variety to another (code-switching) or whether it happens within one and same communicative situation (code-mixing). Another group of scholars emphasizes that both terms refer to bilingual communication strategies. Code-switching then is described as an alternative use of two languages in a phrase or utterance, simply the transfer of non-integrated elements or rules pertaining to language A into language B, the base language (Wei and Auer 2007: 512). Some scholars (Kachru 1978b, Muysken 2000) make a distinction whether the 'mixing' happens between different utterances (code-switching) or within one utterance or sentence (code-mixing). A third group uses both terms interchangeably, avoiding taking sides in the absence of a consensus (Matras 2009). Auer (1995) has suggested the use of a hyperonym, 'code-alternation', to include both code-switching and transfer. He defines it

> "as a relationship of contiguous juxtaposition of semiotic-systems, such that the appropriate recipients of the resulting complex sign are in a position to interpret this juxtaposition as such" (Auer 1995: 124).

The fourth group of scholars implements the term code-mixing as a cover term for various types of phenomena that refer to language contact and language mixing. Regardless of the range applied to its definition, code-switching is in many bilingual or multilingual communities a very common technique which enables its practitioners/users to achieve the ultimate goal of any communication act – effectiveness of a transmitted message within numerous contexts and occasions (Fishman 1965, Heller 1995, etc.).

Having in mind that bilingual and multilingual speakers have a choice of languages that they can employ in every communication act, researchers have been keen to observe the regularities that govern speakers' choices as well as the manner in which mixed linguistic outputs are formed. For that purpose, more than several theories have been proposed to describe the functioning of code-switching from various perspectives: free morpheme constraint (Poplack 1980), equivalence constraint (Pfaff 1979, Poplack 1980), matrix language frame (Myers-Scotton 1993 and later), relevance of grammatical categories, and word class membership in code-switching (Muysken

2000). Whereas some researchers approached the study of code-switching from a statisticians' point of view and investigated the relevance of reoccurring structure types in code-switched material in order to determine constraints, others have tried to classify conversational loci in which code-switching occurs often, such as reported speech, reiteration, topic shift, parentheses, etc. Auer (1995: 127) finds this problematic, though, as categories are often not clearly defined or no analysis of the examples is attempted. Instead, Auer has proposed the implementation of a contextualization theory developed by Gumperz for the analysis of code-switching in order to focus on layers of discourse (addressee, inclusion or exclusion of bystanders, etc.). His input prompted others to study the embedded nature of code-switching in the discourse and follow its role and behavior in the wider environment.[34] It has been shown by several studies (Grosjean 2001, Auer 1999, etc.) that code-switching in certain communities is a default strategy in conversation or an unmarked choice of a discourse (Myers-Scotton 1993 and later).[35]

Another type of research revolves around code-switching and borrowing as a type of behavioral continuum rather than two distinct types of linguistic behavior (Matras 2009: 110-114). The idea of a continuum is in its essence opposed to studies dedicated to research on factors that differentiate code-switching or code-mixing from borrowing, particularly when it comes to single-worded switches or mixes (Poplack, Sankoff and Miller 1988, Myers-Scotton 1993 and later). Matras (2009: 111-114) offers insight into his main conclusions on the code-switching-borrowing continuum:

   a) code-switching is more characteristic for bilingual speaker, and borrowing for monolingual,
   b) code-switching includes elaborate utterances (phrases) and borrowing single lexical items,
   c) code-switching does not include structural integration and borrowing does,
   d) code-switching is related to single occurrences, while borrowing is more related to regular occurrences.

Matras's identification of a continuum is relevant as it outlines the multidimensional nature of space in which interference takes place. The continuum is also unique in its approach to the

---

[34] Auer discussed patterns in which code-switching operates in the discourse whether all or only some speakers chose particular languages as communicative tools in the same discourse.
[35] Code-switching becomes "a token of group identity" (Matras 2009: 127).

characteristics of each speaker's use of these tools, as any of the above-mentioned dimensions can span from a rudimentary occurrence to a complex phrasal insertion. As such, Matras' work is considered important for the general outline of the analysis considered in this thesis.

To summarize, linguistic interference connotes both processes and results that occur under various conditions of language contact. In this study it is understood as a hyperonym for processes and results known as borrowing, code-mixing and code-switching, which more or less can be represented on a continuum.

2.3. Socio-linguistic qualities of language environment

In the everyday world, engrossed in the never-ending communication of observations, needs, wishes, and decisions, everyone participates with all of the tools they possess to pass the information as swiftly as possible, as masterfully as possible. That leads to skillful use of various language varieties in a number of situations. The use of language, however, is not governed solely by linguistic factors. As LePage and Tabouret-Keller (1985: 248) claim:

"national, ethnic, racial, cultural, religious, age, sex, social class, educational economic, geographical, occupational and other groupings are all liable to have linguistic connotations. The degree of co-occurrence of boundaries will vary from one society to another, the perception of the degree of co-occurrence will vary from one individual to another."

The above quote also summarizes in a way all the aspects that the socio-linguistics has been analyzing in order to define language and its role in the society. Thus, there are numerous studies that analyze relations between age and language, sex and language, social class and language etc. In broader picture, socio-linguistics analyzes not just dialects and their usage but also the standardized variety of languages, people's attitudes towards language varieties as well as the question of language identity. The conclusions on those topics are drawn from complex language behavior that a person develops in a society as well as from behavior of entire communities.

The non-linguistic elements influence the usage of language varieties in each situation, as speakers tend to develop attitudes towards the correct or appropriate variety to be used in a particular situation. Such attitudes influence speakers' perception of not just his or her speech but

also that of others, and helps create both individual and group sociolinguistic identities.[36] Numerous studies show that attitudes influence speakers and their behavior in the estimation of value or worth of a particular variety. However, those attitudes are not necessarily always conscious or publicly accepted; some of them can be benevolent while others can be dangerous, speakers can have both negative and positive attitudes towards their own language and that of others, etc. Nevertheless, attitudes do influence communication process and create a particular sociolinguistic environment within which language varieties enter and exit different relations, as per the socially driven changes in the environment, i.e. as per the changes in attitudes.[37] The attitudes thus determine the perception speakers have towards themselves and other members in the society when they use a particular variety. Depending on their desire to present themselves in particular light[38] and achieve the communicative goals, speakers implement the variety they deem is the most appropriate one, while the other participants in the communication process judge the level of successful usage. Studies confirm that such attitudes exist in both monolingual and bi/multilingual societies, as communities discern between formal, non-formal, preferred and less-preferred varieties, village and town speech, speech appropriate for men or women of particular class and status, etc.[39]

---

[36] In the first volume of *Linguistic Survey of India*, Grierson describes his process of collecting material: "Another difficulty was the finding of the local name of a dialect. Just as M. Jourdain did not know that he had been speaking prose all his life, so the average Indian villager does not know that he has been speaking anything with a name attached to it. He can always put a name to the dialect spoken by somebody fifty miles off, but – as for his own dialect – 'O, that has no name. It is simply correct language.' It thus happens that most dialect names are not those given by the speakers, but those given by their neighbors, and not always complimentary. For instance, there is a well-known form of speech in the south of the Punjab called 'Jangalī', from it being spoken in the 'Jungle' or unirrigated country bordering on Bikaner. But 'Jangalī', also means 'boorish' and local inquiries failed to find a single person who admitted that he spoke that language. 'O, yes, I know Jangalī very well, - you will find it a little further on, - not here.' You go a little further on and get the same reply, and pursue your will-o'-the-wisp till he lands you in the Rajputana desert, where there is no one to speak any language at all." (Grierson 1973: 19, vol. I).

[37] Consider the terminology applied to a number of language varieties: while some are referred to as languages, others are called dialects; ergo their functionality in the socio-linguistic environment is narrowed and speakers of those varieties are approached differently in specific situations. However, once / if the social conditions change, the 'dialects' can become languages as well. In the Indian context, it is worth considering situation between Hindi and Maithili, or Hindi and Rajasthani, for example. See also Matišić (2006).

[38] Trudgill (2000), for example, mentions how British musicians often adopt pseudo-American accent in their songs although their audience is British. He also reports on Rampton's analysis (1995) of the 'stylized Asian English', a variety that nobody speaks, but which teenage Punjabis adopt nevertheless as an identity marker. Both examples can be ascribed to identification of language as a symbol of solidarity, power and particular identity profile.

[39] See Bugarski (1996a, 1996b), Trudgill (2000), Wardhaugh (2002) for general introductions. See also Mićanović (2006) for analysis of possible relations between different varieties and speakers' socio-linguistic behavior (Ammon 1989, Dittmar 1997, Fishman 1965, 1971 etc.) as an introduction to his study of standardization process in Croatian.

In contrast to personal attitudes studied through questionnaires or interviews and links between linguistic characteristics and factors relevant for social identity (age, sex, education, class, etc.),[40] group attitudes are often conscious and each new member is taught which attitudes, i.e. which behavior is acceptable and appropriate in a particular situation. The distinctions can be taught via education institutions (standardized language varieties), but can also be taught informally as particular values (taboo words, for example).[41] In that sense, each language variety is regulated, whether it has a standardized written form or not, and its language policy can be discussed and practiced by its users. Such implicit or covert language policy consists of intense observations and measurement of society's language preoccupations, its judgments on language's suitability for private and public communication, and its reshuffling of language 'loyalties'.

The language policy is, however, usually defined as a set of rational and mostly institutionalized actions through which society influences the language forms in public communication. If we assume that individual speaker aims to fulfill his/her personal goals and interests in the communication act, we could also assume that public communication is focused on the interests, attitudes and goals of a larger group of speakers, i.e. of society.[42] Thus, language policy and public communication concern everything from language in education and media to language in science and administration, as well as the language at a work place, i.e. any type of official communication. As an institutionalized project, the language policy can be equaled with the development of standardized varieties as appropriate language codes for public communication.[43] Such development includes not only planning of language corpus, but also the planning of language's status. Each of those two broad categories can be further elaborated in systematic stages taken to develop a standardized variety that is then spread through education and media to general speakers of a particular variety. In comparison to other language varieties used in the same sociolinguistic environment, standardized varieties occupy the widest

---

[40] See Labov (1972), Holmes and Meyerhoff (2003), Milroy (1987), Trudgill (2000), McMahon (1994), etc.

[41] See also Gumperz (1958) on implicit regulations in the Kolhapur community as per communication situation and its participants. *Moti boli*, as members of the Kolhapur community call it, is used primarily in informal situations, in family circles, with children and close relatives as well as with servants. *Saf boli,* on the other hand, is used in more formal conversations. As expected, *saf boli* is, according to Gumperz, morphologically and phonologically closer to the standardized variant of Hindi than *moti boli*.

[42] See Škiljan (2000) on the language of public communication.

[43] According to Kloss (1968), societies can decide to uphold various language varieties as their appropriate public codes, i.e. to have positive attitudes towards their usage in particular public domains. As endoglossic, exoglossic or polyglossic societies, communities differ as they decide to follow one of four language policy models (Škiljan 1988).

geographic reach and have the biggest impact in a particular community / society (Huesmann 1998: 39).[44] In the particular environment standardized variety acts as a unifying factor and as a symbolical representative of nation as a unity, a network (Fishman 1978).[45] It can also be described as supraregional variety that has to be learned, i.e. it is not anyone's home language variety. If or when it is not used properly, the speaker can experience sanctions, whereas, when it is used in accordance to rules, it is supposed to add to prestige and social benefits (Dittmar 1997: 201).[46] Its usage is insured through institutions (codification, teaching) and regulations such as language acts (official / national language), proclamations in constitutions and other legal documents, usage in schools (language medium), as well as through creation of positive attitudes towards it ("national treasure", "mother tongue", "to speak correctly", etc.). In other words, its usage and spread are planned, and as such, standardized varieties are part of explicit language policy, which, it is assumed, society is keen to uphold. Yet, although standardized varieties are usually correlated with positive attitudes, they also have a not very positive impact on the socio-linguistic environment: disappearance of other varieties under the umbrella term of standard variety.

In the socio-linguistics it is also important to consider language identity in its complexity. Thus, next to typological and genealogical identity, Katičić (1992: 43-49) also distinguishes language identity based on political and ideological inclinations of a community (national identity, ethnic identity, etc.). That aspect of language identity plays an important role which can be observed in number of different tactics community employs to ensure sense of unity among its members. The implementation of those tactics leads to various actions in the standardization and language policy. One such action could be linguistic purism,[47] an important strategy in language policy for the development and cultivation of particular standardized variety. As the proscription of lexical usage in public communication, alternation or ban of some lexical entries can influence

---

[44] As in Mićanović (2006: 13).

[45] As in Mićanović (2006: 49).

[46] As in Mićanović (2006: 17). According to Downes (1998), standardized variety provides prestige because of its symbolical role as a unifier and integrator within language community.

[47] Thomas (1991: 12) defines linguistic purism as the wish of language community to preserve or remove a particular language form, particularly those considered alien. According to the same author, linguistic purism is often considered to be related with nationalism and its ideology, however, it should not be judged a priori, but the relevant context should be taken into consideration (Thomas 1991, Mićanović 2006). Edwards (1985) also talks about linguistic nationalism.

speakers' attitudes and confidence in mastering the standardized variety, recent studies also focus on the boundaries of standardization processes, asking for the general right to a language in public space as a free commodity in contrast to the manipulation of public space with the set of rules on language use, particularly the one for the usage of standardized varieties (Shohamy 2006, etc.).[48] In other words, all of the above shows that language is used to establish one's identity in relation to the identity of someone else, whether it is an individual or an entire community of speakers. To establish that identity, a speaker does a number of things which we can call in one word strategies and with which he/she hopes to communicate the "correct" idea of own identity. In other words, speaker builds the face for himself or herself, i.e. the public image of one's self (Hudson 2011: 230) by using particular language variety. A number of studies shows that once a speaker establishes own identity he/she also wishes to stress solidarity with other speakers by altering own language behavior to express solidarity or power (Hudson 2011: 232-233, 240). In that process the degree of accommodation will depend on speaker's wish to be liked (Hudson 2011: 235, 239). Trudgill (1983) shows that British music groups thus adopt a pseudo-American accent while Rampton (1995) shows how Anglo or Asian youths in England put on Creole or Asian English (Hudson 2011: 239).

To conclude, language contact and its results are regulated by non-linguistic factors such as language policy, i.e. language planning and language attitudes. In that sense, linguistic results and interference are inseparable from socio-linguistic behavior of a particular individual as each individual is a member of particular language community that functions in a particular socio-linguistic environment. As a result of the attitudes that individual has, as well as of the input individual receives from the society on both implicit and explicit level, a particular socio-linguistic behavior takes place. For that reason, in the thesis, the term 'language policy' is used in a broader sense from the one usually applied to it. Thus, language policy is understood also as the set of inexplicit rules that determine the relations of standardized and non-standardized linguistic varieties within a society, as well as the status of each language variety in the said society. Explicitness, here, is understood as rules written and codified by various institutions which are then passed on to other members of the society through written texts (grammars, rules on spelling, dictionaries, etc.) that explain how to use that language in "the right way" (Shohamy

---

[48] See the overview by Tollefson (2006), *Critical Theory in Language Policy*.

2006: 2) in contemporary societies. In that sense, explicit language policy corresponds with the usual meaning of language policy and space it governs. However, such explicit codification constitutes only a part of language policy and language planning. The explicit rules in proclamations, laws, government's official actions, educational policies and general implementation of languages in the public sphere, are all tested and amended implicitly. Studies on linguistic human rights[49] (minority languages, endangered languages) show that individuals are aware of implications language policy brings in any society, yet it is up to them to accept it or refuse to oblige it. That implicit language policy perhaps can explain why in some cases even in eroding language communities there are speakers who continue to use the particular variety for a very long time and sometimes are left as the only or last speakers of that very variety. Rather than to ask as Shohamy (2006) why are we still talking about good versus bad language use, this thesis wishes to emphasize the two-sided aspect of language policy in shaping particular socio-linguistic behaviors. Hence, explicit language policy shapes and reveals the *de iure* language regulations and community's perception of language's ideal role, whereas the second variety of regulations, implicit language policy, conveys the *de facto* use of languages and society's perception of each.

As Katičić (1992: 52-54) has rightly assumed that language identity is a complex notion, thus we have to assume that the process of realization of socio-linguistic behavior is complex in itself as well. It can be defined as a product of influence of both explicit and implicit language policy present in the particular socio-linguistic environment on an individual speaker as well as on the community in total.

---

[49] See Ricento (2000: 203 and further). Ricento refers to socio-linguistic studies that have emerged from 1980s onward and which focus on language loss, language diversity, role of ideology in language policy, etc.

Chapter 3:

Language interference on Indian subcontinent: case of English and Hindi

3.1. Indian socio-linguistic environment

In India, bilingualism and multilingualism, far from being a rare occurrence, present a norm (Agnihotri 1992, 2001) which serves rather as a facilitator than an obstacle of communication (Pandit 1972).[50] It then does not come as a surprise that language contact[51] takes place every day throughout the subcontinent, both in cities as well as in villages[52] despite relative percentage of literacy,[53] and so does, as its unintended but inevitable consequence, the linguistic interference. For the speakers in the subcontinent the least expensive and, at the same time, the most profitable language acquisition though relies on the development of fragmented performance in two or more language varieties (Bhāṭiyā 2011: 38-39). In socio-linguistic studies, that asymmetry in speaker's focus on different registers in several language varieties led researchers to the formulation of **functional multilingualism** (Gumperz 1964 and later). In such a sphere, a number of people on the subcontinent speak English and Hindi next to a variety of other languages.

For better assessment of contemporary multilingual relations in India, including those of Hindi and English, it is, however, important to note that multilingualism and language contact have a

---

[50] As in Subbarao (2011: 54).

[51] Languages spoken in India belong to several language families. Indo-Aryan languages (Bengali, Hindi, etc.) and English present Indo-European language family. Dravidian language family represents a group of languages spoken mostly in southern parts of India (Tamil, Telugu, etc.). Austro-Asiatic family is represented by two subgroups, predominantly Munda (Korku, Santali, etc.), and to a smaller scale by Mon-Khmer subgroup (Khasi, Nicobarese). Tibeto-Burman languages (Bodo, Naga, etc.) belong to Sino-Tibetan language family. Andamanese is so far unrelated to any family, and similarly, Nihali is an isolate language just like Burushaski in Pakistan.

[52] Gumperz and Wilson (1971) studied the Kupwar village in Maharashtra and its speakers communicating in Kannada, Marathi, Telugu and Urdu.

[53] The literacy rate in India in 1951 was 18.33% and had since then grown to 64.83% in 2011, according to Census reports. UNESCO's Institute for Statistics estimation for 2000 was a bit lower than census report for 2001, 57.2%. Literates predominantly include male population, as girls leave school at an early stage or do not go into one at all. The gender gap in literacy rate for 2001 was 21.59% in favor of male population.

long history in the subcontinent. According to Matišić (1984: 33-38), past language relation in India, owes many of its qualities to particular relevance of Sanskrit in the wider region of South Asia. Sanskrit dominated for centuries as a cultural and political symbol of particular Sanskrit culture, as Pollock (2006) refers to it. Matišić (1984: 33) calls the same phenomenon Sanskritic civilization, which created over centuries a particular complex system of values or particular socio-linguistic environment. In this system, Sanskrit played an important role as a socio-linguistic landmark that defined socio-linguistic position of other languages in the same space and aspirations of its speakers. According to Matišić (1984: 36), even the arrival of Persian and its political and linguistic relevance for several centuries had not changed the socio-linguistic hierarchy, but rather established the system in which both Persian and Sanskrit had shared the nature of influence and values and thus dominated over other varieties in the Indian socio-linguistic environment. Pollock (2006: 254) claims the cosmopolitan Sanskrit culture had been an important tool in ensuring trans-regional political aspirations unlike the vernaculars which symbolized regional political conceptions. In his study, Pollock (2006: 254-256) names several reasons for which Sanskrit had been perceived as the language of the widest scope, ergo as a symbol of universal qualities, political and cultural, in opposition to vernaculars: translocality, transethnicity, expressive power and stability of use. Thus, its standardized form, ability to be related to everyone at the same time in the same manner (everyone had to learn it, it was no one's mother tongue, it was not a language of particular region) gave it a value that other languages, besides Persian, could not attain.

In such socio-linguistic environment, English had arrived as a language of foreign traders. However, from 19th century onwards it had established its place as a powerful socio-linguistic tool, replacing Persian as a dominant language in governing, education and in other spheres. In a system of values of Sanskritic civilization, such language change signified a much larger loss / gain of political power. Curiously, replacement of Persian had not, however, established Sanskrit's position as a more stable, but had led to the establishment of a new language, English, as a dominant symbol in the existing politico-cultural system. As Appendix 2.1 shows, by the time India gained independence in 1947, English had been established as a new socio-linguistic value, the major reason for which was the presence of British political, martial and economic

power just as the presence and power related to promoters of Sanskrit culture had supported the spread, use and influence of Sanskrit language in prior periods. Pollock's (2006) analysis of particular qualities that Sanskrit had can be applied to English in India and South Asia as well. Just as everyone had to learn Sanskrit in prior periods, English was for the same reasons desirable as the language shared by all from 19th century onwards in a modern imagined national and political entity that India was to become with 1947. Namely, translocality, transethnicity, expressive power and stability of use have been its strengths. Yet, as Matišić (1984: 38) cautiously mentions, the arrival and presence of English had perhaps brought an alternation in the socio-linguistic balance as a number of Indian languages came to be more present in the public communication. With the advent of 19th century and discussions on role of English in the Subcontinent, the work on grammars and dictionaries of modern Indian languages, together with the work on their standardization and propagation had been commenced (see Appendix 2.1.). Thus, we could assume that the rise of Hindi, i.e. Urdu or Hindustani in early 20th century suggests that the nature of Sanskritic civilization had changed. However, a more observant look shows that it was English which acted as a glue to establish modern Indian politico-economic entities in the first place, while Hindi-Urdu-Hindustani had acted not just as national glue but also as a tool of ethno-linguistic divide.[54] Thus, the ancestors and leaders of new India confronted not a very easy question as they tried to decide: in which language to function as a new political entity and which language policy model to use to fashion the new nation, the one that was born on August 15th 1947.

3.2. English and Hindi after 1947

3.2.1. Languages in administration at union and state level

With the proclamation of independence, India gained the right to organize itself in a manner most suitable to its needs and needs of its people.

---

[54] See Orsini (2002) on the relation Hindi-English in the first half of 20th century.

Table 3.1. Official languages in states and territories.[55]

State / Territory	Official languages	Status
Andhra Pradesh	Telugu, Urdu	official **bilingualism**
Arunachal Pradesh	English	official *monolingualism*
Assam	Assamese	official *monolingualism*
Bihar	Hindi, Urdu	official **bilingualism**
Chattisgarh	Hindi	official *monolingualism*
Jammu i Kashmir	Urdu	official *monolingualism*
Jharkhand[56]	Hindi, Urdu	official **bilingualism** (?)
Goa[57]	Konkani, Marathi	official **bilingualism** (?)
Gujarat	Gujarati	official *monolingualism*
Haryana[58]	Hindi	official *monolingualism* (?)
Himachal Pradesh[59]	English, Hindi	official **bilingualism** (?)
Karnataka	Kannada	official *monolingualism*
Kerala	Malayalam	official *monolingualism*
Madhya Pradesh	Hindi	official *monolingualism*
Maharashtra	Marathi	official *monolingualism*
Manipur	English, Manipuri	official **bilingualism**
Meghalaya[60]	English, Khasi	official **bilingualism** (?)
Mizoram	English, Hindi, Mizo	official multilingualism
Nagaland	English	official *monolingualism*
Odisha	Oriya	official *monolingualism*

---

[55] Data is based on 50th – 52nd report on linguistic minorities in India.

[56] 52nd Report does not mention Urdu. 51st Report mentions that additional official languages are to be introduced: Santhali, Bengali, Oriya, etc.

[57] 51st and 52nd Report do not mention Marathi as official language.

[58] According to 51st Report there are two official languages: Hindi and Punjabi. 52nd Report claims that next to Hindi, official language in Haryana is English.

[59] 52nd Report does not mention English.

[60] 52nd Report does not mention Khasi.

State / Territory	Official languages	Status
Punjab	Punjabi	official *monolingualism*
Rajasthan	English, Hindi	official **bilingualism**
Sikkim[61]	Bhutia, English, Gurung, Lepcha, Limbu, Manger, Mukhia, Newari, Rai, Sherpa, Tamang	official multilingualism (?)
Tamil Nadu	English, Tamil	official **bilingualism**
Telangana[62]	Telugu, Urdu	official **bilingualism**
Tripura	Bengali, English, Kokborok	official multilingualism
Uttarakhand	Hindi	official *monolingualism*
Uttar Pradesh	Hindi, Urdu	official **bilingualism**
West Bengal[63]	Bengali, English, Hindi, Nepali, Oriya, Punjabi, Santhali, Urdu	official multilingualism (?)
Andaman and Nicobar Islands	English, Hindi	official **bilingualism**
Chandigarh	English	official *monolingualism*
Dadra and Nagar Haveli[64]	Gujarati, Hindi, Marathi	official multilingualism (?)
Daman and Diu	English, Gujarati, Hindi, Konkani	official multilingualism
Delhi[65]	Hindi, Punjabi, Urdu	official multilingualism
Lakshadweep[66]	English, Hindi	official **bilingualism** (?)
Puducherry	English, Malayalam, Tamil, Telugu	official multilingualism

That freedom of choice enveloped, among other things, freedom to choose official language policy for the regulation of public communication in new political entity, union of number of states and union territories,

---

[61] Apart from English, all other mentioned languages are Sino-Tibetan. 52nd Report mentions only English as official language.
[62] Source: 51st and 52nd Report. 50th Report for linguistic minorities was finished on July 16th 2014 and does not include information on Telangana which was formed out of Andhra Pradesh on June 2nd 2014.
[63] 52nd report mentions only Bengali and Nepali.
[64] 52nd Report does not mention Marathi.
[65] 52nd Report mentions also English.
[66] 51st and 52nd Report mention only English as an official language.

Republic of India. The Constitution assembly (1946-1949)[67] resolved the question of union's official languages in a manner that it named Hindi and English co-official languages for the period of 15 years (1950-1965). However, after the expiry of the said period social and political tensions[68] have led to amendments of political decisions on language usage (Official Language Act 1963, 1967, etc.) securing use of English in administration at union level for the indefinite period. The very same resolutions continued to regulate further official investments in Hindi (Hindi classes for government employees, formation of an independent Hindi department as official language, Internet visibility, celebration of Hindi day, etc.). The goal was to increase use of Hindi in government offices gradually and to one day have Hindi as the sole official language of the union.[69] However, 60 years after the proclamation of Hindi as official language and 60 years after its propaganda, there is still the question of the extent of its usage in administration by union government offices. To understand better how English's position may have affected language behavior of Lok Sabha members, and also language balance in the Sanskritic socio-linguistic environment, an overview of language usage in public sphere (administration, judiciary, media, and education) is given in this section.

According to the Constitution, states[70] name their own official languages for administration purposes (Articles 345 – 347). States' legislative bodies had arrived at different conclusions, creating some states as officially monolingual and some as officially multilingual as any language spoken within the state's territory, according to the Constitution, theoretically could be promoted as one of the languages for official public communication. The results of such policy can be observed in the situation in India today (Table 3.1.), where 14 states out of 29 promote official

---

[67] Jaffrelot (2010: 14-15) cites Austin (1972) and proceedings of Constituent Assembly to show that language was an issue from the moment the Assembly started with sessions.

[68] Parts of Indian society were against introduction of Hindi as the sole official language for the union claiming that then Hindi mother speakers will have leverage wherever knowledge of Hindi would be required, particularly in government jobs (see Sonntag 2014).

[69] The rule was that in Hindi speaking states, the documents had to be written in Hindi, while in other states the issuing had to be in proportion with the percentage of officers skilled in Hindi in the receiving office on all India level.

[70] According to Schwartzberg (2009) states were mostly formed taking into consideration language boundaries. Sonntag (2014) also mentions Mitchell's (2010) argument that language, as an identity marker, in India is a construct of late 19th and 20th century. See also Wessler (2014).

monolingualism as well as 1 union territory, contrary to 15 states and 6 union territories which promote official bilingualism or multilingualism.[71]

The majority of official languages at states' level have also been included in the document called Eighth Schedule, mended and included in the Constitution (Article 344.1 and 351) during 1950s' (see Table 3.2.). The Eight Schedule was in its conception imagined as a list of languages from which Hindi as official language of the union could and should draw lexical and other elements for its enrichment and further standardization. However, over decades it has grown to mean the list of languages to which government extends support for their own standardization (Mallikarjun 2004: 8-10) and as such, it is an important element in India's language policy. Due to economic advantages, a number of language communities have applied for inclusion, however, the requirements for the inclusion appear not to be transparent prior to the formation of Mohapatra Committee in 2004. Table 3.2 shows that a number of speakers is for example not a relevant factor as Sindhi, Sanskrit and Bodo are not spoken by a vast population. Yet they are included in the list, while other varieties with similar number of speakers and values have not found their place in it. The number of official languages in various states that are not currently on that list is also not a small number either. Next to Khasi, Garo, Mizo, Nepali and Kokborok language, just to name some,[72] English, union's associate official language, is also not to be found on that list.[73] We could interpret the situation in several ways. One could assume that English should not be used to enrich Hindi as a standard language or that English as a foreign language is not supposed to get funds for its standardization from Indian government. The second implication, however, does not stop speakers of English in India, the ones who claim English as

---

[71]Source, published by Government of India, can be found online: http://nclm.nic.in/shared/linkimages/NCLM50thReport.pdf.

[72] Next to those, Bhutia, Gurung, Lepcha, Limboo, Manger, Mukhia, Newari, Rai, Sherpa and Tamang are also official languages in particular states. At the moment, state of Sikkim has the biggest number of proclaimed official languages (11).

[73] Wessler (2014) also points out that lobbying is what matters to get the particular language on the list.

their mother tongue,[74] from putting their demands to include English in the Eight Schedule forward.[75]

Table 3.2. Languages of the Eighth Schedule and their approximate distribution.

Language	Speakers (2001)[76]	States and territories in which the language has the highest density of speakers[77]
Assamese	13 168 484	Assam (4944)
Bengali	83 369 769	West Bengal (8534), Tripura (6735), Assam (2791), Andaman and Nicobar Islands (2595)
Bodo[78]	1 350 478	Negligible number of speakers in any state / territory.
Dogri[79]	2 282 589	Jammu and Kashmir (2194)
Gujarati	46 091 617	Gujarat (8448), Daman and Diu (6883), Dadra and Nagar Haveli (2371)
Hindi	422 048 642	Uttar Pradesh (9133), Rajasthan (9109), Himachal Pradesh (8929), Uttarakhand (8803), Haryana (8734), Madhya Pradesh (8732), Chattisgarh (8268), Delhi (8100), Bihar (7312), Chandigarh (6760), Jharkhand (5765), Daman and Diu (1977), Jammu and Kashmir (1861), Andaman and Nicobar Islands (1840), Dadra and Nagar Haveli (1513), Maharashtra (1104)
Kannada	37 924 011	Karnataka (6626)

---

[74] According to the data in Census 2001, 226 449 people claimed English as their mother tongue. Opposite to that, 422 048 642 people claimed Hindi as their mother tongue.
[75] Information retrieved from the website of Ministry of Home Affairs. Source: http://mha.nic.in/hindi/sites/upload_files/mhahindi/files/pdf/Eighth_Schedule.pdf.
[76] Source: Census Report from 2001.
[77] Data is based on the results of Census Report for 2001. The Census data contains mathematical calculation of language identity of 10 000 inhabitants of each state/territory. The table in this paper presents data for the parts of India which had at least 1 000 speakers (10 % or more), while data for those parts where 999 or smaller number of speakers is present is not shown in this table. Thus in West Bengal for example, according to calculation, lives 8543 speakers of Bengali on every 10 000 inhabitants. In Tripura there are 6753 such speakers, in Assam 2791, etc. In states like Uttar Pradesh the calculated number of Bengali speakers, falls bellow 1000, hence it is not presented in Table 2. It is also important to note that the data sheet in the Census report explicitly shows numbers for speakers of Scheduled languages, while all unscheduled languages are presented as one category, hence it is not possible to learn from the said data sheet which particular languages are present in states and territories.
[78] Added in 2003.
[79] Ibid.

Language	Speakers (2001)[76]	States and territories in which the language has the highest density of speakers[77]
Kashmiri	5 527 698	Jammu and Kashmir (5398)
Konkani[80]	2 489 015	Goa (5721), Dadra and Nagar Haveli (1038)
Maithili[81]	12 179 122	Bihar (1427)
Malayalam	33 066 392	Lakshadweep (9788), Kerala (9676)
Manipuri[82]	1 466 705	Manipur (6067)
Marathi	71 936 894	Maharashtra (6889), Goa (2261)
Nepali[83]	2 871 749	Sikkim (6298)
Oriya	33 017 446	Odisha (8318)
Punjabi	28 871 749	Punjab (9170), Chandigarh (2792), Haryana (1052)
Sanskrit	14 135	Negligible number of speakers in any state / territory.
Santhali[84]	6 469 600	Jharkhand (1070)
Sindhi[85]	2 535 485	Negligible number of speakers in any state / territory.
Tamil	60 793 814	Tamil Nadu (8943), Puducherry (8849), Andaman and Nicobar Islands (1784)
Telugu	74 002 856	Andhra Pradesh (8388), Andaman and Nicobar Islands (1293)
Urdu	51 536 111	Bihar (1141), Karnataka (1054)

One should be aware of the fact that several states and territories have listed, however, English as their sole or one of the official languages (Table 3.1.). That had happened mostly in northeastern and southern parts of the country, but in some others as well. Thus, English is official language in Arunachal Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland, Rajasthan, Sikkim, Tamil Nadu, Tripura, West Bengal, Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Chandigarh, Daman and Diu, Lakshadweep and Puducherry. From the same table, it is visible

---

[80] Added in 1992.
[81] Added in 2003.
[82] Added in 1992.
[83] Ibid.
[84] Added in 2003.
[85] Added in 1967.

that Hindi is the sole official language or one of them mostly in northern parts of India: Bihar, Chhatisgarh, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Mizoram, Rajasthan, Uttarkhand, Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal, Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Dadra and Nagar Haveli, Daman and Diu, Delhi and Lakshadweep. Hindi and English share the official multilingual environment in 4 states (Mizoram, Himachal Pradesh, Rajasthan and West Bengal) and 3 union territories (Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Daman and Diu, Lakshadweep). The mathematical approximations on distribution of languages across states in the last column (Table 3.2.) as well as the 50th Report of the commissioner for linguistic minorities in India, on which data on proclaimed official languages is based, show that speakers of particular language are present within the borders of several states and union territories. In that sense, none of the states is indeed monolingual. In other words, linguistic minorities are present everywhere (Annamalai 2011: 225). Hence, the official monolingualism of several states and one union territory is a strong political statement. Such statement determines in which language a population and state are to communicate with each other, as well as in which language state communicates with union and other states in it. If compared, Table 3.1 and Table 3.2 show that decisions on declaration of official languages by states and union territories are not based on mathematical approximation, or if it was, it is slightly outdated. Thus, although Bengali is spoken by 2791 persons in Assam, it is not one of official languages in that state, nor in Andaman & Nicobar Islands (2595 speakers). One finds similar situation in Jammu & Kashmir, where Urdu is official state languages, however, number of Urdu speakers in that state is, according to approximation, well below one thousand speakers, as only 13 people out of 10 000 marked Urdu as their language. On the other side, Dogri and Kashmiri are not official languages. Comparison shows a number of other similar discrepancies. All of it shows that proclamation of official languages as well as placement of languages in the Eighth Schedule is deeply political decision,[86] hence can be seen as an act of deliberate language politics.

---

[86] Census reports can be as well politically influenced. Thus Khubchandani (1997: 128) comments the issue of Punjabi and Hindi as mother tongues in states of Punjab and Haryana. In the same book, Khubchandani (1997: 139-140) emphasizes several times the diversity of speakers in vast Hindustani region (north-central India), where speakers are often heterogeneous. Many are in fact bilingual but are unaware of it or consider Hindi tradition more valuable for emotional reasons, prestige, etc. and thus state in Census reports Hindi as their mother tongue. For that reason, he cautions to consider census reports as relative numbers (Khubchandani 1997: 149).

3.2.2. Languages in the legislature, education and media

In the Indian legislature, languages of legislative bodies are not necessarily same as languages of judiciary system. Within the legislative bodies, separate rules apply to languages used in proceedings and those allowed in law acts. Thus, the legislative bodies of states and union have a permission, based in Constitution, to use in proceedings either Hindi, English or their respective official language(s), whereas the laws are to be formulated, on both levels, solely in English. In other words, while one can further negotiate languages of speeches and reports,[87] English is always language of the law, even if and when Parliament grants permission to pass laws in other languages, as an authoritative translation in English is always required. Likewise, in the judiciary system, English is the only permitted language on the highest level of Supreme Court, and for bigger majority of high courts (24 in total). The Constitution (article 348) and OLA 1963 had left open possibility to introduce Hindi or official language of states in high courts. Nevertheless, both Parliament and President need to agree that such introduction is beneficial. So far, six states had asked for such permission. Out of five states that were given a green light, four of them, namely Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh envisaged Hindi in that role. Tamil Nadu and West Bengal followed their example and asked for implementation of Tamil and Bengali respectively, upon which Tamil Nadu's petition (2006) was denied,[88] as the Supreme Court expressed its fear of brewing incomprehension between advocates and judges if Tamil was to be introduced in high courts. Nevertheless, government of Tamil Nadu appealed against such conclusion and subsequently won in 2010 for its advocates right to argue cases in Tamil. From the letter of the Government of Tamil Nadu to the Prime Minister and to the Union Home Minister and Union Law Minister, it is clear that the appeal of the Government of West Bengal had been rejected.[89]

In the field of education, numerous reforms, from 1854 onward, had envisioned even prior to independence place for Indian languages in education system, from the level of primary

---

[87] With the permission of the Speaker, a parliament member can address audience in his or her mother tongue. However, the Speaker should be aware of it in advance, so that the Parliament can arrange for translation.
[88] Source: www.tn.gov.in/pressrelease/archives/pr2007/pr110307/pr110307_45.pdf.
[89] Ibid.

education to university education (see Appendix 2.1.). The Constitution (article 350A) further provided all minorities with the right to basic education in their respective mother tongues. Thus, at the time of independence it seemed that the only issue left to resolve was the question of language medium in universities themselves and thorough implementation of policies on all levels of education.[90] To solve it, government had appointed several commissions whose role was to advise government on proper steps to undertake. The most important of them was the introduction of trilingual formula,[91] which suggests study of three languages, with each language being introduced at a different stage of schooling prior to tertiary education. As per Abbi (2009: 305),[92] the trilingual formula model can be described as following:

1. **model for Hindi states**:

a) study of Hindi, b) study of another modern Indian language especially from South India, c) study of English or of another modern Indian language not studied as a second language,

2. **model for non-Hindi states**:

a) study of a language listed in Eighth Schedule, b) study of Hindi, c) study of English or of another modern Indian language studied as a second language.[93]

Though the trilingual formula had been installed to increase mobility and cohesion, it has also been interpreted in various manners (Wessler 2014), as it best suited language politics of particular state (Dua 1996, Agnihotri and Khanna 1997),[94] and had partially created havoc where

---

[90] Krishnamurti (1998: 282) quotes Naik and Nurullah (1974: 115) regarding secondary education reforms undertaken from 1921. According to them, the secondary education was doing well in that period with Indian languages as media of instruction.

[91] Recommended by the Central Education Recommendation Commission in 1956, it was amended in 1961 and accepted in 1968.

[92] Abbi (2006) had had, however, proposed also that instead of trilingual formula the four-language formula should be introduced (Wessler 2014: 78).

[93] The government document issued by National Council of Educational Research and Training has it defined slightly different. In both groups of states, first language of schooling should be mother tongue or regional language. See the document online at: http://www.ncert.nic.in/new_ncert/ncert/rightside/links/pdf/focus_group/Indian_Languages.pdf.

[94] On one hand, many Hindi states as well as Orissa and West Bengal chose to offer Sanskrit and Urdu instead of south Indian languages. On the other hand, Tamil Nadu had refused to implement trilingual formula. Instead of it, schools in Tamil Nadu teach Tamil and foreign language (mostly English) to its students.

it was intended to create national cohesion,[95] particularly between north and south. It is, however, important to note that English is included in the model. As Khubchandani comments (1997: 63), presence of English in educational system is one of major mechanisms that ensure its spread in the subcontinent.

Research shows that speakers of Indian languages aspire for certain language medium in education. As Abbi (2009: 305) states, "the speakers of so-called minor languages themselves do not wish to educate their children in their respective mother tongues." LaDousa's study (2014) on attitudes concerning school medium, namely Hindi and English, in Varanasi, shows that English enjoys a higher status in the eyes of speakers of even 'major' languages such as Hindi, a language backed by government's funds. Thus, the question of language medium in schools is not just a question posed by minority language communities. His results confirm Dua's (1996: 568-570) on prestige English enjoys in education circles, which has led to the offer of syllabus in English not only in private schools[96] but also in regular government schools.[97] According to studies, learning English well is important to Indian citizens for several reasons. First, it creates opportunities for successful further studies at university, and second, it creates opportunity for social and economic mobility within and outside of India. The persistence of idea that such opportunities are available solely if one receives education in English medium schools might be a legacy of the dispute from 19th century between Orientalists and Anglicists and further research would be an interesting topic.

It is important to note that the government had passed many resolutions[98] in order to implement Indian languages also at university level, prior and after independence,[99] yet little it

---

[95] According to Krishnamurti (1998: 262), census reports on bilingualism show that a trilingual formula has misfired, particularly in the so-called Hindi-belt, where the rate of bilingualism is rather low (4.76% versus country's average of 13.34% in 1981).

[96] Private schools appeared already in 19th century, particularly after the 1882 reforms, when private institutions took over partially management of schools, due to shortage of funds in government's pockets.

[97] Wessler (2014: 76) mentions how middle classes perceive English as the right language of "modern rational discourse". Wessler argues that people in India correlate English with upward social mobility. Thus, it should not surprise us that lower classes of the society wish to secure their participation in that mobility. It makes easier to understand why Dalits and other communities wish to make study of English accessible to their members.

[98] Chaudhary (2009: 518) prepared the list of educational commissions since 1858: 1. Indian Education Commission or Hunter Commission (1882), 2. Indian Universities Commission (1902), 3. Calcutta University Commission (1917-

42

had done to ensure that universities follow the resolutions *de facto* and not just *de iure.* Thus, the tertiary level enhances what starts at lower levels of education system. In other words, to prepare for university education, one needs good command of English, and therefore, parents and students opt, if they can afford it, to imbibe as much of English as possible prior to tertiary education. At a university level, knowledge of English is an important asset for a student as it enhances the chances of a success in several aspects. Better English skills offer better choice of study fields, ensure successful completion of study, as well as mobility and visibility in the market after the graduation. If we look at the relatively recent events, such as economic reforms of 1990's, entrance of foreign companies in Indian job market or opening up of private universities, they seem to have prolonged the period of *de iure* language policy at tertiary institutions. Thus, even the universities that had previously welcomed the change have taken, according to Dua (1996: 574), a new stance on languages, i.e. gone back to English.[100]

Above shows that there is a clash of actions installed by government (trilingual formula, positive discrimination, reservation of seats for students from lower social strata) and *de facto* situation as one section of student body goes successfully through primary and secondary school in Indian language medium, and arrives at university unprepared for courses conducted in English.[101] The question that everyone in the education system appears to dwell on is whether or not study of or in Indian languages can offer same opportunities at the end of education cycle. Available information suggests that the general assumption is that knowledge of English offers better chances for higher paid jobs together with better social status.

That leads us to the question of languages usage in media and publishing industry. According to Annamalai (2001: 35), 87 languages are present in Indian press, 71 in radio and 13 in cinema.

1919), 4. Hartog Committee (1928-1929), 5. Abbot-Wood Committee (1936-1937), 6. Zakir Husain/Wardha Committee on Basic Education (1938), 6. Sargeant Report (1944), etc.

[99] The rare exception to English medium university education was establishment of Osmania University in Hyderabad in 1917, where Urdu was medium of instruction.

[100] However, university teachers at Delhi University complained about having to adapt their teaching to students who do not understand English well (private communication).

[101] More than few students experience a nervous breakdown at some point of their studies, for various reasons and language policy is sometimes one of them. Unfortunately, some chose to quit more than just their studies by turning to suicide. Moreover, I have noticed while teaching in India that some students take part in particular courses not to learn the content of the course but to get exposure to spoken English in the classroom. It signals complexity of attitudes towards languages, particularly English.

47 languages used in education and 13 in administration at the state level complete the picture. Friedlander (2009: 254) summarizes the situation in media well as he points out persisting image of English media as influential original media for readers that 'matter', while publications in other languages are thought of as successful copy-paste material for non-important readership. Thus, one can imagine that the ideal recipient of English media is an educated, well-off person, living in the city. Opposite to that, a reader of Hindi publications is, according to Ninan (2007: 15) a person from rural area or smaller town, a middle-class person for whom newspapers are affordable:

> "Hindi newspapers, harbingers of nationalism at the turn of the 20th century, had become harbingers of more material change by the turn of the 21st. They were now bursting with color supplements and marketing coupons even as they brought politics, sports and news-you-can-use to rural and urban homes in village and small-town India."

The abundance of publications and growing readership in some of those languages in post-independence era, particularly since 90's, as the statistics suggest, rarely manages to create a point.[102] The entrance of private cable and satellite TVs in 1990's also marked the media space in terms of languages as the contents were localized and adjusted to clients' taste (Thussu 1999: 127).[103] The success of several such channels inspired the launch of Indian TV channel Zee TV, first private Hindi satellite channel, which offered programs to younger generations. Its popularity, however, was a result of popular content such as Bollywood films, music and quiz contests delivered through generous use of Hinglish in contrast to the Sanskritized Hindi of national media channel, Doordarshan. From such pop-culture content, Hinglish also spread to serious content as news, and Zee TV was its pioneer (Thussu 1999). Today Zee TV aims at audience across India and beyond India, as it caters to around 40 countries with a number of channels (Zee TV, Zee TV India, Zee Cinema, Music Asia, etc.).

---

[102] According to Gupta (2007: 4), the circulation of Hindi newspapers is 67 million, while that of English newspaper 27 million. It is difficult to get a good picture of media, as publishers do not send in their reports to government regularly on number of sold copies, etc.

[103] According to Thussu (1999: 125-127), more than 70 different channels started telecasting in India by 1998, many of them offering 24-hour programs.

The presented situation allows one to pose several questions. First question is whether recipients of English media participate in consumption of media content in other languages. If yes, it would be interesting to learn which ones do they take into consideration as relevant? It would be also interesting to know whether they consume same content in different languages or they assign a language to particular content. There is also the question of presentation of the same content across languages. Such questions are also related to questions of education. If students who desire success of greater range opt for English medium schools, do they, or better yet, are they able to read and follow media in other languages. One could also ask what such answers mean for India today as well as for India in the future.

3.2.3. Languages in the Parliament of India

The Parliament of India, central political body on the level of union government, consists of two chambers, Lok Sabha or the General Assembly and Rajya Sabha or the Council of States. Members of legislative assemblies or electoral colleges in states and union territories elected first Rajya Sabha in 1954. Unlike Lok Sabha, it does not dissolve and majority of its members rather retires every second year. Those members who wish to serve the full term retire after six years.

A ratio of state's population and the total number of available seats determines the number of seats allotted to particular state/union territory in the Lok Sabha, with the emphasis on reaching the ratio that would be, as far as practicable, same for all states.[104] The Lok Sabha started with its sessions in 1950 after the Constitution of India came into effect. However, the first elections for it India organized only a year later, in 1951 and continued until February 1952. Thus, the first elected members sat in the Lok Sabha premises for the first time in 1952. Before those first elections, members of the Zero or Provisional Lok Sabha acted as the Parliament's lower chamber. However, its members did not contest elections but had served in the Constitutive Assembly. So far 16 elections of Lok Sabha have been organized since 1952 (see Table 3.3.), and as a result 16 Lok Sabhas had been convened so far, each of which is named after the ordinal number of elections: 1st Lok Sabha, 2nd Lok Sabha, etc. During the year, members of Lok Sabha

---

[104] Source: http://loksabha.nic.in/, last visited on 12.09.2013.

congregate for three sessions named budget session (February to May), autumn or monsoon session (July to August) and winter session (November to December). During each session, the business in Parliament consists of several different formats: discussions in the House, introduction of new bills and laws, written communication between parliamentary members and government, etc. Whereas the bills are always presented in English, oral debates, written answers and papers laid on the table can be in both English and Hindi.

Table 3.3. Elections of Lok Sabha from 1950 onwards.[105]

Lok Sabha	Period	Lok Sabha	Period
Provisional	1950-1952	Ninth Lok Sabha	1989-1991
First Lok Sabha	1952-1957	Tenth Lok Sabha	1991-1996
Second Lok Sabha	1957-1962	Eleventh Lok Sabha	1996-1997
Third Lok Sabha	1962-1967	Twelfth Lok Sabha	1998-1999
Fourth Lok Sabha	1967-1970	Thirteenth Lok Sabha	1999-2004
Fifth Lok Sabha	1971-1977	Fourteenth Lok Sabha	2004-2009
Sixth Lok Sabha	1977-1979	Fifteenth Lok Sabha	2009-2014
Seventh Lok Sabha	1980-1984	Sixteenth Lok Sabha	2014-till today
Eighth Lok Sabha	1985-1989		

With more than 500 representatives in Lok Sabha and above 200 deputies in Rajya Sabha, and more than 20 languages recognized by central government in Eighth Schedule, one would imagine that Parliament of India would be the one place where multilingualism is present on day-to-day basis.

However, despite the presence of speakers with diverse first languages, Parliament conducts its business officially, as per Constitution (Article 120), in Hindi and English. Use of any other language is more or less restricted to individuals who employ them either to communicate a statement by speaking in a language of their region or because they do not speak official languages of Parliament aptly enough or not at all. Ergo, multilingual discourse in the Parliament for official purposes is more of an exception than a rule.

---

[105] Table compiled from publicly available information on history of Lok Sabha.

The resolutions of the Constituent Assembly (1946-1949) represent the foundation of present-day regulations concerning language use in the Parliament. According to those, Hindi[106] is the language of parliamentary communication on union level, while presence of English is to be of temporary nature[107] for the period of 15 years. In the first years, use of any third language in the debates was permitted to those whose knowledge of English and Hindi was inadequate and only after the Speaker endorsed their plea. In the situation when representatives did not understand one of those two languages, they were advised to look up summaries of speeches that, according to Kashyap (1994: 272), were not regularly included in the record of proceedings. Thus, it is possible to imagine that there were members of Parliament (MPs) who did not understand a number of speeches and thus could not treat them as relevant nor participate in discussions.[108] Time and practice showed that language arrangements within Parliament needed improvements. Although requests for it were heard even during 50's,[109] translation from one official language of the Parliament into the other, according to LSH (1967), became available with the 7th September 1964, while the third Lok Sabha was still in session. The solution was provided technically with headphones and language selector switches built in into every seat. The apparatus enabled the representatives to listen to simultaneous translation of debates either in Hindi or in English.[110]

---

[106] The first choice was Hindustani, as a sign of compromise between Sanskritized Hindi and Persianized Urdu. However, before the end of assembly's sessions Hindustani disappeared from the list of languages leaving Hindi as its successor (Kashyap 1994: 271).

[107] As the Constituent Assembly made decision to keep English in the Parliament, it actually continued the tradition of previous modern legislative bodies in India, established during 19th and early 20th century. In those bodies, sole employment of English was regulated and ensured through negative definition for usage of other varieties. Thus, according to records, use of Hindi/Hindustani was allowed for the first time in 1862, but only if the member was not able to speak in English. In such a case, a member could request one of his colleagues to speak for him, i.e. to translate his speech. Only fifty years later, in 1921, did members of those legislative bodies of ante-independent multilingual India experience a pinch freedom in language choice, as use of Hindi was granted to those not familiar with English. Use of other languages was not granted as such, and Hindi itself appears to have been picked up rarely in those legislative bodies. See also Orsini (2002: 316) and Shankar and Rodrigues (2011: 178-179).

[108] Shankar and Rodrigues (2011: 181) are of opinion that more than few members in the first years of Parliament's existence sat in sessions without real participation, as their English, and/or Hindi, was low or non-existent. Consequently, they estimate that some of the topics never gained greater space for debate in those years, as those who were able to raise them as relevant weren't equipped to do so, from socio-linguistic point of aspect, in a 'proper' language variety.

[109] However, the Speaker discouraged those (Shankar and Rodrigues 2011: 184).

[110] See http://164.100.47.132/LssNew/members/membersbook/Chapter2.pdf, paragraph 50. Last visited on 22nd September 2013. Published in 2009 by Lok Sabha.

During the fourth Lok Sabha, in 1967, another rule was set up about speeches in any third language. Thus, a member had a chance to speak in his/her chosen language and others could read its Hindi/English translation that had to be beforehand submitted to the Speaker in three copies (LSH 1967: 115). First three languages to acquire that status were Bengali, Malayalam and Tamil.[111] With 1985, the number of varieties from which translation was possible reached number 12, and today it is available in 14 languages[112] as Assamese, Kannada, Maithili, Manipuri, Marathi, Nepali, Oriya, Punjabi, Sanskrit, Telugu and Urdu were included as well.[113] Even though the Parliament today has an option of simultaneous translation from those languages, the overview of data shows that they are not heard very often.[114]

However, it is important to note that the accommodation of multilingualism happens while Lok Sabha is in the session. Once the speeches are recorded down, whether they are pre-published or published ones, the multilingualism turns into bilingualism as only speeches in Hindi and English are recorded in their original form, as they occurred, while other language varieties are present only by name and in translation of the original text. Until the advent of 1980's the only third discernable language variety in the written form had been Urdu, written in Perso-Arabic script, yet it had disappeared from both published and unpublished proceedings, leaving only English translation in its place. 1980's had also brought a change in the policy regarding published proceedings. While before 1980's those were like unpublished ones trilingual, with Hindi, Urdu and English texts, from 1980's onward Parliament published monolingual translations in which Hindi original speeches appear with Hindi translations of English and other varieties. In English edition, similarly, English original texts appear next to English translations of Hindi and any other speeches. The change in that practice had come with the advent of Internet and modern technologies. Thus, proceedings from 2004 onward can be accessed online in bilingual edition as unpublished proceedings in which Hindi original speeches

---

[111] Bengali and Tamil are also among the first languages that had requested the judiciary system to allow their usage in courts.

[112] If a member wants to speak in any so far unmentioned variety, he/she is still required to produce three copies of translated text in Hindi or English in advance.

[113] If one compares languages introduced with the list of Scheduled languages, Gujarati is omitted from the LSH for no evident reason although LSH refers to other languages accepted by the Parliament as to those of VIII Schedule. It could have been an unintended mistake made in the process of printing.

[114] According to Spary (2010: 311-336), regional languages still occur regularly, and usually to make representational claims to constituency interests.

appear next to English original speeches. Other language varieties remain without a proper accommodation, i.e. only in English translation.

In summary, the Parliament's practice in dealing with Hindi-English bilingualism in its proceedings and publications seems not to invoke anyone's curiosity today, as both Hindi and English are accepted as languages of political discourse in the Parliament. The general outline of language situation in Lok Sabha shows efforts to accommodate bilingualism and multilingualism to some extent. Thus, any research on its history, politics etc. has to account with at least two scripts and two languages in order to get a clearer picture on chosen topics. Any third language besides the short presence of Urdu cannot be found in either published or unpublished proceedings except in the form of English translation.

3.2.4. Summary

If we take everything thus far into consideration, Indian public sphere (administration, legislature, education, media and parliament) shows that English has an important role in it. It has either a unique position as single official language or one of them (see Table 3.1.), or a preferred position in other spheres. We have also seen that Hindi is present in public sphere and that the government propagates its usage (see Table 3.1. and Appendix 2.1.). However, Matišić (1982: 268-270, 283 and further) points out that Hindi did not have a very attractive set of values to propagate, i.e. it was not a prestigious variety, unlike English, which had slowed down Hindi's acceptance, at least in the decades after 1947. English, however, was perceived as more positive and prestigious variety, in a way that some Indian citizens sometimes even refer to English as national language although officially India had never proclaimed a national language as such. Even though Hindi caries some of the similar attributes, Hindi speakers often see it as a regional language, next to Bengali, Tamil, and other varieties.[115] Such labels give insight into common attitudes towards language varieties of the subcontinent, and as such are significant for this study as a reflection of what some of the political speakers in the Lok Sabha may share as a part of their system of socio-linguistic values.

---

[115] Matišić (1982: 283) also points out that Indians of non-Hindi background were also concerned about the possible dominance of Hindi speakers in public domain.

Another important aspect of languages' presence in public sphere to notice is the difference between *de iure* and *de facto* situation in language usage, which is visible in education sphere and probably present in other spheres as well. The third important aspect for English-Hindi relation is the implication that Hindi is the language for uplifting poorer classes of society (Orsini 2002: 335), just like English. In Orsini's words (2002: 335) Hindi had been able to exercise its own hegemony, despite the status given to English, and create middle class culture of a "subordinate but culturally self-satisfied middle class". In that sense it is also important to acknowledge observations such as that Palaniappan Chidambaram, a politician from Tamil Nadu has had made his first public speech in Hindi in 2012 (Sonntag 2014: 99), which some interpret as "if you have the highest ambitions in India, Hindi helps" (Banyan 2012).[116] In such circumstances, relation English-Hindi represents an interesting topic. If we consider Matišić's (1984) and Pollock's (2006) concepts of Sanskritic civilization and Sanskrit culture, it seems then that English is the successor of Sanskrit and Persian, i.e. the heir of values and concepts passed on from previous centuries. The question is not why but how does Hindi fit in that system of values. Does Hindi indeed represent a prestigious language only for members of particular background in Indian society? Another interesting question is whether the social value attached to English translates into linguistic and socio-linguistic evidence as well:

1) are English lexemes and influence of English in general present in non-standard Hindi,

2) are English lexemes and influence of English in general present in standard Hindi,

3) is English influence favored for the process of standardization in Hindi,

4) which Hindi speakers employ English elements in their speech,

5) should such speech be considered non-standard or standard Hindi?

Analysis of Lok Sabha debates will hopefully shed some light on those questions.

3.3. English-Hindi interference: linguistic data

Thus far, we have seen that Indian socio-linguistic environment is a multilingual one, and that the role of English in the society's public spheres is of particular nature. Prior to 19th century, the

---

[116] Cited according to Sonntag 2014: 99.

status that English seems to enjoy today belonged to Sanskrit and Persian. However, the social value attributed to Sanskrit and Persian in the era of their dominance translated into linguistic interference. Thus, the socio-political and cultural relevance of the languages was also visible in language body of linguistic varieties in the subcontinent at different levels: phonology, syntax, lexis, code-mixing and code-switching. Both Sanskrit and Persian, however, acted not only as donor languages (DL), but also as receiver languages (RL), having received transference elements from other languages in sociolinguistic environment.[117] Pre-modern varieties of Hindi were no exception to the rule, and thus there are elements of Sanskrit and Persian influence on several different levels: transference of lexemes, phonological elements, morphological and structural changes, etc.[118] Whereas Persian influence on Hindi, particularly standard Hindi, has been fading ever since change in socio-economic balance in 19th century,[119] the influence of Sanskrit on modern Hindi, particularly standard Hindi, has been on the rise ever since. The most important reason for the rise of its presence in Hindi and other modern Indian languages from 19th century onward is the standardization, i.e. planning of language corpus, which started in early 19th century and has been continued ever since in stages.[120]

Even though, Sanskrit and Persian were surely not the only two languages for which transference of linguistic elements into other languages can be ascertained on the subcontinent in previous centuries, their social position and symbolic value in identity formation, make them an interesting material in whose frame results for English transference today can be viewed. If socio-linguistic position makes possible comparison of English[121] to Sanskrit and Persian, its influence as donor-receiver languages (DRL) on the subcontinent for the last two centuries and particularly

---

[117] The work on Sanskrit discusses Sanskrit's relation to Indian languages in general, not just Hindi. See Burrow (1959), Scharfe (1977), Sridhar (2011), Krishnamurti (2003), Chaudhary (2009), etc. For Persian see Chaudhary (2009), Kuczkiewicz-Fraś (1997, 2003a, 2003b) etc.

[118] See Appendix 2.2. and 2.3. for more details.

[119] However, its influence has been at the same time on the rise in case of Urdu.

[120] Khubchandani (1997: 176-177) comments the negative aspect of borrowing and reborrowing from Sanskrit in following manner: "To equip Indian languages for new roles in administration, technical occupations, higher education and research, classicalists have begun a new trend of translating technical terms and concepts from Sanskrit stock; for example, *jalayān* for ship and *dūrvānī yantra* for telephone. The chances of success in this direction appear to be rather slim, since Indian speakers are prone to borrowing terms from living situations, rather than to coin artificial terms from the classical stock."

[121] Several other European languages have been present on the subcontinent: Dutch, Portuguese and French. The linguistic interference concerning them and Indian languages is also a topic in research circles. See Snell (2011), Cardoso (2006, 2007), etc.

since 1947, has to be taken into account as well as a result of particular socio-linguistic behavior. How do we find answer to that? The need to speak English gave birth to various linguistic formations on the subcontinent, from pidgins to what some researchers call standardized variety of Indian English,[122] as Hosali (2008) and Sailaja (2009) conclude. Those varieties, present in times of British Raj, are present even today, as speakers, in their desire to master English for various reasons, achieve different levels of fluency with which they achieve their communicative goals. Next to those, other varieties of English also exist in the subcontinent. In short, Indian English[123] can offer answers on the transference and influence of Indian languages on English, as the source of its distinctive characteristics is its South Asianization (Ferguson 1996: 38).[124]

The process of South Asianization is, according to experts, visible from phonological level onwards, in morphological innovations such as *cow-eater, dhobi-washed, goondaism*, etc., as well as in new syntactic formations as is absence of inversion in *wh-* questions, distinctive use of verbal tenses or tags (ex. *isn't it*), etc. Of course, lexical borrowing represents the widest bridge for Indian languages into English. The borrowed lexemes fall into two broad categories: 1) borrowings that have penetrated English as employed outside India and, 2) borrowings that have entered English as it is used on the subcontinent. The appearance of the first type of borrowings increased in English with the rise of connections and communication between Great Britain and Indian subcontinent, particularly after India became British colony in the second half of 19th century. Greater number of British citizens on the subcontinent had helped transmit some of the lexis then, just as the presence of subcontinent's minorities in U.K., U.S.A. or Australia helps transmit it today into English spoken there.

---

[122] Schneider (2007) disagrees on the existence of a single standardized agreed-upon variety of Indian English. Khubchandani (1997: 64) commented it as well. According to him, English has situated itself in the Subcontinent as contact language for speakers of various linguistic backgrounds and level of exposure to English. That results in "a scenario concerning a wide spectrum from a smattering grasp of English to 'native-like' command of English" (Khubchandani 1997: 64).

[123] See Schneider (2007), Kachru (1983, 1986 and later), Sedlatschek (2009), Balasubramaniam (2009) and others on that aspect.

[124] Perhaps the most visible sign of South Asianization is the number of books dedicated to analysis of errors and mistakes to smooth the English of Indian speakers.

The list of changes that are visible in English due to contact with subcontinent's languages is very long, as various researches show. The following one tries to present aspects on which scholars have worked lately or most often:[125]

a) phonetics and phonology (Bansal 1976, Chaudhary 1989, Gargesh 2004, etc.)

b) lexical innovations: compounding, hybrid constructions, abbreviations, redundancy (Barannikov 1984, Sailaja 2009, etc.)

c) loanwords (Hawkins 1984, Sharma 2011, Sedlatschek 2009, Yule and Burnell 1968, etc.)

d) use of articles (Sedlatschek 2009)

e) use of verbs, tenses and formation of questions (Sailaja 2009, Sedlatschek 2009, etc.)

f) history of changes in Indian English (Sailaja 2009)

g) syntax (Bhatt 2008b, Parasher 1994, Verma 1978, etc.)

h) reasons of interference (Bhatia 2011, Kachru 1978b, etc.)

i) code-switches (Anderson-Finch 2011, Barannikov 1984, Kachru 1978a, 1978b, Kumar 1986, Malhotra 1980, etc.).

But, as a part of larger trend on the subcontinent, English has left its mark on Hindi and other languages as well. As in the case of Indian English, research work is abundant and analyzes various aspects of transference, but in this thesis, we are interested in English influences on Hindi, while its influence on other languages will be occasionally mentioned to point out comparability of socio-linguistic situation and its results. Research, both newer and older (Kachru 1978a, Bhatt 1997, Bali et al. 2014) shows that

> "While the embedding of Hindi words in English mostly follows formulaic patterns of Nouns and Particles, the mixing of English in Hindi is clearly happening at different levels, and is of different types. This can range from single words to multiword phrases ranging from frozen expressions to clauses" (Bali et al. 2014: 124).

Whereas lexical transference of English elements in Hindi is very visible, nothing so far suggests that English phonemes had been incorporated into Hindi or any other language spoken in the subcontinent. One could argue that the lexical transference did perhaps help maintain some of the

---

[125] Compilation of features is based on Sailaja (2009).

sounds that had come into Hindi with Persian and Sanskrit influence: /f/, /z/, /š/, etc. However, I was not able to find any information on transference of English phonemes *per se* into Hindi.

The English derivational interference in Hindi or in any other Indian language appears to be present as a small number of suffixes (-*ist, -ism, -dom,* etc.) and prefixes (*sub-, vice-,* etc.) was borrowed and attached to nominal stems. Mostly, such elements are employed to create lexemes from borrowed English vocabulary. However, some speakers also attach them to Indian lexemes to form words such as *Buddhist, Hinduist, gurudom*, etc. Some Hindi authors, like Tivārī (1969: 251-253) and Śarmā (1998: 223) account *-full, non-, pro-,* etc. as borrowed derivational elements into Hindi even if they are never attached to Hindi stems as can be seen in following examples:

1) sub- *as in* sub-deputy inspector, subcommittee,

2) vice- *as in* vice-chancellor, vice-principal *(Śarmā 1998: 223).*

Interestingly, some speakers have interpreted certain lexemes in the process of borrowing as prefixes and employed them as such. Thus, a Hindi adjective *mukhya*, main, can be substituted with English lexeme *head-*, as in *headmaster*, main teacher, principal, *heḍpaṇḍit*, main teacher, main sage. Bhāṭiyā (1967: 204) adds to that list of borrowed items lexemes *half-*[126] and *double-* as in *hāfkamīz*, undershirt, and *ḍablroṭī*, bread, etc. More recent papers such as Borowiak's (2007, 2012), show that the derivational interference can include other types as well: 1) combination of Hindi prefix and English noun (*beticket*, ticketless), 2) English noun + Hindi suffix (*filmkār*, filmmaker; *stalinvād*, stalinism), 3) English noun + Hindi lexeme (*migrenepīṛit*, suffering from migrene).

As in the case of Sanskrit and Persian, the greatest influence of English on the subcontinent is visible in lexical borrowing. Bhāṭiyā (1967), Barannikov (1972, 1984 and other), Dvivedi (1971), Kachru (1978a), Miśra (1963) and others, had undertaken the analysis of such borrowings in Hindi. Barannikov's (1984) analysis of English borrowings in Hindi offers a typology similar to the one Filipović (1986) chose for his analysis of English loanwords in Serbo-Croatian. Following linguistic levels, from phonological to syntactic, Barannikov attempted to systematize and describe briefly occurrences he had taken notice of in Hindi as it was used during 1970's in

---

[126] Patnaik and Pandit (1986) also established use of 'head', 'full' and 'half' as prefixes in Oriya.

Indian cities and newspapers. Several decades later, Svobodová (2008) analyzed speech of middle-class Delhi inhabitants for her MA thesis, concentrating predominantly, however on code-switching. Particular registers in which EH interference occurs have also been part of research. Thus, Kuczkiewicz-Fraś and Gil (2014) analyzed English lexical influence in Business Hindi, discussing tradition of naming public institutions (banks, for example) and use of English elements in the sphere of banking and finance. Borowiak's (2007, 2012) and Si's (2010) analysis focused on EH interference in Bollywood film industry. A number of other works also discusses lexical transference: Bhāṭiyā (1967), Kachru (1978a), Bauer (2008), etc. Krishnamurti's (1998, 2003) typology of English lexical elements in Dravidian languages could be useful for studies of English lexical transference in Indian languages in general, but that is altogether another topic.[127]

The comparison of various research papers shows that nouns,[128] the predominantly borrowed type of lexemes into Hindi,[129] belong to diverse and elaborate lexicon, covering various semantic fields. They thus include basic lexemes such as *house, chair, table, stomach, head, school, friend,* etc. as well as highly specialized vocabulary (terminology)[130] in diverse spheres of human activity such as medicine, science, etc. The newly borrowed lexis also often shoves aside previously borrowed elements from other languages. Hindi speakers thus today insert English elements, and their Perso-Arabic lexemes seem to be lost to an extent. Among the lexical transference, nouns and verbs are dominant categories, followed by adjectives,[131] adverbs etc.

Borrowed English nouns are incorporated into system on one of two principles (Bhāṭiyā 1967: 187-188):[132]

1. attribution of grammatical gender and declination-type is based on word's form,
2. attribution of grammatical gender and declination-type is based on word's semantics.

---

[127] See also for Oriya Patnaik and Pandit (1986). For Sindhi see Khubchandani (1968) and for Tamil with observations on other languages as well see Pillai (1968), etc.

[128] 91% of all borrowed lexemes are nouns, claims Bhāṭiyā (1967).

[129] Several recent papers discuss frequency of words in English-Hindi code-mixing as observed in social media like Facebook (see Vyas et al. 2014, Bali et al. 2014).

[130] Matišić (1982: 281) commented that the development of terminology in India was not a result of need expressed by speakers, i.e. that often it was a result of state's investment not interest of experts to develop it for practical use.

[131] Bhāṭiyā (1967: 185) rather places borrowing of adjectives on the second place.

[132] For Sindhi see Khubchandani (1968).

Since speakers usually lent lexemes in singular, one would assume that the plural marker would be of indigenous provenance. Yet, several researches had shown that some English nouns appear in Hindi with English plural marker (Bhāṭiyā 1967, Barannikov 1984, Kumar 1985, Borowiak 2007, 2012). Bhāṭiyā (1967: 198-201) limited such borrowings to particular group of speakers, mostly to politicians and writers, nevertheless, he does acknowledge that some words have become widely accepted in the 'wrongly' created plural form: *advocates, workers, terms, presents, matches*, *drawers* etc. In a similar manner, some irregular English nouns (Bhāṭiyā mentions example of *foot – feet*) have been 'de-irregularized', creating a new plural form[133](*foot - foots*). Borowiak (2007: 5) assumes that the partially adapted nouns are nonce borrowings. However, he also argued (Borowiak 2007: 5) that there are at least two categories of English nouns in Hindi, the fully adapted ones, which are morphologically indistinctive from Hindi nouns, and partially adapted nouns that are either at first or second stage of adaptation. The process of adaptation, among some other elements, includes formation of plural with English element -*s/-es* and not with Hindi morphemes. In 2012, Borowiak published one more article to discuss among other things endings of English nouns in Hindi and to raise a question of their declension as not all of them fit Hindi declension patterns with their endings.

Plenitude of abbreviations based on English or Hindi lexemes and read out by speakers according to the pronunciation of English alphabet (compare *ITI*, Indian Technological Institute, and *RSS*, Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh) represents another particular aspect of English influence in the noun sector. Barannikov (1984: 171-184) assumed that their source was media language, from where they spread fast into spoken everyday Hindi. Kuczkiewicz-Fraś and Gil (2014) show that their presence is not limited to media; they are also present in public space, for instance to mark public institutions such as banks. LaDousa's (2014) visual data helps us understand relations of Hindi and English in Varanasi and also confirms presence of such abbreviations in advertisements in mixture of alphabets and languages. It is important to note once more that such examples are not specific to Hindi. Tamil has its share of such abbreviations (Prasad 2011: 152), and other languages of the subcontinent probably follow the suite.

---

[133] Kumar (1985) discusses use of English lexemes in science classroom. He does say that inserted lexemes can appear with Hindi inflection for plural, but according to him teachers often use English plural marker –s (Kumar 1985: 357).

According to Bhāṭiyā (1967: 185) borrowed adjectives follow nouns with 4.4 %. That leaves around 3.6 % of borrowings to verbs and other types of full lexemes, while 1% is reserved for borrowings on level lower than lexeme (morpheme). Some adjectives are formed from English nouns by attaching gender invariable Hindi adjectival suffix – *ī* as in *skūlī*, belonging to school, of school, *cākaleṭī*, of chocolate, *blekmārkeṭī,* of black market, etc. (Bhāṭiyā 1967: 202, Barannikov 1984: 188-202, Borowiak 2007: 12), forming thus a large group of 'fake borrowings' recognized by authors as 'hybrid formations'. The 'hybrid formations', called so because of combined structural elements from two different languages, however, include much greater variety than adjectives.[134] Borowiak (2012: 42) also mentions as a characteristic of EH interference changes in adjective comparison, i.e. introduction of English analytic and synthetic formations, borrowing of irregular comparison for both adjectives and adverbs, but does not offer any further details on those occurrences.

In Hindi, English verbs are followed by Hindi light verbs such as *karnā* 'do', *honā* 'be' or some other (*denā* 'give', *lenā* 'take', *ānā* 'come', etc.). According to Montaut (2016: 11), English verbs are recategorized as nouns and then followed by a light verb. In such a compound, the borrowed verb donates semantic filling while the indigenous verb, fulfills the role of grammatical marker. Barannikov (1984: 105-125) lists a large quantity of such borrowed verbs in his analysis of spoken Hindi in Delhi and Agra during 1970's. Such compounding leaves verbalization with infinitive morpheme *-nā* as a very rare occurrence. Authors such as Snell (2011: 27) and Bhāṭiyā (1967: 202) quote only several verbs that have entered Hindi verbal system with an infinitive morpheme: *rūlnā*, to rule, *filmānā*, to shoot a film, to create a film, *lūznā*, to lose. Montaut (2016: 10) claims it happens because of the transparency compounding with light verb offers to verb system (transitivity, causativity, etc.). Borowiak (2007: 8-11), however, distinguishes several categories in verbal compounds. On one side, there is a number of verbs formed from English nouns or adjectives joined by Hindi light verbs. On the other side, there are, according to Borowiak, verbs formed from English verbs, which are, also according to him, the most frequent type in modern Hindi. Having analyzed such compounds as a novel type of conjunct verbs, Borowiak (2012: 42) claims that such insertions lead to reanalysis in verb formation system.

---

[134] Nouns participate in such hybridization as well.

Thus, he points out the absence of genitive postpositions in such hybrids, but does not offer any examples to prove his point.

According to Borowiak (2007: 7), adverbs constitute a bigger portion of EH lexical interference in what he calls mixed Hindi. His data shows that such adverbs mostly modify Hindi verbs or adjectives. However, they can also modify English verbs and adjectives. In the film transcripts, he has not been able to discover 'hybrid structures' (English noun + Hindi postposition, Hindi adjective/noun + English morpheme –ly). He had, however, noticed that the position of some adverbs is influenced by English word order (Borowiak 2007: 7). According to Bhāṭiyā (1967: 215), another type of English influence in adverbs materializes through direct translation of adverbial phrases: H. *minaṭoṃ meṃ,* in few minutes, as compared to H. *śīghr hī.* Tivārī (1966: 300-301) gave a longer list of such adverbials that have become commonplace in contemporary Hindi. In those examples, the structure is taken from English and replaced with Sanskrit lexemes in some cases, as in *tattvatah*, in fact, *prathamatah*, firstly, etc. but even when there is no Sanskritization, it is easy to recognize English as a source due to direct translation*: kāfī acchā*, very good, *na keval yah balki*, not only this but.

Direct translations of English phrases have also introduced changes in Hindi's syntactic regulations. Bhāṭiyā (1967: 215-263) and Barannikov (1984: 212-214)[135] as well as Borowiak (2012) commented and recorded examples of such phrases in Hindi, whereas Kachru (1978a: 43) only mentions them briefly.[136] Krishnamurti (1984: 244) agrees with Bhāṭiyā that such expressions that he, as well as other authors, find unsuitable for Indian languages, enter spoken idiom via media discourse. With time, many such expressions that were once new, have had become part of neutral Hindi vocabulary, both in spoken and written language (*praśn pūchnā*, to ask a question, *prem meṃ girnā,* to fall in love, etc.). Calques are particularly present in metaphorical phrases such as *red handed, red tape, yellow journalism, golden opportunity, milestone,* a drop in the ocean, play with fire, etc. all of which have been literary translated into

---

[135] See also Kapur (1966).
[136] Patnaik and Pandit (1986) have detected similar changes in Oriya verbal valency in written variety of the language.

Hindi (Tivārī 1966: 303).[137] Another aspect of loan translations, pointed out by Snell (2011: 26), is disregard for derivational rules of Hindi, creating ambiguity in the sphere of derivation and compounding, as in the following example:

    1) E: *bus service* = service of buses

    2) H: *bus sevā* = service to buses

Bhāṭiyā's examples of syntactic interference sometimes go as far back as 19th century, as he compares two styles of relative sentences present today in Hindi. Thus, according to him (Bhāṭiyā 1967: 348) the sentence

ādmī, jo kal dillī se āyā thā,
man-NOM.SG who-REL.PRON.NOM yesterday-ADV Dilli-OBL.SG from-POST come-PFV.PTCP.SG.M be-3SG.AUX.PST.M,
āj prāta: kalkattā calā gayā
today-ADV morning-ADV Calcutta-OBL.SG go-PFV.PTCP.SG.M go-PFV.PTCP.SG.M
The man who came yesterday from Delhi, left Calcutta this morning.

in Hindi should be formed as

jo ādmī kal dillī se āyā thā,
who-REL.PRON.NOM.SG man-NOM.SG yesterday-ADV Dilli-OBL.SG from-POST come-PFV.PTCP.SG.M be-3SG.AUX.PST.M
āj prāta: kalkattā calā gayā
today-ADV morning-ADV Calcutta-OBL.SG go-PFV.PTCP.SG.M go-PFV.PTCP.SG.M
The man who came yesterday from Delhi, left Calcutta this morning.

Bhāṭiyā (1967: 349) claims that the first model of such relative sentence with posthead modifier *jo*, cannot be traced in Hindi prior to the beginning of 19th century and the texts of grammarian Lallūlāl, one of the first authors of Hindi prose who worked closely with British scholars in Fort Williams College in Calcutta. Puri (2011: 261 and further) ascribes its appearance in Hindi to translations from English into Hindi by non-native Hindi speakers. According to her, by 20th

---

[137] Plenty of such phrases have been translated from Persian into Hindi as well (Tivārī 1966: 301-302).

century and arrival of Premchand, such embedded relative clauses have become a part of Hindi grammar. Yet it is important to note that although Kachru (1978a: 42) mentions Tivārī (1966: 293) who sees it as well as influence of English, he also points out that not all agree on that noting that Guru (1962: 530-531) sees it as influence of Persian.

Tivārī (1966: 297) also pointed out the redundant presence of demonstrative pronoun *vah*, that, next to a subject-noun in main clause, under the influence of English article *the*. Further on, according to him, English syntactic interference is mostly felt in Hindi in the extensive use of parenthetical clause, changes in indirect speech (switch from first person to third person), increased use of passive agent *ke dvārā* (direct translation of English *by*) to express subject of passive sentence and emphasis on prose-writing.[138] Likewise, higher frequency of passive and impersonal constructions has been attributed to the syntactic interferences from English (Bhāṭiyā 1967, Kachru 1978a). Additional smaller syntactic changes that also happened due to interference or were, although present because of Persian interference, strengthened further by influence of English are, according to Tivārī (1966: 296-300), use of conjunction *'and'* , *'or...or'* , *'nor... nor'* . Borowiak (2012: 41-43) also pointed out the direct translation of prepositional verbal phrases from English into Hindi and their normalization in Hindi (ex. depend on X: *X par depend karnā,* stay in touch: *touch meṃ rahnā*). Kachru (1978a: 42) also mentions Miśra (1963: 175-177) who ascribed changes in word order from SOV to SVO in some styles of Hindi to English influence.

Krishnamurti (1998) and Annamalai (2001) have also pointed out an issue that occurs because of English influence, visible particularly in popular scientific texts and textbooks. The syntax in such texts is often transplanted directly from English and comprehension further made difficult because of the use of Sanskritized lexemes.[139] As Krishnamurti (1998: 236) concludes, "these terms are difficult for moderately educated monolingual speakers to understand unless they are explained to them". Same occurrence had been noticed by Abbi (1996: 155-167) in bank forms and other documents whose language, in her opinion, rather increases gap between language prescribers and language consumers, as phrases such as *niṣkṛti ḍākniyantrak*, issuing postmaster,

---

[138] Mentioned by Kachru (1978a: 42-43) as well.
[139] Snell (2011: 28) claims that such compounds although based on Sanskrit words/roots are constructed on the English model of compounds.

are used instead of *bhejne vālā posṭmāsṭar*. The same issue was identified on several occasions (1975, 1976, 1988, 1994, 2007, etc.) by the Department of Official Language (DOL) which identified a problem with Hindi translations of English documents in government offices.[140] Both Borowiak (2012: 41-43) and Snell (1990: 64) comment that such loans bring new syntactic relations into Hindi.

An interesting topic in the field of EH and HE interference had also been the question of code-switching. According to studies, English-Hindi code-switching is present in both private and public communication, advertisements, pop-culture, television, film and radio, and so on (Pandit 1986, Khubchandani 1997, Kachru 2006, Sailaja 2009, etc.). Some scholars labeled English-Hindi code-switching as a 'sign of educated speaker' (Gumperz 1961: 982-983, Pandit 1986: 13-15) or a "socially accepted marker of education and what may be termed 'westernization' in India" (Kachru 1978b: 109) or a tool to identify "membership in a particular social class" (Kachru 1978b: 109). Authors such as Bhatt (1997), Kachru (1978a), Kumar (1986), Pandit (1986), etc. had also analyzed it by means of formal grammatical tools, and others had concentrated as well on socio-linguistic analysis of reasons behind the phenomenon (Kachru 1978a, Kachru 1978b, Kachru 1986, Kachru 2006, Barannikov 1984, etc.). Kachru (1978a: 36-38) thus mentions attitude and linguistic reasons for the presence of code-switching: role, register, elucidation of terms and concepts, as well as interpretation. He also considers neutralization as one of the reasons for code-switching and explains that speakers use the strategy to conceal their social and regional identity. According to Svobodová (2008) code-switching is triggered by change of situation, topic and subjective-emotional conditions, and predominantly used to talk about education, science and technology or administration.[141] Pandit (1986: 27-28, 69 and further), however, argues that Hindi-English code-switching is a separate unmarked communication strategy for a group of non-native speakers whose important quality is that they have been educated, presumably at university level. This code Pandit (1986) calls MHE (mixed

---

[140] Similar observation Annamalai (2001: 108) made for Tamil and Indian languages in general for academic and scientific language claiming: „This reduces the comprehensibility of science texts in Indian languages for monolingual readers. One needs bilingual competence in English and the Indian language concerned to comprehend them."

[141] According to the same author, code-mixing is another relevant strategy used by speakers to express eliteness, conformity with new styles in communication or neutrality.

Hindi-English), and according to her it does not conform to postulates of discourse analysis, ergo topics, situations or intentions of speakers do not explain code-switching results.

Kachru (1978a: 32-41) had discussed some formal aspects of code-switching which later on had been elaborated by others. However, before constraints are discussed, it is important to note one of Pandit's conclusions which she had outlined as a result of her research on MHE. According to her (Pandit 1986: 50), constraints which have been formed as a part of her research are not predictive in nature. This she had stated probably because, as she mentions later on (Pandit 1986: 90-91), corpus analysis is bound to always prove want, as

> "a structure may not occur in the corpus considered and in this framework it will be declared ungrammatical, and just because a structure occurs, the grammar will be constrained to treat it as grammatical. Such situations cannot be avoided when a grammar is written on the basis of observed corpus alone. If a structure does not occur or occurs in a given corpus, it must be checked against more data and depending on whether it does not occur or occurs there also, constraints may be proposed."

Although her observation is aimed predominantly at the question of making conclusions on code's grammar, it is still relevant to questions of data analysis in general and conclusions on code-switching or code-mixing characteristics as such. In that light, her own findings as well as those of others should be seen.

Kachru's (1978a) article shows that the switch can happen between the sentences (inter-sentential code-switch) as well as within the sentence (intra-sentential code-switch). Pandit's analysis (1986: 36-51) also shows same results as she distinguishes between lexical, phrasal and clause-level code-switches. Svobodová (2008) demonstrated that decades later inter- sentential switching occurs at clause and sentence level, as well as that intra- sentential switching and intra-word switching take place. As a separate category Kachru (1978a: 34, 39-41) mentioned insertion of idioms and collocations, but more importantly he discussed existence of constraints in Hindi-English code-switching. Thus he talks about rank shift constraint, conjunction constraint, determiner and complementizer constraints. Bhatt's (1997: 223-251) is a more thorough analysis of constraints based on the field data, recorded speech and questionnaire about acceptability of grammatical (syntactic) elements in code-switch examples. His analysis shows that the

constraints can be violable under appropriate circumstances (Bhatt 1997: 237), and follow a hierarchy which is in accordance with language's syntax. Thus in Hindi head syntax constraint[142] and equivalence constraint[143] outrank linear precedence constraint[144] (Bhatt 1997: 248). In the same manner, spec constraint[145] outranks complaisance constraint[146] (Bhatt 1997: 248). His conclusions are in accordance with optimality theory of Prince and Smolensky (1993) emphasizes Bhatt (1997: 235) as the theory and his data show that in code-switching there are no rules per se, but rather interaction of constraints which aims towards "what constitutes 'well-formed'" (Bhatt 1997: 235), optimal outcome. As per him, in Hindi-English code-switching speakers tend not to switch subjects. Direct objects show greater tendency than subjects to be code-switched and indirect objects (beneficiary of direct object) have been the least-switched material (Bhatt 1997: 226-229). Further on, he mentions higher frequency for the switching of prepositional phrases, adverbial phrases and parentheticals, as well as of topicalized constituents (Bhatt 1997: 229, 231-232). According to his data, switch between verb and complementizer is uncommon, especially if the complementizer in front of the sentential complement is not overtly expressed (Bhatt 1997: 230-231). Just as the switch between complementizer and complement clause is permitted, Bhatt found that entire adjunct clause can be switched together with subordination conjunction (Bhatt 1997: 231). He, however, concludes that code-switch is "relatively free in non-argument positions (Bhatt 1997: 235). Pandit (1986: 46-50) commented on Kachru's observation on constraints from 1975 on conjunctions, complementizers and relative clause constructions, providing counterexamples for each of them. Thus her data shows that within the NP phrase, conjunction can belong to another language, as well as if it conjoins two sentences (Pandit 1986: 47). Next to that her analysis of complement sentences gives interesting results according to which English and Hindi complementizer (*that, ki*) both appear if the matrix sentence is in Hindi and embedded sentence in English. In case of Hindi complementizer, matrix sentence can be either in Hindi or English as well as embedded sentence, which gives a total of three values (H

---

[142] "Grammatical properties (e.g. case, directionality of government, etc.) of the language of the head must be respected within its 'minimal domain'." (Bhatt 1997: 236)

[143] "Switched items follow the grammatical properties of the language to which they belong." (Bhatt 1997: 236).

[144] "Items of code-mixed clauses follow the word order of the language of the Infl (TNS)." (Bhatt 1997: 236).

[145] "…the Spec of an XP must be of the same language as the head which assigns Case to that XP." (Bhatt 1997: 236).

[146] "… if Spec-XP switches, then head X switches too." (Bhatt 1997: 236).

sentence – E sentence, H sentence – H sentence, E sentence – E sentence). Such examples contradict Kachru's constraint that the complementizer from another sources is not inserted or that the preference is given to the complementizer which belongs to the same language as the first sentence (Pandit (1986: 48-50). Her analysis also covered on one side, types of NPs that appear in code-switched data, use of adverbials, verb phrase construction, and, on the other side, observable patterns in compound and complex sentences (Pandit 1986: 36-50). Thus, according to her data, in compound sentences, it is possible to have both Hindi and English sentences as either first or second conjunct, and conjunction can likewise be either in Hindi or English regardless of the language of the first conjunct (Pandit 1986: 40-42). Her analysis of complex sentences included conditionals, when-clauses, relative clause and complement sentences. As a result of that, Pandit concluded that in conditionals either subordinate or main clause can be in Hindi or English. However, *to* or *tab* were always used in her data, whereas English *then* did not occur. The similar situation was found in main clauses with temporal subordinate clause. Whereas in the subordinate clause both *jab* and *when* appeared, main clause was always signaled with Hindi *tab* or *to* (Pandit 1986: 43-44). In the analysis of relative clauses Pandit (1986: 45-46) found that either main or relative clause can be in both Hindi or English, and relative pronoun can be either Hindi (*jo*) or English (*who*). Ultimately her analysis is aimed at proving that Hindi-English code-switching is actually a separate code, distinct from either Hindi or English. According to her, speakers use this code "in situations where they would not use either of the languages of which this variety is a mixture" (Pandit 1986: 69). She further states that the code is used by educated, urban Hindi speaking community, and can like any other language fulfill communicative referential, expressive connotational and social symbolic functions (Pandit 1986: 76-77). Yet, her analysis is not without its limitations. For one, her analysis is based on interviews of 18 people, of which at least 12 were women, if not all, they all had university degree or were in the process of getting one and lived in Delhi (Pandit 1986: 30-35). She was aware herself that her data is influenced by the social status of her informants. Secondly, she treats data in which dominant language is English same as the data in which dominant language is Hindi, which according to me does not always help in the analysis.

Interesting study had been offered by Si (2010: 388-407) who researched diachronic aspect of code-switching in Bollywood film scripts. Her conclusion suggests increasing complexity of code-switching over the period studied in the paper (1980s-2000s), as well as the increase in the alternations, as defined by Muysken (2000), "at the expense of single-word insertions" (Si 2010: 388). It is worth mentioning that her research, although done on a relatively small corpus (seven films), suggests the proportional increase in the use of English, particularly post-1990. It also suggests the change in the quality of EH interference as

"CS patterns have changed over time, with dialogues from the 1980s containing a preponderance of English insertions into Hindi, and post-2000 dialogues showing a far greater proportion (compared to previous decades) of Hindi-English alternations, English-only turns and Hindi insertions into English." (Si 2010: 402).

In other words, Si's diachronic study shows that the EH interference has been changing its course over two decades from the borrowing type of interference towards code-switching type of interference in EH interference and towards borrowing type in HE interference in which case English becomes the language into which Hindi lexemes are inserted.

One more important aspect of English-Hindi relationship had been discussed by Pandit (1986). It concerns attitudes of society towards use of Hindi-English code-switching and code-mixing and the interpretation of its proper social space. Pandit (1986: 14-22) thus defines not just speakers as educated speakers, but also defines the usage range of such code as informal speech. Her further elaboration shows that she includes both written and spoken usage, as she mentions not just oral communication between any two people next to oral usage on radio or television, but also usage in magazines and newspapers for various purposes. Yet, as she claims, such code is frowned up and generally not approved by others. For Khubchandani (1997: 143) Anglicized Hindi is a form of "elegant-casual Hindi-Urdu", popular "among the educated upper middle class". According to him (Khubchandani 1997: 170), it is used in urban oral speech, unlike Sanskritic Hindi which is used in elegant writing, says the author. Unlike Pandit, he does not comment whether English-Hindi speech is frowned upon in certain situations or by certain speakers. He also does not mention whether Anglicized Hindi is used as intra-group code, as Pandit's study suggests, or as inter-group code. Khubchandani also does not analyze Anglicized Hindi as a separate code, whereas Pandit (1986) emphasizes it continuously

65

All of the above demonstrates the bidirectional nature of language contact between Hindi and English. Additionally, when considering broader picture, one also notices studies that describe similar findings concerning English and other Indian languages, from borrowing of lexemes to code-switching. Such linguistic evidence thus supports the idea of English as the new dominant language in the subcontinent, or at least the idea of English as the important element for Hindi speakers.

3.4. Conclusion

As a language of outsiders, English fits the Sanskrit cosmopolis well. First, it has to be learned by everyone. Secondly, it does not disclose ethnic identity, but it does symbolize one's "class" identity as once Sanskrit symbolized universality and political power. Its stability is guaranteed by centuries old tradition in writing and if perceived from the stand point of the 19th century, English had had resources (grammars, dictionaries, elaborate vocabulary) that other languages in India had had just started to create at that time. Those advantages have been then and have remained to be until today disadvantages for Hindi. Thus, it can be said in summary that although Hindi propagators have put a lot of effort to make Hindi a viable political and cultural tool that could incorporate and reproduce values of Sanskrit culture, the studies show that the role had belonged to English in the first half of 20th century. According to Chatterji (1973: 44), the year 1947, did not bring the real change for the relation of English and Hindi, even if Hindi had become official language of the union administration and official language of several states and union territories as

> "inspite of all the propaganda and official and other pressures, Hindi itself is becoming more and more Anglicized in thought, syntax and vocabulary and idiom (along with other Indian speeches)."

Although English was at first kept on temporary basis, today its symbolical, particularly political, value is visible in keeping English as the associate official language of the union, as well as in naming it one of or sole official language in several states and union territories. Relevance of English to education policy, media, legislature and administration at union and state level as well as to economy suggests the same conclusion. Agnihotri's and Khanna's (1997) study of English

in India towards the end of 90's showed that English was present in private as well as in public communication in different situations.

It is, however, important to note that a number of language acts and standardization goals have been set for Hindi and its usage in public communication. As a pan-Indian language, Hindi had been heavily Sanskritized like many, if not all, modern Indian languages in the process of their standardization and preparation for public communication. It was not before early 70's that the Sanskritization had been reduced and colloquial Hindi appeared in newspapers (Friedlander 2009: 257, Ninan 2007: 60). Yet, recent studies such as Vyas et. al (2014) and Bali et al. (2014) together with Si (2010) demonstrate the presence of English in Hindi in film industry and social media in 21st century, and thus show that new generations of Hindi speakers and wide Hindi audience actively produce and absorb Hindi with English elements. Likewise, studies of more recent Hindi newspaper languages and business jargon like Kuczkiewicz-Fraś (2014) confirm presence of English. On the other side, however, recent studies, like LaDousa's (2014), describe Hindi of textbooks as *śuddh* Hindi (pure Hindi), which means that the Sanskritization has not left the education premises. Thus, Hindi speakers appear to be exposed to at least two different types of Hindi in public space, a Sanskritized variety of Hindi and Hindi with English elements.

The questions that such socio-linguistic environment opens for the socio-linguistic study of Lok Sabha debates as a sample of public communication are following:
1) extent of English's influence in Hindi in the debates,
2) profiles of speakers using English elements in Hindi in the debates.

That information will help us determine whether English is present in Hindi in the same manner as at a time other researches had been conducted. In other words, it will offer a chance to question or confirm some of previous conclusions as well as to better understand the complexity of English's presence in Hindi and that of speakers' profile in Lok Sabha.

Chapter 4:

Language use in the Parliament of India 1950-2010

4.1. Lok Sabha material

In the previous chapter we have seen that the EH interference has been researched from various angles. In this chapter the data collected from parliamentary debates will be presented and analyzed. The data had been collected from parliamentary debates held from 1950 to 2010. As entire data from that period could not have been included in the analysis, its scope had been narrowed to analysis of data from every fifth year in the period 1950-2000, and analysis of data from each consecutive year in the period 2000-2010. The data for each year had been further narrowed down, as the amount of pages that would have to be analyzed by hand was still too big. Thus, in the first period, for years ending in 0, approximately 1000 pages of raw material had been analyzed, and for years ending in 5, approximately 500 pages had been analyzed. In the second period, 2000-2010, approximately 1000 pages had been analyzed for years 2000-2004, and for the years 2005-2010 approximately 500 pages had been analyzed. In the randomly selected dates of parliamentary debates, pages on which Hindi text appeared had been counted and then compared to the total number of pages in the material taken for analysis. Appendix 1.2 shows the distribution of pages in total and those in which Hindi appears, for each analyzed year. From the same appendix it is visible that next to Hindi and English, third language, Urdu, written in Perso-Arabic script, also appeared in the material for certain years in the first period. After 1980, Urdu in Perso-Arabic script had not been noticed in the analyzed material. The same appendix also gives an overview of number of Hindi speakers analyzed in the data in comparison to the total number of parliamentary members for each Lok Sabha.

If we look closely at dates for each year, it becomes apparent that the said number of pages in reality includes a very small sample, sometimes just debate held in one single day. For that reason, the statistical data in the results has to be taken only as illustration of the language situation in the field. For the same reason, researcher had opted for the qualitative analysis of linguistic data rather than for statistical. From that, researcher hopes to be able to add some new insight on English transference in Hindi.

The analysis in the thesis is interested in two main aspects of language behavior observed in the Lok Sabha material:

1) **linguistic** aspect of language behavior: whether it is possible to deduct rules of English transference in Hindi

2) **sociolinguistic** aspect of language behavior: whether it is possible to deduct rules on probable users of observed language behavior.

The insights from those are to be combined in the attempt to interpret the language behavior of Hindi speakers observed in the Lok Sabha material. In Chapter 4, the linguistic aspect of language behavior will be analyzed, whereas the sociolinguistic analysis takes place in Chapter 5. In Chapter 6, researcher attempts to interpret collected information.

4.1.1. Framework for linguistic analysis

The process of organization and systematization of the parliamentary data pointed out the need of choosing the most suitable tool for such endeavor. In some previous studies of English and Hindi contact (see Pandit 1986), English insertions in Hindi are treated along Hindi insertions in English. According to the researcher, that is the first thing that should be distinguished, even though there are cases where the results of the contact between the two overlap.[147] The separation of those two processes and results can help researchers get a clearer picture of situation and rules that presence of one particular language as a structural base permits. Thus, this analysis is focused on the study of transfer of linguistic features from English to Hindi (EH interference), and not on the transfer of linguistic features from Hindi to English (HE interference). In other words, it is assumed that Hindi represents the structural frame for the data collected from Lok Sabha material. Examples 1a, 1b and 1c demonstrate the type of material that was collected for the study. Examples 2a, 2b and 2c show the type of data that the present study was not interested in, and in which English can be considered matrix or structural base.

1a. islie maiṃ *comrade* bāsudeva ācārya jī se apnī or se yah *appeal* karnā cāhūṅgī ki… (61, 05/05/2010)[148]

That is why I would like to appeal to comrade Basudev Acharya so…

---

[147] See section on EH 3 interference type in this chapter.

[148] In all examples in the study, English lexemes are written as per English orthography as researcher was not interested in analysis of orthographical alterations in English lexemes in the EH interference. One of the reasons is that such transfer occurs in the material due to transcribers and not speakers whose utterances are analyzed. Another reason is that such words and/or sentences were difficult for me to read and re-read and I assumed that the reader would feel the same. Here is an example of sentence that was written in Devanagari although majority of it was in English and not in *Hindi:* yahāṃ ke laṛke laṛkiyāṃ, de kear mor phār dear luks dain dear buks *(313-4, 1/9/1970). The sentence reads as* Local boys and girls (Hindi), they care more for their looks than their books (English).

1b. *I have not yielded.* Maiṃ *yield* nahīṃ kar rahā hūṃ. (84, 05/05/2010)

I have not yielded. I am not yielding.

1c. … śivasenā *communal right* kī bāt nahīṃ karegī to kyā koī anya *party* vahāṃ *communal* right *kī bāt karegī.* They are saying that. We believe that if the Minister ... *(42, 04/05(2010)*

If Shivasena will not discuss communal rights, is there any other party there that will discuss it? They are saying that. We believe that if the Minister …

2a. … on the 12th of February, in a purely non-violent way, the *dalits* of Orissa did a *Satyagraha* and forced the temple management and the gates of the temple were opened for the *dalits.* (128, 06/05/2010)

2b. We cannot deny the legacy of the *manuvadi* society in our country; (124, 06/05/2010)

2c. In Delhi also, I attended and inaugurated their *dharna* and in Mumbai, suburban train service in Mumbai is the lifeline. (40, 04/05/2010)

Next element that was noticed in several studies on language contact was the interchangeable usage of terminology. Thus, code-mixing and code-switching are sometimes taken as synonyms and, on other occasions, as separate processes. In this study, however, the description of data is based on Matras's (2009: 111-114) idea of continuum between code-switching and borrowing (Figure 4.1.). As can be seen in Figure 4.1 Matras supposes that on the opposite ends of the continuum one can find monolingual speaker who does not code-switch unlike the proficient bilingual speaker. The space in-between is filled with "bundle of criteria, each arranged on a continuum" (Matras 2009: 113) that cover all the transitive and complex cases between those two opposites. Most of those transitions can be, however, according to Matras (2009: 114) described as belonging to a type of bilingual speaker as some of them might have a very minimal knowledge of the second language. Further on, he assumes that bilingual speakers have a skill to code-switch using elaborate utterances to achieve conversational effect, whereas monolingual speakers borrow single lexical items (only etymologically foreign to them) which often represent default expressions for particular concepts (Matras 2009: 112). Matras also assumes that para-lexical items[149] are closer to the

---

[149] Matras quotes as an example use of lexeme *Bahnhof* by Turkish emigrants in Germany. Instead of translating concept in Turkish, new speakers implement a new word to address it.

borrowing side of the continuum, whereas core vocabulary is often inserted by choice to create particular effect (Matras 2009: 113). He also assumes that in this continuum speakers opt for various frequencies of regularity. Thus, particular utterance could be a regular occurrence, independent of contextual constraints, or it could appear only once. It could also be structurally integrated or not. Despite some of the questions, such as whether functionality always operates the way Matras assumes, the continuum is found useful for the study as it introduces the idea of non-binary classification of data. In such environment it is assumed that there can exist in theory a language behavior that accommodates elements that can be placed between two opposite ends of spectrum, i.e. code-switching and borrowing. What that entail for the type of speaker, i.e. whether we can ever classify a speaker as being between bilingualism and monolingualism is a question for another discussion.[150]

The important element that analysis takes into account is the composition. The initial overview of data already showed that its complexity has to be managed in categories that would be easier to follow and analyze.

| Bilinguality |
| bilingual speaker ↔ monolingual speaker |
| Composition |
| elaborate utterance/phrase ↔ single lexical item |
| Functionality |
| special conversational effect, stylistic choice ↔ default expression |
| Unique referent (specificity) |
| lexical ↔ para-lexical |
| Operationality |
| core vocabulary ↔ grammatical operation |
| Regularity |
| single occurence ↔ regular occurence |
| Structural integration |
| not integrated ↔ integrated |
| codeswitching ↔ borrowing |

Figure 4.1. A bidirectional code-switching – borrowing continuum.[151]

Thus, following Matras's distinction between elaborate utterance and single lexical item, four broad categories of observed EH interference have been deducted: EH 0, EH 1, EH 2 and EH

---

[150] In theory, environment such as Lok Sabha represents a space in which both bilinguals and monolinguals can be assumed to exist. The nature of the data, however, does not offer a solid confirmation and / or recognition of categories in which observed speakers would fit.

[151] Source: Matras (2009: 111).

3. This classification takes into consideration Pandit's (1986: 99)[152] observation that in language contact one language always represents structural frame with which elements from other language interact. That governing language (Pandit 1986: 108-109) may not be the same as dominant language in the text. The first supplies structure, and the second supplies lexical entries. In some examples two might overlap, i.e. both functions are performed by the same language, and in some examples they are two different languages. It should be noted here that the researcher is well aware of the fact that not all instances of interference were always recognized. Hence in the category EH 0, a reader should suppose not only that such speakers have not shown in their speech elements of EH interference, but rather that EH interference has not been observed. There are several reasons why this is important.

First of all, certain elements of EH interference, such as phonological traits, have not been observed due to the nature of data. Hence, it could be that some speakers whose speech had been marked by researcher as EH 0 show some of the elements from English on this level that could not be noted on the paper. One such element that cannot be checked for all debates is the question whether numbers were uttered by speakers in English or in Hindi, as in the debates we find them noted down in the form of digits.

Table 4.1. Interference categories in parliamentary debates.

Phrase Level	Mixed Type of Interference	Clause & Sentence Level
EH type 1 single-worded phrase	**EH type 1;3** EH type 1 + EH type 3	**EH type 3**
EH type 2 multiple-worded phrase	**EH type 2;3** EH type 2 + EH type 3	

Second reason is that certain phrases, such as *pyār karnā, to love* have been accepted by Hindi speakers although they are direct translations of English phrases. Moreover, researcher would require far greater knowledge on the history of Hindi language to recognize such EH transference every time it occurs.

Third reason is that some of English phrases in Hindi are sometimes inserted using Sanskrit lexemes, which makes them even more difficult to unearth.

---

[152] For Pandit (1986: 99) the constraint which she formulates as „MHE sentences do not violate the structural pattern of the governing language of the sentences." is a rule which all sentences in MHE (mixed Hindi-English) observed.

For those reasons, the first broad category, EH 0, includes speakers in whose speech patterns no visible signs of EH interference were detected. That leaves us with three categories in which visible signs of EH interference occur: EH 1, EH 2 and EH 3 (Table 4.1.). The differences between them can be described as syntactic.

The EH 3 differs from the EH 1 and EH 2 as it includes instances with EH interference which comprise of at least a sentence clause or, on the other side, of the entire sentence. Thus, all instances in which in a Hindi sentence at least one clause was in English are put in the group EH 3. Similarly, if in the Hindi discourse there were instances of included English sentence or sentences, the speech of that particular speaker was classified as EH 3 type.

That leaves EH 1 and EH 2 as categories on the level lower than clause, i.e. as categories at the level of phrase. The difference between EH 1 and EH 2 is structural. Whereas phrases placed in EH 1 group all consist of single lexeme, phrases in EH 2 group consist of at least two English lexemes in Hindi text, such as adjective + noun, noun + noun, etc. The main reason for such differentiation of interference on phrasal level is that it offers an opportunity to analyze single and multi-worded phrases, and see if any relevant conclusion can be made at the moment regarding their preference or structural differentiation within the data collected in Lok Sabha.

Another important observation to note is that the behavior of speakers in the Lok Sabha does not always fit well in the categories devised by the researcher. In other words, the categories EH 1 and EH 2 are by some speakers combined within the same discourse with EH 3. Thus, a speaker A would start a sentence in Hindi, but would before switching to English in another clause or sentence, use a phrase in English in the first clause or first sentence. After a lot of thinking, it was decided that such instances represent a complex language behavior, which confirms Matras's idea of continuum.

As such it was then further divided into instances in which

a) interference on the level of a clause or a sentence is interchanging with single-worded interference (EH 1;3),

b) interference on the level of a clause or a sentence is interchanging with multiple-worded interference (EH 2;3).

As already mentioned, EH interference on the level of phonology is not part of this study. That leaves analysis of morphological adaptation, syntactic adaptation and semantic adaptation. Semantic adaptation is, like phonological adaptation, not included in the analysis. One important reason is that such analysis would require identification of lexemes which are

on the borrowing side of the Matras's continuum. That would have to be followed by survey of semantic aspects of such lexemes in English and then by the comparison of their usage in Hindi. All in all, such analysis asks for a separate and detailed study and from such researcher refrains at this stage. In case of EH 1 and EH 2, morphological and syntactic adaptation represent important elements in the analysis, and in the case of EH 3, the analysis includes observation of syntactic inclusion of English clauses in Hindi text similarly to Pandit's (1986) study.

With the implementation of such a framework, the research hopes to achieve the following:

1) clarity in the presentation of data, i.e. to discourage implications and assumptions caused by terminology which is not uniformly defined across the discipline,

2) openness of the data to various interpretations and discussion.

4.1.2. Assumptions and limits of the analysis

The analysis is expected to reveal the following details about EH interference:

a) which linguistic elements (parts of speech, syntactic patterns, etc.) participate in EH interference,

b) how are those elements, if they are, incorporated into Hindi system,

c) which elements (parts of speech) show signs of stability (constant appearance) in EH interference,

d) which changes in particular aspects of EH interference can be observed within the frame of 60 years,

e) the rising or falling pattern of EH interference of particular types in Lok Sabha over decades: which EH types are "popular" with the analyzed speakers at a particular moment,

f) whether it is possible to generalize rules about EH interference from the available data.

As we have seen in previous chapter, researchers have analyzed the extent in which particular parts of speech, i.e. nouns, adjectives, etc. participate in EH interference. In this study, the data will be analyzed to confirm or further develop some of the previous conclusions regarding the occurrence of particular parts of speech in EH interference and the characteristics of such elements in EH environment.

The diachronic perspective is deemed important for several reasons:

1) It allows us to observe how particular aspects of EH interference behave or change over decades and to discover which types of EH interference were or are most often enhanced in the analyzed material.

2) It also shows us how such elements are incorporated into Hindi system and whether or not there are any changes in incorporation strategies over time.

3) Next to that, diachronic perspective signals which elements at a certain period have been deemed, on one side, borrowable by speakers and on the other side, approved and accepted by the community after a certain period.

Related to the acceptability is the question of stability of particular occurrences and strategies. Linguistics distinguishes between several levels of adaptation that the transferred elements undergo. Hence, the researcher assumes that once the element has been accepted by the community, which is marked by the full adaptation to grammar rules of a new linguistic environment, the element can be deemed stable. Further on, a greater number of speakers would be encouraged to use such elements. Opposite to that, new interfering elements would be marked as unstable interference and would not be fully adapted to their new environment, in this case Hindi, as Borowiak (2007, 2012) argued for English nouns in Hindi. In this study the question of stability will be analyzed in regard to EH1 type of interference as EH2 examples can not be claimed to be on the borrowing side of Matras's continuum. It is also narrowed down to the most often transferred elements according to prior studies, nouns, adjectives and verbs.

With all that said, it is important to note the shortcomings of the analysis. First of all, results are based on the observation of a relatively small quantity of data and as such cannot be used to make general observations of Hindi speakers' tendencies at any moment. The most accurate claim would be that the results represent description of speech patterns of particular MPs found in the Lok Sabha. However, not all MPs speech patterns have been observed, as the data was limited to a particular number of analyzed pages. It is not highly likely that such random choice of pages was able to capture the majority of Hindi speaking MPs in a particular session, or even the considerable number of them. In that sense, the falling and / or rising tendency of EH interference in a particular year or period (1950-1995, 2000-2010) should be taken with extreme care and merely as one possible outcome. It is, thus, possible to imagine that another study with a different 1000 pages count for any of the years in question could show different results.

Fully aware of this shortcoming, the researcher has decided not to pursue statistical analysis of data, as already mentioned. Ergo, reader cannot expect to find answers on percentages of particular occurrence in the following pages, whether it is the question of occurrence of nouns, adjectives etc. or of particular lexeme or syntactic pattern. Likewise, the analysis does not reveal how many times have any of the analyzed speakers employed

particular EH type. Rather, the analysis shows that speakers with particular EH type occur in the analyzed material for any of the years. Thus, values such as those in Table 4.5 represent relative values that arise from attribution of EH 0, EH 1, EH 2 or EH 3 as a speech pattern to observed speakers in the data. Same relations are also expressed on maps for each of the studied years (1947, 1949, 1950, 1955, etc.),[153] on each of which a single dot represents one speaker. That dot, however, does not tell us how complex language behavior of each of the speakers is. In some instances speakers realize EH1 behavior, in others EH2. The results were simplified for all years in the general analysis to represent the most complex behavior visible in speaker's repertoire. Table 1 in Appendix 3.2, derived from the raw data for May 3rd 2010,[154] shows a small sample of complex analysis of data for 2010, in which complex language behavior of each Hindi speaker is shown in relation to speakers who used English or other languages in the Lok Sabha debates. From Table 1 in the Appendix 3.2 it is visible that Hindi speakers alternate EH types in the data. It is also visible that the EH types are not directly related to their use of English in the same discourse or on the environment, i.e. speakers that participate in the conversation.

Looking at data from this perspective, it becomes clear that the data is not statistically relevant for Hindi language speakers in general. However, in several places, general assumptions regarding statistics of occurrences are made. Thus, English nouns occur more often than English prepositions, which has been verified in previous studies, and can be seen in the Lok Sabha data as well. Such observations are, however, based on the general perception of collected data and studied material, and should not be, and cannot be, taken as rules that apply to all types of EH environments.

To summarize, the analysis of data shows different types or sets of language strategies in the Lok Sabha that result from EH interference. The data cannot claim to offer description of all elements that could occur as a result of EH interference. This is primarily because of the small quantity of data. Working with any corpus, it is impossible to predict or attest all possible types of behavior. To reach a more abstract level of conclusions, it would be necessary to look into the larger quantity of data in the same source (Lok Sabha) as well as in other sources (films, social media, TV or radio stations, etc.). The thesis should thus foremost be looked at as an attempt to describe, as thoroughly as possible, qualitative aspects of EH interference as perceived in the Lok Sabha. Although such analysis does not give an insight in

---

[153] See Appendix 4.2.
[154] Raw data can be found in the Appendix 3.2. It shows names of all speakers that participated in the debate on that day, page number, territory unit which speakers represent, if the same was mentioned in the material. Raw data also shows whether speaker addresses audience in English or Hindi. For Hindi speakers it also contains information on EH 0, 1, 2 and 3 and examples.

statistics of occurrences, it does contribute to observations in to already existing research on morphological and syntactic adaptation of English elements in Hindi environment.

4.2. EH interference types 1 and 2

The data in this part of the analysis is organized around parts of speech: nouns, adjectives, verbs, etc., as it was determined to be the most transparent factor. Thus, noun phrases are dealt with separately from verb phrases etc. Within each category several questions are asked regarding the degree of an element's incorporation into Hindi and the strategies applied to achieve that level of integration. Also within each category, single-worded and multiple-worded phrases (e.g., single-worded and multiple-worded noun phrases) are distinguished, if it is relevant to the data. Due to the nature of acquired data, phonological adaptation and interference are excluded from the analysis. The analysis is focused on levels of morphological and syntactic adaptation. Morphological adaptation in Hindi refers to the analysis of gender, number, and other grammatical features. Syntactic analysis is expected to show how an element behaves syntactically in the new environment. The main aim was to present functions that English elements of EH type 1 and 2 can occupy in the sentence (for example functions of English elements in an NP).

4.2.1. Assumptions and expected results

The general assumption is that interfering material is at least partially integrated into Hindi. Thus, it is assumed that nouns have been accommodated as masculine or feminine nouns and have, in the process, acquired Hindi inflective endings. Adjectives are expected to follow rules of Hindi system, and the same can be said of any English part of speech interfering in Hindi. Another assumption is that English verbal forms are incorporated as bare infinitives via verbalizers such as *karnā*, to do, and *honā*, to be, and that the verbal material is fitted into Hindi SOV word order. In the end an attempt to generalize some rules for the EH types 1 and 2 will be made.

4.2.2. Hindi noun phrases and EH interference

As a left-branching variety, Hindi assigns modifiers as predecessors of head nouns. With the full modifier's position, the noun phrase in Hindi (Masica 1993: 373) can be described as:

(Genitive phrase)[155]

---

[155] Genitive relation in Hindi is not considered a case, but rather a mechanism for derivation of adjectives from nouns, particularly since postposition *kā, ke, kī* is congruent with the gender of the head noun, as any other changeable adjective. Masica is aware that the postpositions in Hindi and other new Indo-Aryan languages are not real cases; moreover he (Masica 1993: 233) claims that they are typologically either agglutinative suffixes or analytic particles (Layer II elements). He (Masica 1993: 238), however, further states: "The oblique cases with distinct Layer II markers in one NIA language or another are Dative (or Dative-Accusative), Agentive (or

+ Determiner + Quantifier + Adjective (phrase) + Noun

(Locative phrase)[156]

Some authors, such as Sinha (1986: 90, 127-132), have pointed out that noun phrases in Hindi have right-placed modifiers as well as emphasizers and qualifiers. Nevertheless, their position is not strictly limited to the right-side of a head noun, as they can also be inserted to the left of the noun, after the modifier and before the noun itself, as Sinha himself shows and thus the noun phrase can be described as:

(Genitive phrase)

+ Determiner + Quantifier + Adjective modifier + Emphasizer+ Noun + Emphasizer + Qualifier

(Locative phrase)

Let us explain what each of the modifiers is in a Hindi noun phrase. In Hindi, the place of a determiner can be empty or filled with demonstrative pronouns in singular or plural, or with a numeral *ek* (one). The position of a quantifier can be filled with numerals and other quantity-indicating elements. Adjective modifiers can consist of single or several adjectives and their quantifiers. Sinha defines emphasizers as words that tend to intensify the meaning of one or more items in the noun phrase (1986: 130). Those, then, can appear either on their own (*bhī*, too; *hī*, the very) or in a combination. Qualifiers, according to Sinha, can be defined as an element which always follows a noun head (1986: 127). Sinha differentiates two sub-categories of it: a) non-rank shifted and b) rank-shifted qualifiers. The first group consists of reflexive adjectives (*khud*, *svayaṃ* – own) as well as adverbials and honorific elements (*jī*, *sahab*, etc.). The second one consists of relative clauses (Sinha 1986: 129), which can be described as an attribute/apposition of a head noun (adjectival clause).

Some of Sinha's examples, however, show that a relative clause does not have to be necessarily positioned after the head noun. It can also be placed on the left side, before the head noun. A bit more light is shed onto the topic by Kachru (1980: 32-35),[157] as she explicates the order of head nouns and relative clauses according to syntactic roles in the sentence:

Ergative), Instrumental, Sociative (or Comitative), Ablative, Locative, Genitive, and Vocative. See Spencer 2005 on further discussion on case system in Hindi and here in the text.

[156] All references to postpositions as case markers (genitive, dative, accusative, etc.), which Masica adopts, should be taken as a mere convenience to describe phenomena. Hindi as an agglutinative language has only three cases: nominative case, vocative case and oblique case. Other syntactic relations in the sentence are accomplished through the use of postpositions which follow a noun or pronoun. According to Spencer (2005: 444-445), "the Layer II postpositions are syntactic terminals, but morphologically they are phrasal affixes."

[157] Kachru (1980: 29) is of the opinion that neither appositive relative clauses nor restrictive relative clauses are constituent parts of the noun phrase in Hindi. However, she further states: "For convenience, relative clauses will be discussed as if they are a part of the noun phrase, along with the antecedent or head noun."

a) subject position – relative clause precedes the head noun,

b) non-subject position – relative clause follows the head noun.

Kachru (1980: 32-33) brings additional rule in connection with the definiteness of head nouns:

c) a relative clause follows the head noun, irrespective of its syntactic role, if the head noun is indefinite.[158]

Lastly, the genitive phrase, as Masica refers to it, should be discussed as a modifier in Hindi noun phrase. Here, first of all, it is important to say that Hindi differentiates only three cases: nominative, vocative and oblique. The postpositions which are added to nouns in oblique case do not represent cases. According to Spencer (2005: 434), one of the reasons for labeling Layer II forms as cases was probably their function, as they serve to mark grammatical functions, such as subject. According to him (Spencer 2005: 445) such treatment of Layer II postpositions is redundant, as those postpositions fail to project a phrase. Instead "they adjoin directly to the NP to which they apply, but since they fail to project, the categorical features of the host NP remain unchanged. In particularly, this means that the case value of the NP will remain that of the head noun, namely, oblique" (Spencer 2005: 445).

Therefore, a genitive phrase, or the genitive case as such, just as other cases known from other linguistic varieties (dative, accusative, locative, instrumental, etc.), is not in fact a distinct case form. The genitive form, in Hindi refers to the formation of possessive adjectives. According to Spencer (2005: 439), an NP is given "the agreement syntax of an adjective, while remaining an (oblique case marked) NP." According to Masica's model for NP (1993: 372-373), the genitive phrase, or NP in oblique case marked as an adjective, differs from a lexical adjective in its position within the noun phrase. It is placed furthest most to the left of the head noun and included as a modifier via a postposition *kā, ke, kī*. Spencer (2005: 441) analyzes such construction as embedded possessor construction, in which form *kā, kī, ke* marked NP is the possessor of the NP placed on the left.

Masica (1993) has also included locative phrases into a noun phrase as a distinct modifier. Although we would assume that locative phrases were included as a modifier via a locative postposition, Masica himself concludes that locative phrases in Hindi are incorporated via the postposition *kā, ke, kī*, as in the following example:

1) *mez par kī kitābeṃ*
table-OBL.SG on of-F.PL books-NOM.F.PL

---

[158] See also Masica (1993) and Subbarao (1984).

the books on the table

In other words, any noun phrase (NP) can become a modifier at the furthest most left position through a postposition *kā, ke, kī*. The model can be simplified into one row as:

NP- *kā, ke, kī* + Determiner + Quantifier + Adj. Modifier + Emphasizer + Noun + Emphasizer + Qualifier

With postpositions considered as well, the model of noun phrase now looks as:

NP- *kā, ke, kī* + Determiner + Quantifier + Adj. Modifier + Noun + Postposition + Emphasizer + Qualifier

The model can now take into account any case, whether all positions apart from the noun and postposition are equal to zero, or some or all of them are full.

As seen in previous studies such as Bhāṭiyā's (1967), in the data from the Lok Sabha, Hindi noun phrases with elements of EH interference were a predominantly inserted material. The abundant data can be abstracted into the following occurring types:

1) English noun + postposition/Ø

2) English/Hindi adjective + English noun + postposition/Ø

3) English adjective + Hindi noun + postposition/Ø

4) English/Hindi noun + English/Hindi noun + postposition/Ø.

Interfering English adjectives are not attributed with properties of Hindi grammatical gender or number, and thus the NP remains the same as in English with the alternation of preposition into postposition present in all models. Equally, when a Hindi adjective is employed, if it is unchangeable, gender-properties are not revealed. However, if the adjective is changeable, NP offers an extra piece of information, i.e. the gender of the head noun. The most intriguing model is, however, the last one, as it raises the question of mechanisms used to establish syntactic connection between the head noun and the noun which modifies it. According to the Hindi NP model, the connection should be established through a postposition *kā, ke, kī*. The data shows that the syntactic relation in type 4 was not always established in such a way:

a) if the head noun was a Hindi lexeme, postposition *kā, ke, kī* was employed to establish the syntactic relation,

b) if the head noun was an English lexeme, postposition *kā, ke, kī* was not always employed,

c) in the data, in few examples the English preposition *'of'* was also inserted.

Several examples can demonstrate the first case, when Hindi lexeme was the head noun: *botanist log* (botanists, 1314, 8-19/2/1960), *international hālāt* (international circumstances, 1297, 8-19/2/1960), *tribunals kī saṃkhyā* (number of tribunals, 26, 12/3/1980), *water*

resources kā mantrālay (water resources ministry, 565, 9/4/2001), *backward classes kā tabkā* (stripe of *backward classes, 34, 3/5/2010), trade related intellectual property rights kā māmlā* (case of property rights related to intellectual property, 488, 9/4/2001).

The cases when no postposition was employed are more difficult to analyze. It is partially clear that such phrases tend to appear in official administrative register as names of particular *phenomena:* fruit canning unit *and* community canning centers *(929-931, 8-19/2/1960)*, central tractor organization *(262, 22-25/2/1955)*, state fisheries development corporation *(190, 26/8/1970)*, community development program *(243-245, 8-19/2/1960),* foreign exchange regulation amendment bill *(195, 17-22/2/1965),* law and order situation *(40, 4/5/2010),* industrial *economy growth ke lie* (for the growth of industrial economy, 469, 21/11/2002), etc. It is however, important to note that postposition *kā, ke, kī* was also employed with English head nouns, as will be visible from examples later on.

Of was usually inserted if the phrase was very often present in a particular context or form: *government of India* (14, 1-14/8/1950, 595, 9/4/2001)*, chamber of commerce* (259 and further, *26/8/1970)*, point of view *(210, 8-19/2/1960),* ministry of information and broadcasting *(867-8, 8-*19/2/1960)*, point of order* (275, 26/8/1970, 224, 27/8/1970), *rule of law* (382, 24/5/1990), etc. In the analysis of such examples, one has to be aware of the role English has had and has today in India, as official names of particular institutions in English are very often heard expressions in public communication sphere in India. Several examples of inserted *of* in the data, however, cannot be explained as names of institutions or often used expressions: *neglect of villages par* – neglect of villages-NP.OBL.SG on-POST (on the neglect of villages, 365, 12/3/1980), *pre-war consumption of clothe* – NP.NOM.SG (217, 22-28/2/1955), *specific cases of bhraṣṭacār* –NP.NOM.SG (specific cases of deprived behavior, 217, 22-25/2/1955), *hamārā balance of payment,* our-ADJ.POSS.NOM.SG.M payment balance-NP.NOM.SG (our payment balance, 821, 16/8/2000), *line of actual control ko*, line of actual control-OBL.SG POST.OBJ (for the line of actual control, 458, 9/4/2001), etc.

Whereas Hindi nouns in the modifier's position were single nouns, either in singular or plural oblique form, English lexemes employed as modifiers, on the other hand, were often complex noun phrases:

1) *law and order kī samasyā* (67, 15/3/1980)
law and order-NP.OBL.SG of-F.SG matter-NOM.SG
matter of law and order

2) *all India radio ke station* (89, 22-25/2/1955)

all India radio-NP.OBL.SG of-M.PL station-NOM.SG

stations of All India Radio

3) *state ministries kī conference* (73, 17-22/2/1965)

state ministries-NP.OBL.PL of-F.SG conference-NOM.SG

conference of state ministries

4) *membroṃ kī family definition kyā hai?* (108, 21-30/7/1975)

member-OBL.PL of-F.SG. family-OBL.SG definition-NOM.SG.F what-PRON be-3SG.COP.PRS

How do members define family?

5) *industries ke proposals āye haiṃ* (1617, 8-19/2/1960)

industry-OBL.PL of-M proposal-NOM.PL.M come-PFV.PTCP.PL.M be-3PL.AUX.PRS

The industry proposals came.

6) *planning commission ke deputy chairman* (35, 24/4/2000)

planning-ADJ.OBL commission-SG.OBL of-M deputy-NOM.SG.M chairman-NOM.SG.M the deputy chairman of planning commission

In example 1 we see that speaker uses complex modifier *law and order*, which is present as a phrase in English. Thus, connector *and* is not considered problematic by speaker. In other words, speaker does not try to substitute, i.e. alter the English connector with Hindi connector *aur* or *evam*. Example 2 shows that a name of institution in English can be employed as a complex modifier in the Hindi NP. We assume that since the head is also English noun, speaker opted not to insert any Hindi postposition as a part of modifier (* *all India ke radio ke station*). Similar observation can be made for example 3 (* *state ke ministries kī conference*). However, example 4 shows contrary pattern to examples 2 and 3. In example 4, unlike in examples 2 and 3, Hindi postposition is part of determiner, whereas there is no postposition between modifier and head noun (* *membroṃ kī family kā definition*). Example 6 shows that both determiner and head noun can be complex and consist of English elements. The Hindi element in the example 6 comprises of postposition *ke*.

It can be concluded that in all observed noun phrases (1950-2010), interfering determiners and quantifiers appeared rarely.[159] Further on, the analyzed phrases were mostly accompanied with postpositions *ko, ke lie* for object, postpositions *par, meṃ* for locative adverbial or by a zero postposition (ϕ), which can be interpreted as either signal for subject or direct object. It follows, then, that noun phrases were mostly employed as subjects, objects, or locative adverbials.

4.2.2.1. Grammatical gender and EH interference

According to hierarchy theories, nouns represent the most commonly borrowed lexical material from one language into another (Haugen 1950, Matras 2007, Muysken 1981, etc.). According to Bhāṭiyā (1967), English nouns represent 91% of borrowed lexemes in Hindi. Hindi, unlike English, differentiates between masculine and feminine nouns,[160] which are further classified into subgroups as per the presence of gender markers (Shapiro 2003: 250-285). Masculine nouns are marked with *-ā* (*laṛkā*, boy) and feminine with *-ī/-i/-iyā* marker (*laṛkī*, girl; *śakti*, power; *dariyā*, river). Such 'marked' nouns are also called thematic, strong thematic, extended, augmented, enlarged or overtly marked by different authors (Masica 1993: 219). Both can, nevertheless, be unmarked for gender if it is ending in *-∅* (*seb-* M.SG apple, *kitāb-*F.SG book) in direct nominative singular case. Thus, there are two genders and within each there are two subgroups, one marked and one unmarked for gender property.[161] The unmarked nouns, however, can be gender marked secondarily if they are 1) accompanied by adjectival modifiers with visible gender markers, 2) if a postposition *kā, kī, ke* is part of the noun phrase, or 3) if there is a direct congruence between a noun and predicative verb in the sentence.

If one looks at the nouns in English, on the other hand, we see that they are not distinguished as masculine and feminine at all, except few cases. In such occurrences, the gender-properties are mostly differentiated through the application of a lexeme or a suffix (*chairman : chairwoman* vs. *poet : poetess*). Similarly, other constituents of noun phrases or predicative verbs in English are not distinguished for grammatical gender either.

However, once English nouns are inserted into Hindi or any other language which is marked for grammatical gender, they are fitted into a new system as gender-attributed items (Borowiak 2007, etc.). Khubchandani's study (1968) of English insertions into another

---

[159] See the section on interfering articles and numerals for further analysis.
[160] Some Hindi grammars, such as that of Kāmtāprasād Guru (1962), mention the possibility of third grammatical gender: neuter.
[161] The second group probably outnumbers the first, according to Masica (1993: 219).

modern Indo-Aryan language, Sindhi, shows that speakers in that case attribute grammatical gender to newly acquired lexemes according to stem endings. In other words, when speakers hear in the interfering lexeme an ending that exists in their own system, they assign a new word to the class of native or known lexemes with the same properties. However, when that signal does not explicitly exist, speakers assign gender according to the analogous or near-analogous noun and its existing gender-properties in a language, in which the new lexeme enters.[162]

The same happens in Hindi; and thus as most English nouns end in consonant, once inserted by Hindi speakers, they fall into the subcategory of gender unmarked nouns (-∅ ending). In such conditions, Hindi speakers are left with a wide speculative space to decide on the noun's gender and inflectional properties in order to integrate them into Hindi system. In that aspect, the data collected from the Lok Sabha debates shows the following characteristics:

A. gender is not visible on all nouns found in the data, as they were not accompanied by Hindi adjectives nor in the direct concord with predicative verb(s):

7) *jail meṃ,* jail-OBL.SG in-POST, in the jail (14, 1-14/8/1950)

8) *court meṃ,* court-OBL.SG in-POST, in the court (29, 24/7/2003)

9) *multipurpose cooperative society ko*, multipurpose cooperative society-NP:OBL.SG POST.OBJ, to/for the multipurpose cooperative society; (1285-1297, 8-19/2/1960)

B. nouns for which gender information is available were usually subjects, objects or nominal predicates

10) *state ministries kī conference huī* (73, 17-22/2/1965)
state-OBL.SG ministry-OBL.PL of-F conference-NOM.SG.F be-PFV.PTCP.SG.F
There was a conference of state ministries.

11*) various committeeyāṃ appoint huī thīṃ* (470, 21/11/2002)
various-ADJ.NOM   committee-NOM.PL.F   appoint-ROOT   be-PFV.PTCP.F   be
3PL.F.AUX.PST
The various committees have been appointed.

C. nouns for which gender information is available were the heads of noun phrases and were secondarily marked via a postposition *kā, kī, ke*, revealing their grammatical gender

---

[162] Matras quotes similar results and strategies for many languages (2009: 174).

12) *dostoṃ kī speeches* (205-222, 8-19/2/1960)

friend-OBL.PL. of-F speech-NOM.PL.F

speeches of friends;

13) *mumbaī kī life line* (40, 4/5/2010)

mumbai-SG.OBL. of-F life-NOM.SG.F line-NOM.SG.F

the life line of Mumbai

D. nouns for which gender information is available were preceded by changeable Hindi adjectives that carried a gender marker

14) *sāre major factors ko* (237, 13/3/1980)

all-ADJ.OBL.PL.M major-ADJ.OBL factor-PL.OBL POST.OBJ.

to/for all major factors

15) *nayī line ke bāre meṃ* (13, 21/11/2002)

new-ADJ.OBL.SG line-OBL.SG about-POST

about new line

E. nouns for which gender information is available were used in nominative plural with Hindi grammatical morphemes and thus their grammatical gender was revealed

16) *enquiryāṃ āyīṃ* (242, 1-14/8/1950)

enquiry-NOM.PL.F come-3PL.F.PST

Enquiries came.

17) *tourist āte haiṃ* (596, 9/4/2001)

tourist-NOM.PL. come-IPFV.PTCP.PL.M be-3PL.AUX.PRS

Tourists come.

In examples 7 and 8 we see simple NP from which it is not possible to read gender information. Similarly, if the NP is complex as in 9 but none of its determiners are in Hindi, it is also not possible to read gender information. In examples 10 and 11 and further, it is, however, possible to read secondarily gender information because of Hindi elements in NP that reveal it. In 10, 12 and 13 examples, the gender information is revealed for the head nouns *conference, speech* and *life line* through postposition *kī* and in examples 14 and 15 through the gender marking on adjective. Examples 11 and 16 have two gender markings, on

the noun itself as well as on the predicate in Past Tense, whereas example 17 has the gender marking only on the predicate.

4.2.2.2. Plural markers and EH interference

Inflection in Hindi is of a complex nature, as it combines remnants of both Old Indo-Aryan (OIA) and Modern Indo-Aryan (mIA) systems with the new agglutinative elements. The inflectional endings inherited from OIA and mIA are, according to Masica, primary inflectional affixes. They attach directly to the base with morphophonemic adjustments, and in Hindi they are visible as *-e* in masculine singular and as *-oṃ* or *-o* in general plural oblique case and vocative when those are compared to the nominative (*-oṃ* OBL.PL vs. *-o* VOC.PL vs. NOM.PL endings). Nominative plural markers, unlike general plural oblique marker (*-oṃ*), are gender sensitive. Thus, there is a choice of *-ø* or *-e* for masculine nouns and *-eṃ/-āṃ* for feminine nouns, all of which (see Table 4.2.), as already stated, become neutralized with *-oṃ* as the general plural oblique case marker, as can be seen in the examples bellow:

masculine gender:

NOM.PL: *laṛke / bhālūø khel rahe haiṃ.*   Boys/bears are playing.

boy/bear-NOM.PL.M play-DUR.PTCP.PL.M be-3PL.AUX.PRS.

OBL.PL: *vah laṛkoṃ / bhāluoṃ ke sāth ā gayā.*   He came with boys/bears.

he-PRON.NOM.SG boy/bear-OBL.PL. with-POST come-ROOT go-PFV.PTCP.SG.M

feminine gender:

NOM.PL: *laṛkiyāṃ / bahaneṃ khel rahī haiṃ.*   Girls/sisters are playing.

girl/sister-NOM.PL.F play-DUR.PTCP.F be-3PL.AUX.PRS

OBL.PL: *vah laṛkiyoṃ / bahanoṃ ke sāth ā gayā.*   He came with girls/sisters.

he-PRON.NOM.SG girl/sister-OBL.PL with-POST come-ROOT go-PFV.PTCP.SG.M

The nominal plural marker in English is *-s*, which becomes *-es* in particular phonological environments. It is visible that in Hindi there is a greater diversity of markers, and that separate markers are there to distinguish nominative from oblique case.

Table 4.2. Plural Hindi markers for masculine and feminine nouns.

Gender/Case	Nominative Plural	Oblique Plural
Masculine	-e, -ø	-oṃ
Feminine	-eṃ, -āṃ	-oṃ

The grammatical gender of nouns is important as well in this aspect as it further distinguishes which markers are added to a particular noun in nominative plural. In other words, implementation of *-s/ -es* for both the nominative and oblique cases causes the partial loss of information that was available in Hindi morphemes and shifts the balance towards the postpositions to determine the nature of syntactic relations. The shift probably is not felt by speakers as a grave alteration as the Hindi system is already built on postpositions as important factors to determine grammatical relations (Spencer 2005). However, although those markers are available, when EH interference occurs, as Bhāṭiyā (1967) has already noted, Hindi speakers show a tendency to incorporate English grammatical plural marker *-s/ -es* in Hindi phrases to denote nominative plural and oblique case plural irrespective of grammatical gender. Borowiak (2007: 5) ascribes the presence of English plural marker to non-full adaptation of transferred elements. According to him (Borowiak 2007: 5), only after two stages of adaptation does a nominal reach a level where *-ø* marker or other nominative marker can be adjoined to nouns, after which the oblique plural markers can also be added. That, however, does not explain why nouns which are present in Hindi for a long time such as *skūl* (school), *bas* (bus), etc. and for which it can be assumed that their process of adaptation is complete, are still employed by some speakers in the Lok Sabha with English plural marker *-s/-es*. If we compare examples 18-20 we observe that marker *-s/ -es* falls into the place of distinct Hindi markers, both nominative plural and oblique case plural, and fills their role without any sign of disturbance in syntactic surroundings, as postpositions remain the same and the attributed modifiers in their positions.

18) *antisocial elements/ *element* (225, 11/3/1980)[163]
*videśī companyoṃ/ *companies ko* (359, 5/5/1995)
foreign-ADJ.OBL company-OBL.PL POST.OBJ
to/for foreign companies

alag alag agencyāṃ (614, 14/5/2002)
different-ADJ agency-NOM.PL.F
different agencies

19) *choṭe-choṭe damø / *dams* (517, 24/4/2000)
small small-NOM.M.PL dam-NOM.M.PL be-3PL.COP.PRS
There are small, small dams.

---

[163] Elements marked with * are theoretical possibilities that could occur in the same position.

*industries / *industry kholte haiṃ* (1616, 8-19/2/1960)

industry-NOM.PL open-PFV.PTCP.PL.M be-3PL.AUX.PRS

industries are opened

choṭī canaloṃ ke nirmāṇ par (44, 3/5/2010)

small-ADJ.OBL.F canal-OBL.PL. of-M building-OBL.SG.M on-POST

on the building of small canals

20) *stationoṃ/ *stations ke madhya* (344-5, 15-30/11/1950)

station-OBL.PL between-POST

between stations

*customs/ *customoṃ ke kānūn* (156, 22-28/2/1955)

custom-OBL:PL of-M law-NOM.PL.M

custom laws

Thus, the plural of English lexemes in Hindi can be marked with either Hindi or English elements as can be seen in Table 4.3. If we look at contrasting pairs in examples 18-20 and at the Table 4.3., we notice that the introduction of the English plural marker in Hindi utterances would cause loss of two distinctions:

  1. that of case (nominative/oblique) and

  2. that of gender (masculine/feminine).

However, Hindi plural markers for nominative and oblique case help speakers determine two sets of information that disappear when EH interference takes place. Of course, secondary marking, via adjectives as in example 19[164] (*dam, canal*) or verbs in predicative position in examples 19 (*industry*), 21 and 22, or earlier in example 11, can reveal the grammatical gender of a particular noun.

21) *applications āyī haiṃ* (63, 22-25/2/1955)

application-NOM.PL come-PFV.PTCP.F be-3PL.AUX.PRS

Applications have arrived/come.

22) *yah report state governments ko jātī hai* (519, 1-14/8/1950)

---

[164] Similarly, *aise cases,* such cases (M.PL, 24, 15-30/11/1950), *bahut-sī complaints,* many complaints (F.PL, 269, 27/8/1970).

this-PRON.NOM.SG   report-NOM.SG.F   state-OBL.SG   government-OBL.PL   to-POST.OBJ go-IPFV.PTCP.F be-3SG.AUX.PRS

This report goes to state governments.

Table 4.3. Plural markers in the Hindi system with EH interference in masculine and feminine nouns.

Gender/Case	Nominative Plural	Oblique Plural
Masculine	-e, -ø, -s, -es	-oṃ, -s, -es
Feminine	-eṃ, -āṃ, -s, -es	-oṃ, -s, -es

This form of marking, however, is not always included/ available in the sentence. Moreover, Hindi adjectives can be non-changeable as in example 18, or English adjectives can be inserted in the place of Hindi adjectives (18), or can be completely absent as in examples 20-22. Likewise, subject-predicate agreement in Hindi is not always utilized or possible, and furthermore it leaves nouns in other syntactic functions unmarked for gender, for example *state governments* in 22.

All of the above indicates that some Hindi speakers relay on dual sets of plural markers, when they use English nouns in Hindi environment. Overview of the data for the sub-period 1950-1995 shows that *-s/ -es* markers in inserted English nouns were already present. In other words, the use of *–s/-es* marker can not be ascribed to contemporary Hindi speakers. One can speculate that some lexemes such as *station*, *school*, *missionary*, *film*, *line* found their place in Hindi long before 1950, and thus had a chance to stabilize in Hindi. However, in the same sub-period, Hindi plural markers were sometimes attributed to lexemes denoting new technology as well (*machinoṃ ke sambandh meṃ,* machine-OBL.PL of-M respect-OBL.SG in-POST, in respect to machines, 242, 1-14/8/1950). Their appearance seems to not be stable either, as some speakers opted to attribute to those lexemes English *-s/ -es* as well.

In the second sub-period 2000-2010, the situation is the same, i.e. both *-s/-es* and Hindi markers appear to designate nominative plural and oblique case plural. In several examples, combination of both Hindi and English markers by speakers was used to express case differentiation. Thus some speakers applied Hindi markers to nominative and English markers to other relations (*jo dūsrī PSU companyāṃ haiṃ*-the other PSU companies which… : *marketing companies kī under requires*- under requires of marketing companies…, 15, 22, 6/5/2010). The opposite cases also appear in which English marker is used for nominative

plural and Hindi markers for oblique plural (*149 companies haiṃ –*there are 149 companies : *companyoṃ kā zikr-* mention of companies, 36, 6/5/2010). Further on, within the same discourse to one and the same lexeme (*local traineṃ : local trains-* local trains, 38, 40, 4/5/2010) speakers assign different plural markers.

To conclude, the *-s/-es* is employed by speakers to express:

1) nominative plural for both masculine and feminine nouns

2) oblique plural form.

The variability in the occurrence of *-s/-es* perhaps suggests that speakers feel comfortable with its usage. However, if we take into the consideration adaptation stages (Borowiak 2007, Filipović 1986) we can say that the same transferred elements are not on the same stage of adaptation for every speaker, i.e. that the process of adaptation is not completed, unlike for example English lexeme *boksač* in Croatian which had been fully adapted and is recognized as full adaptation by all speakers of Croatian today. If we look at Matras's continuum we could conclude that English nouns with *–s/-es* marker are on the code-switching side of the continuum, whereas those that have been used with Hindi markers are on the borrowing side of the continuum. Those nouns for which results show both Hindi and English markers are yet to be placed on one of continuum's ends. The question of stability also leans onto the adaptation process. Taking everything above into consideration, one could say that despite frequency of occurrence for particular nouns, English nouns appear to not be stable in Hindi, ergo that the process of stabilization and adaptation is still ongoing.

4.2.2.3. Nouns, derivation and EH interference

A) Derivation of nouns

In the data for the period 1950-2010, it is possible to find several derivational patterns:

1) verb/noun + suffix = noun

2) noun + *vālā* = noun

3) adjective = noun

4) acronym = noun

Type 1 concerns the formation of verbal nouns. On one side, they are formed from English verbal roots and English suffixes *-ing, -ment, -ance, -ion* etc. (*smuggling, training, mixing, traveling, escorting, thinking, feeling, development, maintenance, consumption*). On the other side, an English verbal root or nominal is joined by a Hindi light verb[165] in an infinitive form

---

[165] Light verbs refer to mechanics through which Hindi incorporates foreign verbal lexemes into its system. See

(*film banāne meṃ,* film-OBL.SG make-INF.OBL in-POST, in filming, 17, 27/8/1970; *allotment karne ke lie,* allotment-OBL. SG do-INF.OBL for-POST, for doing allotment, for allotment, 35, 14/5/2002; *re-open and re-view karne ke lie,* re-open-ROOT and-CONJ re-view-ROOT do-INF.OBL for-POST, for re-opening and re-viewing, 6, 15/3/1980). It was also possible to discern from the data that some speakers preferred verbal nouns (*apply karnā* /to apply/ applying, application) over the simple insertion of nouns (*application*) as in the example *apply karne kī tārīkh*, /apply-ROOT do-INF.OBL of-F date-NOM.SG.F/ date of application (353-4, 8-19/2/1960).

Yet another derivational pattern includes the addition of a noun before the Hindi suffix -*vālā* to denote either an adjective (in attributive distribution)[166] or a doer (subject or object distribution) as in example *left front vāle-* NOM.PL.M, leftists (10, 3/5/2010).[167] The pattern was also used pleonasticaly by some speakers to form a noun denoting a doer, even though the inserted English noun already denoted the meaning of a doer (compare *opposition : oppositionvāle,* NOM.PL.M, those who are in opposition = opposition, 439-449, 8-19/2/1960). It is interesting, though, that in instances where - *vālā* is used regularly in Hindi, such as in the word *rikśāvālā*, a person pulling riksha, it was omitted in some Parliament speeches in Hindi in which we find instead the lexeme *rikshapuller* (203, 26/8/1970) to denote the same meaning.

In the data, we can also find examples of adjectives used as nouns as in the example:
23) *black kā kāfī rupayā* (17, 27/8/1970)
black-ADJ of-SG.M lot-ADJ money-NOM.SG.M
plenty of money from black (market)

The adjective *black* was turned into a noun as the contraction of the phrase *black market*, which appears in the same context by the same speaker on several occasions. Similar observations on substantivization of particular parts of speech have been made by Borowiak (2007: 4).

Special interest should be paid also to acronyms[168] that do not exactly interfere from English but are rather fashioned out of English equivalents for names of various institutions or processes. The use of such acronyms is widely spread in Hindi, in media and business

---

the section on verbs for more details.
[166] See more on this type under the section on adjectives.
[167] Verbs can also be joined with -*vālā* to denote an attribute or doer.
[168] See Barannikov's study (1984).

Hindi.[169] The peculiarity of acronyms in Hindi lies in pronunciation as it is fashioned on the pronunciation rules of English and not Hindi, as Barannikov has already observed. Therefore the acronym 'P.W.D.' is pronounced as ∕pʰiː 'dʌb.əɫ juː diː∕ the name of a political party, BJP, is pronounced as /biː d͡ʒeɪ pʰiː/, and so forth. In the analyzed data, acronyms were employed as modifiers within noun phrases:

24) *central PWD ke karmcāriyoṃ ko* (74, 22-25/2/1950)

central-ADJ PWD-OBL.SG. of-M worker-OBL.PL.M for-POST.OBJ

for the workers of central P.W.D.

CPM ke state sponsored hamle (840, 16/8/2000)

CPM-OBL.SG. of-M state-OBL.SG sponsor-PFV.PTCP.OBL attack-PL.M

attacks sponsored by CPM government

25) *senior MP haiṃ* (62, 5/5/2010)

senior-ADJ MP-NOM.PL be-3PL.COP.PRS

they are senior MPs

B) Derivation from nouns

Nouns in the data had also been used as a base for derivation of other types of lexemes, such as adjectives and verbs. Besides with the Hindi suffix *-vālā*, adjectives were created from nouns with the help of English prefixes: *pre-war* (217, 22-28/2/1955), *pro-moscow* (128-129, 17-22/2/1965), etc. If we look again at Masica's model for NP (Masica 1993: 373), we see that in his Genitive phrase any noun can be included as part of the determiner phrase in complex NP. In such instances as in instances when in the NP noun is followed by postposition *kā, kī, ke* we have example of possessive adjective. Another suffix that was employed to create adjectives was *-kṛt* as in *abhīlekhoṃ ko computerikṛt ∕adyatan karne ko-* for computerization/updating of records (23, 3/5/2010).

Nouns in Hindi were also placed in verbal structures. Together with verbalizers, these nouns formed nominal conjunct verbs, verbs whose semantics are lent by a 'host' noun (Montaut 2016: 142) and a verbal structure by a light verb[170] that accompanies the noun. According to Das (2009: 195-196), a noun undergoes 'semantic bleaching' and after that becomes an integral part of the verb. Kachru (2006: 93) claims that it is not possible to predict

---

[169] See Snell (1990: 66) and Kuczkiewicz-Fraś (2014).
[170] See Butt (2003 and later) on light verbs.

which verb will appear with a nominal part in a conjunct, even if it is a very productive strategy for creation of new verbs. In the data for the sub-period 1950-1995, the following verbalizers were noticed:

rakhnā, to hold: *proposition rakhnā*, (to propose, 45, 17-22/2/1965), *standard rakhn*ā (to keep

standard, 929-31, 8-19/2/1960), etc.

denā, to give: *notice denā* (to give notice, 450, 15-30/11/1950, 123, 17-22/2/1960, etc.), *statement denā* (to give statement, 48, 17-22/2/1965), *opinion denā* (to express opinion, 228 and further, 26/8/1970), *repression karnā* (to repress, 431, 7/9/1990), etc.

karnā, to do: *good morning karnā* (to say good morning, 2000-2004, 8-19/2/1960), *competition karnā* (to compete, 197, 17-22/2/1965), *mixing karnā* (to mix, 339, 27/8/1970), *repression karnā* (to repress, 431, 7/9/1990), etc.

lenā, to take: *action lenā* (to take action, to act, 216, 27/8/1970, 17, 12/3/1980, etc.), *initiative lenā* (to initiate, 431, 7/9/1990), etc.

honā, to be: *reduction honā* (to be reduced, 64, 29/8/1970), *infiltration honā* (to be infiltrated, 26, 12/3/1980), etc.

lagānā, to attach: *tax lagānā* (to tax, 226, 26/8/1970), *allegation lagānā* (to allege, 387, 24/5/1990), etc.

ḍālnā, to throw: *vote ḍālnā* (to cast a vote, to vote, 314, 13/3/1980), *pressure ḍālnā* (to pressurize, 228 and further, 26/8/1970).

In the second sub-period (2000-2010), among noticed verbalizers were:

honā, to be: *debate honā* (to debate, 453, 9/4/2001), *inquiry honā* (to inquire, 16, 15/12/2009), *approval honā* (to approve, 13, 21/11/2002), etc.

karnā, to do: *allocation karnā* (to allocate, 24, 24/4/2000), *voting karnā* (to vote, 79, 29/4/2005), *maintenance karnā* (to maintain, 117, 23/8/2006), *treatment karnā* (to treat, 24, 19/8/2004) etc.

denā, to give: *notice denā* (to give notice, 814, 16/8/2000; 33, 3/5/2010), *reply denā* (to give reply, 467, 24/7/2003), *support denā* (to support, 20, 4/6/2004), *permission denā* (to permit, 14, 19/8/2004), *treatment denā* (to treat, 24, 19/8/2004), etc.

ḍālnā, to throw: *vote ḍālnā* (to cast a vote, to vote, 78, 29/4/2005),

lagānā, to attach: *ban lagānā* (to ban, 16, 7/12/2009), etc.

As is visible from both lists, in the second sub-period the number of verbalizers appears to have been decreased, leaving the verbs *honā*, to be, and *karnā*, to do, as the main verbalizers. It is hard to say how the situation should be interpreted, and whether it is possible to interpret

it with such a small number of examples. It could be that on the analyzed pages those verbalizers were not present, but were present in some other. Another explanation could be that some of the verbalizers that were noticed in the sub-period 1950-1995 are not often employed and require specific environment to appear.

This can be, however, also looked at from another perspective. It could be that verbalizers which were noticed in the sub-period 2000-2010 have taken over roles of other verbalizers that were noticed in the earlier sub-period. Such claim would have to be tested with another set of data. Meanwhile, Borowiak's (2007) analysis of verbalizers in the film and radio material cannot be overlooked. He (Borowiak 2007: 8) mentions, thus, greater number of verbalizers than those found in Lok Sabha for the sub-period 2000-2010. That points out to the conclusion that situation is more complex than it would appear at first glance.

Some speakers also opted to create a causative form from a conjunct verb (*discussion karvānā,* to entice discussion, 26, 4/6/2004), which might be taken as a sign of the lexeme's stable position in the Hindi system. The conclusion is drawn as a parallel to Borowiak's (2007: 10) assumption that appearance of adjectives with verb *karnā*, to do, as a verbalizer instead of verb *honā*, to be, might suggest adjective's full adaptation to Hindi system.

In several cases the interpretation of data was not easy as it was not clear whether the data should be interpreted as a derivation from English nouns or English verbs: *display honā* – to display, to be displayed, 137, 22-28/2/1955, *control honā* – to control, to be controlled, 36, 6/5/2010, *experiment honā* – to experiment, 9, 27/8/1970, *finance karnā* – to finance, 336, 27/8/1970, *export karnā* – to export, 34, 22-28/2/1985, *reply karnā* – to reply, 467, 24/7/2003, *study karnā* – to study, 496, 24/7/2003, *request karnā* – to request, 26, 23/8/2006, etc. It yet remains to be seen whether speakers differentiate any semantic difference in expression such as *allocation karnā : allocate karnā,* to allocate (24, 27, 24/4/2000).

4.2.2.4. Syntax of nouns and EH interference

Inserted nouns had been congruent subjects of predicative forms and direct objects were expressed with the postpositions *-ø, -ko,*[171] and *-ke lie*. Rather than to be isolated islands in Hindi sentences, many of English nouns were interlinked via postpositions, mostly postposition *kā, kī, ke*, into noun phrases that served as modifiers of nouns (attributes). Apart from modifiers, nouns also appeared in adverbials[172] and in nominal predicates. If we observe

---

[171] Also used to express an indirect object.
[172] See the section on adverbs for more details.

a part of a nominal predicate adjoined to the verb *honā*, to be, in examples (26, 27) we can see following elements: 1) plural is expressed either with an *-ø* or *-s* marker; 2) the NP is established with postposition *ke*, and in the first example overt markers within NP are absent. In both cases, subjects are congruent with predicates in number (26, 27). In example 26 the gender congruency is also present.

26) ye *law graduate hote haiṃ.* (774, 8-19/2/1960)

they-NOM.PL law graduate-NOM.PL be-IPFV.PTCP.PL.M be-3PL.AUX.PRS

They are law graduates.

27) ve *drugs ke experts haiṃ.* (1314, 8-19/2/1960)

they-PRON.NOM drugs-OBL.PL of-M.PL experts-NOM.PL.M be-3PL.COP.PRS

They are drug experts.

The NP can be realized with other elements as well, as can be seen in examples 28 and 29 where preposition *of* is integral part of both NPs. In 29, a postposition *kī* also appears, from which it is clear that the speaker is aware of the Hindi strategy for building NPs. The same example might also point that the examples of NPs with preposition *of* might not be insertions as such of each NP's element but rather an insertion of entire NP as a single unit.

28) *medium of instruction foreign language hai?* (477, 8-19/2/1960)

medium of instruction-NP.NOM.SG foreign language-NOM.SG be-3SG.COP.PRS

Is the medium of instruction a foreign language?

29) *is working group kī terms of reference kyā haiṃ?* (478, 8-19/2/1960)

this-PRON.OBL.SG working group-OBL.SG of-F.PL terms of reference-NP.NOM.SG.F what-PRON be-3PL.COP.PRS

What are the terms of reference of this working group?

Several speakers also chose to employ the English marker *-'s/-s'* (*people's institutions,* 1285, 8-19/2/1960; *state's service ke ādmī,* people in state service, 748-768, 8-19/2/1960; *people's kā law and order,* people's law and order, 44, 4/5/2010). The second and last example are particularly interesting because possessiveness is expressed twice, with the English *-'s* and the Hindi postposition *kā*. Example 30 shows that interfering elements can be employed in non-nominative cases as well.

30) *college meṃ teachers meṃ indiscipline hotā hai.* (832-834, 8-19/2/1960)

college-OBL.SG in-POST teachers-OBL.PL in-POST indiscipline-NOM.SG.M be-IPFV.PTCP.SG.M be-3SG.AUX.PRS

There is indiscipline in college among teachers.

In example 31 we also see that the place of a determiner can be taken by Hindi number *ek, one,* as an indefinite article.

31) *mera ek point of order hai.* (228, 27/8/1970, 210, 13/3/1980)

my-ADJ.POSS.SG.M one-NUM point of order-NP.NOM.SG.M be-3SG.COP.PRS

I have a point of order.

To conclude, English nouns in Hindi environment were used for various functions: as subjects, objects, nominal predicates, attributes, appositions and adverbials. All the examples show that inserted nouns fit well into the Hindi syntactic frame. Even the NPs in which postposition *kā, ke, kī* is missing, fit in the system, because they can be attributed to *tatpurusha* compounds.

4.2.2.5. Conclusion on noun phrases and EH interference

According to Filipović (1986), there are two phases of adaptation, primary and secondary, through which foreign lexemes integrate into a new system. The first phase would be, in his view, a temporary solution for the integration of a newly inserted lexeme, and the second one, the phase in which the final structure of a lexeme and its grammatical, semantical, and syntactic qualities are formed. Filipović, of course, gives examples relevant to his research on English lexemes in Serbo-Croatian, as we can see in the example *boxer – boksač*, a sportsman who fights with his fists, where English derivative morpheme *-er* has been substituted by Serbo-Croatian morpheme *-ač*. Such practices have not been noticed in the data for the entire period 1950-2010 apart from the derivational pattern for new nominal lexemes with suffix *-vālā*. However, Pillai's (1968) study on English borrowings in Tamil shows that it is possible to have such interference, i.e. to have Tamil words joined with English prefixes and suffixes, such as *un-, -able, -ify, -ing, -cation, -atic, -ism*, etc., to create new lexemes. In the data found in the Parliament such elements have not been detected, which does not mean they are not there as some linguists have mentioned some of them as prefixes in Hindi (see Śarmā 1998: 224, Bhāṭiyā 1967: 204). As a sample of analyzed pages does not cover large amount of data, it could be that such examples were simply not present in the analyzed material.

We have also seen that English nouns have been used as a base for further derivation with Hindi elements and following Hindi derivational patterns. Some speakers have also missed

the appropriate use of the nominal lexemes, as in the example "*I am still on my legs.*"[173] in which instead of a lexeme *feet* the lexeme *legs* was used by a speaker.

To conclude, the integration of English nouns in Hindi appears to be of two types. First, there exists an older layer of lexemes, the ones which have been present in Hindi for a period longer than 60 years, such as *school, car, bus,* etc. Some speakers treat those however as new insertions, and employ them in plural with English marker *-s/ -es.* If we consider the model of integration, developed by Filipović (1986), it appears that English insertions are not completely integrated into Hindi system. Borowiak's analysis (2007, 2012) showed already that fully adapted nouns in Hindi have to be differentiated from non-fully adapted ones. Unlike Filipović (1986) he distinguishes three stages of adaptation (2007: 5). For him, the first stage is equated with Matras's code-switching side of continuum as he (Borowiak 2007: 5) considers such nouns to be nonce borrowings. In the same paper he claims that the ø marker opens the path to full adaptation, i.e. presence of oblique case markers in plural. How, why and when does that happen, is something that data does not tell us. It is, however, clear, that further study is necessary. A question that should be analyzed in light of Pandit's (1986) claim that MHE is a separate code is then whether English marker *–s/-es* should be considered an integral part of such code. In that case, all options are correct, if we assume that MHE's grammar is equal to system described in Table 4.3. Irrespective of that question, it should be also considered whether compounding strategies, and employment of nouns in conjunct verbs, could also be arguments for complete integration of English lexemes in Hindi.

4.2.3. Adjectives and EH interference

According to hierarchies on borrowability, adjectives are the most borrowable material after nouns and verbs (Haugen 1950: 224),[174] just after nouns (Muysken 1981),[175] or after nouns, verbs, and discourse markers (Matras 2007: 61).

Table 4.4. Adjectives in Hindi: markers.

	masculine		feminine	
singular nominative	ā	ø	ī	ø
singular oblique	e	ø	ī	ø
plural nominative	e	ø	ī	ø
plural oblique	e	ø	ī	ø

---

[173] Source: 340, 27/8/1970.
[174] As in Matras (2009: 157).
[175] As in Matras (2009: 157).

Hindi adjectives belong to two broad classes distinguished by the presence/absence of a gender and number agreement marker (see Table 4.4.). Adjectives ending in a vowel *-ā* stand before a noun of masculine gender,[176] and when *-ā* is altered into *-ī*, the adjective stands in front of a feminine noun *(acchā kuttā,* good-M dog; *acchī billī,* good-F cat). The same class of adjectives is further modified for singular oblique in masculine form, plural nominative, and oblique with the morpheme *-e (acche kutte ko* – SG.OBJ for-POST, for a good dog; *acche kuttoṃ ko* – PL.OBL for-POST.OBJ, for good dogs); while adjectives in feminine form remain unchanged *(acchī billī ko* – SG.OBL for, for a good cat; *acchī billiyoṃ ko* – PL.OBL for-POST.OBJ, for good cats). The second class of adjectives, ends in *-ø* morpheme (Singh 2010: 100, Jāyasavāl 1979: 43), and remains unchanged in both numbers and in both genders (*lāl kuttā* – M.SG, red dog; *lāl billī* – F.SG, red cat). English adjectives behave the same way, both in singular and plural. Likewise, special endings are not generally attached to them if the modified word is marked for gender (*good poet – good poetess*), unless it is a special category of borrowed adjectives (*Professor Emeritus – Professor Emerita*). In the data collected for the thesis, it was observed that inserted English adjectives were placed in the *-ø* morpheme-class of Hindi adjectives as Borowiak already observed (2007: 6).

4.2.3.1. Adjective derivation and EH interference

Inserted adjectives belong to several derivational classes. Thus they can be derived from nouns and verbs, as well as from numerals (*third*) or pronouns (*self*). In the first sub-period (1950-1995), adjectives derived from nouns with following suffixes and prefixes were observed:

1) with suffixes *-al* (addition – *additional,* 9, 27/8/1970; history – *historical*, 23, 13/3/1980), *-ic* (economy – *economic*, 185, 15/3/1980; academy – *academic,* 170, 15/3/1980), *-less* (*party-less democracy,* 98, 21/7/1975), *-able* (*undesirable,* 108, 21/7/1975), or

2) with prefixes *pre-* (*pre-war,* 217, 22-28/2/1955), *pro-* (*pro-moscow, pro-peking,* 128-129, 17-22/2/1965) or *non-* (*non-agricultural,* 365, 12/3/1980), etc.

Speakers were also aware of the possibility to combine several elements such as prefixes *(anti-)* and suffixes (*-al*), as in *antisocial,* 311, 27/8/1970.

In the second sub-period (2000-2010), next to those patterns present in the first period (industry – *industrial,* 17, 6/5/2010; caste – *casteless samāj,* casteless society, 132, 6/5/2010; *ticketless traveling,* 494, 15/12/2003; *democratic process,* 66, 6/5/2010; *available (funds),*

---

[176] Some adjectives ending in *-ā* are, however, indeclinable and are usually of Persian origin (Matišić 1996: 24).

530, 24/7/2003, *unofficial visit par,* on the unofficial visit, 589, 15/12/2003, *honorable minister,* 9, 7/12/2009, several more were also noticed:

1) suffixes: *-ern* (*western mahārāṣṭra meṃ,* in Western Maharashtra, 596, 9/4/2001), *-ary* (*regulatory regime ko,* 17, 19/8/2004), *-ing* (*ongoing project,* 19, 21/11/2002), etc. or

2) prefixes: *in-* (*inhuman conditions meṃ* – OBL.PL in-POST, in inhuman conditions, 481, 14/5/2002, *indefinite strike* – NOM.SG.F, 38, 4/5/2010), etc.

Verbal adjectives, were derived with the past participle suffix *-ed* and present participle suffix *-ing: trained scholars* (449, 1-14/8/1950)*, displaced person* (207 and further, 8-19/2/1960)*, recognized unions* (245 and further, 26/81970)*, improved quality* (297, 12/3/1980)*, computerized ārakṣaṇ kendra,* center for computerized reservation (95, 18/12/2006), *working* group (478, 8-19/2/1960) *planning commission* (202, 17-22/2/1965)*, drinking water* (423, 24/5/1990), *working capital* (473, 21/11/2002), *banning authority* (456, 24/7/2003), and so on. It is important to note that speakers were aware of 'irregular' past tense forms in English, which can be seen in the examples *paid-up capital* (not *payed-up, 182, 17-22/2/1965), *pre-paid mobile services par* (OBL.PL on), on pre-paid mobile services (16, 7/12/2009). Adjectives with the *-ed* suffix were occasionally combined with prefix *un-* (*unauthorized ādmī,* 'unauthorized people/personnel', 935, 8-19/2/1960, *uncontrolled exercise of power,* 215, 8-19/2/1960) or *dis-* (*displaced person*, 207 and further, 8-19/2/1960).

In the second sub-period (2000-2010), *-ed* was occasionally omitted in the NPs: *scheduled castes : schedule caste* (107, 106, 6/5/2010), *scheduled tribe : schedule tribe* (107, 106, 6/5/2010). Occasionally speakers also employed derivationally complex adjectives such as *well-to-do* (*well-to-do log,* affluent people, 434, 21/11/2002), *ongoing* (*ongoing project,* 19, 21/11/2002), etc.

Adjectival formations were also derived from nouns and verbs with suffix *-vālā*. Such derivatives behave as adjectives and change according to the number and gender of a noun to their right (Kachru 1980: 70, Singh 2010: 91). In the analyzed data, *-vālā* was suffixed to both nouns and verbs: *oppositionvāle* – M.PL, opposition, 439-449, 8-19/2/1960; *left front vāle* – M.PL, persons on the left front, leftists, 10, 3/5/2010. Its adjectival form is clear from its position in the sentence (32, 33), as it is used to modify a noun:

32) *motion ko move karne vāle mahoday ne* (253, 17-22/2/1965)
motion-OBL.SG POST.OBJ move-N?V? do-INF.OBL suffix-M.OBL. gentleman-AG.M
a gentleman who moved the motion

33) *mindset change karne vālī bāt* (294, 6/5/2010)

mindset change do-INF.OBL suffix-F speech-NOM.SG.F

the speech that changes/is able to change a mindset

Furthermore, it can be combined with other adjectives or pronouns that behave as adjectives as in example 34:

34) *koī rule out karne vālī bāt* 90, 30/7/1975)

any-ADJ.NOM rule out do-INF.OBL suffix-F talk/speech-NOM.SG.F

any talk on ruling X out'.

Next to adjectives that are recognized as such in English, Hindi speakers, on few occasions, also opted to use a noun as an adjective without additional derivational or inflectional changes on them: *mission school,* missionary school, 1983-4, 8-19/2/1960. We could look at such examples as alernative use of English code, but other examples such as *problem villages* in *jitne hī problem villages haiṃ,* (as many problematic villages there are, 425, 24/5/1990) point out the possibility that English nouns are used as adjectives in Hindi environment. The two examples can be seen as cases of omitted postposition *kā, ke, kī.*

In one interesting example (35), the adjective is followed by the postposition *kā*. It appears as if the speaker derived with postposition an adjective from a lexeme that was already adjective.

35) *black kā kāfī rupayā film banane meṃ lagāte haiṃ*. (17, 27/8/1970)

black-ADJ of-SG.M lot-ADJ money-NOM.SG.M film-OBL.SG create-INF.OBL in-POST

place-IPFV.PTCP.PL.M be-3PL.AUX.PRS

They put a lot of money in the film industry.

One possible analysis suggests that the adjective *black* is the contracted version of the expression *black market*(*ing*) that the speaker used in the same context in his speech. In that case, the adjective had been nominalized only to be turned into an adjective again through the postposition *kā*.

4.2.3.2. Syntax of adjectives and EH interference

English adjectives were 1) placed before nouns, English or Hindi, as their modifiers, or 2) employed with verbalizers to create new verbs.[177] In the case of modifiers, the following combinations were noticed in the data:

1) English adjective + English noun: *honorable minister* (29, 1-14/8/1950, 205-222, 8-19/2/1960, etc.),

2) English adjective + Hindi noun: *honorable mantrī,* honorable minister (352, 1-14/8/1950)

3) Hindi adjective + English noun: *śrīman minister*, honorable minister (248, 15-30/11/1950)

Several speakers combined different solutions within the same phrase:

A. same adjective with English and Hindi noun

primary *societies ke* **primary** *sadasya*, (182, 17-22/2/1965)

primary-ADJ.OBL society-PL.OBL of-PL.M primary-ADJ.NOM.PL member-NOM.PL.M

primary members of primary societies

B. same English noun with Hindi and English adjective

Bihār ek **garīb** *state hai*, **poor** *state hai*. (55, 15/3/1980)

bihar-NOM.SG ek-NUM poor-ADJ.SG state-NOM.SG be-3SG.AUX.PRS, poor-ADJ.NOM state-NOM.SG be-3SG.AUX.PRS

Bihar is a poor state, a poor state.

The premodifier position allowed further productive incorporation of adjectives in different formations with postpositions such as *se*, 'from', *ke lie,* 'for', etc. Thus, in the data one notices different combinations:

1) English adjective + English noun + Hindi postposition + English/ Hindi noun,

   i) *vah officer central government kā ho…* (165, 8-19/2/1960)

   that-DEM.NOM.SG officer-NOM.SG central-ADJ.OBL government-OBL.SG of-M.SG be-3SG.COP.SUBJ

   that officer may be of the central government…

   ii) *unauthorized possession kā savāl,* (439-449, 8-29/2/1960)

---

[177] See section on conjunct verbs.

unauthorize-PFV.PTCP possession-OBL.SG of-M question-NOM.SG.M

question of unauthorized possession,

2) English adjective + English noun + preposition + English noun + Hindi postposition,

i) *uncontrolled exercise of power se* (215, 8-19/2/1960)

uncontrol-PFV.PTCP exercise-OBL.SG of-PREP power-OBL.SG from

from/because of the uncontrolled exercise of power,

3) Hindi/ English adjective + Hindi/English adjective + Hindi noun + postposition,

i) *sāre rejected log* (470, 24/3/2003)

all-ADJ.PL.M reject-PFV.PTCP people-NOM.PL.M

all rejected people,

ii) *severely damaged pakke ghar ko* (67, 23/8/2006)

severely-ADV damage-PFV.PTCP baked/made of bricks-ADJ.OBL.M house-OBL.SG.M for-POST.OBJ

for the severely damaged brick house,

4) English noun + English verbal adjective + noun,

i) coal based industries (15, 6/5/2010),

ii) *state sponsored hamle* (840, 16/8/2000)

state-OBL.SG sponsor-PFV.PTCP attack-NOM.PL.

state sponsored attacks

As already mentioned, the postposition *kā, ke, kī* opens the role of modifiers to noun phrases. As can be seen from examples bellow, nouns in plural, verbal nouns, and noun phrases formed from English nouns and Hindi postpositions were used as modifiers:

1)   English noun in plural:

adults kī social education (164, 1-14/8/1950)

adults-OBL.PL of-SG.F social-ADJ.OBL education-NOM.SG.F

education of adults

2)   verbal noun

smuggling kā charge (156, 22-28/2/1955)

smuggling-OBL.SG of-SG.M charge-NOM.SG.M

charge of smuggling

3) verbal noun derived from English verb:

apply karne kī tārīkh (353-4, 8-19/2/1960)

apply do-INF.OBL of-SG.F date-NOM.SG.F

date of application

4) verbal noun derived from English adjective:

communal hone kī bāt (44, 4/5/2010)

communal-ADJ be-INF.OBL of-SG.F question, matter-NOM.SG.F

the question of being communal

5) noun phrase:

civil liberties kī bāt (631-2, 8-19/2/1960)

civil-ADJ liberties-OBL.PL of-SG.F speech, matter-NOM.SG.F

matter of civil liberties

law and order kī samasyā (67, 15/3/1980)

law-OBL.SG and-CONJ order-OBL.SG of-SG.F matter-NOM.SG.F

matter of law and order

6) noun phrase with interference

research ke scholar kā sthān (497, 15-30/11/1950)

research-OBL.SG of-PL.M scholar-OBL.PL of-SG.M place-NOM.SG.M

position of research scholar

chah page ke letter kā reply (105, 6/5/2010)

six-NUM page-OBL of-SG.M letter-OBL.SG of-SG.M reply-NOM.SG.M

six-page long reply on letter.

Examples above show variety of strategies that speakers employ in modifiers. Next to simple NPs as in 1 there are also complex NPs as in 5 and 6. In 6 we see use of postposition *kā, ke, kī* in modifier as well. Examples 2-4 show use of verbal nouns in modifiers. Whereas 2 employs English verbal noun, 3 and 4 use Hindi structures to create verbal noun from English lexeme (verb and adjective). Besides plural marker -*s*, Hindi plural marker for oblique case -*oṃ* was also used to express modifier in oblique plural, as in *dostoṃ kī speeches* (NOM.PL.F, 205-

222, 8-19/2/1960), speeches of friends. Some speakers opted to employ both in the same discourse as in example 36:

36) *mission schooloṃ aur convents kā moh* (1983-1994, 8-19/2/1960)

mission-ADJ.OBL school-OBL.PL and-CONJ convent-OBL.PL of-SG.M attraction-NOM.SG.M

the attraction of missionary schools and convents

The speaker is obviously aware of both Hindi and English markers, yet implements both. A possible reason for it might be the level of incorporation of a particular lexeme. *School* as an inserted lexeme is present in Hindi and other Indian languages more actively than the lexeme *convent*, which perhaps sounds more foreign than the first lexeme.

It is important to note that nouns were also employed as modifiers in the form of abbreviations: *AC chair car* (51, 3/5/2010) *, RLNG gas* (14, 6/5/2010) *, CBI kī ek team,* one of CBI's teams (57, 7/12/2009), *BSNL ke mobile towers,* BSNL's mobile towers (29, 7/12/2009), etc.

The introduction of an English adjective, however, sometimes prevented speakers from utilizing an adjective form available in Hindi, as can be seen in the example 37:

37) *west Pakistan ke refugees ke lie,* (6, 15-30/11/1950)

west-ADJ Pakistan-OBL.SG of-PL.M refugee-OBL.PL.M for-POST

for the refugees from West Pakistan.

Although the Hindi system permits production of adjectives with the suffix *-ī* (Pakistan – *Pakistanī),* the possibility was not utilized by the speaker, even if the phrase would not be marked as incorrect (38):

*west pākistānī- ADJ *refugees ke lie-* OBL.PL for-POST,

for the refugees from West Pakistan.

Another interesting example, transferred from English is

38) *Pakistan held Kashmir se,* (238, 13/3/1980)

Pakistan-OBL.SG held-PFV.PTCP Kashmir-OBL.SG from-POST

from Kashmir, held by Pakistan,

in which right branching changed to left branching. That probably caused the omission of postposition *ke dvârâ*, by. We could reconstruct the phrase as in 40:

Pakistan ke dvârâ held Kashmir se

Pakistan-OBL.SG by held-PFV.PTCP Kashmir-OBL.SG from-POST

from Kashmir held by Pakistan.

Adjectives were also joined with the verbalizer such as *karnâ*, to do, or *honâ*, to be, to create conjunct verbs (39-41). In those examples we can see that English adjectives appear in position of Hindi adjectives: *clear karnā – sāf karnā*, to clear, *different honā – alag honā,* to be different. Example 40 shows that such verbs can be further combined with other verbs just as verbs formed from Hindi adjectives. In examples 39-41 all such conjunct verbs are employed as predicates. However, verbs in Hindi can also be employed to perform other functions in the sentence. As all verbs in Hindi can be nominalized, so can be conjunct verbs. As verbal nouns they can be employed in various functions in the sentence, and one such example we can see in 42.

39) *jab group of ministers ne clear kiyā thā* (17, 19/8/2004)

when-CONJ.Q   group-OBL.SG   of-PREP   minister-OBL.PL.AG   clear-ADJ   do-PFV.PTCP.SG.M be-3SG.AUX.PST.M

When the group of ministers cleared (it).

40) *hamārī situation different hai* (29, 4/6/2004)

our-NOM.SG.F. situation-NOM.SG different-ADJ. be-3SG.COP.PRS

Our situation is different.

41) *hamāre views divergent ho sakte haiṃ* (29, 4/6/2004)

our-NOM.PL.M.   view-NOM.PL   divergent-ADJ   be-ROOT   can-IPFV.PTCP.PL.M   be-3PL.AUX.PRS

Our views can be divergent.

42) *communal hone kī bāt (44, 4/5/2010)*

communal-ADJ be-INF.OBL of-SG.F question, matter-NOM.SG.F

matter of being communal

To summarize, English adjectives appear as modifiers of English and Hindi nouns: *primary sadasya* – NOM.SG, primary member (182, 17-22/2/1965); *additional yojnā* – NOM.SG, additional plan (9, 27/8/1970); *honorable mantrī* – NOM.SG, honorable minister (352, 1-14/8/1950); *private taxiyoṃ aur caroṃ meṃ-* private-ADJ.OBL taxi-PL.OBL and-

CONJ car-PL.OBL in-POST, in private taxies and cars (397, 5/5/1995), *national flag* (815, 16/8/2000), *serious māmlā*, serious matter, NOM.SG (843, 16/8/2000), etc.

In both sub-periods adjectives were also employed as parts of nominal predicates with verbalizers. What remains unclear is:

1) do speakers decide which adjectives can be employed as modifiers of Hindi and English nouns,

2) is it possible for English adjectives to form conjuncts with other verbalizers.

4.2.3.3. Comparatives and EH interference

In both sub-periods use of English superlatives and comparatives was noticed, which falls in line with Borowiak's (2007: 6) observation:

a) comparatives: *higher education* (285, 26/8/1970), *weaker section ke* – OBL.SG of-M, of weaker section (116, 6/5/2010)

b) superlatives: *most backward district meṃ* (most backward district-NP.OBL.SG in-POST), in the most backward district (162, 11/12/2009), *senior-most vyakti ke bāre meṃ* (NP.OBL.SG about-POST), about the most senior person (17, 4/6/2004), *best parliamentarian kā khitāb* (NP.OBL.SG of-M title-NOM.SG), title of the best parliamentarian (23, 4/6/2004) etc.

The small number of examples does not allow any firm conclusion on the topic, besides that the positive form of adjectives is the more preferred material.

4.2.3.4. Conclusion on adjectives and EH interference

In general we can conclude that English adjectives have not been integrated into Hindi system through Hindi gender sensitive morphemes *-ā* and *-ī*. This has caused the loss of morphosyntactic information available from one type of Hindi adjectives and has transplanted the attention of a listener to other parts of the sentence to look for gender signals. However, it can also be argued that English adjectives have been incorporated on the model of invariable Hindi adjectives, and hence English insertions fit in well within Hindi system. Ergo, we could argue that English adjectives are fully adapted in Hindi environment.

Another conclusion that appears valid is that English adjectives are inserted as modifiers of English nouns in Hindi environment. That could be interpreted as a sign of alternative use of two codes (code-switching). There is then the question how we should interpret appearance of English adjectives as modifiers of Hindi nouns: do we mark it again as a case of code-

switching or do we consider it a case of code-mixing. It is also important to note once more that English nouns are often found in the position of adjectives (modifiers) because they can be incorporated into Hindi system with the postposition *kā, ke, kī* which is used to form modifiers generally. This possibility might also explain why the number of English nouns in Hindi is bigger than that of adjectives (Bhāṭiyā 1967). There is no need to borrow adjectives if the system allows simple formation of adjectives from any noun. Some English nouns, employed as modifiers, are incorporated without postposition *kā, ke, kī*.[178] However, such incorporation can be justified from the aspect of Hindi system. Within it, such incorporation can be interpreted as a case of compounding. As is clear from examples, English adjectives can be combined as modifiers with other English or Hindi adjectives, whether those are derived from nouns or verbs.

The last aspect to note is that English adjectives can be used with verbalizers to form conjunct verbs. In that form they take place of a predicate and can also be employed as verbal nouns.

4.2.4. Verbs and EH interference

4.2.4.1. English insertions and Hindi verbs

Next to nouns and adjectives, the most often inserted lexical material in most languages are verbs. Studies dedicated to verbal integration into new language systems have revealed the existence of several integration strategies (Moravcsik 1978, Muysken 2000, Wichmann & Wohlgemuth 2008). Verbs can be inserted in the original form without any modification (direct insertion) or with the morphological modification of the original form of the verb (indirect insertion). Verbs can also be inserted into a compound construction where it is accompanied by an inherited verb (light verb) or it can be imported along with its original inflection (paradigm transfer).

As in other languages of the subcontinent and beyond (Matras 2009: 180), English verbs are inserted in Hindi accompanied by a light verb. In Hindi such linguistic strategies can be observed when it comes to insertions of English lexemes, but also lexemes from Sanskrit, Persian, etc. Montaut (2016: 13-14) argues that the number of complex verbs in Hindi rose with the strength of the Mughal empire (16th-18th century) and the importance of Persian language as the need for communication between the rulers and the general public increased. More importantly, Montaut (2016: 10) argues that a number of such verbs rose because of the transparency the system of conjunct verbs offers (transitive-intransitive verbs are easily

---

[178] See section on nouns.

created thus), whereas the old system (vowel alternation in the root to create transitives, intransitives, causatives, etc.) has become unproductive. In this, she agrees with Gambhir (1993: 83): "the success of the new indigenous simplex verb is the fact that 'there was no complicated phonotactic changes in the borrowed element for deriving various verb forms', whereas the indigenous 'causative derivation' involves 'complex phonotactic rules and irregularities'." If one takes into consideration importance and status English has today in the subcontinent and globally, it is no surprise to see a greater number of verbal expressions containing English elements in the data.

Light verbs in many languages are usually verbs 'do' (H. *karnā*) and 'be/become' (H. *honā*), and follow the inserted infinitive, bare stem, or verbal nominal form. Montaut (2016: 11) invokes Moravcsik's conclusion (1978) that verbs are less easy to borrow than other parts of speech; hence they are recategorized as nominals and included in the system. Thus, it follows that English verbs in Hindi are actually nouns which with the help of verbalizers transform into Hindi verbs. Such verbs are in Hindi known as conjunct verbs (Kachru 2006: 85). Other cases of terminology have not been found except for a broad term 'unit hybridization' introduced by Kachru (1978a: 33), which concerns the union of any two lexemes that happen to appear within the same phrase and belong to separate sources. Kachru (1978a: 33) thus lists examples for noun phrase, verb phrase and compound phrase and qualifies unit hybridization as "extremely productive process for 'mixing' Indian languages such as Hindi-Urdu with the non-Indian languages, English and Persian." The term in Hindi which refers to verb + verb combination, compound verb, however, includes aspectual reference which is absent from the combination English verb + Hindi verb, hence it also cannot be applied to the category.

From there it follows that when we talk about English verbs in Hindi we discuss nominals which are altered into verbs. According to Borowiak (2007: 8),[179] conjuncts formed from English elements, which he calls mixed conjuncts, can be further described as three categories. Besides combination 1) English verb + Hindi, the conjunct verbs also include 2) English noun + verb and 3) English adjective + verb. Thus, all three aspects will be considered in the thesis.[180]

4.2.4.2. Conjunct verbs

Conjunct verbs, as already mentioned, comprise of nominal and verbalizer. In the conjunct verb, semantics is lent by a noun or an adjective (Montaut 2016: 1-2), and verbal structure by

---

[179] He does not, however, state whether English verbs are recategorized as nouns.
[180] See also section on nouns and adjectives.

a verbalizer. According to Das (2009: 194), a noun undergoes 'semantic bleaching' (Das 2009: 195-196) and after that becomes an integral part of the verb. In such constructions, in many languages verbalizers are usually verbs 'do' (*karnā*) and 'be/become' (*honā*). The number of such verbalizers in Hindi is, however, much bigger, even if the verbs 'do' and 'be' are the most frequent ones, as Butt (1995), Mohanan (1995) and Begum et al. (2011) have concluded. Thus Montaut (2016: 2) mentions both transitive and intransitive verbalizers such as *rakhnā* (to hold), *denā* (to give), *rahnā* (to stay), *lenā* (to take), *lagānā* (to attach), *ḍālnā* (to throw), etc. as verbalizers with high frequency of occurrence. It is important to note that Kachru (2006: 93) claims that it is not possible to predict which verb will appear with a nominal part in a conjunct, even if it is a very productive strategy for creation of new verbs.

As is visible from the data, in both sub-periods the main verbalizers had been *honā*, to be, and *karnā*, to do. It was also noticed that not all verbalizers appear with all nominals. Thus, a greater number of verbalizers appear with English verbs, whereas adjectives are always followed, according to the data by *honā,* be, or *karnā,* do. In the following pages conjuncts will be described as per the element that stands before the verbalizer.

4.2.4.2.1. Adjectives in conjunct verbs

According to Borowiak (2007: 8, 10), English adjectives are less often employed than English nouns and verbs to form conjuncts. As per his research, adjectives at first appear in the structure ADJ + be (copula), and as the integration of a new lexeme progresses structure ADJ + do also appears (Borowiak 2007: 10). He is also of the opinion that adjective-based conjuncts are much more difficult to integrate in Hindi, i.e. to develop at all, after the first stage ADJ + be. Thus he mentions English adjectives *busy, interested, excited* as examples of adjectives with frequent appearance in the form ADJ+be, which have, however, not developed verbs with other verbalizers, unlike adjectives *sharp, fresh* (Borowiak 2007: 10). His observation deserves some comments but those will be offered later on in the chapter.

Examples (43, 44) found in Lok Sabha confirm Borowiak's findings as all found adjectives were placed next to verb *be* to form a nominal predicate in plural (43) or singular (44). Such predicates can be found in simple sentences (43, 44) as well as in complex sentences (45). Example 44 also shows that verb *do* appears as verbalizer. In Hindi negation is placed in front of the verbalizing element, i.e. adjective and Hindi verb. Sentences in 46 show a model of an English adjective in predicative position with negation.

43) *āp log itne impatient haiṃ* (34, 19/8/2004)

you-PRON.NOM   people-NOM.PL   that-PRON.ADJ.NOM.PL   impatient-ADJ   be-3PL.COP.PRS

You people are so impatient.

44) *jab group of ministers ne clear kiyā thā* (17, 19/8/2004)

when-REL.ADV group of ministers-OBL.PL.AG clear-ADJ do-PFV.PTCP.SG.M be-3SG.AUX.PST

When the group of ministers cleared it…

45) *telephone calls jo free haiṃ so haiṃ lekin ham field meṃ kām karte haiṃ.* (117, 23/8/2006)

telephone calls-NOM.PL which-REL free-ADJ be-3PL.COP.PRS hundred-NUM be-3PL.COP.PRS but-ADV we-PRON.NOM field-OBL.SG in-POST work-SG do-IPFV.PTCP.PL.M be-3PL.AUX.PRS

There are 100 free telephone calls but we do field-work.

46) * *telephone calls fo free nahīṃ haiṃ…*

telephone calls which are not free…

* *log itne patient nahīṃ haiṃ…*

people are not so patient…

4.2.4.2.2. Nouns in conjunct verbs

As in case of regular Hindi nominal conjuncts, English noun is followed by Hindi verb to create a new verb. Next to the single noun insertion, Borowiak (2007: 9) also noticed insertions of noun phrases with verbalizers. He, however, refers to those as compound noun based conjuncts: *guḍ morning karnā,* 'good morning do', *peparvark karnā,* 'do paperwork', etc. He also mentions (Borowiak 2007: 8) verbs *karnā* (do), *honā* (be), *denā* (give), *lenā* (take), *ānā* (come), *lagānā* (join, apply) as verbalizers (light verbs) following English nouns. In the paper from 2012, Borowiak (2012: 41-42) also observed that English elements are often loaned with English prepositions, hence Hindi expressions mirror syntactic forms of the donor language: *foxus on X - X par fokas karnā*, to foxus on someone or something.

In the transcripts of parliamentary debates following verbs appeared as verbalizers of English nouns:[181] *honā* (be), *karnā* (do), *denā* (give), *karvānā* (to make do, causative form of verb *karnā*), *rakhnā* (to keep), *lenā* (to take), *lagānā* (to attach), *ḍālnā* (to throw). The comparison of two lists of verbalizers, shows that the either is far from being complete and a larger quantity of data might reveal other verbalizers as well. It also prompts the question whether the choice of verbalizer suggests semantic difference, besides the already noticed nuance transitivity - intransitivity in combinations with verb *do* and *be* (examples 47 and 48). It is easy to imagine that the example 47 has an intransitive pair *statement honā*, to be stated, or on the other hand transitive pair with a different verbalizer *statement denā*, to give statement. It is equally possible to think of a use for transitive verb *investigation karnā*, to investigate.

47) *statement ekadam to yahāṃ koī kar nahīṃ saktā hai* (13, 4/5/2010)
statement-SG momentarily-ADV then-ADV here-ADV anyone-PRON.NOM.SG do-ROOT no-NEG can-IPFV.PTCP.SG.M be-3SG.AUX.PRS
Nobody here can give statement momentarily then.

48) *usmeṃ investigation ho rahā hai income tax kā.* (99, 11/12/2009)
it-PRON.SG.OBL in-POST investigation-NOM.SG.M be-DUR.PTCP.SG.M be-3SG.AUX.PRS income-SG.OBL. tax-SG.OBL of-M.SG
In it there is an investigation of income tax.

Examples 49 and 50 show how speakers alter verbalizers, according to their semantic and syntactic needs. Verbalizers *karnā* (47) and *denā* (49), i.e. *denā* and *lenā* (50) transform nouns into transitive verbs, but there is a question if their places can be switched without affecting semantic layer. Whether the use of *notice denā* (to give notice, tran.) in place of *notice lenā* (to take notice, tran.) would effect the semantic layer or if its presence would make any difference to a speaker and how, is a question that requires further research. Same question applies to verbs found in examples 47 and 49.

49) … *unke MOS ākar yahāṃ statement deṃ* (13, 4/5/2010)
their-ADJ.POSS.PL MOS-NP come-CNPT here-ADV statement-SG give-3PL.SUBJ
… their MOS should give statement having come here.

50) *inhoṃne 26 janavarī ko haḍatāl kā notice diyā thā, vah notice inhoṃne vāpis liyā.* (40, *4/5/2010)*

---
[181] See section on nouns.

they-PRON.AG 26-NUM January-OBL.SG POST.OBJ strike-OBL.SG of-M.SG notice-SG give-PFV.PTCP.SG.M be-3SG.AUX.PST that-DEM.PRON.SG notice-SG they-PRON.AG back-ADV take-PFV.PTCP.SG.M

They (he) have a notice of strike on 26th January, and that notice they (he) took back.

Number of examples shows that next to single nouns, noun phrases can also constitute a nominal part of a Hindi conjunct verb, as Borowiak had noticed. Examples 51 and 52 show that complex noun phrase can also be part of nominal conjunct (52). Example 52 is of a more elaborate structure than the Borowiak (2007) had shown in his examples and includes a code-switched material.

51) *membroṃ kī family definition kyā hai*? (108, 21/7/1975)

member-OBL.PL of-F family-OBL.SG definition-NOM.SG what-PRON.Q be-3SG.COP.PRS

What definition of family do members have?

52) *unko ham behind the bar kar denge* (510, 21/11/2002)

they-PRON.OBL POST.OBJ we-PRON.NOM behind-PREP DEF bar-SG do-ROOT give-1PL.M.FUT

We will put them behind the bar.

Following examples (53-55) show that NP can be very complex. Thus, in example 53 we see that a noun has a very elaborate determiner introduced through postposition *kā* which in Hindi serves as a transformer tool noun → adjective, as already mentioned. In example 54, however, the noun phrase that participates in nominal predicate includes also English preposition *out of*. In example 55 it is visible that a complex English NP (*terms of reference*) has another English determiner introduced through postposition *kī*.

53) *chaḥ page ke letter kā reply hai*. (105, 6/5/2010)
six-NUM page-OBL.SG of-M letter-OBL.SG of-M.SG reply-NOM.SG be-3SG.COP.PRS
The reply to letter is six pages long.

54) *mumbaī meṃ local train band hone se vahāṃ kī law and order situation out of control ho* cukī hai. *(40, 4/5/2010)*
Mumbai-OBL.SG in-POST loca-ADJ.OBL train-OBL.PL shut-ADJ be-INF.OBL from-POST there-ADV of-F law-OBL.SG and-CONJ order-OBL.SG situation-NOM.SG out-PREP of-PREP control-NOM.SG be-ROOT finish-PFV.PTCP.F be-3SG.AUX.PRS

In Mumbai with the shutting of local trains, the city's (there) law and order situation has gone out of control.

55) *kyā maiṃ yah jān saktā hūṃ ki is working group kī terms of reference kyā haiṃ.* (478, 8-*19/2/1960*)

is-Q I-PRON.NOM it-PRON know-ROOT can-IPFV.PTCP.SG.M be-1SG.AUX.PRS that-CONJ this-DEM.OBL.SG working-IPFV.PTCP group-OBL.SG. of-F terms NOM.SG.F of-PREP reference-OBL.SG what-PRON.Q be-3PL.COP.PRS

May I know (it) (that) what are the terms of reference of this working group?

In examples 51 and 55 it is also visible that other elements can be placed between nominal and verbal part, i.e. in front of the verbalizer. In those two examples we find insertion of interrogative pronoun just like in the example 56, while in the example 57 we find demonstrative pronoun. Examples 58 and 59 demonstrate that negation is placed in the same position.

56) *officials kaun kaun haiṃ.* (10, 3/5/2010)

officials-NOM.PL who-PRON.Q.SG who-PRON.Q.SG be-3PL.COP.PRS

Who are officials? / Which officials?

57) *unkā mūl demand yah hai ki...* (44, 4/5/2010)

their-ADJ.POSS.NOM.SG.M original-ADJ.SG demand-NOM.SG this-DEM.PRON.SG be-3SG.COP.PRS that-CONJ

Their original demand is that ...

58) *yah koī club nahīṃ hai* (34, 19/8/2004)

this-PRON.NOM.SG any-PRON.ADJ.NOM.SG club-NOM.SG no-NEG be-3SG.COP.PRS

This is not a club.

59) *policy matters kā koī discussion nahīṃ huā (1334-1336, 8-19/2,/1960)*

policy-OBL.SG matter-OBL.PL of-M.SG any-PRON.ADJ.SG discussion-NOM.SG.M no-NEG be-PFV.PTCP.SG.M

There was no discussion on policy matters.

4.2.4.2.3. Verbs in conjunct verbs

In his early work, Kachru (1978: 33) mentions insertion of English verbs in Hindi when he talks about unit hybridization, a very broad term that could include any phrase in which some

elements are from Hindi and some from English or any other language. Barannikov (1984: 105-125) lists a large quantity of such borrowed verbs in his analysis of spoken Hindi in Delhi and Agra during 1970's. Such compounding leaves verbalization with infinitive morpheme -*nā* as a very rare occurrence. Thus, Snell (2011: 27) and Bhāṭiyā (1967: 202) quote only several verbs that have entered Hindi vebal system with an infinitive morpheme: *rūlnā*, to rule, *filmānā*, to shoot a film, to create a film, *lūznā*, to lose.

According to Borowiak (2007: 8), conjuncts formed from English elements are classed as mixed conjuncts, and combination English verb + Hindi verb is one of three possible forms that a conjunct with English element can have. As per him (Borowiak 2007: 9), verb *karnā* (do) is the most often used verbalizer for insertion of English verbs, although *honā* (be) can also be found. He further concludes "As a matter of fact, one can predict that similarly to non-mixed expressions, both verbs are possible for each and every mixed construction" (Borowiak 2007: 9), having in mind the difference transitive – intransitive verb Later. Borowiak (2012: 42) gives a more precise definition of such verbal insertions and describes them as "analytic verb constructions which have counterparts in SH only is simple verbs". According to him (2012: 42) such instances are deviations from standard Hindi (SH), in which he recognizes nouns and adjectives as constituents of conjunct verbs. The proof for deviation is the different use of postpositions due to reanalysis in the verb system (Borowiak 2007: 42). Thus, he mentions introduction of dative postposition and -*ϕ* postposition as well as the absence of genitive postposition. Montaut (2016: 11), as already mentioned, discusses combinations of English verbs with verbalizers as conjunct verbs, since she is of opinion that English verbs are recategorized in the process of insertion: verb → noun.

In the transcripts of Lok Sabha, the common verbalizer of English verbs were *karnā*, do, and *honā*, be. Since the research did not aim at this stage at statistical analysis it is not possible to say which one occurs more often and in which conditions. At this stage of research it can be said that these are the only two verbalizers that introduce English verbs into Hindi. However, there are several examples where it is not clear whether the verb or noun is introduced, but more will be said about these cases in following section. Examples 60-63 show typical sentences with English verbs. As we can see, both verbalizers take English infinitive. Both verbalizers appear in older (61, 63) as well as in newer data sets (60, 62). Example 61 also shows that inserted English verb can be *complex:* walk out.

It is also important to note that in example 64, verb *honā*, be, takes English participle as a base of a new conjunct verb. The use of participle is what I would have expected to encounter in the first place, as translations of examples 62 and 63 point out that this is the form that should be there. Hence, the question is why it does not appear always. We can look at

examples 63 and 64 as two different strategies to express the same notion of perfective. Thus in 63, speaker expresses perfectiveness using Hindi tools, i.e. verbalizer takes form of perfective participle and is followed by auxiliary. In example 64, however, perfectiveness is expressed in English element, i.e. in inserted English form, and Hindi part of the sentence is devoid of perfectiveness expression as the verbalizer is in Present Tense. Thus, the speaker and listener have to be both aware of the difference agitate vs. agitated to comprehend the sentence in example 64.

60) *maiṃ yah clarify kar dūṃ kyoṃki…* (202, 18/12/2006)

I-PRON.NOM this-DEM.SG clarify-INF do-ROOT give-1SG.SUBJ because-CONJ

I should clarify this because…

61) *ham walk out kar jāte agar* … (271-2, 27/8/1970)

we-PRON.NOM walk out-INF kar-ROOT go-IPFV.PTCP.PL.M if-CONJ …

We (I) will walk out if…

62) *cār cār ghaṃṭe train delay hotī hai* (61, 16/8/2004)

four-NUM four-NUM hour-NOM.PL train-NOM.SG delay-INF be-IPFV.PTCP.F be-3SG.AUX.PRS

The train is delayed for four hours.

63) *itnā sonā smuggle huā thā* (237, 13/3/1980)

that much-DEM.NOM.SG.M gold-NOM.SG.M smuggle-INF be-PFV.PTCP.SG.M be-3SG.M.AUX.PST

So much gold had been smuggled.

64) vah is kṣetra meṃ itne one sided kyoṃ haiṃ (20, 16/8/2004)

he-PRON.NOM.SG this-DEM.PRON.OBL.SG sphere-OBL.SG in-POST that much-DEM.NOM.SG.M one-NUM side-PFV.PTCP why-Q be-3PL.COP.PRS

Why is he in this sphere so one sided?

Next to examples like 63 and 64 it is also important to note that examples like 65 are abundant. In those examples perfectiveness is not expressed in either way, although it seems plausible that the speaker wishes to convey it.

65) *scheme implement ho rahī hai* (10, 3/5/2010)

scheme-NOM.SG implement-INF be- DUR.PTCP.F.SG be-3SG.AUX.PRS

Scheme is being implemented.

Overview of examples with *honā* shows that it is not clear why speakers opt for combinations such as in 63-65, i.e it is not clear how do they decide. A quick overview of data shows that combination INF + *honā* have a tendency to appear more often. However, that should be confirmed with a statistical analysis. Another interesting aspect related to English participles is that they appear in the data as regular insertions in noun phrases as in example 66:

66) *uske sāth action taken report bhī submit kareṃ.* (373-380, 13/3/1980)
it-PRON.OBL.SG with-POST action-SG take-PFV.PTCP report-NOM.SG too-ADV
submit-INF do-2PL.SUBJ
Please submit with it the report on actions taken.

If we look at earlier mentioned Borowiak's observation (2007: 10) on adjectives such as *interested, excited* not found in data with verbalizer karnā in contrast to verbs such as *fresh, popular* the reason for it might be that the first two belong to a different class of adjectives, i.e. verbal adjectives (participles) and express a particular aspect which cannot be combined with verbalizer 'do'. It would be good to analyze in the next stage of research study of acceptability of combinations such as: *interest honā / denā / lenā / karnā* versus *interested honā / denā / lenā / karnā*.

An overview also shows that new conjunct verbs can create compounded verbal structures such as in example 67. This example sets aside conjunct verbs from compound verbs, as we may assume that all conjunct verbs can become compounded but all compounded verbs cannot be conjunct verbs.

67) *jitne bhī irrigation projects haiṃ unko complete kar denge.* (147, 16/8/2004)
how many-REL.PL.M. too-ADV irrigation-OBL.SG projects-NOM.PL be-3PL.COP.PRS
they-PRON.OBL.OBJ complete-INF kar-ROOT do-1PL.FUT
We will complete all the irrigation projects, as many as there are.

Another interesting topic is the placement of negation in combinations English verb + verbalizer. From examples 68-71 it is clear that it is placed between inserted English verbal element and Hindi verbalizers, both in indicative and other modes (71). In that sense English verbal insertions behave as nominal counterparts in conjuncts, as can be seen from examples 58 and 59 in previous pages. That suggests that Montaut (2016) could be right to assume that verbs are recategorized as nouns, as in Hindi the negation is placed in unmarked speech just before the verb (Kachru 1980, Masica 1993, Matišić 1996, etc.).

68) *vah eka aisī activity hai jo isolate nahīṃ ho saktī. (*160, 16/8/2004)

it-PRON.NOM.SG   one-NUM   such-DEM.ADJ.SG.F   activity-NOM.SG.F   be-3SG.COP.PRS   which-REL.NOM.SG   isolate-INF   no-NEG   be-ROOT   can-IPFV.PTCP.SG.F

It is such an activity which can not be isolated.

69) *foreign exchange regulation amendment bill enforce nahīṃ huā hai*. (195, 17-22/2/1965)

foreign-ADJ exchange-regulation-amendment-bill-NP.NOM.SG enforce-INF no-NEG be-PFV.PTCP.SG.M be-3SG.AUX.PRS

The foreign exchange regulation amendment bill was not enforced.

70) *maiṃ āpko allow nahīṃ kartā hūṃ*. (284-290, 27/8/1970)

I-PRON.NOM   you-PRON.OBL.OBJ   allow-INF   no-NEG   do-IPFV.PTCP.SG.M   be-1SG.AUX.PRS

I do not allow you (to…).

71) *āp hameṃ bolne ke lie force mat kījiye. (36, 17/8/2004)*

you-PRON.NOM we-PRON.OBL speak-INF.OBL for-POST force-INF no-IMP.NEG do-2PL.IMP

Do not force me (us) to speak.

4.2.4.2.4. Verb, noun or adjective

However, if we assume that it is important to distinguish inserted material as nouns, adjectives and verbs, it should be noted that in some examples there are not clear lines that show whether insertion is nominal or verbal. In example 72 it is thus not clear whether inserted lexeme is an English adjective or a verb. In the following examples, there is a similar ambiguity whether insertions are nouns or verbs (73-76). In those examples it is possible to imagine pairs with other verbalizers: *clear honā* – to be clear, *profit honā* – to profit, to have profit, *import karnā* – to import, *control karnā* – to control, *request honā* – to be requested, to request. This exercise shows that not all conjuncts formed with *honā* are perhaps intransitives. Similarly, not all examples with *karnā* are necessarily transitives, as it is possible to create examples such as *walk (out) karnā*. Previously mentioned example (50) also opens a space to consider whether there are some verbalizers that English verbs cannot adopt. In other words, the question is whether example 50 tells us that *denā,* give, and *lenā*, take, as verbalizers can

take only nouns, whereas *karnā*, do, and *honā*, be, can include a much wider specter of elements and verbalize them.

72) *jab group of ministers ne clear kiyā thā* (17, 19/8/2004)

when-CONJ.Q   group-OBL.SG   of-PREP   minister-OBL.PL.AG   clear-ADJ   do-PFV.PTCP.SG.M be-3SG.AUX.PST.M

When the group of ministers cleared (it).

73) *private airlines to profit kar rahī haiṃ.* (29, 6/5/2010)

private-ADJ airlines-NOM.PL then-ADV profit-N?V? do-DUR.PTCP.F be-3PL.AUX.PRS

Private airlines then make profit.

74) *... jo import hotī hai ...* (16, 6/5/2010)

which-REL import-N?V? be-IPFV.PTCP.SG.F be-3SG.AUX.PRS

... which is being imported...

75) *passport kaise control hogā-* (239, 6/5/2010)

passport-NOM.SG.M how-ADV.Q control-N?V? be-3SG.COP?AUX?FUT

How will be the passport be controlled?

76) *maiṃ bār bār request kar rahā hūṃ* (204, 18/12/2006)

I-PRON.NOM   often-ADV   often-ADV   request-N?V?   do-DUR.PTCP.SG.M   be-1SG.AUX.PRS

I request over and over again.

4.2.4.2.5. Hindi compound verbs and English verbs

Compound verbs represent a particular category in Hindi linguistics, which consists of two verbs. The first verb supplies lexical meaning, while the second verb serves a specific role as it "contributes a varying number of lexico-semantic features that are already present or inherent in the lexical meaning of the first verb" (Nespital 1997: IX). According to Nespital (1997: XVII), there are 47 such verbs which can follow the first verb and create compound verb. In the data found in Lok Sabha, examples show that conjuncts created with English elements take such forms if the context requires it: *test kar lenā* – to test (19, 23/4/1985), *cancel kar denā* – to cancel (78, 15/3/1980), *reject kar denā* – to reject (183, 15/3/1980), *utilization kar lenā* – to utilize (32, 15/12/2003), etc. Compound verbs appeared in both active and passive voice as can be seen in examples 77 and 78.

77) *mahārāṣṭra ne pūre amount kā proper utilization kar liyā hai* (32, 15/12/2003)

maharashtra-OBL.SG.AG complete-ADJ.OBL.SG amount-OBL.SG of-SG.M proper-ADJ
utilization-SG do-ROOT take-PFV.PTCP.SG.M be-3SG.AUX.PRS
Maharasthra utilized properly complete amount.

78) *government kī laboratories meṃ bhī ise test kar liyā gayā hai* (19, 23/4/1985)
government-OBL.SG of-F laboratory-PL.OBL in-POST also-ADV it-PRON.OBL.OBJ
test-N?V? do-ROOT take-PFV.PTCP.SG.M go-PFV.PTCP.SG.M be-3SG.AUX.PRS
It has been tested in government laboratories.

The implementation of English verbs in compound structures might suggest that Hindi
speakers consider at least some of the English insertions as fully adapted to Hindi system.

4.2.4.3. Non-infinitive English verbal forms in Hindi
Next to English verbs incorporated as infinitives, there are also those which are incorporated
in Hindi in the participle form. As we have already seen participles can also be followed by
verbalizers and create Hindi conjunct verbs. To summarize briefly, *-ed* participle appeared
with verbalizer *honā*, to be, to become, as can be seen in example 79.
79) *is āg se kitne log affected hue the?* (17, 24/5/1990)
this-DEM.ADJ.OBL.SG fire-OBL.SG from-POST how many-ADJ.Q.OBL.PL.M. people-
NOM.PL.M affect-PFV.PTCP be-PFV.PTCP.PL.M be-3PL.M.AUX.PST
How many people have been affected by fire?

The *-ed* form has not been, however, employed on every such occasion (80, 81), even if the
Hindi system does require the use of a participle form in that syntactic position, which was
also mentioned earlier.

80) *rikśāpullers exploit ho rahe haiṃ.* (203, 26/8/1970)
rikshapuller-NOM.PL exploit-INF be- DUR.PTCP.M.PL be-3PL.AUX.PRS
Rikshapullers are being exploited.

81) *charges prove hue haiṃ* (433, 7/9/1990)
charge-NOM.PL prove-INF be-PFV.PTCP.PL.M be-3PL.AUX.PRS
The charges have been proved.

However, next to that function, English participles were employed in other functions as well.
Thus, the data shows that *-ed* is present in the position of a modifier in front of a head noun:
joint committee *(43, 4/5/2010);* mechanized instruments *(34, 16/8/2000),* unauthorized

possession ka *saval hai* (439-449, 8-29/2/1960), it is the question of unauthorized possession, etc.

Similarly, Present Participles appear throughout the data in both positions, as a modifier or as part of a predicate, as can be seen in the following examples:

82) *missing link ke taur par* (OBL.SG on the account-POST), on the account of a missing link (8,7/12/2009);

83) *managing directors* (NOM.PL), managing directors (192, 17-22/2/1965);

84) *planning commission* (NOM.SG), planning commission (202, 17-22/2/1965);

85) *choṭī choṭī working capital* (NOM.SG.F), small working capital (473, 21/11/2002);

86) *training school* (NOM.SG) training school (29, 1-14/8/1950);

87) *case pending hai* (143, 6/5/2010)
case-NOM.SG pend-IPFV.PTCP be-3SG.AUX.PRS
Case is pending.

The number of examples shows that the *-ing* form is present in verbal nouns as well:

88) *melting aur premixing kā kām* (9, 7/12/2009)
melting-OBL.SG and-CONJ premixing-OBL.SG of-M.SG task-NOM.SG.M
task of melting and premixing

89) *is networking meṃ,* (9, 7/12/2009)
this-PRON.OBL.SG networking-OBL.SG in-POST
in this networking

90) *railway employees kī training ke lie*, (30, 24/7/2003)
railway-OBL.SG employee-OBL.PL of-F training-OBL.SG for-POST
for the trainging of railway employees

91) *compulsory voting,* (78, 29/4/2005)
compulsory voting

As such, it can become a part of conjunct verbal forms or a part of nominal predicates (92-96):

92) *mixing karnā,* to mix = conjunct verb; (339, 27/8/1970)

93) *widening karnā,* to widen = conjunct verb; (31, 21/11/2002)

94) *train kī escorting hogī,* = nominal predicate (500, 15/12/2003)
train-OBL.SG of-F escorting-NOM.SG.F be-3SG.COP.FUT
There will be train escorting.

95) *counter checking hotī hai,* = nominal predicate (458, 9/4/2001)
counter-OBL.SG checking-NOM.SG.F be-IPFV.PTCP.SG.F be-3SG.AUX.PRS
There is counter checking.

96) *un meṃ tribals ke prati koī understanding nahīṃ hotī* = nominal predicate (308, 23/4/1985)
they-PRON.OBL in-POST tribal-OBL.PL for-POST any-ADJ.NOM understanding-NOM.SG.F no-NEG be-IPFV.PTCP.SG.F
They have no understanding for tribals.

However, it would merely be speculation to try to interpret reasons for which speakers opt for infinitive or participle forms on a sample as small as the Lok Sabha debates. As already mentioned, the Hindi system does require a participle in such contexts, and so does English. It might be that the speakers with a deeper knowledge of both languages feel at odds when they employ the infinitive form in such structures; however, without a greater number of examples, it is hard to make any solid conclusions.

4.2.4.4. Syntax of verbs and EH interference
4.2.4.4.1. Predicates

Since verbs across languages are employed as predicates, it comes as no surprise that English verbs in Hindi text in Lok Sabha have also been placed in the position of a predicate. The same has been discussed as a topic in the section on conjunct verbs. There it is shown that English adjectives, nouns and verbs followed by verbalizer can take place of predicate. To summarize briefly, adjectives in the Lok Sabha material were followed in that role by verbalizer *honā*, to be, whereas nouns and verbs had had number of various verbalizers.

Nouns in that position were used both in singular and plural forms. Apart from single lexemes, noun phrases were also employed to form nominal predicates:

97) *unko ham 'behind the bar' kar deṃge*, (510, 21/11/2002)

they-PRON.OBL.OBJ we-PRON.NOM behind-PREP the-DEF bar-SG do-ROOT give-1PL.FUT

We will put them behind the bar.

98) *situation out of control ho cukī hai*, (40, 4/5/2010)

situation-NOM.SG.F out-ADV of-PREP control-NOM.SG be-ROOT finish-PFV.PTCP.SG.F be-3SG.AUX.PRS

The situation has gone out of control.

4.2.4.4.2. Other syntactic functions

Inserted verbal material was also used by speakers in the position of subject, object, attribute, or adverbial. Since verbal nouns in Hindi are equal to the infinitive form, when they are created from inserted English verbs they correspond to the formula infinitive + light verb. Some speakers have also inserted verbal nouns directly from English, as already mentioned (-*ing* form). In both cases, their syntactic role was that of an attribute as can be seen in examples 99-101.

99) *smuggling kā charge*, (156, 22-28/2/1955)

smuggling-OBL.SG of-SG.M charge-NOM.SG.M

charge of smuggling

100) *apply karne kī tārīkh,* (353-354, 8-19/2/1960)

apply-ROOT do-INF.OBL of-SG.F date-NOM.SG.F

date of application/applying

101) *us station ko nationalize karne kī bāt huī hai.,* (241, 27/8/1970)

that-PRON.OBL.SG station-OBL.SG POST.OBJ nationalize-INF do-INF.OBL of- SG.F talk-NOM.SG.F be-PFV.PTCP.SG.F be-3SG.AUX.PRS

There was a question of nationalizing station.

Such verbal nouns have, in several cases, been further modified to suit their role of a modifier with the addition of the lexeme -*vālā*:

102) *production karne vālī industries,* (903, 16/8/2000)

production-OBL.SG do-INF.OBL vālā-NOM.F industry-NOM.PL.F

industries that produce (X)

103) *mindset change karne vālī bāt*, (294, 6/5/2010)

mindset-SG.OBL. change-SG.OBL do-INF.OBL vālā-NOM.F thing-NOM.SG.F

the thing that changes mindset

Both Past Participle (*-ed*) and Present Participle (*-ing*) appear as syntactic attributes of nouns, as was already mentioned and as can be seen in the following examples:

104) *training school : trained scholars* (29, 449, 1-14/8/1950)

105) *managing directors : unregistered power looms* (192, 17-22/2/1965, 208, 22-28/2/1955)

106) *planning commission : unauthorized possession kā savāl* (202, 17-22/2/1965; 439-449, 8-29/2/1960)

planning commission : the question of unauthorized possession

107) *working group : improved quality kā khānā* (478, 8-19/2/1960; 297, 12/3/1980)

working group : the food of improved quality

Past Participle adjectives were paired with both Hindi and English nouns, regardless of whether they were head nouns or modifiers of other nouns, subjects or objects as can be seen in examples 108-110.

108) *isolated fields kī gas ko* (OBL.SG POST.OBJ for gas from isolated fields, 14, 6/5/2010)

109) *state sponsored hamle* (NOM.PL.M attacks sponsored by state, 840, 16/8/2000)

110) *gender biased bill hai, men dominated bill hai* (NOM.SG, the bill is gender biased, *dominated by men, 958, 16/8/2000*)

As we can see from the examples, unlike Hindi verbal adjectives, English verbal adjectives are not gender and number sensitive and therefore it is not possible to learn any such information from those forms when they are included in Hindi.

Verbal forms were also found in adverbial functions as is demonstrated in the following examples:

111) *development karte vaqt*, (10, 27/8/1970)

development-NOM.SG do-IPFV.PTCP.M time-NOM.SG.M,

while developing/during the development

112) *film bānāne meṃ*, (17, 27/8/1970)

film-NOM.SG make-INF.OBL in-POST

in film-making (industry)

The Conjunctive Participle adverbs were also created from inserted English elements, either nouns or verbs (113-115).

113) *serious thought dekar*, (36, 6/5/2010)

having given a serious thought

114) *combine karke,* (459, 9/4/2001)

having combined

115) *formality complete karke,* (23, 23/4/1985)

having completed formality

4.2.4.5. Conclusion on verbal forms

Data from the Lok Sabha (1950-2010) shows that verbs were mostly joined with the two verbalizers, *karnā*, to do, and *honā*, to be. However, other Hindi verbs were also present as verbalizers, *denā*, 'to give', *lenā*, 'to take', etc. Many English verbs have been combined with Hindi verbalizers as stems or infinitives, but examples with participle forms can also be found. Verbal forms were employed syntactically not just as predicates but also as modifiers of nominal lexemes.

If we compare the techniques employed to insert interfering Persian verbal elements to techniques employed to insert English verbal elements, it becomes visible that use of suffix –*nā* has become outdated.[182] According to Snell (2011), when the same technique is employed with English verbs it incites laughter in Hindi speakers.[183] For the speakers, it appears to be deemed inappropriate to add this suffix; and the question is "why is this?", since it is a legitimate technique for the incorporation of new verbal elements in Hindi system. Montaut (2016: 10, 13-14) looks at the situation as the change of two systems: from

---

[182] According to Kuczkiewicz-Fraś (1997: 56), very small portion of Persian verbs were adopted with the infinitive morpheme –*nā.* That suggests that such cases were outnumbered by the light verb system.

[183] Snell's (2011: 27) and Bhāṭiyā's (1967: 202) bringing up of seldom cases where English verbs are formed with the infintive –*nā* might suggest that in some varieties of Hindi it could still be an active strategy.

morphonologically expressed transitivity to the transitivity expressed with the use of light verbs. A detailed comparative historical analysis of these elements would be a valuable asset for the study of EH interference and of interference between English and languages of the Indian subcontinent in general.

The analysis of verbal forms in Lok Sabha material also shows that negation is placed before the verbal segment of the predicate, regardless of the nature of the first segment in the conjunct (adjective, noun, verb). The place of negation does not change with the alteration of negative particle (*nahīṃ, na, mat*). That suggests that English verbs once they enter Hindi behave like nominal elements, nouns and adjectives and not like Hindi verbs.

4.2.5. Adverbs and EH interference

Research on various languages (Haugen 1950, Matras 2007, Muysken 1981, Thomason & Kaufman 1988, etc.) shows that adverbs, which are defined as modifiers of verbs, adjectives, other adverbs, or sentences, are not as popular as an insertion material as nouns, verbs, or adjectives. Hindi adverbs are formed:

 a) from adjectives with -*ø* morpheme or -*e*,

 b) from nouns followed by postposition *se,* 'from/out/with', *ko* 'to, for', *meṃ* 'in', or without a postposition,

 c) participles can also be employed to express adverbial meanings, and

 d) entire subordinate clauses can be used adverbially as well.

As demonstrated by Tivārī's paper (1966: 300-301), English adverbial insertions and calques are not difficult to find in Hindi. In standardized Hindi, a number of adverbial calques is modeled on English, yet they appear to be of Sanskrit origin, as Sanskrit lexemes are used to form them: *pūrvakathit*, 'aforesaid' (*pūrva*, ADJ.S. 'prior/first/initial' + *kathit*, ADJ.S. 'said', 'uttered').

The quantity of inserted adverbs in the data can be described as low if compared to number of nouns and verbs. In the first sub-period (1950-1995) adverbs mostly consisted of a single lexeme. Some were phasal, referring to time (*temporary*, 26, 1-14/8/1950), and some adverbs refered to manner (*clearly, socially,* etc.).[184] While several of them are inserted in adverbial form with the English suffix -*ly,* some are derived from English adjectives (*alternative*, *administrative*) with a secondary Hindi postposition *ke rūp meṃ* ('in the form of', 'as') from the noun *rūp* (form, shape).[185]

---

[184] Sources: 165, 8-19/2/1960; 373, 13/3/1980.
[185] Sources: 159-166, 8-19/2/1960; 629 and further, 8-19/2/1960.

In the stated sub-period, adverbs were also derived from nouns and verbal stems. Thus adverbs made from nouns employed the lexeme 'time' in plural form, preceded by Hindi adverb/adjective *kaī,* 'several, few' as in example 116.

116) *kaī timoṃ meṃ*, (110, 21-30/7/1975)

several-ADJ time-OBL.PL in-POST

at several times

It should be noted here that Hindi construction of the same meaning *kaī bār meṃ*, several-ADJ time-NOM.M in-POST, at several times/turns, is usually not shaped in the oblique plural form.

Adverbs formed from verbal stems in the form of conjunctive participles were employed to express sequences of events:[186] *violate karke*, having violated (510, 21/11/2002); *formality complete karke*, having completed formality (23, 23/4/1985); etc. In examples of present participle adverbs, which express simultaneous events, a noun *vaqt*, 'time', was employed to underline the semantics of time in the adverb:[187] *interim relief dete vaqt*, at the time giving interim relief (338, 1/9/1970).

Next to single lexemes, adverbial formations can be more elaborate such as *cooperatives ke mūl act meṃ,* in the original act for cooperatives (185, 17-22/2/1965), *cost of living index ke hisāb se,* according to the cost of living index (51, 21/7/1975), etc. Inserted adverbs were employed to modify sentences (*administrative ke rūp meṃ,* administratively, 629 and further, 8-19/2/1960) or nouns *(industrially backward zilā*, industrially backward county, 301, 13/3/1980).

While in the first sub-period some adverbs were created by combining derivative elements from English and Hindi (adjective + postposition, *alternative ke rūp meṃ,* alternatively, 159-166, 8-19/2/1960)), in the second sub-period speakers inserted English adverbs directly from English (ex. *timely lekar-* having taken timely… 958, 16/8/2000; *specifically*, 34, 16/8/2000; *seriously,* 436, 21/11/2002, *administratively aur financially,* administratively and financially, 421, 24/7/2003; *inhuman conditions meṃ,* in inhuman conditions, 481, 14/5/2002; etc.). The model from the first sub-period has also been noticed, nevertheless: *scientific rūp se,* scientifically (134, 6/5/2010). Inserted English verbal elements in the role of adverbials appeared, as in the first sub-period, in the form of conjunctive participles: *rules violate karke,* having violated rules (510, 21/11/2002); *serious thought dekar*, having given serious thought

---

[186] Same structural type of adverbs can also express manner and reason (Kachru 1980: 80-81).
[187] Kachru 1980: 85, Matišić 1991: 124.

(36, 6/5/2010); etc. The present participle adverbials such as *liability fix karte vaqt*, 'while fixing liability (285, 6/5/2010), were also present in the sub-period 2000-2010.

When it comes to subordinate clauses, like in the first sub-period, more complex adverbials were present such as *iske implementation ke nām par* (in the name of its implementation, 10, 3/5/2010), *government of india kī taraf se* (from the side of Government of India, 595, 9/4/2001), etc. Some of the observed adverbial expressions were centered on a noun (*social responsibility ke nām par,* in the name of social responsibility, 31, 6/5/2010) or on a verb combined with a noun (*librahān commission kī report leak hone par,* when the Librehan Commission's report had been leaked, 84, 7712/2009).

To summarize briefly, from the collected material it is clear that inserted English adverbs in Hindi do not undergo any morphological changes in order to be accommodated into the Hindi system. As already stated, compared to nouns and verbs as inserted material, adverbs still represents a very small percentage of the total English interference in Hindi just as other researchers have also concluded.

4.2.6. Numerals and EH interference

Despite the relatively high borrowability of numbers (Matras 2009: 201) in different languages, the Lok Sabha debates do not show many traces of numbers as inserted material. Hindi experts (Tivari 1966: 262) do confirm the borrowability of both cardinal and ordinary numbers: *two, second, first, single*, etc. In the analyzed material, however, numerals are mostly written as digits, and therefore their verbal realization is not documented on paper.

In the material for the sub-period 1950-1995, numbers were found in their full lexical form on very few occasions such as *first attack*, 19-20, 26/8/1970; *fifth five year plan meṃ* (OBL.SG in-POST) in the fifth five-year plan, 19, 13/3/1980, *third five year plan kā tālluk* (NOM.SG.M) the reference to third five year plan, 1297, 8-19/2/1960. In the second sub-period, likewise, full lexical forms appeared: *tenth plan ke lie* (OBL.SG for-POST) for the tenth plan, 21, 9/4/2001; *third front ke X,* X of the third front, 469, 21/11/2002, *agar first year meṃ* (if-CONJ first year-OBL.SG in-POST) if in the first year, 172, 11/12/2009, etc.

The material suggests that numerals are not very popular interfering material. However, it remains questionable in which language were the numerals, which are written down in the material as digits, actually uttered. Having in mind the Indian context, there is a large possibility that they were pronounced as English lexemes, and not Hindi. Due to the nature of

notation as it is, nevertheless, this is hard to prove. Further analysis could be focused on audio recordings of debates to shed some light.

4.2.7. Definite and indefinite articles and EH interference

The borrowing of articles is a rare phenomenon, as data from various languages has shown, especially when it comes to active employment of articles (Matras 2009: 216). Hindi, in principal, does not recognize articles as a special part of speech; however, occasionally the number one, *ek,* is used as a non-definite determiner (Kachru 1980: 22-25). The definite noun phrase can contain demonstratives such as *yah,* 'this', and *vah,* 'that', but generally the placement of definite determiners is left empty in Hindi. In conjunction with this, Tivārī (1969: 297, 1966: 272) claims that there has been an increase in the use of demonstratives due to the interference of English, ergo he sees the increase in the usage of demonstratives *yah* and *vah* as a disguised introduction of the English definite article system. He argues that the new pattern has replaced the old one in which the relative pronoun was located at the head of a sentence, as can be seen from his example below:

old pattern:

jis ghar meṃ maiṃ pahle rahā kartā thā bik gayā.

which-REL.OBL.SG house-OBL.SG in-POST I-PRON.NOM before-ADV live-PFV.PTCP.SG.M do-IPFV.PTCP.SG.M be-1.SG.M.AUX.PST sell-ROOT go-PFV.PTCP.SG.M

The house in which I lived before was sold.

new pattern:

vah ghar jismeṃ maiṃ pahle rahā kartā thā bik gayā.

that-DEM.SG.OBL house-OBL.SG.M which-REL.OBL.SG in-POST I-PRON.NOM before-ADV live-PFV.PTCP.SG.M do-IPFV.PTCP.SG.M be-1.SG.M.AUX.PST sell-ROOT go-PFV.PTCP.SG.M

The house in which I lived before was sold.

Materials from the Lok Sabha confirm articles as unpopular material to insert, as only several instances of inserted definite articles had been noticed in both sub-periods. Examples 117-119 show how definite article had been inserted.

117) *ham logoṃ ne minimum wages to the agricultural labourers ko bhī ...* (55, 15/3/1980)

we-PRON.OBL people-OBL.PL.AG minimum-ADJ wage-OBL.PL to-PREP the- DEF labourer-OBL.PL POST.OBJ too-ADV

We have… minimum wages to agricultural labourers as well…

118) *under-the-table bahut sārā paisā dete haiṃ,* (17, 27/8/1970)

under-PREP the-DEF table-OBL.SG lot-ADV all-ADJ.SG.M money-OBL.SG.M give-IPFV.PTCP.PL.M be-3PL.AUX.PRS

(They) give a lot of the money under the table.

119) *ab maiṃ neglect of the villages par ānā cāhtā hūṃ* (374, 12/3/1980)

now-ADV I-PRON.NOM neglect-OBL.SG of-PREP the-DET village-OBL.PL on-POST come-INF like-IPFV.PTCP.SG.M. be-1SG.AUX.PRS

Now I would like to come to the neglect of villages

In the second sub-period, definite articles appeared embedded as well: *leader of the house* (17, 4/6/2004), *behind the bar* (510, 21/11/2002), etc.

Data shows that the influence of English indefinite articles *a/an* is greater than that of the definite article. The article is almost never kept in its original form, but rather translated as a number one, *ek*. Examples with indefinite articles appeared with either a Hindi or English noun:

120) *ek baccā*, a child; *ek point of order*, a point of order;[188]

or a Hindi or English noun modified by an adjective,

121) *ek academic praśn,* an academic question; *ek historical necessity,* a historical necessity.[189]

An interesting situation is found in the sentence in example 122 where an indefinite article is placed before a Hindi adjective, but not in front of its English equivalent in the second part of the sentence when the information is reiterated by the speaker in 'English', (though the Hindi verb from the first part of the sentence is also kept).

122) *Bihār ek garīb state hai, poor state hai.* (55, 15/3/1980)

bihar-NOM.SG ek-NUM poor-ADJ.SG state-NOM.SG be-3SG.AUX.PRS, poor-ADJ.NOM state-NOM.SG be-3SG.AUX.PRS

Bihar is a poor state, a poor state.

---

[188] *Ek baccā kaise apnī student life maintain kar saktā hai?*, How can a child maintain its student life? (323, 13/3/1980) *Merā ek point of order hai.*, I have a point of order. (210, 13/3/1980)

[189] *Yah ek historical necessity hai.*, This is a historical necessity. (237, 13/3/1980); *Maiṃ ek academic praśn uṭhānā* cāhtā hūṃ., I want to raise an academic question. (170, 15/3/1980)

The appearance of such examples confirms that it is perceived by speakers as a 'normal' usage of the lexeme *ek*: *ek minute* (44, 5/5/2010)*, ek kānūn,* a law (294, 6/5/2010)*, ek border road* (43, 29/4/2005)*, ek question* (49, 7/12/2009), etc. The implementation of *ek* as an indefinite article can be distinguished from other expressions as *ek working group aur ek planning group*, one working group and one planning group (19, 13/3/1980), where *ek* can represent a number and not an indefinite article; we can determine this because if we insert higher numbers, the expression will remain semantically coherent. This is not the case with previously mentioned examples.

To summarize, the data shows that *ek* appears in front of Hindi and inserted English nouns, whether alone or accompanied by attributes. Whether *ek* is being used as an indefinite article due to English interference is a question that has yet to be analyzed and researched in more detail. Furthermore, the question of comparison between the Hindi demonstrative *vah* and the English definite article also still remains to be answered.

4.2.8. Prepositions and EH interference

Just like adverbs, prepositions appear to be very low on the borrowability scale. Nevertheless, some languages (Matras 2009: 200) do borrow them; examples of this phenomena include the Romani language (from Slavic, German, Romanian, Greek, Swedish, etc.), Indonesian (from Sanskrit), Central American languages (from Spanish), Maltese (from Italian). The data gathered from the debates shows that English preposition *of* was inserted to establish relation within the noun phrase. It appeared in phrases such as: *point of order* (275, 26/8/1970), *cost of living index* (68, 17-22/2/1965)*, medium of instruction *(478, 8-19/2/1960)*, letter of intent *(78, 15/3/1980)*, neglect of *the villages* (365, 12/3/1980)*, etc.

In the sub-period 1950-1995, in many cases *of* was replaced with Hindi preposition *kā, ke, kī* as in *adults kī social education*, social education of adults (164 and further, 1-14/8/1950); *production kī total capacity,* total capacity of production (31, 22-28/2/1955). On a few occasions, prepositions were also omitted as can be seen in the example, *action taken report,* report on taken actions (373-380, 13/3/1980). The data in the audio version would perhaps be able to show whether other signs for the correct assignment of relations on the suprasegmental level were present in the speech.

Besides *of*, other prepositions also appeared in material until 2000 such as *on* in example 123 or *under* in example 124.

123) *technology mission on drinking water,* (423, 24/5/1990)

124) *under-the-table paisā*, money given under-the-table (17, 27/8/1970).

In the second sub-period (2000-2010), the situation with prepositions was same: preposition *of* was embedded in different noun phrases. The examples *in terms of minute, in terms of second* (39, *4/5/2010),* commission of enquiry *(6, 4/2006),* Archeological survey of India *(97, 7/12/2009)* suggest the presence of *of* in formulaic expressions. However, other examples (125-126) show that the preposition *of* appears in non-formulaic environment as well.

125) *committees of secretaries ne*, (PL.OBL.AG, 32, 6/5/2010)

126) *specific cases of bhraṣṭācār*, (NOM.SG), specific cases of deprived behavior (217, 22-25/2/1955, 100, 11/12/2009)

Prepositions were also noticed in verbal phrases: *off grid honā,* to be off grid (18, 7/12/2009), *dispose of karnā,* to dispose of (283, 26/8/1970), *take over karnā,* to take over (290, 12/3/1980), *cover up karnā,* to cover up (41, 16/8/2000); etc.

We can conclude that the insertion of prepositions occurs rarely compared to insertion of nouns and verbs, and that the inserted prepositions were used to establish relations between inserted English nouns. However, one should keep in mind Borowiak's (2012: 41-43) observation and the possibility that many English phrasal expressions were calqued in Hindi (*focus on X : X par focus* karnā*).*

4.2.9. Conjunctions and EH interference

Following Stolz's (1996) research on Spanish borrowings into approximately 40 Central American and Pacific languages, as well as his own in Romani language in contact with different languages (French, Romanian, Turkish, etc.), Matras (2009: 158, 194) concluded that the borrowability hierarchy of conjunctions is based on contrast. Thus the conjunction *but* is the most often inserted conjunction, after which follows *or* as another marker of contrast, while conjunction *and* is the least preferred insertion material.

However, the data available for the sub-period 1950-1995 contradicts the conclusions of Stolz and Matras, as the conjunction *and* was noticed several times (*temperature and humidity,* 78, 22-28/2/1955*, law and order,* 229, 28/8/1970*, 67, 15/3/1980, 382, 24/5/1990, re-open and re-view karne ke lie,* for re-opening and re-viewing, 6, 15/3/1980) contrary to conjunction *but* (*on the contrary,* 228, 26/8/1970).

Equally interesting are examples in which Hindi *aur*, and, is used to establish relation between inserted English lexemes:

127) *innocent aur noncontroversial,* innocent and noncontroversial (106, 21/7/1975),

128) *political aur economical,* political and economical (1277-98, 8-19/2/1960),

129) *west aur south Dilli meṃ,* (57, 17-22/2/1965),
west-ADJ.OBL and-CONJ south-ADJ.OBL Delhi-SG.OBL in-POST
in west and south Delhi

130) *mission schooloṃ aur convents kā moh* (1983-1994, 8-19/2/1960)
mission-ADJ   school-OBL.PL   and-CONJ   convent-OBL.PL.   of-M.SG   attraction-NOM.M.SG
attraction of mission schools and convents.

The data for 2000-2010 confirms the findings of the first sub-period:

131) *vahāṃ kī law and order situation* (40, 4/5/2010)
there-ADV of-SG.F law-OBL.SG and-CONJ order-OBL.SG situation-NOM.SG.F
the situation of law and order in there

132) *constructive suggestions and constructive views āye haiṃ.* (62, 5/5/2010)
constructive-ADJ   suggestion-NOM.PL.   and-CONJ   constructive-ADJ   view-NOM.PL
come-PFV.PTCP.PL.M be-3PL.AUX.PRS
Constructive suggestions and constructive views came.

Next to the English connector *and,* as in the first sub-period, two Hindi connectors, *aur,* and, and *evam,* and, were also employed to correlate English insertions in the second sub-period as well as can be seen from examples 133-138.

133) *true roots aur link roots ke lie* (9, 7/12/2009)
true-ADJ root-OBL.PL and-CONJ link-OBL root-OBL.PL for-POST
for the true roots and link roots

134) *schedule castes aur schedule tribes kī 1885 jātiyāṃ* (106, 6/5/2010)
schedule-INF caste-OBL.PL and-CONJ schedule-INF tribe-OBL.PL of-F 1885-NUM jati-NOM.PL.F

the 1885 jatis of scheduled castes and scheduled tribes

135) *national highways aur state highways ke development ke lie* (28, 24/4/2000)

national-ADJ.OBL highway-OBL.PL and-CONJ state-ADJ.OBL highway-OBL.PL of-M

development-OBL.SG.M for-POST

for the development of national and state highways

136) *driver evaṃ sahāyak driver* (49, 4/5/2010)

driver-NOM.SG and-CONJ deputy-OBL driver-NOM.SG

driver and co-driver

137) *express evaṃ intercity express* (51, 3/5/2010)

express-NOM.SG and-CONJ intercity-OBL express-NOM.SG

express and intercity express [trains]

138) *south evaṃ west uḍīsā kī jantā* (534, 9/4/2001)

south-ADJ and-CONJ west-ADJ Orrisa-OBL.SG of-F people-NOM.SG.F

people of southern and western Orrisa

4.2.10. Conclusions on EH interference types 1 and 2

The data was measured for four types of occurrences:

   1) zero visible EH interference which was marked in the data as EH type 0,

   2) single-worded English phrases which were marked in the data as EH type 1,

   3) multiple-worded English phrases which were marked in the data as EH type 2, and

   4) clause- and sentence-long English insertions which were marked in the data as EH type
3.

The analysis shows that among 549 analyzed Hindi speakers in the first sub-period (1950-1995), almost every second Hindi speaker employed strategy EH type 0, i.e. no EH interference was noticed in their speech. Every fourth speaker employed strategy EH type 1 or EH type 2. Number of speakers whose speech can be marked as EH type 3 was not high in that sub-period as not even every fifth speaker adopted that particular strategy while speaking in Hindi (see Table 4.5. and Graph 4.I.). In the second sub-period (2000-2010) the ratio between types is slightly different. The strategy EH type 0 was adopted by every third analyzed speaker, as was EH type 1; while strategies EH type 2 and 3 were adopted by every fourth speaker. Thus the increase of EH interference in speech patterns of analyzed speakers appears to have taken place mostly after the year 2000 and resulted in the greater presence of

single worded phrases (EH type 1) and of EH interference on the level of clause or sentence (EH type 3). The multi-worded phrases (EH type 2) appear to have decreased in the same sub-period. A closer look at the statistics (see Table 4.6. and Graph 4.II.) for the first sub-period shows that the speakers preferred EH type 2 to EH type 0 in the data for 1965, 1975 and 1985. The percentage of speakers, however, with EH type 0 rose very high in the data during the year 1990 (69%) and continued in 1995 (80%), causing the change in the balance of speech patterns in the analyzed data for the entire first sub-period. It was the most preferred strategy also in the data for year 1960 (38%). The dominance of EH type 0, noticeable in the beginning years of the analyzed data (1950, 1960), continued after the year 2000 as well; there were exceptions to this trend in the years 2005-2007 and 2009-2010, and the percentage of EH type 0 never reached the same high percentage again as in the years 1990 and 1995.

Table 4.5. EH interference in the two sub-periods, 1950-1995 and 2000-2010.

	Speakers	Type 0	Type 1	Type 2	Type 3
Period	1514	33%	27%	23%	17%
1950-1995	549	37%	24%	25%	14%
2000-2010	965	31%	29%	22%	19%

The years 2000 and 2002 were the peaks for this particular strategy in the analyzed data, with more than half or almost half of analyzed speakers adopting EH type 0, for the sub-period 2000-2010. Other strategies never came to the same percentage of preference among analyzed speakers, with the exception of EH type 1 in the year 2010 (45%). Strategy EH type 1 was preferred by speakers in the years 1955, 1970 and 1980 in the first sub-period and in 2005, 2006 and 2007 in the second sub-period, in addition to its peak year in 2010. The strategy EH type 2 was preferred in the years 1965, 1975, and 1985 within the first sub-period whereas in the second sub-period it was never the most preferred strategy. The strategy EH type 3 in the first sub-period was not employed often; however, in the years 1960 and 1965 it was preferred to the strategy EH type 1, 1960 seeing EH type 3 as the second most employed strategy. In the second sub-period, the strategy EH type 3 was the most preferred strategy in 2009 with 32%.

Graph 4.I. EH interference in the two sub-periods, 1950-1995 and 2000-2010.

However, as stated in the beginning of this chapter, the statistical information should be taken with caution due to the manner in which data had been collected and analyzed. In light of the linguistic analysis for the Constitutional debates (See Appendix 3.1.), the results for 1950 are partially surprising because the members of the Constitutional Assembly were also the members of the Provisional Lok Sabha which started its work in 1950 and continued until the results for the first Lok Sabha elections came. Thus it appears that very different language behavior had been exhibited by the same group of speakers before and after independence. In the Constitutional debates the dominant strategy had been EH type 2, whereas the strategy EH type 0 held the last place. In 1950, as already stated, the largest number of speakers employed strategy EH type 0, sharing the same percentage of speakers with the strategy EH type 2 (37%). That jump from 0% speakers to the highest number of speakers in 1950, perhaps can be interpreted as a change in the socio-linguistic environment. Another probable explanation is that the random selection of data does not give the clear picture of the language situation in either of the two years in question, or any other included in the study. As mentioned before this is due to the small sample of data and also because all speakers are not active in the debates at any given moment. A high number of speakers with the strategy EH type 0 at the end of the first sub-period seems to confirm the assumption given at the beginning that the socio-economic changes in the early 1990s caused changes in language behavior. That aspect of socio-linguistic analysis, however, will be presented in the following chapter.

Table 4.6. EH interference in the period 1950-2010.

Year	Speakers	0	1	2	3
1950-2010	1514	33%	27%	23%	17%
1950	30	37%	23%	37%	3%
1955	55	29%	38%	31%	2%
1960	96	38%	14%	24%	25%
1965	41	34%	10%	37%	20%
1970	88	25%	39%	24%	13%
1975	44	16%	30%	36%	18%
1980	78	23%	33%	27%	17%
1985	15	33%	13%	40%	13%
1990	67	69%	13%	4%	13%
1995	35	80%	6%	9%	6%
2000	85	54%	14%	18%	14%
2001	46	33%	26%	30%	11%
2002	69	49%	20%	13%	17%
2003	91	36%	26%	18%	20%
2004	148	33%	24%	21%	22%
2005	95	24%	37%	25%	14%
2006	96	24%	35%	23%	18%
2007	115	24%	37%	19%	20%
2008	49	33%	22%	27%	18%
2009	84	15%	24%	29%	32%
2010	87	17%	45%	23%	15%

The most commonly found inserted material in the data was English nouns and verbs. In nominal interference, the analysis pointed out interference of plural markers -*s*/ -*es*. Its appearance causes the partial loss of information about grammatical gender available from Hindi plural markers. The lost information has then to be looked for either on modifiers or on verbal forms if a subject-predicate or object-predicate concord exists. If, however, modifiers are also English adjectives and there is no concord, such information is completely lost in the sentence. Such a situation grants us the possibility to assume that grammatical gender is information whose loss does not affect communicative goals to a great extent.The insertion of verbs is, as many scholars before have noted, accomplished via light verbs. The most interesting observations with regards to verbal interference are a) the position of the Hindi

negation *nahī́ṃ* and b) the interference of English Past Participles in combination with the Hindi verb *honā*, be.

Graph 4.II. EH interference in the period 1950-2010.

The number of noticed verbalizers was not completely determined but the list does include more verbalizers than just *karnā,* do, and *honā,* be, as the main tools for the transformation of a nominal lexeme into a verb. The comparison with similar lists of verbalizers (Borowiak 2007) shows that a larger quantity of data or different type of data would perhaps have given different results. The inclination of speakers to utilize a Past Participle as a modifier and their tendency to omit them in the predicate position in preference of infinitives should be further tested in independent research before any firm conclusions can be made.

Inserted adjectives were attached to inserted English and Hindi nouns. If the number of inserted adjectives is lower than that of nouns and verbs, the reason for it could lie in the presence of a structure which allows for the quick transformation of English nouns into adjectives by using the Hindi postposition *kā, ke, kī* or suffix *-vālā*. As can be assumed, the majority of adjectives were inserted in positive form and not in a comparative or superlative degree.

Prepositions, articles, and numbers, although not the most common material in EH interference, do find their place in the data. Thus articles have been occasionally calqued into

Hindi, particularly the indefinite article *a/ an* in the form of the number one, *ek*. As Tivārī (1966, 1969) and others suggest, the definite article is calqued as the demonstrative pronoun *vah*, that. As we have seen from examples, definite article was inserted as a part of transferred phrase and never on its own. As per data, prepositions are not incorporated into Hindi system; even though some of them have entered Hindi as a part of other noun phrases that were taken into the language as single lexemes or as a part of complex verbs (*take up, dispose of,* etc.). All of the above leads one to conclude that such insertions should be marked as nonce borrowings. The insertion of numbers cannot be discussed in great detail as numbers were mostly written as digits.

At the beginning of the chapter the difference between EH1 and EH2 insertions was introduced. The overview of data shows that the bigger part of EH2 type insertions includes noun phrases with the structure noun + noun or adjective + noun. Some of them also include embedded English prepositions. In other words, data on EH type 2 is the data on complex NP with different syntactic roles.

The question that arises in the end is whether the inserted English elements should be perceived as borrowings with a given level of adaptation to Hindi system or as examples of code-switching on the level of a phrase. It is a difficult question to answer. Examples such as *neglect of villages par* (on the neglect of villages, 365, 12/3/1980), show that speakers are skilled in shifting from one language to another. We could ask ourselves what would have done monolingual speaker in that case. The answer is probably that a monolingual speaker would have switched English lexemes for Hindi lexemes and altered preposition *of* into postposition *kā, ke, kī* according to the grammatical gender of Hindi equivalent for *neglect*. The plural form would be also expressed with equivalent Hindi element, i.e. oblique case *-oṃ*. If we analyze example from this perspective the answer seems very simple: it is the case of code-switching. But the question is then what conclusion do we draw for the EH type 1 examples which consist of single lexeme, whether it is noun, adjective or verb. Which verbs, nouns and adjectives should one place on the side of borrowing in Matras's continuum (2009) and which ones go to the other end, on the side of code-switching? Another complex aspect which one has to take into consideration are official names of institutions and terminology which due to their length are considered EH type 2 but which are also common presence in everyday life, hence not just nonce-borrowings. Another interesting question is the issue of functionality which Matras (2009) also discussed. There is a question of what does it mean to be a default expression as in Hindi there are several words for *school* next to English lexeme. Does it mean that *school* is not default expression and ergo is an example of code-switching?

To make the issue more complex, we can also discuss cases such as *telephone, university, teacher, judge, union, to communicate, to debate,* etc. For each of them Hindi equivalents do exist in dictionaries, but the question is whether the presence of a particular lexeme in a dictionary is enough to say that the default expression in Hindi exists. We could approach the question with the idea that the presence of English lexemes in Hindi dictionaries would confirm to us their acceptance in standardized Hindi or at least as existing active lexemes among Hindi speakers. Yet, not all dictionaries list such insertions, and if they do, they do not list all of them consistently.

Another element that the data shows as important is the question whether inserted English elements have passed the adaptation process in Hindi, like the one Borowiak suggests (2007). As we have seen from examples, the process is far from completed, as even English lexemes which are present in Hindi for a long period behave both as stable and unstable insertions in the plural form. If we look at the Matras's continuum (2009), we would have to conclude that since English lexemes have not completed their integration (adaptation), they can not be considered as borrowings. But situation is far more complex than that simple conclusion.

We could also decide to tackle the topic from another perspective. If insertions, irrespective of them being borrowings or code-switches, do represent a communicative strategy, we could ask about the reasons for using a particular strategy. One of the plausible reasons would be the non-existence of particular lexemes in Hindi. Yet, inspection of Hindi dictionaries shows that this is not the case. Another assumption then would be that speakers are not aware of those lexemes in Hindi, but that does not, however, explain every occurrence of inserted English elements. *Le mot juste* might, in the end, be resultant more from the socio-linguistic Indian environment, as a speaker might be aware of Hindi lexemes yet makes the choice to employ English lexemes in their place.

4.3. EH interference type 3

The last type of EH interference to analyze is EH type 3. As described in the introduction of this chapter, EH type 3 can be defined as interference that happens on the level of clause or sentence (see Table 4.1). Thus, all instances in which in a Hindi sentence at least one clause was in English are put in the group EH type 3. Similarly, if in the Hindi discourse there were instances of included English sentence or sentences, the speech of that particular speaker was classified as EH type 3. The data also includes also those instances in which speaker switched from one type to another, i.e. speaker would start sentence in Hindi but would also use EH type 1 or 2 before the switch happened. Those instances of complex language behavior were

marked as EH type 1;3 and EH type 2;3 wherein the first marks use of EH type 1 and EH type 3, and the second one marks the use of EH type 2 and EH type 3. EH type 3 can be equaled to code-switching occurring on clause and sentence level. Such code-switching between Hindi and English, as mentioned in Chapter 2, had been studied from various angles by Pandit (1986), Gumperz (1961), Kachru (1978b), Kumar (1986), Bhatt (1997), Si (2010), etc.

As this type of interference happens on clause and/or sentence level, one could ask whether the line between EH interference and HE interference is always clear. For that reason it is important to distinguish as Pandit (1986: 108-109) has the notion of governing language from the notion of dominant language. The first one sets the structure frame (Pandit 1986: 99), whereas the second one provides lexical entries. The question of EH/HE interference is clear in case of clause level code-switching, whereas in the case of switching on sentence level, it might be determined by the environment. If the English sentence is embedded in Hindi discourse, it would be a question of EH interference, whereas if the opposite was case one would talk about HE interference.

4.3.1. Assumptions and expected results

According to studies, English-Hindi code-switching is present in both private and public communication (Pandit 1986, Khubchandani 1997, Sailaja 2009, etc.). The general assumption is that the collected material will thus confirm presence of strategy EH type 3 in Lok Sabha and the speakers' tendency to employ it. As previous studies have also shown (Kachru 1978a, Pandit 1986), the switch is expected to happen between sentences as well as within the sentences. Leaning on Si's study (2010), the researcher assumes that presence of EH type 3 will increase over the entire period, particularly after 2000.

The expected results can be summarized as follows:

1) a greater number of speakers is expected to employ strategy EH type 3 at the closing years of the period included in the research as compared to the beginning years of it,

2) a description and analysis of EH type 3,

3) the relation between strategy EH type 3 and strategies EH type 1 and 2.

4.3.2. Analysis

Strategy EH type 3 was employed in two ways. On one hand, full sentences were inserted or code-switched and on the other clauses in Hindi and English were combined. The following example demonstrates EH type 3 on the sentence level:

139) *Therefore, it is the duty of the Speaker to ensure that the Opposition has its say. Hamne apne samay meṃ kośiś kī thī.* (14, 4/6/2004)

Hindi sentence: we-PRON.OBL.AG own-ADJ.OBL.SG.M time-OBL.SG in-POST try-SG. F do-PFV.PTCP.F be-3SG.AUX.PST

Therefore, it is the duty of the Speaker to ensure that the Opposition has its say. We tried in our time to do the same.

It is visible from the example above that the flow of discourse is uninterrupted by the switch from the main language of the discourse, whether or not English sentences precede or follow those in Hindi. Analyzed speakers in the Lok Sabha showed a tendency to employ English to address another speaker or to conclude their speech, regardless of the language that particular speaker used to address them in the first instance. Likewise, no restrictions were detected regarding the topic of discussion, i.e. the content of the discourse did not influence the language form. The switches were made regardless of the initial language in which a speaker would begin his utterance and also irrespective of languages used by other speakers prior to his/her turn in the conversation. The same can be seen from the Table 2 in Appendix 3.2 for raw data gathered for May 3rd 2010. This form of EH type 3 strategy was present in both sub-periods.

The more interesting form of EH type 3 for linguists are cases where the switch happens within the sentence. Number of studies (Kachru 1978a, Pandit 1986, Bhatt 1997, etc.) have had analyzed such cases taking into consideration different theories and results of studies from elsewhere in the world. The analysis of data from Lok Sabha shows that in both sub-periods, interference of EH type 3 on clause level occurred in both main and subordinate clauses. In observed examples, the clauses had one of the following syntactic roles: a) subject, b) object, c) predicate, d) cause, e) consequence, and f) attribute. The boundaries of switches were mostly clause endings: *ki* for object clauses; *islie*, 'because', for cause clauses; *jo*, 'who/which/that', for relative clauses which stand for subject, attribute, etc. This can be seen in example 140-146. Those examples show that the EH type 3 switch on clause level occurs in both sub-periods. Several of them show that the signal for the switch can be absent, i. e. it can be equal to ø as in examples 140, 143, 145, 146. Examples 140 and 143 can be compared as contrastive pair in which the roles have been switched between main clause and relative clause, i.e. they occur in two different languages. In 140 the main clause is in English whereas in 143 the main clause is in Hindi. This confirms also Pandit's (1986: 45-46). Example 146 is an example of EH type 3 which could easily be described as sentential switch as there is no subordination relation in it. Example 145 is very different from it as it is clear that the English clause is in the subordinate relation to Hindi clause. Unlike in 145, in examples 141, 142 and 144 the switch is signaled with Hindi complementizer *ki* (141, 142) and English

complementizer *that* (144). Example 144 also shows that the switch can happen between verb and complementizer, contrary to Bhatt's (1997: 230-231) findings that such switch would be uncommon.

140) *Everybody is a Hindu here ↓ jo hindustān meṃ nivās kartā hai vah hindū hai.* (1655, 8-*19/2/1960*)

Hindi clause: who-REL.PRON.NOM.SG India-OBL.SG in-POST residence-SG.M do-IPFV.PTCP.SG.M be-3SG.AUX.PRS he-PRON.NOM.SG hindu-NOM.SG be-3SG.COP.PRS

   English clause   ADV ↓ SUBJECT-REL.PRON.NOM.SG   Hindi clause

Everybody is a Hindu here, ↓ whoever resides in India he is a Hindu.

141) *yah islie lāyā gayā hai ki ↓ it was a mandatory provision of the Convention that a law must be enacted and enforced.* (292, 6/5/2010)

Hindi clause: it-PRON.NOM.SG it-PRON.OBL.SG for-POST bring-PFV.PTCP.SG.M go-PFV.PTCP.SG.M be-3SG.AUX.PRS that-CONJ

   Hindi clause   CONJ ↓ SUB: PRON.NOM.SG   English clause

This was enacted because ↓ it was a mandatory provision of the Convention that a law must be enacted and enforced.

142) *maiṃne svayaṃ 1968 meṃ yah savāl kiyā thā ki the information is being collected. (291, 26/8/1970)*

Hindi clause: I-PRON.OBL.AG on my own-ADV 1968-NUM in-POST this-PRON.SG question-SG.M do-PFV.PTCP.SG.M be-3SG.AUX.PST that-CONJ

   Hindi cluse   CONJ ↓ SUB: NOM.SG   English clause

In 1968 I asked myself the same question if the information is being collected.

143) *nālandā ke bāre meṃ na socā jāe, ↓ which is a seat of learning universally,* (64, *11/12/2009*)

Hindi clause: nalanda-OBL.SG about-POST. no-NEG think-PFV.PTCP.SG.M go-3SG.SUBJ

   Hindi clause   PRED: 3SG.SUBJ ↓ OBJ: REL.PRON   English

clause

One should not think about Nalanda, ↓ which is a seat of learning universally.

144) *itnā mahatvapūrṇ māmlā hai ↓ **that** it is connected with the whole of the country.* (486, *24/4/2000*)

Hindi clause: that much-PRON.ADJ.NOM.SG.M important-ADJ.NOM.SG.M topic-NOM.SG be-3SG.COP.PRS

    Hindi clause   PRED: 3SG.COP.PRS ↓ that   English clause

The topic is so important ↓ **that** it is connected with the whole of the country.

145) *ek hazār ṭan tak māl taiyār karne kī ummīd hai, ↓ subject to the availability of* chemical pulp. *(31, 22-28/2/1955)*

Hindi clause: one-NUM thousand-NUM ton-OBL.PL up to-POST goods-NOM.SG ready-ADJ do-INF.OBL. of-F hope-NOM.SG.F be-3SG.COP.PRS

    Hindi clause   PRED: 3SG.PRS ↓ ø   English clause

We hope to prepare up to 1000 tons of goods, ↓ subject to the availability of chemical pulp.

146) *ham log kitnā aur push button kareṃge, ↓ let us not push button the Parliament, the great Parliament of our forefathers.* (109, 6/5/2010)

Hindi clause: we-PRON.NOM people-NOM.SG how much-Q.ADJ.SG.M more-ADV push-N?V? button-SG do-1PL.FUT

    Hindi clause   PRED: 1PL.FUT ↓ ø   English clause

How much longer will we push button, let us not push button the Parliament, the great Parliament of our forefathers.

In some sentences, the switch however happened irrespective of clause boundaries as in 147-150. In example 147 the switch takes place after the adverbial and is followed by another switch on the clause boundary in front of the conjunction *aur*, and. It is not clear from example 147 nor in 148 or 150 what had triggered the switch. In 148, similarly switch happens after adverbial, however in 149 the switch takes place after subject. Example 148 is interesting because the switch was expected at the clause boundary before or after the position of complementizer yet the switch had not occurred in that place. In 149 we could speculate that the switch was triggered by the borrowed English lexeme *agency*. Interestingly, the speaker had opted to use that lexeme with Hindi plural and gender marker yet it triggered the switch.

147) *sārī duniyā meṃ ↓ Lahore is the Number 8 city when it comes to infrastructure ↓ aur śrī amṛtasar sāhab number āṭh par nahīṃ haiṃ.* (61, 11/12/2009)

Hindi clause: entire-ADJ.OBL.SG.F world-OBL.SG in-POST … and-CONJ holy-ADJ amrtsar-NOM.SG honorific number-OBL.SG eight-NUM on-POST no-NEG be-3PL.COP.PRS

In the entire world Lahore is the number 8 city when it comes to infrastructure and holy Amritsar is not the number 8.

148) *yānī maiṃ āp se kahūṃ ki hindustān* **meṃ** *↓ in 20 Ministries, and 18 departments of the Ministries not a single OBC is there in Group A category.* (116, 6/5/2010)

Hindi clause: if-CONJ I-PRON.NOM you-PRON.OBL from-POST tell-1SL.SUBJ that-CONJ india-OBL.SG in-POST

If I tell you that in India ↓ in 20 ministries and 18 departments of the ministries not a single OBC is there in the category A.

149) *Alag-alag agenciyāṃ[190] ↓ are intervening...* (614, 14/5/2002)

Hindi: different-ADJ different-ADJ agency-NOM.PL.F

Various agencies ↓ are intervening...

Some speakers demonstrated very complex patterns in EH 3 type strategy with several alterations of languages as in example 150. Within one complex sentence the speaker switched five times from one code to another. The switches *and* and *merā,* my, fall in the beginnings of clauses where alternation can be expected to take place. The last switch becomes visible with the Hindi postposition *ko* as a mark of direct object; however, it is not clear where exactly the boundary is, i.e. whether the connector *and* should be taken as an inserted element into Hindi or the boundary falls behind the following phrase *monitoring system ko.*

150) *Sir, security ke point of view se, koī D.T.H. operator yadi kisī videśī chanel ko information de de yā permission de de, ↓ and if any message or information is passed on to another country like Pakistan and if there are no proper checks and balances in the policy, ↓ merā savāl yah hai ki jab ye tīn measure lacunae hamārī* guideline aur policy meṃ haiṃ, *↓ before issuing the license, will the Government have proper checks and balances, and monitoring system ↓ ko update kareṃge kyā?* (14, 19/8/2004)

Hindi parts: security-OBJ.SG of-POST point of view-OBL.SG from-POST, any-ADJ.NOM.SG DTH-ADJ operator-NOM.SG if-CONJ any-ADJ.OBL.SG.F foreign-ADJ.OBL chanel-OBL.SG to-POST information-OBL.SG give-ROOT give-3SG.SUBJ … my-ADJ.SG.M question-NOM.SG.M this-PRON.NOM.SG be-3SG.COP.PRS that-CONJ when-CONJ this-PRON.NOM.PL three-NUM measure-OBL.SG lacuna-NOM.PL our-

---

[190] The preceding sentence is also in Hindi; therefore, the sentence is considered as a case of code-switch.

ADJ.OBL.SG.F   guideline-OBL.SG   and-CONJ   policy-OBL.SG   in-POST   be-3PL.COP.PRS … system-OBL.SG POST update-INF do-3PL.FUT what-Q

Sir, from the security point of view, if any D.T.H. operator gives away to a foreign channel information or permission, ↓ and if any message or information is passed on to another country like Pakistan and if there are no proper checks and balances in the policy, ↓ my question is when these three lacunae in measures are in our guidelines and policy, ↓ before issuing the license, will the Government have proper checks and balances, and update monitoring system ↓ or what?

In the example 150 we can speculate that since the speaker started uttering the condition in English s/he continued to speak in English, but because the syntactic pattern belonged to Hindi, the speaker ended the utterance in Hindi and therefore the unexpected switch *ko* took place.

In the analyzed material examples of EH type 1 and/or EH type 2 combined in the same utterance with EH type 3 were also found. Example 151 shows how both EH 1 and EH 2 can co-occur with EH type 3. Example 152 shows how EH type 1 can occur solely with EH type 3. Examples where EH type 2 occurs solely with EH type 3 were also present.

151) *Future* kī zimmedārī future generation legī, ↓ how can you take the guarantee for future? (14, 11/12/2009)

Hindi clause: future-OBL.SG of-F responsibility-OBL.SG.F future-ADJ generation-NOM.SG.F take-3SG.FUT.F

The future generation will take the responsibility for the future, ↓ how can you take the guarantee for future?

152) *jaise zindagī meṃ aurat kī pregnancy hotī hai, phir childbirth hotā hai, ↓ it is a cycle.* (107, 16/8/2004)

Hindi clause: like-REL.ADV life-OBL.SG in-POST woman-OBL.SG of-F pregnancy-NOM.SG.F be-IPFV.PTCP.SG.F be-3SG.AUX.PRS then-ADV childbirth-NOM.SG.M be-IPFV.PTCP.SG.M be-3SG.AUX.PRS

Just like in life, woman is first pregnant, than she gives birth to a child, ↓ it is a cycle.

Several speakers have also shown a tendency to employ English and Hindi to reiterate the same or similar content as can be seen in examples 153 and 154.

153) *I have not yielded. maiṃ __yield__ nahīṃ kar rahā hūṃ.* (84, 5/5/2010)

Hindi sentence: I-PRON.NOM yield-N?V? no-NEG do-DUR.PTCP.SG.M be-3SG.AUX.PRS

I have not yielded. I am not **yielding**.

154) *Man is the major factor, ↓ mānav hī sabse baṛā kāraṇ hai.* (551, 24/7/2003)

Hindi sentence: man-NOM.SG precisely-ADV all-PRON.OBL from-POST big-ADJ.SG.M reason-NOM.SG.M be-3SG.COP.PRS

Man is the major factor, ↓ precisely man is the most important reason of all.

The example 153 is particularly interesting as the speaker employs the same English lexeme in both the Hindi and English sentences. As the main carrier of information, the reiteration of the English verb, instead of employment of its Hindi equivalent, does not really help the audience unfamiliar with English to understand the information in the utterance. Of course, it is only a speculation that the speaker's goal is to make himself/herself understood by such an audience. In example 154 the speaker alters the lexemes completely. When he/she speaks in Hindi the speaker does not include any English lexemes in his utterance.

In both sub-periods, speakers also employed English to quote another speech or text that may have consisted of a single sentence or a larger number of sentences. English mostly dominated in the content of quotation (see example 156); however, in few instances English was employed as the frame while the quotation was in Hindi as in example 155.

155) *How can you say nahīṃ dūsrī bhāṣā meṃ exam karo?* (528, 15/12/2003)

Hindi: no-NEG second-ADJ.OBL.SG.F language-OBL.SG.F in-POST exam-N?V? do-2PL.IMP

How can you say: "No, do the exam in another language."

156) *Chapter 3 meṃ kahā gayā hai ki cash reserves of scheduled banks to be kept with the banks. (191, 17-22/2/1965)*

Hindi: chapter-OBL.SG three-NUM in-POST say-PFV.PTCP.SG.M go-PFV.PTCP.SG.M be-3SG.AUX.PRS that-CONJ

It is said in the Chapter 3: "cash reserves of scheduled banks to be kept with the banks.

It is also important to note that several sentences inserted in English were transcribed in Devanagari for no obvious reason, as the following one, for example:

157) *In democracy majority is fundamental right so therefore majority must be granted.*

It is not clear whether such occurrences should be ascribed to the pragmatics of typists in the Lok Sabha or to their interpretation of speech as a constituent part of Hindi discourse. No connections were established between the numerous examples and the role of English alternation in each case because no discernable preference was given to English for a specific topic in a particular type of discourse or to a particular type of switch.

4.3.3. Conclusions on EH type 3

The analysis shows that EH type 3, compared to EH type 1 and 2, was not favored by speakers in the Lok Sabha. Throughout both sub-periods, it persisted as the least employed communicative strategy (see Table 4.5, 4.6 as well as Graph 4.I and 4.II). Nevertheless, in the second sub-period (2000-2010) the number of speakers who employed it did slightly increase.

Table 4.7. EH interference types and sub-types in the sub-periods, 1950-1995 and 2000-2010.

	Speakers	0	1	2	3	1;3	2;3
Period	1514	33%	27%	23%	4%	4%	9%
1950-1995	549	37%	24%	25%	3%	2%	9%
2000-2010	965	31%	29%	22%	5%	5%	9%

In the first sub-period, the ratio of speakers employing strategies on the level of phrase (EH type 1 and 2) and speakers employing EH type 3 was [3,3 : 1], and in the second sub-period it was [2,6 : 1].

Graph 4.III. EH interference types and sub-types per year.

In other words, out of every one hundred speakers employing EH type 1 and 2 in the first sub-period there were 29 speakers employing EH type 3, and in the second sub-period 37 such speakers were found. At the same time the proportion of speakers who did not insert English elements into Hindi slightly decreased, even though they remained the most numerous group of speakers throughout both sub-periods. Among the speakers employing strategy EH type 3, speakers in both sub-periods preferred to simultaneously employ strategies EH type 1 and 2 (61 vs. 18 speakers in the first sub-period and 136 vs. 46 speakers in the second sub-period) as can be seen from Table 4.7.

Table 4.8. EH interference types and sub-types per year.

	Speakers	0	1	2	3	1;3	2;3
Year	1514	33%	27%	23%	4%	4%	9%
1950	30	37%	23%	37%	3%	0%	0%
1955	55	29%	38%	31%	2%	0%	0%
1960	96	38%	14%	24%	8%	2%	15%
1965	41	34%	10%	37%	12%	0%	7%
1970	88	25%	39%	24%	2%	1%	9%
1975	44	16%	30%	36%	2%	5%	11%
1980	78	23%	33%	27%	0%	3%	14%
1985	15	33%	13%	40%	0%	0%	13%
1990	67	69%	13%	4%	0%	4%	9%
1995	35	80%	6%	9%	0%	0%	6%
2000	85	54%	14%	18%	8%	2%	4%
2001	46	33%	26%	30%	7%	2%	2%
2002	69	49%	20%	13%	7%	4%	6%
2003	91	36%	26%	18%	8%	7%	5%
2004	148	33%	24%	21%	7%	5%	9%
2005	95	24%	37%	25%	1%	4%	8%
2006	96	24%	35%	23%	2%	7%	8%
2007	115	24%	37%	19%	3%	4%	12%
2008	49	33%	22%	27%	0%	10%	8%
2009	84	15%	24%	29%	5%	7%	20%
2010	87	17%	45%	23%	2%	3%	9%

Among such speakers, EH type 2;3 was preferred in both sub-periods (51 vs. 10 speakers in the first sub-period and 86 vs. 50 speakers in the second sub-period). EH type 2;3 was preferred by speakers almost throughout the entire analyzed period 1950-2010 (9%)

compared to the 4% each for EH type 3 and EH type 1;3. From the information in Table 4.7 the conclusion can be drawn that the speakers in the second sub-period felt more comfortable employing both languages within the same discourse as the percentage of EH types 3 increased, even though technical reasons for this language strategy have decreased due to the service of simultaneous translation which was well established by that time, unlike in the first sub-period. The analysis unfortunately does not offer insight into reasons for the preference of a particular strategy at any given moment of the analyzed period. Table 4.8 and Graph 4.III show that out of all subtypes of EH type 3, EH 2;3 was very often used in both sub-periods, particularly in years 1960, 1975, 1980, 1985, 2007 and 2009 as in each of these years it had been noticed in more than 10% cases of EH type 3. EH type 3 reached that kind of usage in 1965 (12%) and EH type 1;3 in 2008 (10%).As previously mentioned the reasons for such jumps in percentages or examples where no occurrences have been noticed could be the nature of collected data, i.e. it could be that its randomness did not capture all possible and occurring language behaviors.

To summarize briefly, clause-level interferences respect the outlines of clause-boundaries; there were, however, cases when the material in English or Hindi leaped over such boundaries. The combined employment of strategies EH type 1 or 2 with EH type 3 suggests that some speakers perceive the boundaries between the two languages as very porous. In addition we have seen a couple of examples where the boundary between the two codes is hard to determine. The appearance of EH types 1;3 and 2;3 also shows that the border between inter- and intra-sentential code-switching as a strategy is not very clear, as no apparent triggers have been found in the data to suggest the reasons for the appearance of EH 1;3 or 2;3 instead of EH type 3 as a language behavior. Such state of affairs makes the idea of code-switching-borrowing continuum more probable in case of English and Hindi in Lok Sabha. In other words, at least some speakers in the Lok Sabha are at opposite ends of the said continuum, creating a space of simultaneous bilingual and monolingual utterances. As the use of both Hindi and English are allowed in the Parliament and, additionally, the translation from one language into the other is available at all moments, the presence of interfering English elements in Hindi speech appears to be dependent more on socio-linguistic factors than on linguistic factors. More to the point, the exhibited language behavior can be described as a demonstration of a particular complex social identity.

4.4. Conclusions

It is important to stress once more that the examples of EH interference occurred not because it was required from speakers to use two languages at any moment, as the translation from English into Hindi and vice versa was available for almost the entire length of the analyzed period. According to Shankar and Rodrigues (2011: 201) for the same period (1950-2010), we can assume that at least 2500 members of the Lok Sabha, approximately 40% of all members in the Parliament, claimed Hindi as their first language. That, of course, does not mean that all of them attempted to speak in the Lok Sabha in Hindi and moreover in the analyzed data.

At the beginning of the chapter several assumptions have been made that researcher hoped to analyze in more details in this study. These are:

a) to analyze which linguistic elements (parts of speech, syntactic patterns, etc.) participate in EH interference,

b) how are those elements, if they are, incorporated into Hindi system,

c) which elements (parts of speech) show signs of stability (constant appearance) in EH interference,

d) which changes in particular aspects of EH interference can be observed within the frame of 60 years,

e) the rising or falling pattern of EH interference of particular types in Lok Sabha over decades (macro and micro changes)

f) whether it is possible to generalize rules about EH interference from available data.

Analysis of EH types 1, 2 and 3 has shown that almost any part of speech can participate in EH interference. However, as in many other cases across languages, nouns, adjectives and verbs participate more often than numbers, prepositions or conjunctions, for example. The analysis has also shown strategies which speakers use to incorporate those elements in Hindi system.

If we are to judge from the number of analyzed speakers (see Table 4.5) in the data of approximately same size (see Appendix 1.2),[191] we could argue that the EH interference is on the increase, i.e. that it has a rising pattern. The 75% increase in the number of speakers in the data for the sub-period of 2000-2010 shows that a bigger amount of Hindi can be heard in the Lok Sabha. The attempt of a statistical analysis[192] of the collected material suggests a stable apportionment of strategies EH type 0, 1, 2, and 3 among analyzed speakers (see Tables 4.5-

---

[191] 10.765 pages were analyzed for period 1950-1995 and 9.902 pages were checked for the period 2000-2010.

[192] A genuine statistical analysis would require more precision in the handling of data. As such, statistical analysis was not part of the primary research proposal; the statistics in the thesis should be taken with caution.

4.8 and Graphs 4.I-4.III). The most frequently inserted elements were, as already stated, verbs and nouns, as either single-worded or multiple-worded phrases (EH types 1 and 2). EH type 3 appears throughout the period to be the least preferred strategy, although in the second sub-period it appears to be on the rise. One of the assumptions was also that the data will allow us prediction i.e. insight in macro and micro changes. Macro changes were followed in the first sub-period (1950-1995), whereas micro changes were followed in the analysis of data fro consecutive years in the second sub-period (2000-2010). The analysis of primary data in the first sub-period (years ending in 0) suggests the following up to year 1990:

    a) EH type 0 will decrease

    b) EH type 1 will be around 30%

    c) EH type 2 will be stable around 24-27%

    d) EH type 3 will be around 20%.

In that light readings for 1990 show as anomaly as the prediction was wrong about everything as can be seen in Table 4.6, since EH type 0 was 69%, EH type 1 had 13%, EH type 2 dropped to 4% and EH type 3 dropped to 13%. If we look only at the data for control years (years ending in 5) the same prediction would look something like this for year 1995:

    a) EH type 0 will increase to between 30 and 40%

    b) EH type 1 will decrease to around 10%

    c) EH type 2 will increase above 30%

    d) EH type 3 will decrease bellow 20%.

The prediction would be wrong in case of percentage for EH type 0 as it would not be able to predict the change from 33% in 1985 to 80% in 1995, nor would it be at all able to predict the course for EH type 2. Instead of increase that the result of 40% in 1985 would seem to suggest, in 1995 there was a decrease to 9% for EH type 2. Thus, the data separated by a decade does not allow us precision in prediction. It can be interpreted in following manner:

    a) the time lapse is too big to allow precise prediction,

    b) the randomness of speakers gives false impression in either case as the sample is too small to be representative.

The second definitely plays an important role, but my assumption is that the first reason is also important, ergo that changes in the society influence the language change in too many factors that can be taken into account for a valid prediction. The question is what happens if we combine the data for primary set of years and control years, does it allow us to have a better prediction. The general conclusion would be that we would be able to predict increase for EH type 0 and decrease in EH type 1 and 3 but we would have been wrong about the

direction of course for EH type 2. The reasons are probably the same as in the case of prediction for a decade-long period.

The next question is whether prediction works better if one analyzed data for consecutive years. In the second sub-period primary were first five years of a decade (2000-2004) and the control data were collected for years 2005 to 2010. If we look at the first set of data the prediction for the years 2005-2010 would be as following:

  a) EH type 0 will decrease to approximately 30%

  b) Eh type 1 will be approximately 25%

  c) EH type 2 will increase

  d) EH type 3 will increase.

The prediction would have been wrong in following conclusions:

  a) it would have not been able to predict that the EH type 0 would fall bellow 30%

  b) it would have not been able to predict the EH type 1

  c) it would have not been able to predict the decrease for EH type 3.

The question is how to explain those differences. One possible reason is that the data for the sub-period 2000-2010 includes information on three different Lok Sabha representatives as three different elections have been held in that period.[193] Thus the primary data includes material for the one and same Lok Sabha representatives which were elected in 1999. This however does not completely explain the results, as the data for 2004 includes material for the newly elected Lok Sabha members. Another probable explanation is that the different Hindi speakers were caught in the random sample; hence the results for a previous sample can not predict the results of the following one. The third possibility is the human error, i.e. my error, in marking of speech patterns, which should also be taken into account for the entire data. Lastly, one should also take into account whether the quantity of data also influences results, i.e. if the speech patterns are dependent on type of work that happens in Lok Sabha and number of speaker that participate. The final conclusion is that the prediction of micro changes was not successful in this thesis.

English insertions in Hindi are acknowledged by Indian authors of Hindi grammars (Tivārī 1969, Śarmā 1998), who, as we have seen (see 2.2), even acknowledge the presence of lexemes such as *head-, sub-, vice-,* etc., in Hindi. As we have seen in the analysis of EH types 1 and 2, it is not possible to conclude which English insertions are stable in Hindi. What is discernable from the data, however, is the assimilation of English *-s/ -es* as plural markers

---

[193] See Table 3.3. in Chapter 3 on Lok Sabha elections.

even for stable and accepted lexemes such as *school, bus,* etc. It may mean that the -*s*/ -*es* are in the eyes of many speakers is a normal occurrence that comes with inserted English lexemes. In other words, the process of adaptation of English nouns in Hindi is not finished even for the lexemes that are present in Hindi for a long period and occur frequently. Similar conclusion can be made about the presence of Past Participle in predicative position with verb *honā,* be, in comparison to its presence as modifier next to a noun.

One assumption that was proved wrong by the analyzed data was the expected increase in the number of speakers employing strategy EH type 3, as the presence of such speakers in the first and second sub-period is statistically similar. The second assumption on combined strategies was shown to be correct because its presence in the second sub-period indeed does increase in comparison to the first sub-period (see Tables 4.7 and 4.8). If we look at Matras's (2009) continuum of code-mixing and code-switching, EH 3 represents code-switching end of it, as well as EH type 2 as already discussed. EH type 1 can represent both ends of it, as some insertions are, as we have seen, well adapted and adjusted to Hindi system, while others are still in the process.

If one was to attempt to generalize rules on EH interference according to the analysis of this data, the conclusions that could be proved as correct are already well known:

   1) nouns and verbs are more often incorporated than other types of lexemes,

   2) nouns can be incorporated with English or Hindi plural markers,

   3) verbs are incorporated via light verbs, usually in the form of a bare infinitive but participle forms are also noticed,

   4) EH type 3 as a strategy occurs on both the clause and sentence level,

   5) EH type 3 on the level of a clause happens on the clause boundary but the switch can also take place regardless of the clause boundaries.

Several more conclusions can be added:

   6) EH interference strategies can be combined,

   7) from the diachronic perspective, phrasal interference (EH type 1 and 2) is more common than clause and sentence level interference (EH type 3),

   8) EH interference is more common today in public political communication than 50 or 60 years ago,

   9) approximately 30% to 33% of Hindi speakers in the Lok Sabha can be expected to speak without visible EH interference.

The analysis shows that speakers adopt different strategies (EH type 0-3) when they communicate in Hindi in Lok Sabha. The chapter 3 shows us how those strategies can be

analyzed from the linguistic point of view. In the next chapter we will look into the socio-linguistic characteristics of speakers included in the analysis in order to see whether certain strategies are related to particular social aspects (age, gender, political affiliation, occupation, etc.).

Chapter 5:

The identity of EH speakers in the Parliament of India

5.1. The socio-linguistic analysis of eH speakers

In the previous chapter, we have seen the changes that have been introduced into Hindi speech patterns with importation of English elements in several different forms. The question that has remained unanswered concerns the identity of speakers behind such utterances. As the research is placed in the Parliament of India it is clear that the speakers are members of the Parliament or more precisely members of Lok Sabha, the Parliament's lower house. The representatives of Lok Sabha are elected normally every five years via general elections. Over the years and decades, the number of representatives in the Lok Sabha had increased, due to changes in numbers and boundaries of particular constituencies (Shankar and Rodrigues 2011, etc.). Yet, the process of election has remained the same as the general voters are given a choice to elect representatives from various political, social and linguistic backgrounds helping thus form a complex representative political body on the all-India level.

To be able to study the profiles of analyzed speakers, one needs data. The data on parliamentary members in general is collected by bodies and institutions closely related to the Parliament itself, namely Lok Sabha Secretariat. The Parliament, as a public institution, is liable to the public and therefore the Secretariat informs the public of the Parliament's work and its members via different types of publications. The publication that is extremely valuable for this study consists of biographical data submitted voluntarily by the representatives as they become members of Lok Sabha:

> "The biographical sketches of Members of Lok Sabha provided on website are based on the formulary that is filled up and vetted by the Members of Lok Sabha and other authentic sources. The information is also contained in the publication titled, 'Who's Who' of Lok Sabha, published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha for each Lok Sabha, which is also available on sale."[194]

Who's who in Lok Sabha, issued usually every five years, if the Lok Sabha remains in seat for the entire duration of its mandate, is primarily envisioned as a practical booklet aimed at the very representatives as primary audience. The newly elected members are, thus, informed

---

[194] Source last accessed on February 2nd 2014: http://164.100.47.132/LssNew/Members/disclaimer.aspx.

about each representative in the Lok Sabha as well as about the set of rules that are to be respected in the House for its successful functioning. It is concentrated on providing not just information such as political affiliation, name of the constituency from which a representative is elected, educational and professional background, but also personal information on family situation, favorite pastime and recreation, etc. (See Appendix 4.1.). Except in a printed form, the same information can also be accessed on-line on the official website of Lok Sabha *(http://loksabha.nic.in/)* or on the official website of the Government of India *(http://www.archive.india.gov.in/govt.php).*

Next to the Secretariat, there are other institutions interested in collection of statistical data on parliamentary representatives. Thus, the reports issued by Election Commission *(http://eci.nic.in/eci/eci.html)* are a valuable source as well as the papers and information gathered by research institutes such as the Center for the Study of Developing Societies (CSDS) in Delhi. The CSDS publishes its own surveys and uses surveys from outside to analyze and interpret particular aspects of political life in India. It collects regularly data on elections (electoral patterns and voting behavior), party politics and attitudes on political activities among the citizens.[195]

The surveys of all mentioned sources analyze the Indian political body from various angles and, thus, allow complex interpretation, based on statistical information on education, caste, political affiliation, language and religious background, etc. There are, as expected perhaps, slight discrepancies in data between information that are put forward by Lok Sabha Secretariat in continually updated editions and, for example, an independent research institute such as CSDS.

The secondary sources of information are studies on Parliament undertaken by independent scholars who base their conclusions and research on the data collected by the Secretariat and CSDS. One of the newer such studies by Shankar and Rodrigues (2011) offers an insight in changing social composition of the Lok Sabha from 1950 onward, with the emphasis on three decades, namely on 1950's, 1970's and 1990's, as three important points of social and political changes in India. The factors of analysis and the entire data are, however, drawn from the previously mentioned sources and then interpreted one more time: age, religion, caste/community, educational levels, urban or rural background, occupation and members' income and their relationship to civic and national institutions (Shankar and Rodrigues 2011: 70). The authors had been mostly interested in political shifts in 1950's, 1970's and 1990's,

---

[195] See the website of Lokniti, a unit of CSDS, dedicated to the study of elections in India (http://www.lokniti.org/).

all the while offering plenty of statistics for the period 1950-2004. They had also taken into consideration use of Hindi and English in the Parliament, which is of great interest for this study. Their data suggests that in 1970's the dominance of English in the Parliament and society had been diminished in favor of Hindi and other Indian languages. Yet, as they had put it, 1990's have given a lot of that space back to English as it

> "was seen by its users, at this stage, not as a statement of status but as a tool to negotiate one's way in a world brought closer by information technology and satellite communication. In fact, now segments of those voices which had clamored for Hindi in the early part of the century were demanding English education for their progeny" (Shankar and Rodrigues 2011: 195).

Such conclusion reveals that the more global perspective of social movements and changes should be considered in the analysis of socio-linguistic alterations and results. Next to theirs, there are other good resources on statistic data on the Parliament such as Phul (1984), Kaul and Shakdher (1979), Malhotra (2002), Mehra and Kueck (2003), Kashyap (2008). However, Rodrigues and Shankar's was the most up-to-date study at the moment, and for that reason considered a reliable source for this study.

To inspect the social identity of analyzed speakers the following categories had been chosen as relevant: gender, age, education and field of occupation, political and geographic affiliation. Each category of the analysis is introduced in order to gain insight in its distribution among Hindi speakers and its correlation with other factors.

Gender

The analysis is focused on determining the ratio of male and female Hindi speakers in the collected data. Shankar and Rodrigues have already noted that the number of female members in the Lok Sabha has not varied a lot from the first to the fourteenth Lok Sabha. According to them, the number of female MPs never crossed the margin of 10%.[196]

Age

The lower age limit had been proscribed by the Constitution (article 84). Thus, nobody bellow the age 25 can contest elections. However, the upper age limit is not prescribed. As the majority of analyzed members is younger than 65, 65 was chosen as another important point

---

[196] The lowest percentage of women representatives had been 3.4% in the 6th Lok Sabha, and the highest 9.02% in the 13th (Shankar and Rodrigues 2011: 81).

for the analysis and thereafter three age-groups were introduced to demarcate younger and more senior members: a) aged 25-45, b) aged 46-65 and c) aged above 65.

Educational qualifications

According to the international standard classification ISCED,[197] three categories of educational qualifications were recognized in the analysis: primary, secondary and tertiary education. Primary education is defined as sufficient to provide basic skills such as reading and writing and basic knowledge in mathematics and other subjects. Following primary education, the secondary education usually starts between age 14 and 16, and prepares the student for tertiary education or provides employment skills or both. The tertiary education requires a successful completion of the secondary stage. Its programs are academically based or occupationally specific, and in their last stages can lead to the award of advanced research qualification such as PhD. In the raw biographical data on parliamentary speakers, information on educational qualifications differentiates bigger number of categories, such as under matriculation, matriculation etc., and had been hence reinterpreted into the above categories. Further on, Shankar and Rodrigues (2011, see their Table 2.1., pp. 72-73) have used raw data to form a very elaborate set of educational categories: Under-Matriculation, Matriculation or Higher Secondary or Intermediate certificate holders, Vocational Courses, Graduates and equivalents, Postgraduates (including technical qualifications) and Doctoral degrees or other equivalent qualification. The sources they had used were Malhotra (2002) and Who's Who in the 14th Lok Sabha (2005), however it remains unclear how such information was extracted from the original data given by members. As it was estimated that deeper insider knowledge would be required to deduct such conclusions from the raw material I have concluded that for the purposes of this research the differentiation primary, secondary and tertiary would be sufficient.

Occupational qualifications

The statistically more frequent occupations among analyzed speakers were kept as independent categories: advocate, political worker, social worker, journalist etc. Those occupations that appeared less often in the analyzed data were collected in the category Other. The category Other thus includes MPs who claimed as theirs some of the following professions: trade unionist, priest, religious missionary, businessman, editor, etc.

---

[197] Source last accessed on February 2nd 2014: http://www.uis.unesco.org/Library/Documents/isced97-en.pdf.

Political affiliation

Likewise, the political parties that were left as independent categories were the most numerous ones in the analyzed data. If the parties had similar basic standing in ideology, as in the case of different communist parties, they were classified together under one category, i.e. as Communist party. Similarly, socialist parties, as left-wing parties, were classified under the category Socialist. The data was interpreted in that way to prevent dispersion of information, particularly if and when the particular parties were found only once in the data. When it was impossible to define standing of the political party as either left or right wing, similarly to occupations, that particular party was put in the category Other.

Regional affiliation

Indian states are placed according to their geographical position into eight categories. The central focus is given to Hindi speaking states that are for the purposes of this thesis separated in two sub-categories. The reason for division of data on Hindi speaking states lies in the vastness of space that Hindi mother-tongue speakers occupy in the northern parts of India and the need to somehow classify the data on Hindi mother tongue speakers. Hence, the Hindi states are categorized in four groups based on their geographical position. Two Hindi states form the separate category, **Northwestern Hindi states** as they are geographically above the northern plains, in the hills: Himachal Pradesh and Uttaranchal. **Western Hindi states** consist of Haryana, Rajasthan, Delhi and Chandigarh as union territories. **Central Hindi states,** as a category, covers Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh as well as former states Madhya Bharat, Vindya Pradesh and Bhopal. **Eastern Hindi states** as a category includes Bihar, Jharkhand and Chattisgarh. This presents an idealized classification of Hindi speaking states, however, since the data for EH interference and Hindi speakers has been scarce for some years, for example 30 speakers in 1950, it is later in the chapter combined with a cruder segmentation on **Hindi belt states**, i.e. states in plains and Northwestern Hindi states. Hindi belt states as a category then incorporates categories Western Hindi states, Central Hindi states and Eastern Hindi states. Such presentation is, of course, just one possible solution, and as such is artificial. **Eastern Indian states** comprise of Bengal, Orissa and northeastern states such as Assam. Other categories present in the analysis of regional affiliation are **West of Hindi belt** (Gujarat, Jammu and Kashmir, Punjab), **Southern Indian states** (Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, Karnataka and island-union territories Andaman and Nicobar as well as Lakshadweep islands) and **Western coastal states** (states of Maharashtra and Goa and union territories of Daman and Diu as well as of Dadra and Nagar Haveli). During the 60-year long period, the borders of states have been readjusted and moved, and their names have also been

changed several times. Thus, although in older maps one can find names of Vindhya Pradesh, Madhya Bharat, Hyderabad and Madras states, in contemporary India they do not appear anymore. The data on regional affiliation is present in two forms: 1) statistical overview in tables and graphs, 2) graphically on the map(s) representing India's constituencies and electorates throughout decades.[198] On the maps speakers are placed in the more or less exact region that they had represented in the Lok Sabha (see Appendix 4.2. Maps of India 1950-2010). The maps here are of great help as they show which region exactly does the MP represent. Hence, they throw more light on the analyzed Lok Sabha data then categories of grouped states as such categories are always artificial.

Caste

Information on caste and religion had not been collected. However, the one on scheduled caste (SC) or scheduled tribe (ST) was, since it was present in the available data due to the trend of affirmative discrimination actions towards the citizens who recognize themselves as members of those sub-groups. It is important to bear in mind that the provision of all information was in essence voluntarily and depended on Lok Sabha members themselves, if and when they decided that a particular or any information was not required of them, in those cases the data could not be collected. When the percentage of unavailable data mattered in the representation of results, the category "not available" (NA) was also introduced as the task of discovering reliable information in other sources, such as encyclopedias, biographies, histories on the particular period or political party, proved to be arduous and risky business. Therefore, certain data is left missing for several speakers as a more accurate state of affairs. However, such cases have not been frequent.

All the above-mentioned categories were correlated with the type of EH interference (0, 1, 2, 3, 1;3, 2;3). The results thus attained are presented in two forms, in the form of graphs and tables with the same information expressed in percentages. Each segment of the bar or the number in the table refers to the percentage of Hindi speakers whose speech pattern was qualified as EH 0, EH 1, etc. and its cross-relation with the specific non-linguistic data such as age, gender, etc. When placed on the map within the constituency they represent, each speaker is marked by a specific color designated to the particular type of EH interference. For example, pink color marks speakers with EH type 0, blue marks speakers with EH type 1, etc. (see Appendix 4.2.). The complex information, which is, thus, gathered, is compared with the data that Shankar and Rodrigues (2011) have compiled on Lok Sabha in general, particularly

---

[198] The source of maps was an on-line edition of Census of India (2001), which contains maps of India's constituencies for each year of the census (1950, 1960, etc.).

with the data that refers to the social composition of the Parliament. As the research tries to analyze collected material from Lok Sabha and not count Hindi speakers in their totality within the same environment, there is a possibility of discrepancy in information found in research and studies on the Lok Sabha in general, as the goals are defined differently. Thus, one should be aware that all speakers who claim Hindi as their mother tongue or who speak Hindi in Lok Sabha are not represented in the material analyzed in this study. Next to it, one should be aware that the structure of the research does not allow for generalizations that apply to all Hindi speakers in the Lok Sabha and least of all to entire body of Hindi speakers in India according to any of the factors taken into consideration here. The analysis is a description of MPs who employed Hindi in the collected data. Thus, all conclusions are but one of possible interpretations reached with limited data that I have at the moment. A different section of randomly chosen data from Lok Sabha could have given easily very different results.

5.2. Assumptions and expected results

The main question that is to be addressed in this chapter concerns the existence of correlations between assumed shared socio-demographic characteristics among analyzed representatives of the Lok Sabha and the particular language behavior that they exhibit within the walls of the Parliament while carrying out their public political role. Several theoretical assumptions are implicated in the research, the first being that a language is a social phenomenon that can be described as a tool used to express particular statements about environment and the speaker himself or herself, ergo a language can be assessed as a tool that communicates and evokes particular values when employed in a particular manner. The recent studies in socio-linguistics have also been researching language's symbolic power and its correlation with identity. It is assumed that distinct choice of language code in a particular communicative situation is correlated with factors such as time, space, medium, interlocutors, social hierarchy among interlocutors, topic, speaker's attitude towards language etc. All that influences the speaker in his/her decision on the appropriate language variety. The justification for such correlation is given by socio-linguistics in general as it assumes that the language as a Parole is always contextual, i.e. language is situated into a non-linguistic frame. In every act of communication, one relies on a communicative competence (Hymes 1971 and later, etc.) which, among other things, consists of complex implicit understanding of correlations between the codes one uses and non-linguistic implications that are part of its usage, without them being overtly stated as such. In that sense, the occurrences of EH interference that have

been described in previous chapter, can be seen as instances of distinct symbolic value for the interlocutors in the Lok

Sabha. They signal not merely the existence of specific social relations among representatives present in the Parliament at the particular moment, but also the possibility of successful coding and decoding of those relations in the language. Following those assumptions, the question that arises is whether speakers in the Parliament who exhibit particular language behavior that we have named eH, share any non-linguistic characteristics. The analysis of non-linguistic characteristics of eH speakers can, thus, be understood as an attempt to detect elements that the usage of eH utterances signals to the interlocutors in the Lok Sabha as well as to the outsider group of listeners of Lok Sabha debates, radio and TV journalists and citizens of India.

The general assumption is that Lok Sabha members who represent Hindi states speak in Hindi more often than those members who represent states in which Hindi is not one of official or spoken languages. Another assumption is that the speakers from Hindi states will have less EH interference elements than other speakers for several reasons:

1. since they come from Hindi speaking states it is possible that Hindi is one of languages of their everyday communication,

2. for the same reason, for some of them Hindi could be the dominant language in their communication,

3. due to three language formula, it is assumed that they have been exposed to Hindi in school.

Thus, even if they were educated in English medium schools and not exposed to standardized Hindi in the classroom, they would still have a certain exposure to everyday Hindi because of their geographical position. Speakers from non-Hindi regions would lack such exposure, unless Hindi was one of their home languages or language of education.

As the sector of education is under the direct influence of language policy chosen by the society, it equips and promotes a type of linguistic inequality and linguistically mediated social hierarchy. Thus, it is assumed that the dominant language of education influences the presence of EH interference, particularly if that language had been English, at all stages of education or solely at the university level. Hence, it is assumed that if MP has a higher level of education, EH interference type would be of higher level as well (EH 2 or EH 3). There is also an assumption that even if English has not had any effect on representatives prior to their membership in Lok Sabha, its presence in the Parliament for the conduct of business certainly

can be claimed as an important factor, the one that leaves considerable impact on representatives regardless of their previous language behavior or language background.

It is also assumed that younger MPs are more prone to EH interference than their elder colleagues in the Lok Sabha. Thus, it is assumed that younger MPs will represent the bigger number of analyzed speakers with EH interference elements in their speech patterns. Another assumption is that after 1990, analyzed MPs in general are more prone to EH interference.

Next to education and regional affiliation, it is assumed that a political affiliation may signal particular attitudes towards language(s) or language groups. The analysis will try to detect whether the data can show existence of relation between political affiliation and Hindi with elements of EH interference as a type of language behavior present among analyzed representatives of the Lok Sabha.

It is further assumed that female MPs would speak in Hindi with less EH interference as a smaller percentage of women in India is educated in general, as Census report for 2001 continues to show. Thus, more than 272 million of women had been illiterate that year in contrast to 195 million men. According to the same census report, 12 million women had graduated or had higher degree, whereas number of men with such qualifications was over 25 million.

It is also assumed that certain professions, such as advocates have a level of EH2 or EH 3 interference rather than of EH 1 or EH 0, because of the educational system in India. As law studies are available at universities in English language, it seems probable that their speech patterns would be different from patterns of individuals with different occupations.

Finally, the data will also be tested to see whether caste (SC and ST) plays any significant role in Hindi speech patterns in Lok Sabha. It is assumed that MPs with SC and/or ST background will have EH 0 or EH 1 speech patterns because of the historically unfavorable position of those groups in the Indian society.

5.3. Non linguistic analysis of Hindi speakers in the Lok Sabha
5.3.1. Analysis of Hindi speakers in the Lok Sabha based on their gender
As already mentioned, number of female members in Lok Sabha in general is very low (see Shankar and Rodrigues 2011: 81). While the highest number of female representatives was elected for the 13th Lok Sabha in 1999 (49 female MPs), the lowest number of women, only 19 representatives, was elected in 1977 in the 6th Lok Sabha (see Shankar and Rodrigues

2011: 81). On the average, approximately 30 women were present in the Lok Sabha at any given moment throughout the period 1952-2009.[199] If all the female representatives are added up together (471 representatives), their number would still be lower than the least numerous 1st Lok Sabha, elected in 1952, which had 499 representatives.

Table 5.1. Gender and EH interference types.

|		0	1	2	3
total	1514	33%	27%	23%	17%
female	94	34%	22%	23%	20%
male	1420	33%	27%	23%	17%

Thus, it does not come as a surprise that out of total 1514 Hindi speakers in the primary data collected for this research only 94 were women, as can be seen in the Table 5.1. The said table shows, as well as the Graph 5.I., the gender-biased tendencies towards Hindi as a language among Lok Sabha members. Analyzed women tended to include slightly less English elements, as 34% of them contrary to 33% of men, spoke Hindi with EH interference described as that of EH type 0. Men, on the other hand, included one worded phrases (EH type 1) more often than women in the analyzed data. Women, however, showed greater tendency than men for interference EH type 3, as 20% of women employed strategy EH type 3 whereas 17% of men employed that strategy. The very low percentage of women in Lok Sabha in general and in the data (see Table 5.2. and Graph 5.II.), however, does not allow any broad conclusions on gender-based preferences. Therefore, the information should be taken into consideration very carefully. As can be seen in Table 5.2., the number of analyzed Hindi male representatives in the collected data is not just greater, but almost always close to 100% and in two instances it indeed amounts to 100%, as no Hindi speaking female representatives were noticed in the analyzed material. The data does, however, indicate that female representatives who employed Hindi were more visible at certain periods. Thus, only 1 out of total 27 women in the Lok Sabha was noticed speaking in Hindi in the data for 1955, however in 2004, out of 47 women, 11 of them were noticed participating in debates employing Hindi or Hindi with English elements. If we take into account the assumption that the year 1950, 1960, 1990 and 2000 could be the turning points for language behavior, the gender analysis of the data suggests following:

  1) for the year 1950 the data is not available and no comparison can be had,

  2) out of 22 female MPs present in Lok Sabha in 1955, 5% of them were noticed in our data employing Hindi,

---

[199] At the moment of writing thesis I could not find any information on women representatives in the Provisional Lok Sabha in 1950 or for the 15th Lok Sabha which was elected during 2009.

3) in 1960 out of 27 female MPs, 24.8% were noticed in our data employing Hindi,

4) in 1990 total number of female MPs was 28, and in our data 9,57% of them were noticed employing Hindi.

5) in year 2000, out of total number of female MPs, 19% of them employed Hindi in our data,

6) in 2009, the percentage of female MPs employing Hindi compared to the total number of female MPs was 17.8%.

The increase had spiked in 1960, when the debate on the role of English was very much alive. As such, the spike follows the general increase of Hindi speakers in the analyzed data for that year. Otherwise, data suggests slow but stable increase of female MPs employing Hindi in Lok Sabha in the pages that were taken into consideration for this study. One should, of course, bear in mind that women who employed any other language but Hindi were not included in analysis; ergo conclusions should be taken with caution, as a number of women was not take into account in this research. Nevertheless, the increase from 1 to 11 female Hindi speakers among analyzed MPs could be meaningful. It could be interpreted as the increased interest of women in Lok Sabha to speak in Hindi and not in other varieties.


Graph 5.I. Gender and EH interference types.

As such, the increase is parallel to the general increase of Hindi speakers in the Lok Sabha, and therefore to the increase of male Hindi speakers in the House. However, the overview of

data shows that Hindi speaking female MPs are a minority for each analyzed year just as they are a general minority in LS (Shankar and Rodrigues 2011: 81, see Table 2.7.).

Table 5.2. Analysis of Hindi speakers in the Lok Sabha based on their gender.

year	total	female	male
	1514	6%	94%
1950	30	0%	100%
1955	55	2%	98%
1960	96	7%	93%
1965	41	2%	98%
1970	88	1%	99%
1975	44	7%	93%
1980	78	6%	94%
1985	15	13%	87%
1990	67	4%	96%
1995	35	11%	89%
2000	85	11%	89%
2001	46	13%	87%
2002	69	4%	96%
2003	91	8%	92%
2004	148	8%	92%
2005	95	2%	98%
2006	96	4%	96%
2007	115	7%	93%
2008	49	0%	100%
2009	84	10%	90%
2010	87	9%	91%

Graph 5.II. Analysis of Hindi speakers in the Lok Sabha based on their gender.

They also represent the main pool of speakers who favor EH type 0 as their main strategy. EH types 1 and 2 are almost equally distributed in the same group, as well as in the group 25-45, while in the age group above 66, EH type 2 is slightly less present. For all age groups EH type 3 is the least preffered behavior, particularly for the youngest age group 25-45. Only the

group aged 66-83 had passed the threshold above 20% in EH type 3. The analysis of data per year, shows, as is visible in Table 5.4. and Graph 5.IV., that in the first Lok Sabha, elected in 1952, Hindi speakers mostly belonged to the age group 46-65 (47%). That age group was followed by younger speakers, aged 25-45, with 33%. In the first sub-period, information on age was not available for a number of MPs. Thus, for the year 1950 we do not have information on age for 20% of analyzed speakers. Later on, that percentage falls down, and in the second sub-period, its average value is 1.5%. As a minority, it is difficult to assume that Hindi speaking female MPs have dominated over other Hindi speaking MPs in the data. No factors indicate also how female MPs chose the variety in which to address Lok Sabha. As already mentioned, the analysis shows what information can be gathered from analyzed pages, and those represent but a small portion of Lok Sabha's total archive.

5.3.2. Analysis of Hindi speakers in the Lok Sabha based on their age

Out of 1514 speakers, the majority, 917 speakers, belonged at any moment of the analyzed period to the age group 46-65, as can be seen in the Tables 5.3. and 5.4. and Graph 5.III. All three age-groups show equal tendencies towards Hindi with various types of EH interference, with the exception of the youngest age group, 25-45, which shows slightly higher tendency towards EH type 0. However, members in the age group 46-65 represent the main pool of speakers in general.

Table 5.3. Age and EH interference types.

Age group	Speakers	0	1	2	3
	1514	33%	27%	23%	17%
25-45	351	36%	27%	23%	14%
46-65	917	32%	27%	23%	18%
66-82	194	33%	27%	19%	21%
Not available	52	31%	25%	31%	13%

Graph 5.III. Age and EH interference types.

Table 5.4. Analysis of Hindi speakers in the Lok Sabha based on their age.

| Year	Speakers	25-45	46-65	66-82	Not available
	1514	23%	61%	13%	3%
1950	30	23%	57%	0%	20%
1955	55	33%	47%	13%	7%
1960	96	33%	50%	7%	9%
1965	41	24%	51%	12%	12%
1970	88	31%	58%	6%	6%
1975	44	18%	61%	7%	14%
1980	78	36%	53%	4%	8%
1985	15	27%	60%	7%	7%
1990	67	31%	57%	9%	3%
1995	35	20%	57%	23%	0%
2000	85	29%	59%	11%	1%
2001	46	17%	72%	11%	0%
2002	69	25%	62%	13%	0%
2003	91	20%	63%	15%	2%
2004	148	26%	61%	13%	0%
2005	95	15%	72%	13%	1%
2006	96	21%	60%	19%	0%
2007	115	16%	66%	17%	1%
2008	49	16%	61%	20%	2%
2009	84	13%	64%	23%	0%
2010	87	14%	68%	16%	2%

In the second sub-period, the ratio between age groups under 45 and the group above 45, falls in favor of age-group 46-65, with the average 60% presence in the Lok Sabha among the analyzed speakers. In the same sub-period, the number of elder speakers, aged 66 and above had been on a rise as well which could be a significant social factor for the type of Hindi spoken at the same time.

Table 5.5. Gender-age cross analysis of Hindi speakers in the Lok Sabha.

	25-45	46-65	66-82	Not available
female	26	60	6	2
male	325	857	188	50
total	351	917	194	52

On one side, one should not dismiss Shankar and Rodrigues's data (2011: 80-81) which suggests that the Lok Sabha shows consistent signs of aging over decades, with the increase from 2.38% in 1952 to 16.31% in 2004 in the age group 65 and above. The average age of all members in each Lok Sabha suggests the same tendency.Thus, the age of an average Lok Sabha member has gone up from 46.5 in 1952 to 54.19 in 2004.For the analysis of the age data in this study the increase is not that relevant as even the thus aged members still belong to the same age subgroup, yet it should not be dismissed for a more detailed study. The period after 1990 has politically and economically been very important for India, as has been already said. It could be that the broader political and economic changes, such as opening to the global market and foreign capital influx, have had their influence on the social structure in the Lok Sabha in total, and hence in the structure of Hindi speakers in the Lok Sabha and consequently on their language behavior. The cross analysis of gender and age shows (Table 5.5.) that both female and male analyzed MPs predominantly belonged to the age group 46-65. Based on the available data, one can conclude that the dominant carriers of Hindi language behavior types in the Lok Sabha have been members aged 46 to 65 years. Such members were mostly men, but female MPs of the same age group are also dominant. These dominant carriers predominantly employed Hindi with elements of EH interference types belonging to EH type 0 and EH type 1.

Graph 5.IV. Age-wise analysis of Hindi speakers in the Lok Sabha.

5.3.3. Analysis of Hindi speakers in the Lok Sabha based on their educational qualifications

As per collected data (Table 5.6. and Graph 5.V.), the predominant majority of analyzed Hindi speakers, 1207 speakers out of 1514, has had a tertiary level of education. The least represented section was the least educated group of speakers, i.e. speakers with primary level of education. Only 24 analyzed Hindi speakers marked the primary level as a level of their educational background. The educational structure of Hindi speakers formed from the information found in data does not correspond with the data Shankar and Rodrigues (2011: 72-73, Table 2.1.) have for the entire Lok Sabha. Thus, their data shows that the number of members with under-matriculation level of education was far greater. For example, in the year 1952 there were 23.48% such speakers in Lok Sabha, 28.77% in 1965, and 9.8% in 1977. Only towards the end of 1980's does the presence of such representatives in the Parliament fall to an average 3% per Lok Sabha.

Table 5.6. Education and EH interference types.

Education level	Speakers	0	1	2	3
	1514	33%	27%	23%	17%
Primary	24	38%	38%	21%	4%
Secondary	197	39%	33%	21%	7%
Tertiary	1207	32%	26%	23%	20%
Not available	86	34%	28%	27%	12%

170

Their data, however, does not tell us clearly how many speakers had marked primary education and how many had claimed secondary education as well. Contrary to that, as can be seen in Table 5.7 and Graph 5.VI the number of speakers who had marked either primary or secondary education in the collected data varies in total between 7% and 20%.

That discrepancy can be interpreted in several ways:

1. the non-inclusiveness of all Lok Sabha members gives a false impression on the presence of speakers with primary/secondary level of education

2. members with primary/secondary level of education were not always Hindi speakers,

3. some members with primary/secondary level of education were Hindi speakers but did not participate actively in discussions in the data material.[200]

Graph 5.V. Education and EH interference types.

All three interpretations seem probable. However, as the carriers of tertiary education are the most numerous group of MPs, they are also the predominant group in the shaping of Hindi language behavior in the analyzed Lok Sabha debates (see Table 5.6. and Graph 5.V.). The behavior of members with tertiary level is also the most complex one, as the distribution of EH types falls almost evenly among the members of that group, with very small differences. Thus, it is very unlikely to make correct assumptions on how the Hindi-speaking MP with the degree equal to tertiary education (graduate, postgraduate, etc.) will behave language-wise in

---

[200] It is important to keep in mind the conclusion which Shankar and Rodrigues have reached. According to them, in 1950s those members of Lok Sabha who did not feel comfortable speaking in English, did not participate in debates. Likewise, those who spoke in Hindi were but a few: "Very few spoke in Hindi and even when they did so, the issues they raised were not given much importance as those in English." (Shankar and Rodrigues 2011: 180-181). It could be that some speakers in the analyzed data, those who felt their Hindi was not adequate because of their low education level have decided not to participate in debates.

the Lok Sabha. Data also shows that the knowledge of English, which is in most cases implied indirectly by tertiary level of education, has not influenced approximately one third of Hindi speakers in the Lok Sabha as they employed Hindi with EH type 0.

Once more it is important to bear in mind that the research is concerned with lexically visible EH interference and not with syntactic interference. Yet, it remains relevant that for the two thirds of highly educated Hindi speakers, EH interference is visible, although one can assume that

1) speakers come prepared to the Parliament, and

2) they participate in the debates not just once but on more than several occasions throughout the term of elected Lok Sabha each year.

Thus, the data does indicate something relevant for the study, namely that the EH interference cannot be attributed to the illiteracy or poor levels of education nor to the unexpectedness of the topics discussed in the Parliament. For the speakers with primary level of education it seems probable to assume that EH type 2 and 3 can be excluded as their primary language behavior (14%). Nevertheless, the educational paradigm found in India, includes existence of primary schools in English medium, hence the question of whether or not this level of education leaves out EH type 2 and 3 has to remain open, when talking about Indian population in general.

Table 5.7. Analysis of Hindi speakers in the Lok Sabha based on their educational qualifications.

Year	Speakers	Primary	Secondary	Tertiary	Not available
	1514	2%	13%	80%	6%
1950	30	0%	10%	60%	30%
1955	55	2%	15%	78%	5%
1960	96	3%	8%	73%	16%
1965	41	0%	7%	73%	20%
1970	88	0%	14%	72%	15%
1975	44	0%	5%	73%	23%
1980	78	5%	5%	78%	12%
1985	15	7%	0%	80%	13%
1990	67	1%	18%	79%	1%
1995	35	3%	14%	77%	6%
2000	85	1%	16%	80%	2%
2001	46	0%	17%	83%	0%
2002	69	0%	14%	84%	1%
2003	91	0%	14%	82%	3%
2004	148	0%	14%	86%	0%
2005	95	1%	19%	78%	2%
2006	96	2%	13%	84%	1%
2007	115	3%	17%	79%	1%
2008	49	6%	6%	84%	4%
2009	84	0%	8%	92%	0%
2010	87	2%	17%	78%	2%

Graph 5.VI. Analysis of eH speakers in the Lok Sabha based on their educational qualifications.

The statistical analysis of data suggests the same conclusion for speakers with secondary level of education. Further, EH types 0, 1 and 2 have similar distribution among analyzed speakers of various educational backgrounds. The differences are very subtle, as speakers with tertiary degree prefer slightly more EH type 2 (23%) than other groups, and speakers with primary education are more prone than others to employ Hindi with EH type 1 (38%). Speakers with secondary education slightly prefer EH type 0 (39%). The detailed analysis of educational levels for each year offers a deeper insight. From such analysis, it is visible that for the entire period 1950-2010 the holders of tertiary degrees have been the dominant group among analyzed Hindi speakers. The only other relevant group throughout almost entire period had been the holders of secondary level degrees, which corresponds with the general trend of educational structure in the Lok Sabha. Here it is also important to note that in the first sub-period, particularly in 1950, 1965 or 1975, a fourth relevant group, for which information on attained educational level was unavailable or had to be classified as such, as the members described their education as privately attained, also existed. If we consider so far attained information in its complexity, the conclusion that imposes itself is the following: the predominant Hindi speakers with a particular language behavior in the Lok Sabha are highly educated male MPs aged between 46 and 65 years. The majority of women for whom data was available had had tertiary education (87). Only few of them had marked primary education (3) or secondary education (2). For 2 of them the information on their educational qualifications was not available.

5.3.4. Analysis of Hindi speakers in the Lok Sabha based on their occupation

Parliament has had for its own purposes created a statistical analysis of members' occupational background. However, Shankar and Rodrigues (2011: 76) had described those categories as far too broad and had therefore organized available data into a novel manner, which, as they have admitted themselves (2011: 94-95 and further) was a very tiresome process due to the complexity of the category as such. In the collected data, it was, however, impossible to attest information supplied by members as some of them have occasionally marked more than one occupation in the Parliament's query as their own. Such state of affairs makes it difficult to mark clearly the primary occupation of members, as well as to compare with clarity differently labeled occupations.According to statistics (Table 5.8. and Graph 5.VII.), majority of analyzed speakers had stated to belong to one of the following occupations: social worker (331), advocate (304), agriculturist (243) and political worker (175). Teachers (93), journalists (53) and industrialists (38) followed those occupations.

Table 5.8. Occupation and EH interference types.

Profession profile	Speakers	0	1	2	3
	1514	33%	27%	23%	17%
Social worker	331	32%	29%	21%	18%
Advocate	304	31%	21%	23%	24%
Agriculturist	243	38%	31%	22%	9%
Political worker	175	31%	27%	23%	18%
Teacher	93	34%	30%	19%	16%
Journalist	53	26%	23%	19%	32%
Industrialist	38	29%	24%	26%	21%
Other	215	33%	31%	23%	13%
Not available	62	32%	18%	35%	15%

For 62 speakers, no information on occupational background was available and 215 of them belonged to some of the less frequently stated occupations such as trade unionist, editor, engineer, religious missionary, businessman, writer, economist, priest etc., which had been classed together in the category Other since they statistically did not change significantly data on their own. Journalists, industrialists, as well as political and social workers have been kept as separate entries for several reasons. The journalists and teachers, although not very numerous, have been treated separately as they bring in a different note to the category of Hindi speakers with their chosen type of code. Journalists constitute a separate category because they as professionals are oriented towards public communication with the audience and because of the importance of language code in their professional life. Teachers, on the other side, participate with their language behavior in language policy enactment and signal to their students the 'appropriate' varieties in the public address of other members in the community.

Graph 5.VII. Occupation and EH interference types.

The category of industrialists is perceived similarly as an important source of socio-linguistic and social power as the carriers of particular level of recognizable economic power. Shankar and Rodrigues (2011: 85) treated social workers and political workers as synonyms. However, in this thesis each of them forms a separate category in order to demonstrate a shift in the naming of particular occupation in the Lok Sabha.

Social workers, advocates, agriculturists and political workers as the most numerous categories influenced greatly the analyzed distribution of EH types in the Lok Sabha. Although agriculturists appear as the most influential in the EH 0 sub-group, the social workers, especially if taken together with political workers, are on the average the most numerous carriers of the EH type 0. EH type 3 was again in the domain of the same occupational category in toto (36%). Per se, as expected, EH type 3 was most widely distributed among advocates and journalists. In the category of advocates, it is understandable as English language is important for Indian legal system, as we have seen in Chapter 3. As expected, advocates also show high tendency towards EH type 2, however, the type seems mostly to be distributed among political and social workers as well as among industrialists. The category Other demonstrates that other occupations, which appear rarely in bigger percentages in the Lok Sabha, show similar preferences for the EH types. The exceptions were speakers on whose occupational background no information was available - they mostly employed Hindi with EH interference type 2 (35%).

Table 5.9. Analysis of Hindi speakers in the Lok Sabha based on their occupation.

Year	Speakers	Social worker	Advocate	Agriculturist	Political worker	Teacher	Journalist	Industrialist	Other	Not available
	1514	22%	20%	16%	12%	6%	4%	3%	14%	4%
1950	30	3%	27%	7%	13%	7%	0%	0%	7%	37%
1955	55	4%	24%	11%	27%	7%	4%	0%	11%	13%
1960	96	5%	27%	13%	20%	5%	8%	0%	10%	11%
1965	41	10%	24%	29%	10%	5%	0%	0%	17%	5%
1970	88	2%	10%	30%	27%	5%	8%	0%	15%	3%
1975	44	5%	14%	18%	32%	7%	5%	0%	9%	11%
1980	78	4%	27%	27%	21%	3%	6%	0%	5%	8%
1985	15	7%	40%	20%	20%	0%	7%	0%	0%	7%
1990	67	15%	19%	31%	9%	7%	6%	0%	10%	1%
1995	35	6%	9%	29%	20%	17%	3%	0%	17%	0%
2000	85	28%	19%	11%	6%	8%	2%	7%	18%	1%
2001	46	30%	17%	9%	0%	20%	2%	2%	17%	2%
2002	69	29%	28%	4%	4%	7%	4%	3%	19%	1%
2003	91	31%	21%	13%	5%	10%	2%	2%	12%	3%
2004	148	35%	18%	18%	3%	5%	3%	3%	14%	1%
2005	95	34%	19%	12%	6%	3%	4%	5%	16%	1%
2006	96	30%	23%	16%	5%	3%	3%	5%	14%	1%
2007	115	37%	17%	16%	1%	5%	2%	3%	17%	3%
2008	49	41%	22%	8%	8%	2%	0%	6%	10%	2%
2009	84	26%	20%	10%	18%	5%	1%	1%	18%	1%
2010	87	18%	14%	14%	16%	6%	1%	6%	24%	1%

As we can see in Table 5.9 and Graph 5.VIII, the label political worker was more popular in the sub-period 1950-1995 (9-32%), whereas the label social worker gained popularity after 2000 (18-41%). This can be understood in the wider social context. Political worker in the first sub-period was a popular term, and covered two main subcategories of politicians, as is discernible from the forms that members submitted to the Parliament. The first sub-category within the mentioned occupation refers to the politicians who were active prior to the independence and 1947 as freedom fighters. The second sub-category refers to politicians who have been in opposition with official politics after 1947, particularly during the period of Indira Gandhi's government, and had been incarcerated or prevented from the propagation of their own ideas in any other manner. The democratization of politics, particularly after 1990's, globalization and influx of ideas and goods from outside has helped in the dismantlement of the previous political legacy, and thus the political worker became unnecessary label. At the same time, the care for the society and social issues had gained more visibility and in the context of tolerance towards the multitude of identities, social worker became more acceptable nome proprio for the occupation.[201]

---

[201] Another interesting aspect is that in the eyes of an ordinary person, all members of the Parliament can be perceived as social and/or political workers. Ergo, it is questionable how the occupation should be understood.

Graph 5.VIII. Analysis of Hindi speakers in the Lok Sabha based on their occupation.

Over the period 1950-2010, the average of 22% analyzed speakers have had identified themselves as social workers, 20% as advocates, 16% as agriculturists and 12% as political workers. Here the discrepancy with the results attained for educational levels becomes visible. An average 80% of Hindi speaking MPs in the research have had the degree of tertiary level and that less than 2% (24 speakers out of total 1514) had marked primary education as the only education. It is interesting to see how has the category of agriculturists, the one that is usually in the general opinion equated with the low or lower educational level, reached the figure of 16%. The discrepancy perhaps exists due to the quality of information given by members in the forms. Another reason is that there is perhaps no relation between the occupation and level of education. The information on Lok Sabha in general suggests that the 40.76% of Lok Sabha members in 2004 (Shankar and Rodrigues 2011: 96, Table 2.14.) and prior to that 49.06% of them in 1998 (Shankar and Rodrigues 2011: 96, Table 2.14.) have identified themselves as agriculturists. Among analyzed Hindi speakers, agriculturists had a strong majority between 1965 and 1995, as at least 18% of Hindi speakers (1975) entered that occupation in the form.

The occupation agriculturist attained the highest percentage among analyzed speakers in 1990 (31%). After that, the presence of agriculturists has diminished to an average of 14 to 16% in each subsequent Lok Sabha. The question one can pose now is whether the greater

majority of agriculturalists in general in Lok Sabha are Hindi speakers or speakers of other languages.

Next to it, we can also raise the question whether all Hindi using agriculturalists have been noticed speaking in Hindi in the analyzed data as well as how often are they active in the Lok Sabha. In relation to educational background, we can only wonder what their educational level is on average. As already stated, the statistical data in the thesis should be taken very cautiously, as it takes into consideration a very small fragment of total data found in Lok Sabha. If we consider the relevant years 1950, 1960, 1990 and 2000 in relation with occupational background of Hindi speaking representatives, the results for the period 1950-1965 are predictable as the first generations of parliamentarians were mostly advocates and political workers. In 1965, the most significant change among analyzed speakers, that can be seen, is the increase in the category agriculturists which jumped from 13% in 1960 to 29% in 1965 and had remained equally high in 1970 (30%) as well. The 1990's have reaffirmed the position of agriculturists among Hindi speaking representatives and have introduced higher percentage of various non-standard occupations (group Other) among members. The 2000's have confirmed the relevance of those occupations (10-24%) and established the dominance of social workers. If we connect the newly acquired information with the previous, the dominant Hindi speaking representatives in the Lok Sabha are highly educated men, aged between 46 and 65, who mostly claim following occupations: social and political worker, advocate, and agriculturist. Their preferred mode of Hindi belongs to EH types 0 and 1, however, approximately two thirds of them use Hindi with EH elements (EH type 1, 2 or 3). So far, it is perhaps the most appropriate to conclude that the interference is a mark of their education and their occupation. The only exception to it would be the occupation agriculturist, which does not necessarily require knowledge of English to be successfully practiced.

5.3.5. Analysis of Hindi speakers in the Lok Sabha based on their belonging to Scheduled castes (SC) and Scheduled tribes (ST)

The caste variable was included in the research in order to analyze relation between affiliation to Scheduled castes (SC) or Scheduled tribes (ST) and their identification as Hindi speakers in the Lok Sabha. Both groups are recognized by Constitution as historically disadvantaged. Therefore, members of those groups have been entitled to affirmative action or positive discrimination to ensure they have equal opportunity in government's representative bodies and in other places. In the Lok Sabha, SC members take around 12 to 15% of all seats, while

ST members are less present, with an average of 6% from the 1950 onward (Shankar and Rodrigues 2011: 220).

In the collected data, among 1514 speakers 256 identified themselves as SC (72% or 185 speakers) or ST (28% or 71 speakers) as can be seen in the Table 5.10 and Graph 5.IX. Up to the year 2000, the presence of both groups in analyzed Hindi speakers is lower than after 2000. Years 1970 and 1980 represent exceptions.

Yet, if the information is seen in the light of Lok Sabha results for the category in general, both SC and ST groups are less then active, if they happen to be Hindi speaking MPs, which, of course, does not have to be the case, as they may be Marathi speaking, Bengali or English speaking members, etc. If we, however, consider the data for Hindi speaking members with SC or ST background with the data for analyzed Hindi speaking representatives in general per year, their presence appears as significant in 1970, 1980 and 1990 in the first sub-period and from 2000 to 2007 in the second sub-period. On one side, this may signify the importance of discussed topics for specific group(s). On the other side, the number of such speakers in the particular year makes them important carriers of particular EH type among analyzed Hindi speakers. Comparison of available data with that of Shankar and Rodrigues (2011: 220, Table 5.2.) shows that such Hindi representatives were more active after 2000.

Table 5.10. Analysis of Hindi speakers in the Lok Sabha based on their belonging to SC and ST.

Year	Speakers	SC	ST
	256	72%	28%
1950	1	100%	0%
1955	5	80%	20%
1960	9	67%	33%
1965	5	100%	0%
1970	16	94%	6%
1975	7	86%	14%
1980	21	52%	48%
1985	1	100%	0%
1990	15	87%	13%
1995	4	75%	25%
2000	15	73%	27%
2001	10	60%	40%
2002	16	75%	25%
2003	13	77%	23%
2004	20	55%	45%
2005	23	61%	39%
2006	18	72%	28%
2007	21	81%	19%
2008	7	57%	43%
2009	12	75%	25%
2010	17	76%	24%

It is, however, not clear which factors influence their participation in Hindi. If we take into consideration the probability once again, the members of the group are mainly men, some of which at least are educated beyond primary level and at least some could have specified as their occupation political or social worker, agriculturist or advocate.

Table 5.11. SC/ST and EH interference types.

Affiliation	Speakers	0	1	2	3
	256	38%	35%	16%	11%
SC	185	35%	38%	16%	11%
ST	71	44%	27%	17%	13%

Graph 5.IX. Analysis of Hindi speakers in the Lok Sabha based on their belonging to SC and ST.

For the year 1990 most of them could belong to the EH type 0, as almost 69% of analyzed speakers belongs to that type. The results for other years are probably equally distributed between EH types 0 and 1 (Table 5.11. and Graph 5.X.) as the dominant models among the members of both SC and ST group. In the general view, however, even though members of SC/ST group(s) among analyzed speakers amount to 16.77% of the entire analyzed Hindi group over decades, their presence in each Lok Sabha is overall very indiscernible, except for the years that have already been mentioned. Very few speakers in this group are women, if any at all. Whereas in the first Lok Sabhas they were not visible among Hindi speakers, from 2000 onward 20 such speakers on average participate in debates employing Hindi.

180

Graph 5.X. SC/ST and EH interference types.

5.3.6. Analysis of Hindi speakers in the Lok Sabha based on their political affiliation

Political affiliation in India is a part of a complex system, which had underwent radical changes over time, as Shankar and Rodrigues (2011: 112) state in their analysis on representation in 1950's, 1970's and 1990's respectively. According to them, one of the greater changes over decades was the switch from emphasized idea of national unity in the work of all political parties and elitism (Shankar and Rodrigues 2011: 114, 167) in 1950's to the fragmentation of political parties in 1990's along with the turn to politics based on local identities, religious, communal and other:

> "In the 1990s, the decisive weight of the Indian polity had shifted to a wholly different terrain. Regions, identities, affiliations of all kind, castes and communities had bounced back on to the public arena with a vengeance. They were there earlier, much more cushioned in localities and regions and in the twilight spaces of the private-public divide. However, their assertive presence in the public sphere in the 1990s had great impact not merely on the making of the Lok Sabha, but also on the kind of debates that came to dominate its deliberations. Members of the Lok Sabha demonstrated a great deal of deference to these considerations partly because they imagines themselves to be the authentic representatives of such expressions, and pragmatic considerations often made them highly amenable to their pressures. In a way, the notion of representation was losing a sense of centrality in the 1990s which came to be reflected in the fragmentation of political parties themselves. Coalition governments became its inevitable outcome. In this context, the market released from the shackles through a policy of liberalization positioned itself as the pillar around

which the polity would revolve. The growing consensus within the Lok Sabha regarding this policy in a way reflected the emerging centrality of the market." (Shankar and Rodrigues 2011: 166)

Table 5.12. Political parties and EH interference types.

Political party	Speakers	0	1	2	3
	1514	33%	27%	23%	17%
Congress	567	27%	29%	24%	20%
Bjp	370	37%	25%	19%	18%
Socialist	369	37%	31%	23%	9%
Communist	71	38%	15%	17%	30%
Independent	24	42%	21%	25%	13%
Other	91	32%	21%	29%	19%
Not available	22	27%	23%	32%	18%

Over time, political parties changed not just their political course, but also their names, and because of that, only several have been kept as independent categories. Mostly they were grouped together, particularly if they could be classed under one broad category such as Communist or Socialist. For 22 speakers (Table 5.12. and Graph 5.XI.) information on political affiliation was ambiguous and impossible to check. Members of Congress parties predominantly chose EH types 1 and 2 as a linguistic strategy in Hindi, whereas members of BJP mostly employed EH type 0 as their language behavior (37%). Members of Socialist parties (369) joined them.

Table 5.13. Analysis of Hindi speakers in the Lok Sabha based on their political affiliation.

Year	Speakers	Congress	Bjp	Socialist	Communist	Independent	Other	Not available
	1514	37%	24%	24%	5%	2%	6%	1%
1950	30	83%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	17%
1955	55	87%	0%	5%	2%	2%	2%	2%
1960	96	73%	1%	13%	5%	2%	3%	3%
1965	41	61%	0%	15%	0%	7%	17%	0%
1970	88	50%	0%	19%	6%	9%	14%	2%
1975	44	73%	0%	2%	18%	5%	2%	0%
1980	78	65%	5%	15%	9%	1%	0%	4%
1985	15	80%	7%	7%	0%	0%	0%	7%
1990	67	24%	39%	27%	6%	3%	1%	0%
1995	35	20%	40%	26%	14%	0%	0%	0%
2000	85	21%	36%	25%	2%	0%	14%	1%
2001	46	22%	39%	33%	7%	0%	0%	0%
2002	69	22%	42%	23%	6%	0%	7%	0%
2003	91	19%	41%	29%	4%	0%	5%	2%
2004	148	21%	32%	32%	6%	1%	9%	0%
2005	95	33%	25%	32%	4%	0%	5%	1%
2006	96	21%	41%	31%	1%	0%	6%	0%
2007	115	27%	32%	31%	3%	0%	5%	1%
2008	49	18%	29%	37%	6%	2%	6%	2%
2009	84	30%	31%	31%	1%	2%	5%	0%
2010	87	34%	25%	29%	1%	1%	8%	1%

They, on the other hand, least of all parties employed EH type 3 (9%). Unlike them, Communists almost equally employed EH types 0 (38%) and 3 (30%). Nevertheless, the EH type 3 remains as the least preferred strategy among all, while EH types 1 and 2 are almost equally employed among parties.

Throughout entire period 1950-2010 (Table 5.13. and Graph 5.XII.), majority of analyzedHindi speakers belonged to Congress (37%). This group is followed by equal proportion of speakers from BJP or socialist parties with 24% each. Other parties have less than 15% Hindi speaking representatives altogether in the analyzed data. Among Hindi representatives, the turning year was 1990, when Congress lost majority and the group of Hindi speakers that were members of BJP experienced sudden jump from 7% to 39%.

The number of speakers affiliated to socialist parties had also changed significantly with the same year and with the similar increase from 7% to 27%. Both political groups have gained a lot from the fall of Congress members in the analyzed Hindi group from 1990 onwards and have more or less kept steady presence among them up to the 2010. Communists had a greatest number of Hindi speakers affiliated to them in 1975 (18%) and in 1995 (14%). However, their presence among Hindi speakers is mostly non-existent as is the presence of independent political representatives (Table 5.12.). Other political parties have significantly added to Hindi group in 1965, 1970 and 2000. Otherwise, their presence is also very low, albeit in average higher than the presence of communist parties.

We can conclude that across political parties, one third of Hindi speaking MPs chose EH type 0, while the rest of them chose one of the EH types (1, 2 or 3). The dominant creators of Hindi language behavior in the collected data have been in the first sub-period members of Congress and in the second sub-period members of BJP and socialist parties.

Graph 5.XI. Political parties and EH interference types.

Most of them were highly educated men with tertiary level degree, middle aged (46-65) and called themselves a political worker (in the first sub-period) or a social worker (in the second sub-period), advocate or agriculturist. Some among them belonged to the SC or ST groups. Some were also women.

Graph 5.XII. Analysis of Hindi speakers in the Lok Sabha based on their political affiliation.

5.3.7. Analysis of Hindi speakers in the Lok Sabha based on their regional affiliation

The majority of analyzed speakers (972) represented Hindi-belt states, which corresponds to 64% (Table 5.14. and Graph 5.XIII.). Within that category, Central Hindi states (479) had a majority over Eastern Hindi states (302) and Western Hindi states (191). The fourth place was occupied by speakers from Western coastal states (154 speakers) and the fifth by speakers from West of Hindi belt states (153 speakers). Speakers from neighboring Eastern states (119 speakers) took the sixth place, whereas the speakers from Northwestern Hindi states (40 speakers) were numerically the weakest region with only 3%. Southern states were not far off from them with 4% (63 speakers). Hindi belt states show predominantly stable percentage of speakers throughout analyzed years (Table 5.15. and Graph 5.XIV.). Changes are, however, visible for the years 1960 and 1965. In 1960, speakers from Southern and Eastern states showed greater tendency to speak in Hindi, which resulted in lower percentage for Hindi belt states. In 1965, however, speakers from Hindi belt states were the most predominant (80%). Similar rise, although to a lesser extent, is visible for the years 1990 and 1995 (see Map 11. and 12. in Appendix 4.2.), whereas in years 2001 and 2005 a slightly lower percentage of speakers participated in the analyzed debates. West of Hindi belt states and Western coastal states have an equal average of 10% in total. However, coastal states show a rise in Hindi-

speaking MPs from 1985 onward (see Map 13 and further). Occasionally, as in the case of West of Hindi belt states, these states also do not show great number of active Hindi speaking MPs. After 2000, the level of Hindi speakers from that region is kept more or less stable and close to the average result of 10%. Southern states note the highest Hindi activity in the early years of Lok Sabha, namely in 1955 and 1960 with 13% and 14% respectively. However, after that the number of Hindi speakers from that region decreased to an average 2% or 3%.

Similar higher activity in 1960 was noted by Eastern states (14%). Unlike in Southern states, their speakers have been active in Hindi in later years as well, particularly in 1995 (9%) and after year 2000. Northwestern region had the highest percentage in 1995 and 2005, with 8% and 6% respectively. Bigger part of results for other years is closer to their average of 3%. If we place these data on maps of India[202] (see Maps 1.-23. in Appendix 4.2.), it is visible that the concentration of Hindi speakers in the Lok Sabha is rising over decades.

Table 5.14. Geography and EH interference types.

Region	Speakers	0	1	2	3
	1514	33%	27%	23%	17%
Central Hindi states	479	38%	30%	21%	11%
Western Hindi states	191	31%	27%	22%	20%
Eastern Hindi states	302	35%	26%	27%	12%
Northwestern Hindi states	40	28%	33%	22%	17%
West of Hindi belt	153	29%	26%	21%	24%
Western coastal states	154	23%	31%	28%	19%
Southern Indian states	63	30%	25%	21%	24%
Eastern Indian states	119	30%	14%	13%	42%
Not available	13	23%	15%	38%	23%

As was to expect, Delhi as a center has a bigger concentration of Hindi speakers than Bombay (Mumbai). Geographically, overwhelming majority of speakers is placed on the upper northern part of India. The strongholds of Hindi speakers in the southern India had been the state Andhra Pradesh, a former princely state of Nizams, and the state of Karnataka. The number of Hindi speakers from other southern states has decreased significantly very early in

---

[202] The source of maps that outlined constituencies that were relevant in different periods (1951, 1961, 1971, etc.) was an on-line edition of Census of India from 2001.

the analyzed period, after 1970. Occasionally they appear in southern union territories, such as Andaman and Nicobar Islands, where Hindi is one of official languages. In the northern parts of India, biggest number of analyzed speakers is situated in Uttar Pradesh and Bihar, and after that in Rajasthan. The number of Hindi speakers from Maharashtra increased considerably with the year 2000 (see Map 13 in Appendix 4.2.).

Graph 5.XIII. Geography and EH interference types.

Hindi speakers can also be found in northeastern states such as Assam and Arunachal and in Orrisa next to West Bengal in the east, and in Gujarat and Punjab in the western frontier. In Gujarat, the number of Hindi speakers is high in the second sub-period (2000-2010); particularly in 2006 and 2007 (see Map 19 and 20 in Appendix 4.2.). West Bengal also shows the tendency of continuous presence of Hindi speakers in the same period.

When it comes to the EH interference types 0-3 (Table 5.14., Graph 5.XIV. and Maps in Appendix 4.2.), Hindi belt states in general show predominant occurrence of EH type 0 (36%) or 1 (28%). However, due to their numerical majority, Hindi-belt speakers who employ EH types 2 or 3[203] have a significant role in the creation of Hindi language behavior in the Lok Sabha. Within the Hindi belt states, all three groups, western, central and eastern, show the predominance of EH type 0 (see Table 5.14).

Central Hindi states lead also in the EH type 1 (30%), while analyzed MPs from Eastern Hindi states mostly employed EH type 2 (27%). Western Hindi states had a dominance of EH type 3 speakers over the analyzed period (20%). As the most dominant geographical group

---

[203] The very least employed EH type 3 in the Hindi belt states with 13% equals almost total number of speakers from the states west of Hindi belt (126 vs. 127).

among the analyzed Hindi speakers, we can say that the majority of data on gender, age, education, occupation and political affiliation concerns the speakers from Central Hindi states and Eastern Hindi states. Contrary to that speakers from Northwestern Hindi states represent a very small minority in the analyzed data.

Table 5.15. Analysis of Hindi speakers in the Lok Sabha based on their regional affiliation.

Year	Speakers	Hindi belt states	West of Hindi belt	Western coastal states	Southern Indian states	Eastern Indian states	Northwestern Hindi states	Not available
	1514	64%	10%	10%	4%	8%	3%	1%
1950	30	70%	10%	7%	7%	3%	0%	3%
1955	55	58%	15%	7%	13%	5%	0%	2%
1960	96	54%	11%	4%	14%	14%	1%	2%
1965	41	80%	10%	5%	2%	2%	0%	0%
1970	88	76%	6%	6%	5%	5%	1%	2%
1975	44	77%	14%	7%	0%	0%	2%	0%
1980	78	68%	14%	4%	5%	4%	1%	4%
1985	15	73%	0%	13%	7%	0%	0%	7%
1990	67	70%	7%	12%	3%	3%	4%	0%
1995	35	69%	0%	11%	3%	9%	8%	0%
2000	85	65%	5%	19%	2%	7%	2%	0%
2001	46	57%	13%	9%	4%	17%	0%	0%
2002	69	64%	7%	14%	3%	10%	1%	0%
2003	91	63%	11%	11%	5%	5%	2%	2%
2004	148	60%	8%	12%	3%	13%	4%	0%
2005	95	55%	13%	14%	3%	9%	6%	0%
2006	96	61%	17%	9%	2%	8%	2%	0%
2007	115	63%	11%	12%	2%	7%	5%	0%
2008	49	69%	10%	10%	0%	10%	0%	0%
2009	84	68%	12%	5%	1%	8%	6%	0%
2010	87	60%	8%	16%	5%	9%	1%	1%

The characteristics of Hindi speakers from other regions are slightly different from Hindi-belt speakers in general. Thus, the speakers from Western coastal states mostly employ EH type 1 (31%), just like the speakers from Northwestern states EH (33%), whereas speakers in Eastern Indian states employed mostly EH type 3 (42%). This EH type was the least preferred strategy among speakers from Central and Western Hindi states (11% and 12% respectively). In the Eastern states, strategies EH type 1 and 2 had the lowest percentage, 14% and 13% respectively, while the EH type 0 had the lowest occurrence in Western coastal states with 23%. It is interesting to note (see Maps in Appendix 4.2.) that Northwestern Hindi regions had prevalence of EH type 2 in 1950's and 1960's. That prevalence had switched to EH type 1 in 1970's and to type 0 in 1990's (see Map 3-8 and Map 11-12).

The EH type 0 was predominant in the north until 2005 and the reappearance of EH type 1 in the region (see Map 18 in Appendix 4.2.). EH type 2 was mostly dominant in Rajasthan, Gujarat and Maharashtra. With the year 2006/2007 EH type 2 appears in greater quantity in states of Uttar Pradesh and Bihar (see Map 19 and 20 in Appendix 4.2.). EH type 3 was visible in the north in 1960's and 1980's but after that it has disappeared among the analyzed speakers from the region until 2007 (see Map 5-6, 9-10 and 20). EH type 3, however, was mostly prevalent outside Hindi belt states, in Gujarat, Maharashtra and West Bengal,

particularly its sub-types marked EH types 1;3 and 2;3. Hindi speakers from Bombay changed their strategy from EH type 1 and EH type 2 in combination with EH type 3 towards the EH type 0 with the onset of 1990's (see Map 11. and 12.). Delhi, even though it keeps its linguistic colorfulness, has a predominant presence of EH type 2 in collected data.

Graph 5.XIV. Analysis of Hindi speakers in the Lok Sabha based on their regional affiliation.

To conclude, average Hindi speaker in the analyzed Lok Sabha debates is a middle-aged man (46-65), with the degree of tertiary level, non-member of the SC or ST group. In the first sub-period, he was mostly from one of the Central or Eastern Hindi states and in the second sub-period either from the already mentioned ones or from Western coastal states. He was a member of the Congress party (in the first sub-period) or of the BJP and if not than from one of the socialist parties (in the second sub-period). Majority of such Hindi speakers defined their occupation as that of political or social worker, agriculturist or advocate. One third of those speakers uses throughout analyzed period Hindi without EH interference (EH type 0), however two-thirds use Hindi with some type of EH interference (EH types 1, 2 and 3).

5.4. Conclusions

According to the collected material for the period 1950-2010, on average 60 to 70 Hindi speakers per year were noticed. The highest number of speakers was found in 2004, when 148

MPs employed Hindi in the specified amount of material (see Map 17). As expected, number of Hindi speakers in 1950 was low (30 speakers), and therefore 55 Hindi speakers in the next check-point, 1955, looks as a promising increase of the expected language behavior particularly if one remembers that for the years ending in 5 the amount of material was cut in half. The results for subsequent years ending in 0 and 5 also fall within that expectation as far as it concerns proportion of observed speakers and number of checked text pages. After the year 2000, the number of speakers was on average 80, and therefore on the rise once again. If the numbers for sub-periods are compared, we see that in the second sub-period (2000-2010), the number has almost doubled from 549 in the previous sub-period (1950-1995) to 965 Hindi speakers. The rise is particularly characteristic for the period 2005 onward (see Maps 18.-23.), for which, although the quantity of the material is again cut in half, the number of speakers is as high as or higher than in the data of the twofold size. Based on the data, we may speculate that Hindi speakers after 2004 are more ready to utilize Hindi. We can also conclude that on average 33% of analyzed Hindi speakers follow language rules valid in Lok Sabha. In other words, approximately 33% of analyzed Hindi speakers address Lok Sabha in a monolingual mode as defined by Grosjean (2001, 2011), although they are aware that many of their colleagues would understand them if they decided to choose bilingual mode of speech. The other 67% of analyzed Hindi speakers in whose speech different types of EH interference can be traced shows that they would be able to follow bilingual mode of Englishized Hindi (eH) with different types of EH interference. It is also important to know that all speakers are aware of the technical availability of translation into Hindi or into English at any moment of discussion. The question is then why does 67% of analyzed Hindi speakers employ Hindi with English elements. That question is related to several others:

1. If addressing Lok Sabha in Hindi is so important why do not speakers invest time to improve their proficiency?

2. Does exposure to English as the most often employed language in the Lok Sabha influence Hindi speakers?

3. How to explain presence of EH interference in speech patterns of MPs from Hindi-belt states?

That speaking in Hindi is important for analyzed speakers, we can see from the fact that many of them do employ it even though their communicative abilities in English are good. The examples with EH type 3 confirm that Hindi speakers can use both Hindi and English in a very complex manner. The data on speakers with tertiary degree of education also signifies speakers with good command of English, yet among such speakers we have found those who employed EH type 0 Hindi as their speech pattern. The data also tells us that in the second

sub-period (2000-2010) the presence of EH type 3 varies between 11 and 32%, which means that at least 11% of speakers per year did not find investment in their Hindi proficiency needed and continued to speak in bilingual mode year after year.[204] We can speculate that the provision of simultaneous translation at any moment supports such behavior to an extent, as speakers can rely on translators to make their speeches monolingual for all those who find it difficult to follow their speech pattern because of the English or Hindi elements in it.

The exposure to education in English certainly plays a significant role in language behavior, as does probably exposure to English in general and then to English in Lok Sabha. That perhaps can explain why approximately 40% of analyzed speakers employed EH type 2 and 3, which we can also interpret as examples of bilingual mode of speech (Grosjean 2001, 2011). Another part of the answer probably lies in the symbolical value of English and Hindi use and the identity roles and statuses correlated with those. That might also explain why Hindi-belt speakers in their speeches have English elements. However, despite the EH interference, speakers from Hindi-belt states can be in general described as more versed in Hindi against speakers from other regions, as a small percentage of analyzed speakers from those states employed EH type 3 as a dominant strategy.

Social changes of larger scale could have also influenced language behavior of MPs at certain times. Thus, data shows very high activity of Hindi-belt speakers in 60's, the reasons for which might be related to discussions on the installment of Hindi as an official language in all states and the debate on the role of English in India. We can speculate that Hindi speakers from southern and eastern Indian states in the same period were more active for the same reason. However, when the decision on the matter of official languages (see Appendix 2.1.) was reached, it might be that the symbolic value of Hindi had disappeared, assuming that at least some of the speakers had been reelected into the next Lok Sabha. The 1990's show a different trend, which coincides with the economic change which has had since then very big impact on many, if not all, strata of Indian society in multiple manners. Within the Lok Sabha, the economic liberalization was followed by identity politics (Shankar and Rodrigues 2011: 194) which opened the door for a more-local oriented viewpoints within political groups:

> "The ruling coalition that was put together in the 1996 Parliament was an assemblage of regional voices with the crumbling fortunes of the Congress, while the BJP failed to secure power beyond a few days, in spite of making major gains. This assemblage of plural identities was manifest not merely in language but also in dress, food habits, and modes of life. For example, Deve Gowda who was chosen as the Prime Minister by the United Front coalition continued to wear his native dress, ate ragi, and consciously defended his mode of

---

[204] It would be interesting to know whether and if not then why not, speakers take advantage of published technical dictionaries that contain vocabulary that appears on many occasions in parliamentary discussions.

life. The same could be said about Mulayam Singh Yadav, Lalu Prasad, and other prominent figures in the House. Some of them like Deve Gowda even dared to speak Hindi that was far from the 'standard' version that protagonists of Hindi upheld in 1950s. But the very confidence to speak in Hindi denoted the confidence that regional identities had acquired in 1990s."

In the sphere of language use, 1990's opened the door for the grand return of English onto the political scene, liberated from the heritage of the colonial language (Shankar and Rodrigues 2011: 195):

"There was also a broader context in which this Parliament came to operate and this broader context was made of the globalization and liberalization drive. On the back of these policy shifts, English, largely dislocated from its cultural anchor and encompassing diverse usages and expressions, became very important. While this was the case in many parts of the world, it was more so in India where English became the great unifying bond of the burgeoning middle classes. The regional languages and their highly famished cultures could hardly stand up to the invasion of English in its second avatar. However, this did not pose a moral problem to the new peddlers of English. Many of them simultaneously laid claim to multiple and differentiated linguistic belonging. Language conflicts came to be profoundly re-articulated in the process in the 1990s."

The reactions on such social developments were not always favorable for English. Some of those reactions might be partially visible in the results as there was sudden and notable increase of Hindi speakers from the outside of Hindi-belt in that period. Those new Hindi speakers mostly came from the western coastal states, particularly from Maharashtra (see Maps in Appendix 4.2.). At the same time, the number of analyzed Hindi speakers affiliated to BJP,[205] a right-wing party, rose as well. If we take into consideration the public's association of BJP in the Maharashtra and southern states with the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) and alike organizations usually referred to as Sangh Parivar, it seems that perhaps at least one fraction of Hindi speakers in the Lok Sabha identifies Hindi as Indian and English as a foreign language. If it is so, the speakers who have entered Lok Sabha with the 1990 and afterwards or had had since altered their language behavior, might belong to the group of EH type 0 and 1. At this moment, such conclusions ought to be perceived mostly as interesting topics for further detailed research in the outlined direction rather than as solid statements. Particularly so, since such language behavior, according to the results, is not exclusive for the right-wing parties, as members of socialist and communist parties show similar tendencies. In that sense, exhibited language behavior could also be a result of reaction to globalization as such.

---

[205] BJP has had a majority in Lok Sabha elections in 1996 (29.7%), in 1998 (33.5%) as well as in 1999 (33.5%) and in 2004 elections (25.4%) (Shankar and Rodrigues 2011: 151-155).

If exposure to English indeed influences speech patterns of MPs, we may state that speakers are prone to peer-pressure or situation-pressure in general. However, the assumption that younger MPs would be the carriers of particular EH type was proved incorrect. The Lok Sabha data suggests that the social dominance is associated with elder members, i.e. those aged 46 to 65 set the rules of the dominant speech pattern among analyzed speakers. If it is so, it might suggest that this very age group could be perceived even outside Lok Sabha, among the voters, as a model for desired speech patterns. However, at this point it might be important to note that the contemporary Indian society is very young, with the majority of citizens under 21 (47.9% according to 2001 census). According to the same census, the next most populous age group is 25 to 44 years old (27.6%). This is important since the question of peer- and situation-pressure can then be raised from the opposite angle. We could ask whether the dominant speakers, aged 46-65, adopt their language behavior to the average voter's age and his/her idea of successful code of communication.

Education wise, the assumption that the higher level of education means that Hindi speakers are more prone to EH types 2 and 3 than to EH 0 and EH 1 has been proved generally wrong, even if EH type 3 is present in larger percentage in patterns of Hindi speakers with secondary education (7%), i.e. tertiary education (20%). EH types 0, 1 and 2 generally have similar distribution, regardless of the education level. Nevertheless, majority of analyzed speakers in general and particularly those in the age group 46-65 were highly educated and by profession advocates, social workers, journalists etc. Thus, we could speculate that the level of education does matter as that particular level of education is correlated with good English skills, as already mentioned. As majority of analyzed Hindi speakers shares tendency to bilingual mode of speech, it could be assumed that their level of education influences their speech patterns. If it is so, than even more interesting is the fact that approximately 32% of tertiary-degree holders, out of 1207 speakers with such degree, used Hindi without visible interferences from English. However, it is important to note that neither educational level nor regional affiliation signal clearly whether speaker will opt for Hindi with interference of EH type 0 or EH types 1 to 3.

To summarize, the analyzed Hindi speakers in the Lok Sabha present a continuum of speech patterns or at least a group with two different attitudes towards the language in general and Hindi in particular:
1. those who support speech in separate language code, Hindi or English,
2. those who support Hindi speech with transference of English elements.

Analysis suggests that language behavior cannot be ascribed to low educational level and in most cases also not to unfamiliarity with everyday Hindi as the biggest segment of analyzed Hindi speakers comes from Hindi states. Thus, one wonders whether language behavior implies language attitudes and speaker's association of particular language behavior with social prestige. Another interesting question is, of course, whether geographical position on the subcontinent or the information on one's mother tongue tells us a lot about one's language behavior in Lok Sabha. As we have seen, many other factors, such as language medium in school, choice of profession etc. could also be important influences. From the analysis, we unfortunately cannot learn about the opinions that speakers themselves, other MPs or public have on the analyzed language behavior. Since Parliament is public institution and highly visible in public space, its members with their language patterns could be perceived as potential influencers in the larger community. Hence, in the next chapter we will discuss the nature of possible relations between analyzed language behavior in LS and what it could mean for standardized Hindi and language policy in India.

<div align="center">

Chapter 6:

Final remarks and further questions

</div>

6.1. Analyzed material and questions it raises

We have already seen in Chapters 4 and 5 how the data on EH interference can be analyzed from the linguistic and socio-linguistic aspect. It is clear that the EH interference in Lok Sabha (LS) has occurred and how (Chapter 4), as well as that the various features of it (EH type 0, 1, 2 or 3) have been generated by individual Hindi speakers of various backgrounds (Chapter 5). In Chapter 3 we have also seen the status accorded officially to English and Hindi in different areas concerning public communication, from administration and legislature to media and education as well as in the LS. In these final pages, we will address several questions that arise from the analyzed material, all of which are related to conclusions which one can draw from everything thus far shown. The questions I find relevant relate to two separate aspects of linguistics, one of which is the philosophy of language while the other concerns socio-linguistics and questions of standardization and identity.

6.1.1. Language contact and new languages?

In the case of the first aspect, the analyzed data is interesting as it makes one wonder about the structure of a language as such and its boundaries. As such, those questions would arise from any topic related to language contact and are not specific to the particular material discussed in this thesis. Nevertheless, such questions are equally important as they push the mind to wonder about the conditions necessary for a language contact to produce a new language, for example. We do not have a new language in case of language contact in the Parliament even though some speakers have created interesting combinations of two codes.[206] Yet it makes one wonder at what moment a combination of two codes becomes a new code.

In the same manner, it is important to ask whether abstraction of speech patterns found in individual speakers does indeed indicate speech patterns and abstract rules followed by all speakers of one code. As Pandit (1986) had pointed out, work with corpus always includes a

---

[206] Pandit (1986) would perhaps disagree on this.

chance that something was not observed but the same does not mean that it is not theoretically possible or even used by certain speakers. Then the question is how many speakers should one interview and analyze to decipher generally accepted rules of code mixing and code switching for English and Hindi? How many theoretical possibilities there are which speakers in communication act will never employ? Which conditions determine employment of particular combination? How a speaker does chose among them? There is also the question on qualities that the analyzed speakers should possess to make the abstraction of rules for code-combinations accurate? One cannot but wonder which aspects of speakers' speech patterns can be abstracted?

Perhaps Matras's continuum (2009) indicates the more fruitful way of looking at the phenomena. It does tell us that language behavior particularly that of bilingual speakers is a complex issue as all bilingual speakers do not adopt same strategies when they employ bilingual mode (Grosjean 2011). That offers several more interesting questions in my opinion: 1) should we assume that all monolingual speakers adopt "same" strategies in monolingual mode, 2) if not, are those strategies in any way comparable with the strategies used by speakers in bilingual mode, 3) is it possible to theoretically predict further differentiations within those strategies. Perhaps that way we may be able to tell what type of speaker's strategies are necessary to make a new code out of two existing ones.

6.1.2. Why do Hindi speakers use English elements in Lok Sabha?

Next to philosophical questions, a more specific set of questions related to Hindi, English and the environment in which they co-exist also arises from analyzed data. Thus, one could ask why the speakers in LS have decided to incorporate English elements in their speech, if it is of course the question of deliberate purposeful communication technique.

If we look at the language rules adopted by LS, it becomes visible that they probably stipulate monolingual use of language, i.e. speaking and writing in either Hindi or English, or any third language. If we also remind ourselves of the fact that the simultaneous translation is available at any moment in either Hindi or English, it becomes clear that communication strategies employed by eH speakers in LS do not take into consideration that element. Instead, many of them seem to choose to address their colleagues in eH, a bilingual mode that incorporates both languages to an extent at any given moment. This is particularly true of speakers whose speech pattern falls into categories EH 3, EH 1;3 or EH 2;3. The analysis of social factors showed that for many analyzed speakers one could assume that they have been exposed to English in education, particularly tertiary education. For those hailing from states

in which Hindi is the official language, one could also assume that they have been exposed to Hindi in education and / or in their everyday surroundings and therefore monolingual Hindi mode should not be a problem for them. However, we have seen in LaDousa's (2014) study that although Hindi is the first language of many inhabitants of Varanasi in Uttar Pradesh, that question of education and Hindi/language is much more complex and not entirely dependent on regional placement in India.

Keeping all that in mind, we can then ask ourselves why speakers, particularly eH speakers, choose to employ that particular bilingual mode, instead of monolingual mode, either Hindi or English. We have seen that either monolingual mode is suitable to the situation, hence, it cannot be said that the speakers were oppressed in any way to employ eH variety. Similarly, we have also seen that a number of speakers manage to communicate in Hindi with no visible transference of English elements. From all of the above, it seems probable to assume that speakers use eH speech to achieve or confirm particular extra-linguistic feature. If we follow that assumption there are several more questions that should be considered in the process of looking for the answer:

1) Does language behavior in Lok Sabha mirror the official status accorded to languages in different areas of public communication?

2) Does language behavior seen in Lok Sabha communicate anything about standardized variety of Hindi?

3) How does language behavior in LS correlate with Sanskrit and English as DRLs in Indian subcontinent?

4) What does language behavior in LS tell us, if anything, about the prestige of analyzed language varieties?

5) Finally, what conclusions can we draw on language policy in India from analyzed data?

6.1.2.1. Official status of languages and LS data

The first question that the analyzed data raises is whether it can tell us anything about distribution of official languages in public communication and the correlation of such distribution and the official status assigned to languages. As we have seen in some of the previous chapters, use of Hindi and English in Lok Sabha is officially allowed, as is the use of a number of other languages. All the languages that the rules officially allow in the debates are also official languages in one or several states in India as we have seen in Chapter 3. Hence, their use in LS is not an exception and we can argue that LS data mirrors official statuses of languages in India.

The LS rules however, do not mention alternate use of two codes in the same discourse by the same speaker in examples such as EH 3, EH 1;3, EH 2;3. More importantly, rules do not mention whether Hindi designates use of standardized Hindi, in which case we could ask, which particular aspect of standardized Hindi should be used, i.e. does EH 1 and EH 2 also fall in the category of standardized Hindi. At the same time, the rules also do not mention which variety of English should be used, just as they do not define whether use of Hindi dialects is still considered use of Hindi. The LS data does tell us is that use of English dominates in Lok Sabha as a public environment, whereas many of analyzed Hindi speakers show different proportion of English elements in their speech patterns. If we go back to the claim that LS data mirrors official statuses of languages in India we could ask ourselves whether the use of languages, i.e. the speech patterns, in LS data also mirror elsewhere. In other words the question is would the proportion of English and Hindi be elsewhere similar to that in Lok Sabha and also would the characteristics of Hindi be similar to those in LS data.

Finally we could ask whether presence of English elements in Hindi in LS data confirms that English has a dominant position today in Indian sociolinguistic environment which could be then compared to that of Sanskrit in previous periods. That way we ask whether English is the new Sanskrit today in the Sanskrit culture (Pollock 2006), i.e. in Sanskritic civilization (Matišić 1984). To claim something like that with certainty a series of experiments would be required to compare language behavior in changed / alternate environments outside of LS to get a broader picture. Such experiments are beyond the scope of this thesis.

6.1.2.2. Standardized Hindi and LS data

The second question is whether the analyzed data tells us anything about standardized Hindi. If we assume that standardized language varieties are used in public communication and public environments such as Lok Sabha, first we should ask what features distinguish standardized Hindi from other Hindi varieties. According to Wessler (2014: 74), standardized Hindi is a Sanskritized variety of Hindi in which Sanskrit is considered a resource for modern terminology. Wessler also states that article 351 of the Constitution has often been interpreted as the green signal for Sanskrit neologisms in Hindi in order to "eliminate the Perso-Arabic terminology that forms part of 'the composite culture' (Wessler 2014: 74-75). LaDousa (2014) mentioned Sanskritized Hindi as *śuddh Hindi* that can be found in Hindi-medium schools and textbooks, and thus it would seem that standardized Hindi is equal to Sanskritized Hindi as Wessler (2014) also assumed. McGregor (1987: xi-xii) also mentions in the introduction to Hindi grammar Sanskrit as a sign of more formal language, while Persian and

Arabic loanwords are seen as signs of more colloquial language. Sources, thus, mention Sanskrit as important asset for the standardization of Hindi. In either case, English is not mentioned (McGregor 1987), or it is mentioned in opposition to Hindi (Wessler 2014).

Khubchandani (1997), however, discusses relation between standardized Hindi and English in a slightly different manner. In his analysis of Hindi and Urdu, Khubchandani (1997: 143-144) identifies three sociocultural levels of elegance which differ in the presence / absence of borrowings from Sanskrit, Persian and English. Thus all three DRLs of the subcontinent, i.e. dominant language resources, are present in his presentation of Hindi, i.e. Urdu, and have their place in the modern language environment in highbrow (Sanskrit and Persian),[207] middlebrow (Sanskrit and Persian versus English) and lowbrow (no bias toward DRLs) variety of a language. Khubchandani's analysis shows language space as a complex prism of which standard variety is just a segment towards which speakers reach from different points and angles on that prism. Thus, each speaker carries around his / her own system of hierarchy within the language sphere, labeling its segments as suitable for oral and written communication, for formal and casual communication, as modern or old-fashioned, or as a language suitable for urban and rural communication or for young and old speakers. With such approach, the first assumption that the researcher has to abandon is the monolithic perception of standardized language. For that reason, it is important to notice that Khubchandani (1997: 143) mentioned use of English loanwords in middlebrow Hindi and Urdu:

> "Elegant-casual Hindi-Urdu leans heavily on Western languages, particularly English, in preference to the indigenous. With the increasing impact of urbanization and teachnologization on Indian society the Anglicized Hindi or Urdu has been gaining popularity among the educated upper middle class along with the frequent code-switching between Hindi-Urdu and English."

Several things are noticeable here: 1) speakers who use English elements in Hindi are educated, 2) use of English elements produces an effect of casual elegance, 3) this sociocultural level is present in public communication in number of fields according to Khubchandani (1997: 143) i.e. in "popular literature, songs, films, theatre, mass communication, and so on." From Khubchandani's description it seems that standardized variety of Hindi consists of two segments: presence of Sanskrit as well as of English elements in contrast to lowbrow Hindi which Khubchandani (1997: 144) defines as

> "Casual Hindi-Urdu has no specific bias in favour of Sanskrit, Perso-Arabic, or English. It is evaluated as the substandard speech of uneducated urban speakers and is labeled 'bazaar Hindusthani'. Its written usage is rather infrequent, except in detective fiction and cheap publications."

---

[207] Persian is important for Urdu and Sanskrit for Hindi.

If middlebrow Hindi is the variety generally found in public sphere,[208] then English borrowings constitute an important part of modern standardized Hindi that have been thus far mostly ignored as such. If we argue that:

1) standardized variety of any language is the complex variety equipped to satisfy various needs of speakers in numerous contexts, ergo it cannot be imagined as a monolithic unified structure;

2) English borrowings can be observed in public space in written and oral form (media, names of institutions, literary work, on-line communication etc.),

one could assume that the use of English elements in Hindi speech pattern could still be referred to as standardized Hindi. This would mean that all analyzed Hindi speakers in LS spoke in standardized Hindi but chose different features available in it.

Yet another conclusion is also possible. If we assume that Khubchandani's analysis does not refer to standardized Hindi, hence that English elements are not part of standardized Hindi variety, it would mean that at least some of analyzed Hindi speakers have failed in their use of standardized Hindi in Lok Sabha since English elements appear in their speech patterns. The question is then how do we mark use of English elements in other public spaces mentioned by Khubchandani (1997) and also by Pandit (1986)?

Thus, there are two important questions that analysis of LS data provides:

1) Do we place entirety of eH speech found in LS (EH 1 to EH 3, particularly EH 1;3 and EH 2;3) under middlebrow Hindi as Khubchandani does or do we in some cases talk of Hindi used in monolingual/ bilingual mode? Hence, the question is whether there is a boundary which once crossed means that the speaker is not using only standardized Hindi but standardized Hindi in combination with English?

2) If English elements should be considered standardized Hindi usage, why are descriptions of standardized Hindi void of them?

If we accept that Englishized Hindi is a form of standardized Hindi, as already mentioned, inclusion of this standardized variety in the description of standardized Hindi is yet to occur. The overview of several grammars shows that the extent of EH interference as visible in the Lok Sabha data is not considered yet in descriptions of standardized Hindi. Thus, I did not find any description of borrowed English verbs and their verbalization in Hindi in any of the grammars I had consulted. Likewise, although it is possible to find English insertions in Hindi

---

[208] Highbrow variety is, according to Khubchandani (1997: 143) reserved for "urban contexts of power and elegance, particularly in pedantic and ornate discourse, oratory, and religious sermons." The question is then how to interpret appearance of *śuddh Hindi* in schools and textbooks of which LaDousa (2014) speaks.

dictionaries, their extent in the LS data, for example, is far greater and more varied than the data found in dictionaries. The data and other sources, thus, seem to tell us that standardized Hindi is still predominantly thought of as Sanskritized Hindi by authors of dictionaries and grammars. How, then, do we explain the presence of Englishized Hindi in and outside of LS? In other words, where do Hindi speakers learn to use English elements in Hindi and why?

6.1.2.3. Sanskrit culture and LS data

The third question is focused on the relation between language behavior in the LS and English and Sanskrit as DRLs for Hindi.[209] If we look only at the LS data, it is difficult to argue to what extent Sanskrit and English should be perceived as DRLs for Hindi. It is difficult to say which language ensures more prestige for Hindi speaker in general and, hence, is more relevant for the standardization of Hindi.

As we have seen in previous pages a standardized language is a complex entity. As such, it is defined in dictionaries and grammars, but its description is then verified through employment in public communication and use of Hindi as a tool in a range of situations. Thus one would have to take into account a number of samples of oral and written communication in Hindi across variety of situations to determine the relation of Sanskrit and English for modern contemporary Hindi in total.

If we look at Hindi as described in grammars, the dominant DRL for Hindi is Sanskrit. It was chosen deliberately as such in the 19th century when standardization processes for modern Indian languages were set in motion. In opposition, Persian heritage was not chosen to be included in the standardized variety of Hindi but had been passed on to Urdu.[210] Thus śuddh Hindi today shows signs of that historic decision, even though political power on the subcontinent in that period was already being related with English language.

However, if we approach the topic of DRLs with the LS data, one could temporarily claim that based on the statistical occurrence of Hindi speakers with English elements in their speech patterns, it appears that eH ensures more prestige in such environment, ergo that English is if not dominant then important DRL for Hindi today.

But as we try to reach a final conclusion, one should also consider generations of students that have finished their education in Hindi medium schools exposed to standardized Hindi that LaDousa (2014) describes and that confirms Sanskrit as DRL for Hindi today. Since they have learned it as such, those students probably use Sanskritized Hindi in their communication. But what if they do not? If we assume that all analyzed speakers were

---

[209] See also Appendixes 2.2. and 2.3. on Sanskrit and Persian as DRLs.
[210] See Appendix 2.1.

exposed to Hindi based on Sanskrit as DRL, when did they and why switch to Hindi based on English as DRL? We could abstract the questions as following:

1) What is the relation of Sanskrit and English in modern Hindi?

2) Are they mutually excluding each other or both can co-exist?

3) If both can co-exist together, how can it be described?

Just to remind ourselves, LS data is recorded and preserved in video format as well as edited and published for audience. It can also be accessed online on the Parliament's website. In the video format and online it is available in the original format and exposes language behavior of MPs as it occurred. If we think about readers/listeners of LS data and keep in mind Sanskrit and English as DRLs for Hindi, we could ask who the audience who understands those speeches is,[211] and how do they perceive roles of English and Sanskrit in the standardization of Hindi.

6.1.2.4. Language prestige and LS data

The main question here is perhaps whether the use of Sanskritized Hindi excludes the use of Englishized Hindi or both varieties can co-exist in use within the same discourse. As we have already seen, Sanskrit plays an important role in definition of Hindi as standardized language as a valuable resource and a model for lexical items in modern Indian languages. The question one has to ask is then does presence of Sanskrit as a resource and a model exclude other resources, such as English. If so, why, when and where?

That leads us again to the question of deliberate usage of particular elements in one's speech. As the parliament sessions take place in the capital city and membership in parliament is accompanied with a certain level of prestige, it could be speculated that English elements in speech patterns mirror speaker's wish to be perceived as modern and successful. If we look at the data and keep in mind Khubchandani's analysis (1997), it would appear that many analyzed Hindi speakers in LS wished to be popular and that their usage of English elements shows that they are educated. But then what do we do with LS data on educated speakers who used EH type 0 as a strategy? Would we say that they spoke in lowbrow Hindi (Khubchandani 1997) or that something else occurred? As we have seen in Chapter 5, speakers with EH 0 speech pattern neither are necessarily uneducated individuals nor can their speech be categorized as 'bazaar Hindusthani'. Thus I would argue that their Hindi still falls in the category of standardized Hindi, but it bears no visible traits of English.

---

[211] Another important factor to keep in mind is that the audience outside of LS does not have privilege of simultaneous translation at their disposal.

Before any final answer is offered one should consider that it is Hindi speakers who use English elements in their speech patterns, whereas English speakers in theory do not insert Hindi elements in theirs. The question is then do speakers use English elements deliberately, i.e. do they choose to use English elements instead of Sanskrit elements or it is a question of not knowing indigenous equivalents? Is the presence of English elements in Hindi a question of language prestige or not? If it is not, then what is it? If it is a question of language prestige, what does it tell us about Indian socio-linguistic environment?

6.1.2.5. Language policy and LS data

The final question concerns the language policy in the light of analyzed data. If we look at the data, we see English elements present in Hindi. If we look at descriptions of standardized Hindi, we see that English elements are not usually included in them. Such state of affairs leads one to the opinion that at least two Hindi language policies exist, one overt and the other one covert (Trudgill 1974 and later). Trudgill showed that differentiation between 'overt' and 'covert' prestige explains well the preferences of different social classes, or genders for that matter, for specific linguistic varieties. However, we could also think of DRLs as carriers of overt and covert prestige.

In case of Hindi, on one side, there is Sanskrit, with official support, and hence Sanskritized Hindi or *śuddh Hindi.* As this type of Hindi is officially encouraged it represents overt language policy. On the other side, there is English, whose prestigious position in Indian socio-linguistic environment is visible not just in Hindi but in other languages, mostly but not solely in oral speech, however its influence is not supported by institutions that develop standardized Hindi,[212] hence it would represent covert language policy.

We could argue that the two language policy models thus help create Sanskritized Hindi (sH) on one side and Englishized, i.e. Englishized Hindi (eH) on the other side.[213] The question is how did this happen, where is it visible and how?

If we are to judge from the data collected in LS, it seems plausible that at least one segment of Hindi speakers considers English and not Sanskrit the dominant DRL for Hindi at the moment. On one side, it can be said that due to a language's association with success, wealth and technological novelties, the attention of speakers is constantly drawn from the less prestigious variety to the more prestigious one in various manners (LaDousa 2014). Consequently, the more affluent members of a society start to invest into the new prestigious language. This is what, we can argue, had occurred with the arrival of English on the Indian subcontinent.

---

[212] An important question is who funds the use and development of English in India.
[213] The existence of Persianized Hindi is for the moment left aside.

On the other side, the Indian socio-linguistic environment saw the development of particular language policy model from 19th century onward. The political decisions prior to Indian independence had supported the model that aimed to develop standardized varieties for a number of modern Indian languages. The affluent members of the Indian society, politicians and intelligentsia, were also keen on the idea of national language, administrative boundaries based on language, etc. since those ideas were intertwined with the political goal of an independent India, Indian nationalism and nationhood. For that reason standardized Hindi was based on Sanskrit as DRL. In light of that Department of Official Language and other institutions for the development and protection of Hindi support Sanskritized Hindi, yet, at some moment after independence, Department of Official Language has issued a permission to government offices to substitute difficult Sanskrit words with English words to make official texts more user-friendly.

Such state of affairs suggests that Department of Official Language, which oversees the use of Hindi in official governmental documents, supports the use of Sanskritized Hindi as the variety of standardized Hindi. However, Department also realized that the use of Sanskrit words does not help in communication, hence the decision to substitute difficult words in Hindi with English words was introduced. The reasons the Department of Official Language states for such recommendations are several but all of them revolve around the effort to make text understandable to common people. However, it is visible from the recommendation that text in standardized Hindi was difficult for people in the government offices as well because:

> "It has been observed that the letters etc. are drafted originally in English and then their Hindi translation is done according to requirements. As the result thereof the intent of the letter is not clear in its Hindi version and one is compelled to take recourse to its English version to understand the contents." (Office Memorandum 1994 in Compilation of orders regarding the use of Hindi, Government of India, Department of Official Language for official purposes of the union, 2007: 25).

We could argue two things from here: 1) translations were bad due to translator's fault, 2) translators used a lot of Sanskritized words and that made them unreadable. Perhaps the combination of two factors was what really happened, however above confirms existence of sH as a variety of Hindi developed for public communication in government offices. It also shows that the sH and eH are perhaps larger entities from Khubchandani's (1997) levels of elegance as they also bring out the question of Hindi's status today in India in comparison to the status of English. By status, I mean the status of a language in the eyes of its speakers as in a study conducted on language as a school medium by LaDousa (2014), and not the official status accorded to language varieties by the state. Those statuses look good on paper but do not tell us much about the use of languages in the community. Thus, the statuses accorded to

Hindi and English officially by state appear to be very clear. Yet the question is if those statuses are reflected in the language behavior of Hindi speakers.

Table 6.1. Publications of central and state governments in particular languages.[214]

Year	Language	Publications of central government	Publications of state governments
1960.	Hindi	23	26
	English	81	24
	Urdu	Not mentioned	Not mentioned
	Sanskrit	None	None
1970.	Hindi	33	48
	English	139	43
	Urdu	4	4
	Sanskrit	None	None
1980.	Hindi	50	68
	English	173	54
	Urdu	6	12
	Sanskrit	None	None
1990.	Hindi	74	77
	English	194	64
	Urdu	7	12
	Sanskrit	None	None
2000.	Hindi	86	94
	English	206	74
	Urdu	9	13
	Sanskrit	None	None
2009/10	Hindi	8	0
	English	14	2
	Urdu	4	1
	Sanskrit	None	None

If we consider the directive to English-Hindi translators issued by the Department for Official Language to make official Hindi texts more 'readable' to an average Hindi speaker by inserting English equivalents instead of Sanskrit-derived words, the language behavior of speakers in LS appears to be more than just a coincidence, particularly since the LS is a type of public space in which subjects of debates are known, and the technical setup allows one to

---

[214] Table compilation source: see footnote no. 216.

speak in Hindi without EH interference. Yet, the reiteration of topics and the presence of same speakers for a long period, up to five years, in the same environment appear not to affect behavior of Hindi speakers in the Lok Sabha, i.e. we can not claim that the presence of English elements in Hindi falls down because Hindi speakers get used to topics or because they acquire new Hindi vocabulary. What might, hover, influence it is the attitude which Sadana (2012: 14) has called '*to have*' English as opposed to '*to know English*'. If we look at it from her perspective, the eH speech can be understood as publicly displayed socio-linguistic good. Similarly, LaDousa's study (2014) on Varanasi can be interpreted as a confirmation of such attitude: to learn i.e. to have '*good*' English is to ascertain better chances for one's future in contemporary Indian society. LaDousa's study also implies that for an Indian citizen of a particular profile and social status learning in/of English offers more in various ways than learning in/of Indian languages. This is in line with Abbi's (2009: 306) observation on the reduced number of languages as mediums and also with the shift in speakers' identification with particular languages, as they stopped using them or reduced their usage.[215]

The shift in socio-linguistic identity that Abbi refers to is relevant as it includes various processes and results of linguistic interference in India, including EH interference. It is also linked with the socio-linguistic factors that influence such language behavior and, as such, should not be dismissed on the reasoning that Abbi speaks of identity loss/shift in tribal and other minor languages that have not been standardized.

In other words, we could assume that eH speech mirrors the position accorded to Hindi and English in the society and as such involves speaker's and listener's understanding of extra-linguistic implications which we may call structuring of one's identity and social status through language behavior. In that sense, the remarks by Shankar and Rodrigues (2011: 202) on parliamentary members who speak in Hindi in the Parliament but have stakes in educational institutions which promote English as the medium of education or send their own children to English medium schools are also relevant when one considers the social position of Hindi and English in India. Next to it, number of publications that central and state governments (see Table 6.1)[216] issue in particular languages adds up to the general perception

---

[215] Abbi (2009: 307) refers to the linguistic identity shift caused by the power associated with a particular language variety: "We witness, then, two kinds of submerging identities, one at the state level, when speakers of a language, in the absence of their language being recognized for education purposes, try to identify themselves with the dominant regional language speakers and at best retain their respective tongues only in the home domain. The second type of submerging identity is more serious than the previous one, as it exists at the level of the home domain, where children are discouraged and, at times, punished for using their mother tongues."

[216] The numbers expressed in the Table 6.1 drop significantly for the year 2009/10 because of the unavailability of data. According to the *54th Annual report of the register of newspapers for India under the Press of*

of a language as valuable social asset. If we consider all of the above together, existence of Sanskritized and Englishized Hindi can perhaps be best explained as a clash in language behavior patterns. The covert Hindi language policy supposes that the public space should incorporate elements of relevant DRL at a moment, while the overt Hindi language policy has a fixed DRL, adopted as a DRL in 19th century. The difference between eH and sH usage thus suggests that Hindi language behavior patterns, and perhaps those of entire Indian socio-linguistic environment, are centered on the notion of DRL as a constant element but with changeable features. Once the social conditions change, the language behavior's features change as well, following, however, the same pattern visible in Chaudhary's data (2009) which suggests that the status of Sanskrit and Persian in previous centuries has resulted in similar language behavior we have seen in the LS. In other words, Sanskrit and Persian were also used in bilingual mode or their lexemes have entered many texts as insertions. Important factor to bear in mind is that the economic and socio-political prestige and power in the framework of Sanskritic civilization (see Chapter 3) does not rely on statistical majority. Thus, although Sanskrit's and Persian's position in the Indian society in previous centuries was very high, speakers, i.e. users of those languages, related to government, religion and art, were always a minority among speakers and users of other languages in the subcontinent. If we look at the numbers that reveal statistical correlation between Hindi speakers and English speakers in India, or number of Hindi newspaper readers and English newspaper readers in India, the prestige lies not with the greater number, but quite contrary, with those who are outnumbered, as in the case of Sanskrit and Persian. In the context of LS, following that logic we could be drawn to the conclusion that since Hindi speakers and speakers in other Indian languages are a minority in Lok Sabha that the socio-political and economic prestige is related to their languages. However, Hindi speakers in LS show tendency to use English elements in Hindi speech, whereas English speakers do not try to use Hindi elements in English speech. Such state of affairs reveals that the advantage is with English speakers, i.e. analyzed Hindi speakers would like to be associated with the prestigious identity offered by English, and hence their speech patterns belong predominantly to eH speech.

The data, thus, shows that Hindi and English have complex relations. The arguments presented here show us that Sanskrit has to be included in the discussion on Hindi and English as well. From there, one then concludes that Sanskritic civilization is still a valid model that predicts language behavior of language users in India well. In case of Hindi, one has to

---

registration of books act, issued by Ministry of information and broadcasting, the publishers have stopped submitting their reports and statements over the years and thus the clear and correct picture of the contemporary situation cannot be acquired.

conclude that English and Sanskrit share the prestigious position of DRL in public space. In case of Lok Sabha, English as DRL prevails. The language pattern eH then questions the relevance of Sanskrit as DRL in at least one segment of Hindi public space today.

Hence, the discrepancy in covert and overt Hindi language policy today is not a case of theoretical dispute on the model, as the model comes from Sanskritic civilization (Matišić 1984) i.e. Sanskrit culture (Pollock 2006). The dispute is ideological as the question is whether Sanskrit or English suits the needs of contemporary users of standardized Hindi better. In other words, the question is what does Sanskrit offer to Hindi speakers and English does not, and vice versa. Of course, one could ask, and with a reason, whether or not the covert and overt language policy ever can be in agreement with each other or the discrepancy of the two is already inbuilt in their relation.

6.2. Summary of conclusions and open questions for further research

Some of the conclusions on linguistic as well as socio-linguistic analysis on EH interference have already been given in Chapters 3 and 4. However, here is the overview of main conclusions:

1. The linguistic analysis of data confirms the existence of particular language behavior, which we will continue to attribute to Sanskritic civilization.

2. The particular language behavior is governed by DRL language. DRLs change over the period, and their presence is mostly visible on the lexical level, as the new DRL takes over a number of lexemes that were previously under the influence of another DRL.

3. In the case of Hindi, there are three such DRLs, Sanskrit, Persian and English. English as a DRL governs the Hindi data in the Lok Sabha. Persian as a DRL had not been noticed in Hindi data, but the presence of Urdu in early years of the analyzed data does indicate probability of its presence. Sanskrit as DRL is active, one can assume, in written data in Lok Sabha more than in oral data.

4. If Khubchandani's levels (1997) are taken into consideration, English is relevant for standardized Hindi at some levels, both in oral and written communication. Therefore, it cannot, be eliminated from discussion on standardized Hindi or modern Hindi in general.

5. EH interference as a result of English interference in Hindi takes on several forms, which have been named EH type 0, 1, 2 and 3. They range from borrowing to code switching. Such range indicates the continuum mentioned by Matras (2009), which includes not just monolingual but bilingual speakers in the same domain.

6. EH represents a complex behavior that falls both in monolingual and bilingual mode of speech.

7. Statistically, the least preferred interference type in the data was EH type 3, which corresponds to code switching. However, EH type 3 has had over the period of 60 years the highest rate of growth and spread among the speakers analyzed in the data.

8. The least present elements in the EH interference were English adverbs and English prepositions. English pronouns have not been found in the analyzed data as an interfering element.

9. The most present elements in the EH interference were English nouns and English verbs. Attention had been given to the analysis of their insertion from English into Hindi and their features in the new Hindi environment.

10. It was also noticed that the highest number of analyzed speakers with elements of EH interference come from Hindi speaking regions.

11. The socio-linguistic analysis of data shows that majority of analyzed speakers with EH transference were well-educated men, mostly social and political workers, lawyers, aged 46-65 years.

12. The diachronic perspective says that the number of EH speakers as well as the quantity of noticeable EH elements rises. However, statistically, the percentage of such speakers in the Lok Sabha appears to be stable.

13. The eH speech as a language behavior aimed at achieving particular communicative goal suggests existence of at least two language policies in Hindi, one overt and one covert language policy.

14. The official language policy for Hindi or the overt Hindi policy supports the use and development of Sanskritized Hindi. In the analyzed data, the use of Englishized Hindi (eH) was, however, present. Englishized Hindi is also present in other types of public communication, including written communication.

Characteristics which Pollock (2006) identified as important for the influence of Sanskrit in previous era can be identified also as reasons for the presence of English in the Subcontinent (translocality, transethnicity, expressive power, stability of use). Such characteristics have created space for English to become an important language in public communication on the Subcontinent in various areas, from administration and legislature to media and education. In this thesis, we have also seen that it is present in political institutions such as Lok Sabha. Data collected on Hindi speakers in the LS shows that influence of English is present among Hindi speakers even when they have opportunity to speak freely in Hindi uninfluenced by English as the simultaneous translation is offered to all those who cannot follow their speech.

The analysis of LS data on EH interference opens many questions and offers several opportunities for further research in the sphere of language contact, socio-linguistic study of language policy, language behavior and language attitudes. Foremost, it offers opportunity for further analysis of similar data in other Hindi registers, written and oral, in order to discover elements that confirm or disprove some of the conclusions of this study. Thus, for example the further research on English *-s/-es* or analysis of English verbs in comparison to Persian verbs seems in order, as does the research of negation in Hindi from diachronic perspective and in the contemporary Englishized Hindi in other registers. Socio-linguistic research on correlation of social categories and language behavior could yield more results as well. Khubchandani's (1997) proposal of three socio-linguistic levels of elegance can also be further analyzed in various types of discourse from the perspective of language contact and DRLs. The relation between language behavior of contemporary Hindi speakers and Sanskritic civilization is another interesting topic that ought to be further analyzed for more detailed scientific insight.

This study also offers opportunity for similar studies in other modern Indian languages and their contact with English, for the same purpose, to confirm or disprove some of the conclusions through comparative analysis, in order to understand better both linguistic and socio-linguistic processes and results in contemporary Indian socio-linguistic environment. A coordinated work of several researchers could lead to a detailed analysis of English interference with various Indian languages. Another question, which now lays open, is the question of DRLs in Hindi and other Indian languages, in both historical and synchronic perspective. There is, for example, the question of DRL's phases, distribution etc. and their relations with Sanskritic civilization and Indian linguistic area.

From theoretic perspective, perhaps the most interesting question the study opens concerns the nature of language: whether or not the definition of language can be altered if we look at it from the perspective of language contact and language interference. The question is broad and permits research on the relation between speaker-communicative goal, on one side, and language structures, on the other side. Of course, it is already accepted that speakers influence language as *Parole* and hence it changes. The question that I see as relevant goes a bit further and asks about modifications language contact and interference might have on *Langue* as such.

All those questions will one day, hopefully, find their answers. Of course, there might also be issues presented partially through analyzed data that could be relevant and interesting for further study that I am unaware of. In discovering and raising such topics, I see the greatest potential of this work.

Appendix 1.1. Example of transcribed texts from the parliamentary debates

The Parliament debates are basically oral documents available in written form. Here are several excerpts from the debates to confirm that. Sections A have been transcribed by me and sections B have been uploaded on Parliament's official website in their own official transcription done *in situ.*

I. Excerpt 1:

Date: 22nd July 2008
Speaker: Omar Abdullah
Constituency: Srinagar

A. Excerpt 1 transcribed by me

Audio source: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xo-IVW15TKw

I am a Muslim, and I am an Indian. I see no distinction between the two. … (*Interruptions*) I see no reason why I, as a Muslim, have to fear a deal between India and the United States of America (USA). … (*Interruptions*) This is a deal between two countries. It is a deal between, we hope, two countries that in the future will be two equals. … (*Interruptions*) Sir, the enemies of Indian Muslims are not the Americans, and the enemies of the Indian Muslims are not 'deals' like this. The enemies of Indian Muslims are the same enemies that all the poor people of India face, poverty and hunger, unemployment, lack of development and the absence of a voice. It is that we are against, the effort being made to crush our voice. … (*Interruptions*) Sir, I am not a Member of the UPA, I am not a Member of the UPA, and I do not aspire the Membership of the UPA. But I am extremely unhappy with the way in which my friends in the Left have taken on this self-imposed position of being the certifiers of who is secular and who is not. … (*Interruptions*) Sir, until a few years ago, I was a part of the NDA and I was a Minister with them. The same Left people considered me as a political

untouchable, and they considered me an outcast because I was a part of the NDA. Today, the same Left people are telling me all secular Parties must unite with the BJP to bring down this Government. … (*Interruptions*) Sir, I made a mistake of standing with them once. On the question of Gujarat, I did not resign when my conscience told me to do so, and my conscience has still not forgiven me. I need not make the same mistake again. … (*Interruptions*) Āp ne amaranāth kī bāt karte ho, āp ne amaranāth kā ārop lagāyā, ...(*Interruptions*) āp ek jagah dikhāie, ek jagah dikhāie, jahāṃ par kisī kaśmīrī ne yātrā ke khilāf bāt kī ho, āp ek jagah dikāie jahāṃ kisī kaśmīrī ne kahā ki hameṃ yātrī nahīṃ cāhie, ek jagah dikhāie, jahāṃ yātriyoṃ ke ūpar hamlā huā ho. (*Interruptions*) hamārī zamīn kā muddā thā, ham apnī zamīn ke lie laṛe aur marte dam tak apnī zamīn ke lie laṛenge, lekin ham āpkī tarah firkāparst nahīṃ haiṃ... (*Interruptions*) ham āpkī tarah communal nahīṃ haiṃ. Ham masjid nahīṃ girāte aur mandir bhī nahīN girāte... (*Interruptions*) ek sau sāl se zyādā amaranāth kī yātrā vahāṃ caltī ā rahī hai aur jab tak kaśmīr meṃ musalmān haiṃ, śrīnagar meṃ āpkī yātrā caltī rahegī... (*Interruptions*)

Lekin maiṃ yah bāt dāve ke sāth kahnā cāhtā hūṃ ki in logoṃ kī tarah merī siyāsat badaltī nahīṃ hai, āj is taraf aur kal us taraf... (Interruptions) hamne secular forcec ke sāth hāth milāyā hai aur milāte raheṃge.The Jammu and Kashmir National Conference will vote to support the Motion moved by the Prime Minister.

B. Official recording of the speech

Source:

http://164.100.47.132/LssNew/Debates/textofdebatedetail.aspx?sdate=07/22/2008

I am a Muslim, and I am an Indian. I see no distinction between the two. … (*Interruptions*) I see no reason why I, as a Muslim, have to fear a deal between India and the United States of America (USA). … (*Interruptions*) This is a deal between two countries. It is a deal between, we hope, two countries that in the future will be two equals. … (*Interruptions*)

Sir, the enemies of Indian Muslims are not the Americans, and the enemies of the Indian Muslims are not 'deals' like this. The enemies of Indian Muslims are the same enemies that all the poor people of India face, namely, poverty and hunger, unemployment, lack of development and the absence of a voice. It is that we are against, namely, the effort being made to crush our voice. … (*Interruptions*)

I am not a Member of the UPA, and I do not aspire the Membership of the UPA. But I am extremely unhappy with the way in which my friends in the Left have taken on this self-imposed position of being the certifiers of who is secular and who is not. … (*Interruptions*)

Until a few years ago, I was a part of the NDA and I was a Minister with them. The same Left people considered me as a political untouchable, and they considered me an outcaste because I was a part of the NDA. Today, the same Left people are telling me that all secular Parties must unite with the BJP to bring down this Government. … (*Interruptions*)

I made a mistake of standing with them once. I did not resign on the question of Gujarat when my conscience told me to do so, and my conscience has still not forgiven me. I need not make the same mistake again. … (*Interruptions*)

आप लोग अमरनाथ की बात करते हो, आपने अमरनाथ का आरोप लगाया,…(व्यवधान) आप एक जगह दिखाइए, जहां पर दकसी कश्मीरी ने यात्रा के खखलाफ बात की हो, जहां दकसी कश्मीरी ने कहा हो दक हमें यात्री नहीं चादहए, जहां यादत्रयोां के ऊपर हमला हुआ हो।…(व्यवधान) हमारी जमीन का मुद्दा था, हम अपनी जमीन के दलए लडे और मरते िम तक अपनी जमीन के दलए लडेंगे, लेदकन हम आपकी तरह दफरकापरस्त नहीां हैं।…(व्यवधान) हम आपकी तरह कम्युनल नहीां हैं। हम मखिज़ि नहीां दगराते और मांदिर भी नहीां दगराते। …(व्यवधान) वहां एक सौ साल से ज्यािा अमरनाथ की यात्रा चलती आ रही है और जब तक कश्मीर में मुसलमान हैं, श्रीनगर और अमरनाथ में आपकी यात्रा चलती रहेगी। …(व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोिय, मैं यह बात िॏवे के साथ कहना चाहता हां दक इन लोगोां की तरह मेरी दसयासत बिलती नहीां है, आज इस तरफ और कल उस तरफ। …(व्यवधान) हमने सेक्यूलर फोसेस के साथ हाथ दमलाया है और दमलाते रहेंगे। The Jammu & Kashmir National Conference (J&KNC) will vote to support the Motion moved by the Prime Minister.

II. Excerpt 2

Date: 20.04.2010.

Speaker: Shashi Tharoor

Constituency: Thiruvananthapuram

A. Excerpt 2 transcribed by me

Audio source: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bm4--FzJ6ug

As I explained in my statement to the Lok Sabha on Friday, attempted to deliver in the Lok Sabha on Friday, and reiterated to the Prime Minister on Sunday, my conscience is clear and I know that I have done nothing improper or unethical, let alone illegal. Nonetheless, in view of the ongoing political controversy, I have no desire to be an embarrassment to the Government and believe that my departure at this stage will allow the Prime Minister and his Cabinet colleagues to focus on the great challenges facing our nation. Such a step is in the highest moral traditions of our democratic system and in keeping with the standards that I am sure we would all wish to uphold in our nation's public life.

B. Official recording of the speech

Source: http://164.100.47.132/newdebate/15/4/20042010/Fullday.pdf

As I explained in my statement to the Lok Sabha on Friday—which I attempted to deliver it in the Lok Sabha on Friday--and reiterated to the Prime Minister on Sunday, my conscience is clear and I know that I have done nothing improper or unethical, let alone illegal. Nonetheless, in view of the ongoing political controversy, I have no desire to be an embarrassment to the Government and believe that my departure at this stage will allow the Prime Minister and his Cabinet colleagues to focus on the great challenges facing our nation. Such a step is in the highest moral traditions of our democratic system and in keeping with the standards that I am sure we would all wish to uphold in our nation's public life.

III. Excerpt 3

Date: 3.12.2009.

Speaker: Varun Gandhi

Constituency: Pilibhit

A. Excerpt 3 transcribed by me

Audio source: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LGh5nzpxuEg

Madam Speaker, I'd like to ask the Honorable Minister, according to the Shankar Committee and the Kelkar Committee report the recommendations had been made that natural gas should be numerated in rupee prices. However, they still continue to be numerated in dollar prices where the dollar has been pegged at 40 rupees but in real terms it is 46 to 50 rupees. So on an average the Government is losing a margin of 6 to 10 rupees per unit to these large companies. I just want to ask the honorable Minister what the Government's policy is on this.

B. Official recording of the speech

Source: http://164.100.47.132/debatestext/15/III/0312.pdf

Madam Speaker, according to the Shankar Committee and the Kelkar Committee recommendations, natural gas should be numerated in rupee prices. However, they still continue to be numerated in dollar prices where the dollar has been pegged at Rs.40 but in real terms it is Rs.46 to Rs.50. So, on an average the Government is losing a margin of Rs.6 to Rs.10 per unit to these large companies. I just want to ask the hon. Minister about the Government's policy on this.

Appendix 1.2. Statistical information on collected data for the period 1950-2010

Table 1. Statistical information on collected data for the period 1950-1995.

Year and month	Total number of pages	Number of Hindi (H)/ Urdu (U) pages	Total number of members in Lok Sabha	Total number of Hindi (H)/ Urdu (U) speakers
1950, Provisional LS, 1.-14.08., 15.-30.11.	1201	98 (H), 35 (U)	299	24 (H), 6 (U)
1955, I. Lok Sabha, 22.-28.02.	316	90 (H)	499	55 (H)
1960, II. Lok Sabha, 8.-19.02.	2010	630 (H), 13 (U)	500	95 (H), 1 (U)
1965, III. Lok Sabha, 17.-22.02.	841	387 (H)	503	41 (H)
1970, IV. Lok Sabha, 26.08.-01.09.	1508	622 (H), 3 (U)	523	88 (H), 1 (U)
1975, V. Lok Sabha, 21.-30.07.	986	354 (H), 3 (U)	521	44 (H), 1 (U)
1980, VII. Lok Sabha, 11.-15.03.	1668	436 (H), 11 (U)	544	78 (H), 2 (U)
1985, VIII. Lok Sabha, 23.04.	516	92 (H)	544	15 (H)
1990, IX. Lok Sabha, 24.05., 07.09.	1240	406 (H)	529	67 (H)
1995, X. Lok Sabha, 5.05.	479	168 (H)	509/521/541[217]	35 (H)

---

[217] Information on number of members (seats) are not always unanimous, even when they are collected by the same author, such as Malhotra, an editor of several books on the history of Indian Parliament. Further, if the information comes from other sources, they sometimes do not correspond to the data supplied by Parliament.

Table 2. Statistical information on collected data for the period 2000-2010.

Year and month	Total number of pages	Number of Hindi pages	Total number of members in Lok Sabha	Total number of Hindi speakers
2000, XIII. Lok Sabha, 16.08., 24.04.	1622	603	543	85
2001, XIII. Lok Sabha, 23.03., 09.04.	1425	415		46
2002, XIII. Lok Sabha, 14.05., 21.11.	1193	394		69
2003, XIII. Lok Sabha, 24.07., 15.12.	1185	477		91
2004, XIV. Lok Sabha, 3.-4.06., 8.06., 16.-19.08., 26.08.	1056	422		148
2005, XIV. Lok Sabha, 20.04., 25.04., 29.04.	543	265	552	95
2006, XIV. Lok Sabha, 4.08., 23.08., 6.12., 18.12.	545	204		96
2007, XIV. Lok Sabha, 17.08., 23.08., 19.11., 22.11.	590	304		115
2008, XIV. Lok Sabha, 17.10., 20.-22.10.	517	126		49
2009, XV. Lok Sabha, 7.12., 11.12., 15.12.	664	408		84
2010, XV. Lok Sabha, 3.-6.05.	562	212		87

Appendix 2.1. Events relevant for the history of Hindi's language policy.

Following events and dates have been selected as relevant for decisions on language policy in India since 1800, i.e. since English became relevant in Indian socio-linguistic environment. Events follow development of language policy up to 1947 and after Independence.

1800. foundation of Fort William College in Calcutta

1813. East India Company Act: promotion of knowledge, improvement of literature, encouragement of learned natives of India

1822. *Miratul Akhbaar,* newspaper in Persian, started by Ram Mohan Roy in Calcutta

1826. *Oodunta Martand* (Rising Sun), the earliest known Hindi weekly journal, published in Calcutta

1829. Multilingual newspaper *Bangdoot* in Bengali, English, Hindi and Persian started by Ram Mohan Roy

1835. Macaulay's Minute on the Education; Mughal emperor Bahadur Shah II Zafar proclaims Urdu a court language

1837. Persian abolished and replaced by English and native vernaculars for administrative purposes; Urdu used in local courts as a lingua franca of Northern India; English reserved for the higher levels of administration

1854. Wood's Charter recognizes the need to introduce vernacular languages as a media of instruction in schools; English should be reserved for the secondary and higher education (colleges and universities)

1860. Hindi and Urdu both become media of instruction in government schools; Urdu, however, has a slightly different status than Hindi as it is used for official purposes and Hindi is not - students protest against Hindi classes

1868. *The Reflector*, journal published in English for 'persuading the educated people of the merit of Hindi' (Kluyev 1981: 84)

1872. The use of Nagari script allowed in Central Provinces, next to Perso-Arabic script

1893. foundation of Nagari Pracharini Sabha in Varanasi

1900. Nagari script becomes official in Northern India; its status is equated with that of Perso-Arabic script

1913. Resolution on the Educational Policy of the Government of India: need to establish vernacular schools, i.e. schools in Indian languages, from primary to secondary level

1917. Gandhi's Presidential Address at the second Gujarat Educational Conference at Broach: Hindi as a national language

1918. Hindi Sahitya Sammelan; foundation of Dakshina Bharat Hindi Prachar Sabha to improve Hindi literacy in southern parts of India

1920. first elections for the first Legislative Assembly; Congress boycotts elections; Congress accepts formation of administrative units in India on the language basis; once more vernacular, i.e. Indian languages are introduced as media of education after the decision was made for the first time in 1854.

1920.-1922. Non-cooperation with British government

1925. Indian National Congress, Kanpur session: regional offices should work in regional languages and All India Congress Committee in Hindi or Hindustani as much as possible

1927. establishment of Hindustani Akadmi

1937. Nehru in his essay *The Question of Language* extends his support to Hindustani as national language: it should be written in three scripts, one northern, one southern and Perso-Arabic as third

1938. Zakir Hussain Committee Report on education: "The proper teaching of the mother-tongue is the foundation of all education, without the capacity to speak effectively and to read and write correctly and lucidly, no one can develop precision of thought or clarity of ideas."

1949.-1962. Hindi lessons broadcasted on All India Radio

1950., 26.1. Constitution declared

1955. Preparation of Hindi courses for government employees; appointment of Official Language Commission (OLC)

1956. Central Education Recommendation Commission recommended the three-language formula; Official Language Commission rejected plea of Sanskrit Commission for the introduction of Sanskrit as national language; formation of language-based state borders; formulation of Eighth Schedule; Union Language Convention in Madras

1957. Madras, 1958. Calcutta. Two conventions held on official language. It was concluded that English should be retained indefinitely as official language and Constitution should be amended accordingly. Appointment of Parliamentary Committee to reconsider OLC's report; Parliament member Frank Anthony introduced a non-official resolution in the Lok Sabha to include English in the Eighth Schedule; the movement *English hatao* (Banish English) started by Lohia; Lok Sabha Secretariat published *Glossary of parliamentary, legal and administrative* terms with Hindi equivalents.

1958. Nehru's request to introduce Urdu as a language of education; All India Language Conference in Calcutta

1959. formation of Central Sanskrit Board, advisory body for the promotion and development of Sanskrit; Eighth Schedule becomes an amendment to Constitution

1962. Minister Reddy's suggestion to use same language in Hindi and Urdu radio broadcast opposed - Reddy stepped down as minister

1963. *Official Language Act* (OLA); amended in 1967.

1965. expiry of official 15-year-long period for the complete introduction of Hindi as official language on all-India-level

1967. Sindhi added to Eighth Schedule

1968. use of Hindi in addition to English in treaties and agreements advised; the *Official Language Resolution*: knowledge of Hindi or English compulsory for Union services and posts; all languages of Eighth Schedule recognized as alternative examination mediums for the All India and higher central services; government's resolution on national policy in education

1970. Central Sanskrit Board renamed as Kendriya Sanskrit Parishad

1971. first Census report in which languages with less than 10 000 speakers are omitted from the report; set up of the Central Translation Bureau for the translation of official forms, manuals, etc., Bureau also develops courses for translation training

1975. Department of Official Language established

1976. *Official Language Rules* (OLR) regulate communication of government offices on national level (communication between union and states); formation of the Parliament's Committee on Official Language to supervise progress in the implementation of OLA and OLR, and submit reports to President; various other committees have been set up on the level of state, ministry and town for the same purpose

1977. first speech in Hindi in General Assemby of United Nations by Atal Bihari Vajpayee, foreign minister of India

1979. use of Hindi in international conferences and functions recommended

1983. formation of Techical Cell within the Department of Official Language for the development of Hindi tools for computers

1985. Establishement of Kendriya Hindi Prašikšan Sansthan, the Hindi office within the Department of Official Language; purpose: to teach Hindi typewriting and stenography

1986./1987. establishment of Indira Gandhi Rajbhaša Awards Scheme for government's employees for the successful implementation of Official Language Policy or for writing books in Hindi; Rajiv Gandhi Awards Scheme established - open for all Indian citizens for writing books in Hindi

1989. Urdu proclaimed second official language of Uttar Pradesh

1990. 99 committees on education in various forms formed till this year (Aggarwal 1991)

1991. economic liberalization

1992. addition of Konkani, Manipuri and Nepali to the Eighth Schedule

1998. rules for the use of Hindi in international conferences and functions: oral presentations should be delivered in Hindi if a translator is available, while written presentations can be bilingual, in Hindi and in English; Sonia Gandhi's Hindi lessons attract attention

1998. according to the Sixth All India education survey, 41 languages are taught in schools and 19 are employed as medium of instruction at different levels

1998. National Curriculum Framework for School Education warns of misinterpretation of three language formula by states, organizations and boards; three language formula according to the document: 1. home language or regional language, 2. English and 3. Hindi in non-Hindi speaking states and any other modern Indian language in Hindi speaking states

2003. addition of Bodo, Dogri, Maithili and Santali to the Eighth Schedule

2004. Mohapatra Committee submits report on the criteria needed to be satisfied for the language to be enlisted in Schedule VIII

2008. Dalit writer Chandra Bhan Prasad begins celebrating English language as a Dalit goddess, in addition to commemoration of Macaulay's birthday as a Dalit holiday started in 2004.

Appendix 2.2. Sanskrit as DRL language

Sanskrit's greatest influence on the subcontinent's languages, however, doesn't lie in interference visible in vocabulary although it is quite substantial. It's by far most endurable stronghold of influence lies in theoretic input by Indian grammarians who had taken up categories of Sanskrit's grammatical description as a model for linguistic analysis of other Indian languages, whether they were Indo-Aryan or not, just as European linguists had built description tools for modern European languages on theoretic input available from, and created for, Greek and Latin (Robins 1966: 3-19).[218] Thus, for example, the grammarians of Tamil had under the influence of Sanskrit model established the category of case, which is, according to Tamil scholars, unsuitable for its description. The early grammarians had also adjusted descriptions of verbal forms and nominal compounds to those in early Sanskrit grammars (Scharfe 1977: 180-181; Krishnamurti 2003: 472-474). Another proof of Sanskrit's theoretic dominance is visible in a particular comparative approach to the analysis of Indian linguistic varieties known to pre-contemporary Indian grammarians. In their descriptions those varieties had been analyzed following the rule 'same as' or 'different from' Sanskrit, putting the Sanskrit in the central position[219] Such phonemic rules had established Sanskrit as a norm, a paradigm, against which everything had been measured and had thus made it a prestigious socio-linguistic code.

Studies on Indian linguistic area, often point out adaptation and convergences in phonological systems of Indian languages as an important result of linguistic interference and language contact. Thus, it is thought that Dravidian languages owe to Sanskrit's interference introduction of aspirated stops (*kh, ch, ṭh, th, ph)* and their voiced counterparts as well as introduction of distinct sibilants *s, ś* and *š*. Sridhar's analysis (2011) of contemporary situation in some parts of southern India suggests that the accentuation of those sounds has been employed as a mark of social demarcation between educated and non-educated speakers, which in turn had led more often than not to establishment of connections between caste, vocabulary and pronunciation.[220] It is likely that such demarcations have their beginning prior

---

[218] Thus, grammatical descriptions of, for example, Croatian language, had changed over centuries as well – the number of detected parts of speech, number of cases, etc.

[219] Such rules, that Scharfe (1977: 191) had found in *Nāṭyaśāstra,* written in stanzas in Prakrit, were followed by several Sanskrit stanzas full of examples of Sanskrit words converted into Prakrit. Those examples were meant to help abstract the transfer rules in general.

[220] "Until recently, it was not uncommon to find Brahman parents and teachers upbraiding an unaspirating speaker for 'speaking like a *śūdra.*'"(Sridhar 2011: 247)

to 20th century.[221] Moreover, Sridhar claims that borrowing of those sounds and the prestigious status of Sanskrit in contemporary southern India has led to the process of rephonemization of native lexemes (from non-aspirate to aspirate), in order to make them more prestigious (Sridhar 2011: 242). Historical linguistics suggests that such process of lifting variety's social status was not completely lost in previous periods on IA languages either. Thus the Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit (Burrow 1955: 61, Masica 1991: 56-57), a MIA language, was drenched in Sanskrit's phonological properties, overtaken as a mimicry tactic in all probability to raise idiom's social value.

Some researchers have also emphasized introduction of Sanskrit prefixes and suffixes in Dravidian and IA languages as a result of Sanskrit's interference. The construction of relative clause in Dravidian language varieties is another aspect which some ascribe to the influence of Sanskrit, while Sridhar (2011) is more ready to see it as an influence of a broad category of Indo-Aryan onto Dravidian varieties. Next to it, it is still not clear whether the Dravidian passive construction owes its existence solely to Sanskrit, particularly since the impact of English today in that sphere might be greater and more palpable (Sridhar 2011: 243-244). In that case the existence of such construction would suggest overlapping of interference processes and results in different periods.

The largest segment of Sanskrit's influence on the languages of the subcontinent is visible in newly acquired Sanskritized or, to be more precise, Indo-Aryanized vocabulary which had replaced indigenous lexemes in non-IA varieties. Thus according to Sjoberg & Sjoberg's estimation from 1956, 20% of basic vocabulary in contemporary literary[222] Dravidian idioms consists of loanwords from Indo-Aryan languages, while Sridhar (2011: 241) assumes that in areas prone to cultural influence the percentage might have gone as high as 50 or 60%. Such development is said to had stemmed centuries back in Dravidian languages,[223] as the old compositions[224] abound with Sanskrit lexemes and compounds, incorporated in Telugu or Kannada as either *tatsama* or *tadbhava* borrowings (Krishnamurti 2003: 473), indigenized via phonological assimilation, gender and number appropriative morphemes. Sanskrit's vocabulary had found its way in many Indian languages over the centuries, not just the Dravidian ones. In the history of standardized Hindi from 19th century onward its influence is of great significance as it played a big role in the Hindi-Urdu divergence process.

---

[221] A detailed analysis of that aspect would be able to say more about conditions in which it started happening.

[222] The replacement seems had been restrained to specialized registers such as literature, administration and science, and had helped create diglossic gaps within non-IA languages.

[223] See also Emeneau & Burrow (1962) and Krishnamurti (2003) for further discussion on Indo-Aryan and particularly Sanskrit loanwords in Dravidian languages.

[224] Those include translations or renderings of Sanskrit works such as *Mahabharata* and *Ramayana*.

Furthermore, with the 20th century it had embarked on the path of providing 'raw' lexical material for the development of technical and scientific terminology not just in Hindi, but in all standardized language varieties of the subcontinent, apart from Urdu. As such Sanskrit remains to be associated even nowadays with literacy, education and high-brow language use.[225] However, it is sometimes also connected with the decreased stylistic diversity in standardized registers. Some of those, according to Abbi's analysis of standardized Hindi (1996), intended for wide groups of average language users are made inaccessible to them due to the overload with Sanskrit-based lexis.[226] Sridhar has pointed out (2011: 250) that such overuse of Sanskrit has led recently to several movements in Kannada, Tamil and Telugu for divergent action that aims at upholding of native vocabulary and deconvergence from Sanskrit-based vocabulary.

The interference processes had their toll on Sanskrit as well in a more or less similar manner, although perhaps to a lesser extent. Burrow (1955) suggested that the development of cerebral consonants in Indo-Aryan varieties, ergo in Sanskrit as well, should be attributed to Indian linguistic environment. He claimed that the most probable source for them is the contact with Dravidian languages, after the initial allophone developments within Sanskrit itself. Nevertheless, it was vocabulary that proved as the open door for other languages to exercise their influence on Sanskrit. Burrow (1955: 378 and further) found in Sanskrit lexemes borrowed from Dravidian and Munda languages. Some of them he traced back to the Rig-Vedic period.[227] The majority of those lexemes were, again according to Burrow, borrowed between late Vedic period and early classical stage. Further on, the existence of grammatical terminology for lexis of various origin (*gramya* and *deśya bhāṣā*) suggests that the grammarians were aware of lexical infiltration in Sanskrit.

Burrow (1955: 374) had also speculated that the Indo-European traits in Sanskrit and other IA languages were prone to loss due to their acquiring by speakers of non-IA varieties. It seems probable that it would be eventually affected by syntax of the respective first language(s) of its users. Generations of Sanskrit writers could have introduced into Sanskrit new patterns from other idioms, weaving into it potent new paradigms and producing new

---

[225] See Khubchandani (1997: 143-144) for analysis of three sociocultural levels of language's 'elegance'(lowbrow, middlebrow and highbrow).

[226] Abbi's work comments on 'highbrow' Sanskritized vocabulary included in various official forms that an average speaker is not able to understand and fill properly. Instead to find 'middle brow' vocabulary that would be easy to follow, Abbi argues that the reader is further bewildered with syntactic patterns transplanted from English.

[227] Burrow (1955: 385) gives several examples of Dravidian origin found in RV*: khala* (a rogue), *bala* (strength*), bila* (hole, cave), *mayūra* (peacock), etc. Hock (1975), suggests caution questioning this traditionally accepted notion.

language variants despite strict grammatical codification. Perhaps in that light one should read lines in grammatical treatises warning against incorrect, bad Sanskrit known as *apabhrāmśa* or *apaśabda*, a variant that apparently failed to earn the praise from those well versed in Sanskrit.[228] Contrary to it, Hock is of opinion that there isn't as yet enough evidence to support conclusions of syntactic interference in Sanskrit, as the information so far available is ambiguous, particularly when one takes into account that some of the syntactic developments found in later period's Sanskrit exist in other Indo-European languages as well (Southworth 2005). However, signals from grammatical descriptions might be taken as a starting point to investigate stylistic varieties in Sanskrit in different registers against the background of linguistic interference and convergence.

Grammatical descriptions of Sanskrit reveal as another interesting point instances of code-mixing. Scharfe (1977) points out two such cases. One is north Indian combination of Sanskrit and Prakrit which Bhoja (11th century) knows under the name *saṃkīrṇa jāti* and compares it metaphorically to the admixture of rice and sesame seeds.[229] The other one, called *manipravalam*, is a code-mix of Sanskrit and Dravidian lexemes, with the preponderance of vernacular, as the anonymous author from Kerala claims in *Līlātilakam*.[230] Scharfe also mentions that such amalgamation of languages was known outside of subcontinent as well.[231] The analysis of compounds in old Tamil and Telugu grammatical treatises *Tolkappiyam* and *Balavyakaranam* by Parimalagantham (2010: 6) shows that mixed Sanskrit-Telugu compounding wasn't foreign to Telugu grammarians either. Chaudhary (2009: 202-212) shows that Sanskrit code-mixing as a strategy wasn't foreign to subcontinent even after Persian was introduced as a new language of high social status. He gives an example of a court poet Rahim (16th century) who created Perso-Sanskritic compounds using Sanskrit's inflection rules in two of his works, *Kheṭa-kautukam* (Wonders of the Sky) and *Rahim-kāvya.* The poet also code-switched between Sanskrit and what appears to be a variety of premodern Hindi. In yet another of Rahim's works, Chaudhary found plenty of Sanskrit words, mixed in with Avadhi. Similar treatment of languages in 18th century, Chaudhary claims, is visible in

---

[228] *Apabhrāmśa* has several meanings among Sanskrit grammarians. On one side, it is the name of the later stadium of Prakrits (middle Indo-Aryan languages), but here it refers to its early and rare meaning of *apaśabda,* as Patanjali had used it in *Mahābhāṣya* according to Anirban Dash (2004): "ekaikasya hi shabdasya bahavo'pabhramshaaḥ | tadyathaa | gaurityasya shabdasya gaavi, goṇi, gotaa, gopotaliketyevamaadayo'pabhramshaaḥ ||Mbh. 1.1, p.2 ||" In translation: "*A single correct word has, in fact, many corrupt words arising from it. For instance, the correct word gauḥ has many corrupt words such as gāvi, goNi, gotā, gopatlikā etc.*" (Transliteration is given as Dash had put it.)

[229] Bhoja is, among other things, author of *Sarasvatī kanthābharana*, a treatise on usage of Sanskrit in poetic and rhetoric compositions.

[230] The vernacular Dravidian in *manipravalam*, according to studies, was a predecessor of today's Malayalam, which had diverged from the Tamil significantly at the same period when *manipravalam* was in use.

[231] Thus he mentions code-mixing of Sanskrit and Old Javanese language.

the texts produced by Lakshmipati, court poet of raja of Kumayun. In the 19th century as English entered Indian public communication, Sanskrit had been given a new role, as an ancient variety looked upon for the lexical innovation. In that form it is present in contemporary India as well, while the number of Sanskrit speakers is very low in contemporary India, which leaves Sanskrit primarily as a source of new lexemes in modern Indian languages, Indo-Aryan or Dravidian.

Available linguistic evidence on bidirectional interference confirms that Sanskrit had acted as DRL language on the subcontinent. It had also been a prestigious language variety which is visible in its theoretic influence in grammatical description of other languages as well as in the attempts to uplift the status of particular variety through mimicry of Sanskrit's features. Examples of code-mixing and code-switching confirm it as well.

Appendix 2.3. Persian as DRL language

The written evidence (literary works, pleas, personal and business letters) shows the extent to which Persian, even though it was a language foreign to its patrons as much as to their subjects,[232] nevertheless once captured subcontinent's imagination to a similar extent that English does today, or Sanskrit did in a period prior to Persian's appearance.[233]

Arrival of Persian and its high social position had introduced plenty of Persian loanwords into Indian languages. The historical linguistic analysis shows that most such loanwords in Hindi have been borrowed in the period between 10th and 15th century.[234] With them came also five new sounds */f, z, q, x, γ/*, which continue to exist more or less successfully in varieties spoken on the subcontinent even today. Native speakers of Urdu, according to Masica (1993), maintain those sounds well, while in others they might be substituted with the closest phoneme of the inherited system. Such is the case of Persian loans */q, x, γ/* in Hindi, whose speakers approximate them to */k, kh, g/* respectively (Masica 1993: 92). The case of */f, z/* in Hindi is even more intriguing. Although well established by now in standardized Hindi, and further enticed by loanwords from Portuguese and particularly English, more than few Hindi speakers fails to maintain them. According to Ninan (2007: 59-60), analysis of newspapers in Hindi shows the slow but steady withdrawal of characters for */f/* and */z/*. While Jeffrey (2001) sees in the omission of those characters a political statement by Hindi purists, Ninan, although inclined to see it as an implicit and unauthorized move of linguistic purism directed against Urdu elements in Hindi, contents herself with a doubt that the disappearance of characters in some newspapers can be explained by the change of technology (computer keyboards) as some editors and journalists claim.

According to some researches, Persian exercised its greatest influence on local languages as the language of revenue administration and army. Yet, its influence can't be restricted to

---

[232] Persian was brought to India by speakers of various Turkic varieties. Its presence in India as a prestigious socio-linguistic code was established during the Mughal reign. Such state is comparable with the position and role of Latin in medieval Europe.

[233] Matišić (1984) shows that the higher social and (or) economic status in the period between 12th or 13th century till early 19th century could have been insinuated linguistically in two manners, depending on the chosen cultural tradition, either Persian-based or Sanskrit-based, as Persian and Sanskrit were both dominant varieties within their own spheres.

[234] "The vowels occurring in words borrowed by Hindi from Persian depict an early New-Persian stage of the development of the Persian vowel system (10th-15th c.). Thus we can observe many differences between borrowed Perso-Arabic words in Hindi and their contemporary Persian forms." (Kuczkiewicz-Fraś 2003: 68).

solely those fields as it had given to Indian languages, as a language of high culture, many lexemes equated with cultural and civilizational achievements (polity, etiquette, literature, life style, philosophy, fashion, food and furniture, etc.). Thus, Persian lexemes next to Arabic and Turkish, can be found even today not just in the languages of the northern Indian Hindi-belt, but further south in Marathī and Tamil,[235] as well as in Malayalam, further west in Gujarātī and further east in Assamese and Bengalī (Rahman 2011: 390). Chaudhary (2009: 218-219, 568) thus mentions as an example Mappila Malayalam,[236] spoken by Muslim community in Kerala. According to Chaudhary (2009) and Chakraborty (2002: 15), Muslim communities of Bengal, mostly spoke 'corrupt Bengali', a dialect called Kottha Bhasha, in which Urdu/ Hindi was mixed with Bengali. In East Bengal, Chaudhary (2009: 219) further elaborates, Muslims 'spoke a kind of Patois, colloquial Bengali with a generous mixture of Arabic and Persian.' The incorporation of Persian words was further accelerated by arrival of British to Calcutta. As a result of their retention of Persian as administrative language 'even the upper class Bengali Hindus spoke Persianized Bengali by the end of the eighteenth century.' As Kachru (1983: 201) suggests, "in the *madhya deśa* or the so-called Hindi area, code-mixing with Persian was used by the Kayasthas as a strategy to identify with Muslim rulers, as was done by the pandits in Kashmir." Most notably, in the convergence with the idiom(s) of northern Indian basin, Persian had helped in giving birth to a variety known as Hindī, Hindustānī, Urdū, Rekhtā or Dakkhinī. However, around the end of 18th century historical and political events had left their mark on the socio-linguistic balance and thus the divergence of Indian languages from Persian, particularly in the northern parts of the subcontinent had begun and given birth to two similar yet divergent traditions of Hindi and Urdu.[237] As expected, Persian's greatest influence today is visible in Urdū[238] and through Urdū it reaches wider audiences in the form of popular cultural traditions such as *ghazals* and film lyrics.

---

[235] "The legal language of the Persian court is part of Tamil spoken by all people – ordinary Tamilians talk of *vakalat* and *dastavej*, the first term meaning 'one authorized to argue on behalf of a client' and the second meaning 'a legal document'." (Prasad 2011: 41). See also Chaudhary 2009: 134 and Krishnamurti 2003: 478.

[236] Besides Persian lexemes, it is presumed that Mappila Malayalam incorporates lexis from Arabic, Tamil and Urdu (Cheerangote 2012: 97).

[237] As Rahman (2011: 398) puts it, the history of language policy in India and Pakistan, when it concerns Hindi and Urdu, is still antagonistic: "Even if one listens to the announcements in the Pakistan International Airlines and the Air India one cannot help despairing at the depth of the linguistic boundary-marking and 'othering'. The PIA goes out of its way to use Perso-Arabic and the Air India Sanskritic diction. A common language of such announcements – as well as many other public discourses – could have been made with borrowings from English but South Asian official energies are still spent upon accentuating linguistic cleavages not upon eliminating them."

[238] According to Khan (2006: 137-138), about one fifth of vocabulary in Urdu comes from Arabic and Persian.

On the whole, lexemes borrowed from Persian into Hindi[239] have been classified by researchers under two broad categories as free or bound morphemes. While the second one abounds with verbal stems, prefixes and suffixes, the first one abounds with nouns, adjectives, adverbs and conjunctions, many of which pertain to basic Hindi vocabulary and are still regularly used in everyday communication (ex. *khūn*, blood, *dil*, heart, *gardan*, neck, *sabzī,* vegetables, *kamīz,* shirt, etc.). Nouns and adjectives had been incorporated into Hindi via gender and number appropriating morphemes. Nouns had been assigned gender according to already existing synonyms in Hindi. Together with adjectives they have also gone through inflectional adaptation (ex. P. tāza, adj. fresh, H. tāzā (m), tāzī (f)). Moreover, many nouns and adjectives, according to Bahri (1960) and Kuczkiewiscz-Fraś (2003), were employed as a base to create conjunct verbal forms with verbs as *karnā* (to do), *honā* (to be), *ānā* (to come), *jānā* (to go), *lenā* (to take), *denā* (to give), etc. as can be seen from several following examples:

ārām karnā = P. M., rest, repose + do = to rest, to relax

khuś karnā / honā = P. ADJ., pleased, glad + do/be = to please, to amuse; to feel refreshed, to feel bodily and mental well-being

pasand ānā = P. ADJ. & F., glad, approved/ approval + come = to be approved, to be liked; to please[240]

Similarly, more than few adverbs (*aksar, hameśā, khūb, tarah, taraf, śāyad*) and conjunctions (*agar, balki, magar lekin, cūnki*) that had been acquired from or via Persian are even today actively used in everyday communication. Verbal and nominal stems had been incorporated into Hindi verbal system by appropriation of suffix *–nā* to create Hindi infinitives, as in *kharīd-nā* (to buy), *guzar-nā* (to pass)*, badalnā* (to change), *śarmānā* (to blush) etc. According to Kuczkiewicz-Kraś (2003: 104), Hindi suffix *–nā* appears to be the most employed Hindi suffix in the process of adaptation of Perso-Arabic lexemes.

Another category of Persian elements in Hindi, which has been noticed by both Bahri (1960) and Kuczkiewicz-Fraś (2003) are those in which morphological and lexical elements from two languages had been mixed to create hybrids. In the first type of hybrids Perso-

---

[239] Due to author's insufficient familiarity with other varieties in the subcontinent apart from Hindi, the description of loans from Persian is limited to those in Hindi. Research by those who are expert in more than one variety in this field would be more than welcome contribution to the study of language contact in the subcontinent.

[240] Source of information: Hindi-English Dictionary by McGregor (2011).

Arabic lexemes are adjoined by Hindi affixes and in the second type the roles are reversed and Perso-Arabic affixes[241] are adjoined to Hindi lexemes. As per Kuczkiewicz-Fraś (2003), the second type of hybrids is more dominant, as it represents 72% of the base she worked with against 28% which corresponds with the first type. As the most productive Persian affixes, she identified suffixes *-dār*(ī) and *-bāzī*. The newly formed lexemes fall into different semantic classes (ex. *khānā* (ḍākkhānā, post office) *-ānā* (gharānā, family), *-dān* (kalamdān, penbox), *-dār* (zamīndār, landowner), *-kār* (kalākār, artist), *-īn* (namkīn, salted food), *-var* (jānvar, animal), *-ī* (miṭhāī, sweet dish) and the presence of so numerous elements and the derivatives, according to Kuczkiewicz-Fraś, shows that the lexemes were created mostly in oral communication for the everyday life.

The question that remains mostly unanswered for now is the extent of Persian syntactic influence in Hindi and other Indian languages. According to Hock (2013: xviii), some of the researches that went in that direction, such as Marlow's analysis (1997) on the origin of Hindi complementizer *ki* are still largely unconvincing and ambiguous. Tivārī (1966: 264-266) sees Persian influence in post-noun placed attributes, placement of relative clause before the main clause, calqued conjunct verbs, positioning of adverbs before predicate, positioning of conjunctions 'and' and 'or' between two nouns and use of plural forms instead of singular to express reverence.

As in the case of Sanskrit, Indian linguistic surrounding left its mark on Persian in several manners, creating a new style of Persian known as *Sabk-e-Hindi* (the Indian style). Abidi and Gargesh (2011: 105) see the beginning of Persian's Indianization in translation activities organized by royal courts. By the time of Akbar, according to them, process was well under the way, and the new style, although particular for the subcontinent and alien to Iranians outside of India (Marek 1968: 713) had nevertheless caught on even in some areas outside of it. Nothing in the researches available to the author so far indicates introduction of new sounds into Indianized Persian due to language contact and interference, although it is possible to imagine that there had been various pronunciation 'styles', some of which might be classified in Sanskritic tradition as '*apaśabda*'. Morphological influences of Indian languages on Persian thus far seem to be limited to Sanskrit stems in hybrid Persian-Sanskrit compounds (Chaudhary 2009: 202-212) and few denominative verbs detected by Abidi and Gargesh (2011: 113), such as *mantar kunad,* to recite a mantra. Rasheed (1996) had analyzed infiltration of Indian words and expressions to determine whether Idianized Persian can be

---

[241] In Hindi grammars, such as Sharma's (1998: 223), such Persian elements, and those of other languages, are treated under the category 'videśī upsarg' (foreign prepositions / prefixes).

distinguished from non-Indian Persian (*Sabk-e-Iraqi/Irani),* and Abidi (1960) detected around 130 of Indian words in his analysis of 17th century texts. As yet another distinguishing element of Indianized Persian, both authors name ornate style which might be broadly understood as a sign of not mere stylistic difference but also as a sign of syntactic differentiation that should be further investigated. Sinha (1998) found several such syntactic innovations and attributed them to the influence of Indian languages: a) subject-verb number agreement, when subject is in plural and inanimate and b) the structure of relative clause. Abidi and Gargesh (2011: 114) also scratched the surface of code-switching topic (Hindi-Persian, Khushrau, 14th century), however, more detailed researches in that field seem to be needed to enable better understanding of Persian as DRL in the subcontinent, as well as of the history of languages it came in contact with.

To summarize, Persian had played a significant role as a DRL language in the history of Indian subcontinent, sharing the Sanskrit's prestigious status until 19th century. In 19th century its status was lost due to entrance of English in public communication on the subcontinent and social and socio-linguistic changes that happened afterwards. The linguistic data confirms just as in the case of Sanskrit that the interference had occurred on different language levels. Some of those interference results we have analyzed on the examples taken from Hindi. In the later stages of the analysis those features will be relevant to determine whether or not English-Hindi interference follows the same pattern.

Appendix 3.1. Constitutive Assembly debates – analysis

Constitutive Assembly started its work on the Constitution of India in 1946. One of the questions among many in its debates was the question of national language for India. Assembly's decision on language question is important as it sets the rules for the members of Parliament in which variety to address their colleagues and discuss many issues a newly formed country would want to solve. Another reason that make the analysis of debates in Constitutive Assembly important is that many of its members, if not all were politically active in the Parliament of India in later years after introduction of election system. The analysis is also important, as the members of the very first Lok Sabha before the first elections were held, were the members of Constitutive Assembly, from 1950 to 1952. In a way, the members of Constitutive Assembly have set the rules on language policy and language behavior in offices of central government for others as well as for themselves.

Results of an analysis show that the majority of 299 members of the Constitutive Assembly spoke in English. Within the two years that were taken into account (1947, 1949), approximately 800 pages per year had been checked for the presence of Hindi, and additionally for Urdu, in order to compare the results for both languages immediately before and after separation of India and Pakistan. Next to it, additional 800 pages per year have been checked for the presence of Hindi and Urdu text but not for the number of speakers. Table 1. shows results for both sets of data. Here it is important to note that in the counting, Hindi and Urdu were distinguished merely by the script employed, Devanagari or Perso-Arabic. Another important fact is that the distinction between two languages is blurred in the data itself as speeches of more than one speaker occur sometimes written in Devanagari and sometimes in Perso-Arabic script. Although each of them is followed by English translation, it does not help us discover the initial language as it is referred to as 'translation from Hindustani'. In the debates one can also find examples as following that confirms language was officially presented as Hindustani:

> "After moving the amendment in English the Honourable member continued his speech in Hindustani." (368, 17-27/11/1947)

All members did not agree on the question of language, and thus one can also find examples where members argue about language they are speaking in:

"ise maiṃ hindī kahtā hūṃ āp ise hindustānī kah sakte haiṃ. (speaker 1)

There are no such words as "khushi", "taklif" and "musafir" in Hindi. (speaker 2)" (629, 1-21/2/1949)

I call it Hindi and you can call it Hindustani. There are no such words as khushi, taklif and musafir in Hindi.

Table 1. Material for the Constitutive Assembly, 1947 and 1949.

Year and month	Total number of pages	Hindi (H) and Urdu (U) pages	Number of members in Lok Sabha	Number of Hindi and Urdu speakers
1947 17.-27.11.	834	47 (H), 17 (U)	299	15 (H), 3 (U)
1947 29.11.-10.12.	843	80 (H), 73 (U)	299	Not collected
1949 1.-21.02.	717	26 (H), 31 (U)	299	10 (H), 6 (U)
1949 19.03.-5.04.	801	100 (H), 8 (U)	299	Not collected

Regardless of names given to language, there was not a single speaker in the analyzed material who did not code-mix, i.e used Hindi/Urdu without English elements. The English elements were visible in the printed text as each interfering lexeme was also given in Roman script in the brackets.[242] While speakers employed EH 1, 2 and 3, the EH type 3 of 2;3 subtype was noticed in the analyzed material.

To start the analysis with the least interfering elements, adverbs, connectors and articles were not present at all in the analyzed material or only on several occasions: *part and parcel hai,* there is a part and parcel (426, 1-21/2/1949), *a wrong logic hai*, it is a wrong logic (268, 17-27/11/1947). As such, they do not add significantly to the interference in the data of the said period. The preposition *of* was noticed on several occasions: *council of state* (54, 17-27/11/1947), *freedom of press* (265-270, 17-27/11/1947), *government of India* (638, 17-27/11/1947), *point of view* (32-3, 1-21/2/1949) . All examples seem to suggest borrowing of

---

[242] Thus, it was possible to discern that Urdu speeches were as well interwoven with English interfering elements. However, as Urdu is not the topic of this research that interference is not taken into account.

an overwhelmingly present phrase in the administrative discourse and not of preposition *per se.* Other prepositions were not noticed. Just like connectors and articles, borrowed numbers occurred only several times (*first class,* 608-11, 17-27/11/1947). That leaves nouns, adjectives and verbs as main interfering material in the debates of Constitutive Assembly.

The inserted nouns, as in later years and decades, were noticed in discourses on different topics: administration, economy, transport, law, technology, architecture. Most of them had been employed as subjects, objects or modifiers (attributes). In the last case, when the postposition *kā, ke, kī* was needed it was rarely left out:

1) *railway vibhāg,* railway department (714-16, 17-27/11/1947)

2) *grow more food campaign meṃ,* in the campaign "Grow more food" (288, 17-27/11/1947)

3) *state kī bāt,* question of state (56, 17-27/11/1947)

4) *log jo state railway ke staff meṃ interested haiṃ,* people who are interested in railway staff (56, 17-27/11/1947)

Attribute position was filled both by a single English lexeme and by a group of English lexemes. Abbreviations were also employed by several speakers, either as subjects or attributes: *GNIT buses* (644, 17-27/11/1947). English nouns have been employed with both English plural marker -s/-es (*unke details mem,* in their details, 508, 17-27/11/1947, *factories mem,* in factories, 508, 17-27/11/1947, etc.) and Hindi plural markers (*societyoṃ kī svatantratā,* freedom of societies, 266, 17-27/11/1947, *nayī lineoṃ kā bī savāl hai,* it is also a question of new lines, 608-11, 17-27/11/1947, etc.). Hindi markers were also present in the lexemes such as *station* (*stationoṃ par,* on the stations, 608-11, 17-27/11/1947) for which we can assume long-term presence in Hindi environment.

English adjectives, as in later decades, often appeared as attributes of English nouns: *advisory committee* (588-9, 1-21/2/1949), *black market* (143, 1-21/2/1949), *central board* (102-5, 1-21/2/1949), etc. They were also adjoined to a Hindi noun: *fascist nārā*, fascist slogan (804-6, 17-27/11/1947) *bombastic śabd*, bombastic words (143, 1-21/2/1949), etc.

Just as nouns, adjectives also participated in forming conjunct verbs and nominal predicates: *irresponsible honā,* to be irresponsible (274, 17-27/11/1947), *responsible honā*, to be responsible (143, 1-21/2/1949), *democratic honā,* to be democratic (804-6, 17-27/11/1947), *impatient honā,* to be impatient (508-9, 17-27/11/1947), *welcome karnā,* to

234

welcome (812-15, 17-27/11/1947), *discussion honā,* to be discussed, to discuss (55, 17-27/11/1947), *training denā*, to train (804-6, 17-27/11/1947), etc.

As expected, English verbs were inserted with the addition of verbs *karnā* or *honā*: *rise karnā,* to rise (55, 17-27/11/1947), *misrepresent karnā,* to misrepresent (804-6, 17-27/11/1947), etc. Some of them have also been employed as bases of compound verbs: *pass kar lenā,* to pass (638, 17-27/11/1947), *raise kar lenā*, to raise (804-6, 17-27/11/1947). Verbal adjectives were also noticed, either as a part of predicate or a noun phrase: *interested honā,* to be interested (56, 17-27/11/1947), *banking bill* (588-9, 1-21/2/1949), etc.

In the conclusion, it can be said that English elements inserted and present in Hindi speech before and after independence are similar in following aspects:

1. nouns and verbs are dominant inserted material

2. nouns employ both English and Hindi plural markers

3. noun phrase can consist of several interfering elements, including prepositions

4. verbs are incorporated into Hindi system with verbalizers *karnā* and *honā.*

Number of Hindi speakers immediately before and after Independence is very similar: 19 speakers in 1947 (15 in 1949) and 30 speakers in 1950, even though the status of Hindi language had changed drastically.[243] Other characteristics of speakers are hard to compare, as information on representatives in Constituent Assembly are often scarce and for that reason the non-linguistic information was obtained only for a small number of speakers.

It is possible to discern that Hindi/Urdu speakers in the Constituent Assembly hailed from northern Indian plains (see Maps 1-2 in Appendix 4.2.), where Hindi is one of the spoken varieties for the majority of population.[244] Only one analyzed speaker represented Orissa, a non-Hindi area whose idioms differ relatively more from Hindi, than those of speakers who represented Punjab or Rajasthan.

The non-linguistic analysis of speakers for whom it was possible to find information shows that Hindi speakers were members of Congress party, mostly men (only one female Hindi speaker was noticed in the analyzed material). For those for whom more information was available it can also be said that they were well educated and comfortable with the use of

---

[243] Nevertheless, the number of analyzed Hindi speakers rose from 1955 onwards.
[244] Geographic placement of analyzed speakers in the entire data is discussed in detail in Chapter 5. As it was not possible to find non-linguistic data on all speakers, some of them are not placed on the maps in Appendix 4.2.

English. Looking at the MPs in 1950 and 1955 (Maps 3-4) the LS data shows that with 1950 Hindi speakers from other regions, for example from southern parts of India, also emerged. It could be, however, that they were present in the Constitutive Assembly in 1946-1949 but had not been active in the analyzed data, ergo that the data sample is too small. Throughout this study it is something to be constantly aware of. After 1950, Orissa also continues to be represented with one Hindi speaking MP and 1955 shows that West Bengal, Tamil Nadu and Karnataka also had such MPs.

Appendix 3.2.Sample of data analysis and raw data for May 3rd 2010.

Table 1. Sample of analysis for May 3rd 2010.

Source: Lok Sabha, 3/5/2010

Description: Analysis of languages used in the debates and their correlation with speakers that participate in the communication act (before and after the particular speaker).

Hindi speaker	EH type occurences	Consistency (yes/Y or no/N)	Environment	Speaker speaks English in the data? (yes/Y or no/N)
1. Lalu Prasad	0, 1, 2	N	Madam Speaker/E –Madam Speaker/H; Sharad Yadav/H-Deputy Speaker/H/E	N
2. Mulayam Singh Yadav	0, 1, 2	N	Madam Speaker/H-Madam Speaker/H; Sushma Svaraj/H-Deputy Speaker/H	N
3. Deepa Dasmunsi	1, 2	N	**Madam Speaker/E-Madam Speaker/E;** Madam Speaker/H-Pradip Jain/H	**Y**
4. Pradip Jain	0, 1, 2	N	Deepa Dasmunsi/H-Madam Speaker/E;	N
5. Madam speaker	0	Y	**Deepa Dasmunsi/E, Lalu Prasad/H,** Mulayam Singh Yadav/H; **Pradip Jain/E-**	**Y**

			G. K. Vasan/E; Kapil Sibal/E-B.D. Acharia/E; Sushma Svaraj/H	
6. C. P. Joshi	1	Y	S. M. Krishna/E- J M. Scindia/E	N
7. P. K. Bansal	0, 1	N	Kapil Sibal/E-B. D. Acharia/E; T. **R. Baalu/E-Sharad Yadav/H;** Deputy Speaker/E/H-Dara Singh Cauhan/H-Deputy Speaker/H; **Mallikarjun Kharge/E-Deputy Speaker/E**	**Y**
8. Sushma Svaraj	0, 1	N	Madam Speaker/E-Deputy Speaker/H; Deputy Speaker/H-Mulayam Singh Yadav/H	N
9. Deputy speaker	0, 1	N	Sushma Svaraj/H-V. Narayanasamy/E; **Sushma Svaraj/H**-Mulayam Singh Yadav/H-Gurudas Dasgupta/E-Sharad Yadav/H-Lalu **Prasad/H –** P. K. Bansal/E-Dara Singh Cauhan/H; Nama Nageshvar Rao/H**-M. Thambidurai**; **Mallikarjun Kharge/E-P. K. Bansal/E**	**Y**
10. Sharad Yadav	0, 1, 2	N	Gurudas Dasgupta/E-Deputy Speaker/H; P. K. Bansal/E-Deputy Speaker/H,Lalu Prasad/H;	N
11. Dara Singh Cauhan	0, 1, 2	N	P. K. Bansal/H-Deputy Speaker/H-T. K. S.	N

			Elangovan/E	
12. Anand Rao Adasul	1	Y	B. D. Acharia/E-R. S. Ajnala/E	N
13. Nama Nageshvar Rao	1	Y	R. S. Ajnala/E- Deputy Speaker/H	N
14. Jagdish Thakor	1, 2	N	R. Dhruvanarayana/E-R. Siricilla/E	N
15. Sanjay Singh	1	Y	R. Siricilla/E-S. P. Narayanrao	N
16. S. P. Narayanrao	1	Y	Sanjay Singh/H-R. K. Pandey	N
17. R. K. Pandey	1, 2	N	S. P. Narayanrao-Niraj Shekhar	N
18. Niraj Shekhar	1, 2	N	R. K. Pandey-G. P. Jaysaval/H	N
19. G. P. Jaysaval	1	Y	Niraj Shekhar/H-D. Ch. Yadav/H	N
20. D. Ch. Yadav	1, 2	N	G. P. Jaysaval/H- P. K. Biju/E	N

Table 2. Raw data gathered from the material for May 3rd 2010.

Source: Lok Sabha, 3/5/2010

Description:

72 pages of raw material,

Hindi = H,

English = E;

unknown territory: territory not mentioned because of the role speaker has in the debate in the Parliament; territory source information for such cases: secondary sources

	speakers	language	page	response	EH type	examples	gender	territory
1	Madam Speaker	E	8	none			F	unknown
2	Madam Speaker	E	9	Deepa Dasmunsi/ E			F	unknown
3	Deepa Dasmunsi	E	9	Madam Speaker/E			F	Raiganj
4	Madam Speaker	E	9	interruption/Lalu Prasad/H	0		F	unknown
5	Lalu Prasad	H	9	Madam Speaker/H	0		M	Sāraṇ
6	Mulayam Singh Yadav	H	9	Madam Speaker/H	0		M	Mainapurī
7	Madam Speaker	H	9	none	0		F	unknown
8	Deepa Dasmunsi	H	10	none	1, 2	madam; ve sab leaders ke nām par haiṃ; nayī schemes ā rahī haiṃ; rural development ke ūpar; left front vāle; iske implementation ke nām par;	F	Raiganj
9	Pradip Jain	H	10	Madam Speaker/E	0		M	unknown

10	Madam Speaker	E	10	none			F	unknown
11	Pradip Jain	H	11	Madam Speaker/E	2	national level ke monitor niyukt kie haiṃ; saṃsad sadasya ko pratyek jilā star kī vigilence aur monitoring committe kā chairperson yā co-chairperson banāyā gayā hai	M	unknown
12	Madam Speaker	E	11	Pradip Jain/H			F	unknown
13	Pradip Jain	H	11	Madam Speaker/E	1	ham logoṃ ne ombudsman kā prāvadhān bhī kiyā hai	M	unknown
14	Madam Speaker	E	12	G. K. Vasan/E			F	unknown
15	G. K. Vasan	E	12	none			M	unknown
16	J. M. Scindia	E	12	none			M	unknown
17	M. M. Pallam Raju	E	14	none			M	unknown
18	Guradas Kamat	E	14	none			M	unknown
19	Harish Rawat	E	15	none			M	unknown
20	G. K. Vasan	E	16	none			M	unknown
21	D. Napoleon	E	16	none			M	unknown
22	Secretary General	E	17	none			?	unknown
23	B. D. Acharia	E	17	none			M	Bankura
24	A. K. Antony	E	18	none			M	unknown
25	S. M. Krishna	E	19	none			M	unknown
26	C. P. Joshi	H	23	none	1	Bhūmī abhilekhoṃ ko computerikṛt /adyatan karne tathā	M	unknown
27	J. M. Scindia	E	24	none			M	unknown

28	Guradas Kamat	E	25	none			M	unknown
29	Sachin Pilot	E	26	none			M	unknown
30	Kapil Sibal	E	27	Madam Speaker/E			M	unknown
31	Madam Speaker	E	27	Kapil Sibal/E			F	unknown
32	Kapil Sibal	E	27	none			M	unknown
33	Kapil Sibal	E	28	Madam Speaker/E			M	unknown
34	Madam Speaker	E	28	Kapil Sibal/E			F	unknown
35	Kapil Sibal	E	28	none			M	unknown
36	Kapil Sibal	E	29	Madam Speaker/E			M	unknown
37	Madam Speaker	E	29	none			F	unknown
38	B. D. Acharia	E	29	Kapil Sibal/E			M	Bankura
39	Kapil Sibal	E	29	P. K. Bansal/H			M	unknown
40	P. K. Bansal	H	30	B. D. Acharia/E	1	notice ā cukā hai…	M	unknown
41	B. D. Acharia	E	30	Madam Speaker/E			M	Bankura
42	Madam Speaker	E	30	Kapil Sibal/E			F	unknown
43	Kapil Sibal	E	30	Madam Speaker/E			M	unknown
44	Madam Speaker	E	30	Kapil Sibal/E			F	unknown
45	Kapil Sibal	E	30	none			M	unknown
46	Kapil Sibal	E	31	Madam Speaker/E			M	unknown
47	Madam Speaker	E	31	Kapil Sibal/E			F	unknown
48	Kapil Sibal	E	31	Madam Speaker/E			M	
49	Madam Speaker	E	31	none			F	unknown
50	Sushma Svaraj	H	32	Deputy Speaker/H	0		F	Vidiśā
51	Deputy Speaker	H	32	all	0		M	unknown
52	V. Narayanasamy	E	32	none			M	unknown
53	Deputy Speaker	H	32	none	0		M	unknown
54	Deputy Speaker	E	32	none			M	unknown
55	Sushma Svaraj	H	33	Mulayam Singh Yadav/H	1	maiṃne notice diyā huā hai; itnī baṛī exercise ho rahī hai;	F	Vidiśā

56	Mulayam Singh Yadav	H		33	Deputy Speaker/H	1, 2	to form meṃ ek aisa column ho…; jab supreme court meṃ pareśānī āyī (34)	M	Mainapurī
57	Deputy Speaker	H		34	Gurudas Dasgupta/ E	1	āp log ise debate mat banāiye	M	unknown
58	Gurudas Dasgupta	E		34	Sharad Yadav/H			M	Ghatal
59	Sharad Yadav	H		34	Deputy Speaker/H	1, 2	ek hindustān kā tribal yā ādivāsī hai aur dūsrā backward classes kā tabkā hai; āp budget meṃ allocation kar rahe haiṃ	M	Madhepurā
60	Deputy Speaker	H		35	T. R. Baalu/E	0		M	unknown
61	T. R. Baalu	E		35	P. K. Bansal/E			M	Sriperumbudur
62	P. K. Bansal	E		35	Sharad Yadav/H			M	unknown
63	Sharad Yadav	H		35	Deputy Speaker/H	0		M	Madhepurā
64	Deputy Speaker	H		35	Sharad Yadav/H	0		M	unknown
65	Sharad Yadav	H		35	Lalu Prasad/H	0		M	Madhepurā
66	Lalu Prasad	H		35	Deputy Speaker/H	1, 2	cāhe BJP ho; congres party ke log hoṃ; S. P. ke netā; records of rights meṃ; home minister ne;	M	Sāraṇ
67	Deputy Speaker	H		35	Lalu Prasad/H	0		M	unknown
68	Lalu Prasad	H		36	Deputy Speaker/H	1, 2	under bracket caste bhī likhiye; jis tarah se house stall huā; scheduled castes kī, scheduled tribes kī jāti bracket meṃ likhiye	M	Sāraṇ
69	Deputy Speaker	H		36	Lalu Prasad/H	0		M	unknown
70	Lalu	H		36	Deputy	0		M	Sāraṇ

	Prasad			Speaker/E				
71	Deputy Speaker	E	36	P. K. Bansal/H			M	unknown
72	P. K. Bansal	H	36	Deputy Speaker/H	0		M	unknown
73	Deputy Speaker	H	36	P. K. Bansal/H	0		M	unknown
74	P. K. Bansal	H	37	Dara Singh Cauhan/H	1	house mem	M	unknown
75	Dara Singh Cauhan	H	37	P. K. Bansal/H	0		M	Ghosī
76	P. K. Bansal	H	37	Deputy Speaker/H	1	house kā saṃcālan	M	unknown
77	Deputy Speaker	H	37	Dara Singh Cauhan/H	1	ek minute sun lījie	M	unknown
78	Dara Singh Cauhan	H	37	Deputy Speaker/H	0		M	Ghosī
79	Deputy Speaker	H	37	Dara Singh Cauhan/H	0		M	unknown
80	Dara Singh Cauhan	H	37	Deputy Speaker/H	1	SC hai, ST hai aur OBC hai	M	Ghosī
81	Deputy Speaker	H	37	Dara Singh Cauhan/H	0		M	unknown
82	Dara Singh Cauhan	H	37	Deputy Speaker/H	1, 2	parliament mem; comission kī report āne ke bād	M	Ghosī
83	Deputy Speaker	H	37	Dara Singh Cauhan/H	0		M	unknown
84	Dara Singh Cauhan	H	38	T. K. S. Elangovan /E	1, 2	supreme court ne comment kiyā thā	M	Ghosī
85	T. K. S. Elangovan	E	38	Gurudas Dasgupta/ E			M	Chennai North
86	Gurudas Dasgupta	E	38	M. Thambidu rai/E			M	Ghatal
87	M. Thambidu rai	E	38	B. D. Acharia/E			M	Karur
88	B. D. Acharia	E	38	Anand Rao Adasul/H			M	Bankura
89	Anand Rao Adasul	H	39	R. S. Ajnala/E	1	validity kā savāl; logoṃ ko certificate nahīṃ milā	M	Amarāvatī
90	R. S. Ajnala	E	39	Nama Nageshvar			M	Khadoor Sahib

244

				Rao/H				
91	Nama Nageshvar Rao	H	39	Deputy Speaker/H	1	har party ko bolne…	M	Khammām
92	Deputy Speaker	H	39	none	0		M	unknown
93	Deputy Speaker	E	40	M. Thambidurai/E			M	unknown
94	M. Thambidurai	E	40	Deputy Speaker/E			M	Karur
95	Deputy Speaker	E	40	Ch. L. Singh/E			M	unknown
96	Ch. L. Singh	E	40	none			M	Udhampur
97	A. K. Vundavalli	E	42	none			M	Rajahmundry
98	R. Dhruvanarayana	E	43	none			M	Chamrajanagar
99	Jagdish Thakor	H	44	none	1, 2	flood dranage channel ke nirmāṇ ke lie; in 57 blockoṃ meṃ; choṭī cannaloṃ ke nirmāṇ par; tail evaṃ gas	M	Pāṭan
100	R. Siricilla	E	45	none			M	Warangal
101	Sanjay Singh	H	46	none	1	90 kilometer meṃ	M	Sultānpur
102	S. P. Narayanrao	H	47	none	1	leozin davāī; European deshoṃ ne; davāī taiyar karne vālī companyoṃ kī taraph se	M	Dhule
103	R. K. Pandey	H	48	none	1, 2	kilometer ke radius meṃ; company ke dvārā	M	Giriḍīha
104	Niraj Shekhar	H	49	none	1, 2	kendrIya bhūjal board; 0.50 mg prati L;	M	Baliyā
105	G. P. Jaysaval	H	50	none	1	200 km kī yātrā	M	Devariyā
106	D. Ch. Yadav	H	51	none	1, 2	pūrva madhya railway; express evaṃ intercity express	M	Khagaṛiyā

107	P. K. Biju	E	52	none			M	Alathur
108	Jayant Chaudhary	E	54	none			M	Mathura
109	Badruddin Ajmal	E	55	none			M	Dhubri
110	Mallikarjun Kharge	E	56	Deputy Speaker/E			M	unknown
111	Deputy Speaker	E	56	Mallikarjun Kharge/E			M	unknown
112	Mallikarjun Kharge	E	56	Deputy Speaker/H			M	unknown
113	Deputy Speaker	H	56	Mallikarjun Kharge/E	1	record meṃ jāegī	M	unknown
114	Mallikarjun Kharge	E	56	Deputy Speaker/E			M	unknown
115	Deputy Speaker	E	58	Mallikarjun Kharge/E			M	unknown
116	Mallikarjun Kharge	E	58	P. K. Bansal/E			M	unknown
117	P. K. Bansal	E	60	Deputy Speaker/E			M	unknown
118	Deputy Speaker	E	60	none			M	unknown
119	Deputy Speaker	E	61	none			M	unknown
120	Deputy Speaker	E	61	Mallikarjun Kharge/E			M	unknown
121	Mallikarjun Kharge	E	61	Deputy Speaker/E			M	unknown
122	Deputy Speaker	E	61-70	Mallikarjun Kharge/E	bill - E		M	unknown
123	Deputy Speaker	E	71-72	Ghulam Nabi Azad/E	bill - E		M	unknown

Appendix 4.1. Example of parliamentary representative's profile as given in the Lok Sabha's publication Who's who in the Lok Sabha, 2009.[245]

Name	Shri Rajendra Agrawal
Constituency from which I am elected	Meerut
Father's Name	Shri Om Prakash
Mother's Name	Smt. Satyavati
Date of Birth	02 Oct 1949
Birth Place	Pilkhuwa, Distt. Ghaziabad (Uttar Pradesh)
Maritial Status	Married
Date of Marriage	01 Jan 1985
Spouse Name	Smt. Uma Agrawal
No. of Children	No.of Sons:1 No.of Daughters:1
State Name	Uttar Pradesh
Party Name	Bharatiya Janata Party
Permanent Address	135, Chankyapuri, Shastri Nagar, Meerut - 250 005 Uttar PradeshTels. (0121) 2600002, 09412202623 (M) Fax. (0121) 2769955
Present Address	188, North Avenue,New Delhi - 110 001Tels. 9013180336 (M) Telefax. (011) 23092196
Email id	1[dot] rajendra[dot]agrawal51[at]gmail[dot]com 2[dot] rajendra[dot]agrawal[at]sansad[dot]nic[dot]in
Educational Qualifications	M.Sc. (Physics) Educated at M.M.(P.G.) College, Modi Nagar, Ghaziabad, Uttar Pradesh
Profession	
Positions Held	
2009	Elected to 15th Lok Sabha

31 Aug. 2009	Member, Committee on Information Technology
20 Jul. 2009	Member, Committee of Parliament on Official Language
16 Sep. 2009	Member, Consultative Committee, Ministry of Railways
23 Sep. 2009	Member, Committee on Petitions
	Member, Commitee on Government Assurances
Social and Cultural Activities	(i)Joined R.S.S. in school days and became an active worker while studying;(ii) Pracharak (whole timer)R.S.S. from 1971-84; (iii) Served society in various capacities as office bearer of R.S.S., Swadeshi Jagran Manch, Vidhya Bharti, Sanskar Bharti, Bharat Vikas Parishad, etc from 1984-1997
Special Interests	Environment and social Work
Sports and Clubs	Cricket and tennis
Favourite Pastimes and Recreation	Reading books,listening music, watching theatre and cinema
Other Information	Imprisonment (i) for about 21 months under D.I.R. & M.I.S.A. during emergency from July 1975 to April 1977,(ii)faced short-term imprisonment several times in Ayodhya and other movements; President, B.J.P. Meerut Mahanagar 1997-2000;Incharge B.J.P. Intellectual and Training Cell, Western U.P. 2000-02; Secretary, B.J.P. Western U.P. 2002-07;and President, B.J.P. Intellectual Cell, U.P., 2007 onwards

Appendix 4.2. Geographic location of Hindi speakers with EH interference 1947-2010.

Speakers with different EH interference types are represented each with circle in a different color. With that particular color, each speaker is marked on the map within the constituency or region he/she represented or as closely as possible to his/her constitution/region. MPs from Delhi and Bombay are represented outside of the map in small frames, to make MPs from those constitutions more discernible. Speakers for which information of regional affiliation was not available are not represented on the map but in a small frame at the bottom of each map next to color symbols.

Color symbols:

Pink circle = EH 0
Blue circle = EH 1
Green circle = EH 2
Brown circle = EH 3
Brown circle with blue beams = EH 1;3
Brown circle with green beams = EH 2;3

Source of all maps used in the Appendix 4.2.:

http://censusindia.gov.in/2011census/maps/administrative_maps/Final%20Atlas%20India%202011.pdf

Map 1. Hindi speakers in the Constitutive Assembly, 1947[246]

Map 2. Hindi speakers in the Constitutive Assembly, 1949[247]

[247] Map source:
http://censusindia.gov.in/2011census/maps/administrative_maps/Final%20Atlas%20India%202011.pdf, p. 105.

Map 3. Hindi speakers in the Provisional Lok Sabha, 1950[248]

[248] Map source:
http://censusindia.gov.in/2011census/maps/administrative_maps/Final%20Atlas%20India%202011.pdf, p. 107.

Map 4. Hindi speakers in the first Lok Sabha, 1955[249]

[249] Map source:
http://censusindia.gov.in/2011census/maps/administrative_maps/Final%20Atlas%20India%202011.pdf, p. 107.

Map 5. Hindi speakers in the 2nd Lok Sabha, 1960[250]

[250] Map source:
http://censusindia.gov.in/2011census/maps/administrative_maps/Final%20Atlas%20India%202011.pdf, p. 109.

Map 6. Hindi speakers in the 3rd Lok Sabha, 1965[251]

[251] Map source:
http://censusindia.gov.in/2011census/maps/administrative_maps/Final%20Atlas%20India%202011.pdf, p. 109.

Map 7. Hindi speakers in the 4th Lok Sabha, 1970[252]

[252] Map source:
http://censusindia.gov.in/2011census/maps/administrative_maps/Final%20Atlas%20India%202011.pdf, p. 111.

Map 8. Hindi speakers in the 5th Lok Sabha, 1975[253]

[253] Map source:
http://censusindia.gov.in/2011census/maps/administrative_maps/Final%20Atlas%20India%202011.pdf, p. 111.

Map 9. HIndi speakers in the 7th Lok Sabha, 1980[254]

[254] Map source:
http://censusindia.gov.in/2011census/maps/administrative_maps/Final%20Atlas%20India%202011.pdf, p. 113.

258

Map 10. Hindi speakers in the 8th Lok Sabha, 1985[255]

[255] Map source:
http://censusindia.gov.in/2011census/maps/administrative_maps/Final%20Atlas%20India%202011.pdf, p. 113.

Map 11. Hindi speakers in the 9th Lok Sabha, 1990[256]

[256] Map source:
http://censusindia.gov.in/2011census/maps/administrative_maps/Final%20Atlas%20India%202011.pdf, p. 117.

Map 12. Hindi speakers in the 10th Lok Sabha, 1995[257]

[257] Map source:
http://censusindia.gov.in/2011census/maps/administrative_maps/Final%20Atlas%20India%202011.pdf, p. 117.

Map 13. Hindi speakers in the 13th Lok Sabha, 2000[258]

Map 14. Hindi speakers in the 13th Lok Sabha, 2001[259]

[259] Map source:
http://censusindia.gov.in/2011census/maps/administrative_maps/Final%20Atlas%20India%202011.pdf, p. 121.

Map 15. Hindi speakers in the 13th Lok Sabha, 2002[260]

[260] Map source:
http://censusindia.gov.in/2011census/maps/administrative_maps/Final%20Atlas%20India%202011.pdf, p. 121.

Map 16. Hindi speakers in the 13th Lok Sabha, 2003[261]

[261] Map source:
http://censusindia.gov.in/2011census/maps/administrative_maps/Final%20Atlas%20India%202011.pdf, p. 121.

Map 17. Hindi speakers in the 13th Lok Sabha, 2004[262]

[262] Map source:
http://censusindia.gov.in/2011census/maps/administrative_maps/Final%20Atlas%20India%202011.pdf, p. 121.

Map 18. Hindi speakers in the 14th Lok Sabha, 20005[263]

[263] Map source:
http://censusindia.gov.in/2011census/maps/administrative_maps/Final%20Atlas%20India%202011.pdf, p. 121.

Map 19. Hindi speakers in the 14th Lok Sabha, 2006[264]

[264] Map source:
http://censusindia.gov.in/2011census/maps/administrative_maps/Final%20Atlas%20India%202011.pdf, p. 121.

Map 20. Hindi speakers in the 14th Lok Sabha, 2007[265]

[265] Map source:
http://censusindia.gov.in/2011census/maps/administrative_maps/Final%20Atlas%20India%202011.pdf, p. 121.

Map 21. Hindi speakers in the 14th Lok Sabha, 2008[266]

[266] Map source:
http://censusindia.gov.in/2011census/maps/administrative_maps/Final%20Atlas%20India%202011.pdf, p. 121.

Map 22. Hindi speakers in the 14th Lok Sabha, 2009[267]

---

[267] Map source:
http://censusindia.gov.in/2011census/maps/administrative_maps/Final%20Atlas%20India%202011.pdf, p. 121.

Map 23. Hindi speakers in the 15th Lok Sabha, 2010[268]

Bibliography

Books and articles

1. Abbi, A. 1992. The Explicator compound verb: some definitional issues and criteria for identification. *Indian Linguistics* 53, pp. 27-46.

2. Abbi, A. 1996. Don't Kill My Mother (Tongue). Against Excessive Standardization. In: *Perspectives on Language in Society (Papers in memory of prof. Srivastava)*. Sh. K. Verma, D. Singh (eds.). Vol. I. Delhi: Kalinga Publications, pp. 155-167.

3. Abbi, A. 2001. A manual of linguistic fieldwork and structures of Indian languages. Muenchen: Lincom Europa.

4. Abbi, A. 2006. Vanishing Diversities and Submerging Identities. An Indian Case: In: *Indian Linguistics,* 67, pp. 1-10.

5. Abbi, A. 2009. Vanishing Diversities and Submerging Identities: An Indian Case (reprint). In: *Language and Politics in India*, A. Sarangi (ed.), Delhi: Oxford University Press, pp. 299-310.

6. Abbi, A., Sharma, M. 2014. Hindi as a Contact Language of Northeast India. In: *Defining the Indefinable: Delimiting Hindi*. A. Kuczkiewicz-Fraś (ed.). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, pp. 107-124.

7. Abidi, S. A. H., Gargesh, R. 2011. Persian in South Asia. In: *Language in South Asia*. B. B. Kachru, Y. Kachru, S. N. Sridhar (eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 103-120.

8. Aggarwal, J. C. 1991. Ramamurti Report 1990: national policy on education in India. Delhi: Doaba House.

9. Agnihotri, R. K. 1992. India: Multilingual perspectives. In: *Democratically speaking*. N. D. Crawhill (ed.). Capetown: National Language Project, pp. 46-55.

10. Agnihotri, R. K., Khana, A. L. 1997. Problematizing English in India. Delhi: Sage Publications.

11. Agnihotri, R. K. 2001. Half the Battle and a Quarter. CIIL Foundation Day Lectures. Mysore: Central Institute of Indian Languages.

12. Aklujkar, A. 2011. Traditions of language study in South Asia. In: *Language in South Asia*. B. B. Kachru, Y. Kachru, S. N. Sridhar. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 189-220.

13. Ammon, U. (ed.) 1989. Status and Function of Languages and Language Varieties. Berlin / New York: Walter de Gruyter.

14. Anderson-Finch, Sh. 2011. More than the sum of its parts: Hinglish as an additional communicative resource. In: *Chutnefying English. The phenomenon of Hinglish*. R. Kothari, R. Snell (eds.). New Delhi: Penguin Books, pp. 53-70.

15. Annamalai, E. 2001. Managing multilingualism in India: political and linguistic manifestations. New Delhi: Sage.

16. Annamalai, E. 2011. Contexts of multilingualism. In: *Language in South Asia*. B. B. Kachru, Y. Kachru, S. N. Sridhar (eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 223-234.

17. Auer, P. 1995. The pragmatics of code-switching: a sequential approach. In: *One Speaker, Two Languages*. L. Milroy, P. Muysken (eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 115-135.

18. Auer, P. 1999. From codeswitching via language mixing to fused lects toward a dynamic typology of bilingual speech. In: *International Journal of Bilingualism* 3.4, pp. 309-332.

19. Auer, P., Eastman, C. M. 2010. Code-switching. In: *Society and Language Use*. J. Jaspers, J. Östman, J. Verschueren (eds.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, pp. 84-112.

20. Austin, G. 2012 (1972[1]). The Indian Constitution: Cornerstone of a Nation. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

21. Bahri, H. 1960. Persian Influence on Hindi. Allahabad: Bharati Press.

22. Balasubramanian, Ch. 2009. Register Variation in Indian English. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

23. Bali, K., Sharma, J., Choudhury, M, Yvas, Y. 2014. "I am borrowing *ya* mixing?" An Analysis of English-Hindi Code Mixing in Facebook. In: *Proceedings of The First Workshop on Computational Approaches to Code-Switching,* Doha: Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 116-126.

24. Bansal, R.K. 1976. The Intelligibility of Indian English. 2nd ed. Monograph 4. Hyderabad: CIEFL.

25. Banyan 2012. On the prowl. In: *The Economist,* Dec. 1. Available online at: http://www.economist.com/news/asia/21567363-unexpected-figure-emerging-most-powerful-politician-indias-government-prowl.

26. Barannikov, P. A. 1972. Problemy hindi kak nacional'nogo jazyka. Leningrad: Nauka.

27. Barannikov, P. A. 1984. Jazykovaja situacija v areale jazyka hindi, Leningrad: Nauka.

28. Bartsch, R. 1987. Norms of Language. London & New York: Longman.

29. Bauer, S. 2008. The Sociolinguistics of English-Hindi Code-Switching. A Case Study from India. Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller.

30. Beardsmore, H. B. 1982. Bilingualism: basic principles. Tieto: Avon.

31. Bellenoit, H. J. A. 2007. Missionary education and empire in late colonial India, 1860-1920. London: Pickering & Chatto Limited.

32. Bhatt, R. M. 1997. Code-switching, constraints and optimal grammars. *Lingua* 102.4, pp. 223-251.

33. Bhatt, R. M. 2008a. In other words: Language mixing, identity representations, and third space. In: *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 12.2, pp. 177–200.

34. Bhatt, R. M. 2008b. Indian English: syntax. In: *Varieties of English: Africa, South and Southeast Asia*, vol. 4. R. Mesthrie (ed.). Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 546-562.

35. Bhāṭiyā, K. Ć. 1967. Hindī meṃ angrezī ke āgat śabdoṃ kā bhāṣā tāttvik adhyayan. Ilāhābād: Hindustānī ekedemī.

36. Bhatia, T. K. 2011. The Multilingual mind, optimization theory, and Hinglish. In: *Chutnefying English. The phenomenon of Hinglish*. R. Kothari, R. Snell (eds.). New Delhi: Penguin Books, pp. 37-52.

37. Binoo, K. J. 2007. Entry from backside only – hazar fundas of indian-english. Penguin books, Delhi.

38. Borowiak, T. 2007. Mixed Conjunct Verbs And Other Manifestations Of Hindi Englishization. In: *Investigationes Linguisticaes,* vol. XV, Poznan, pp. 1-13. Accessed at: http://www.inveling.amu.edu.pl/pdf/Borowiak_INVELING15.pdf

39. Borowiak, T. 2012. English-induced changes to urban colloquial Hindi lexicon and structure. mixed speech as a mode of discourse. In: *Lingua Posnaniensis*, vol. LIV (1). The Poznań Society for the Advancement of the Arts and Sciences, pp. 35-44. Accessed at: http://www.degruyter.com/view/j/linpo.2012.54.issue-1/v10122-012-0003-3/v10122-012-0003-3.xml

40. Bose, A. 1978. Higher Education in India in the 19th century. The American Involvement, 1883-1893. Calcutta: Punthi Pustak.

41. Brass, P. 1972. Language, religion and politics in North India. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

42. Bugarski, R. 1996a. Lingvistika u primeni. Beograd: Čigoja štampa, XX. vek.

43. Bugarski, R. 1996b. Jezik u društvu. Beograd: Čigoja štampa, XX. vek.

44. Bugarski, B. 1989. Uvod u opštu lingvistiku. Beograd: Zavod za izdavanje udžbenika.

45. Burrow, E. 1959. The Sanskrit Language. London: Faber and Faber.

46. Burreau of education in India. 1920. Selection form Educational Records, Part I. 1781-1839. Calcutta: Government Printing.

47. Butt, M. 1995. The Structure of Complex Predicates in Urdu. USA: Center for the Study of Language.

48. Butt, M. 2010. The light verb jungle: still hacking away. In: *Complex predicates - Cross Linguistic Perspectives on Event Structure.* M. Amberber, B. Baker, M. Harvey (eds.).

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 48-78. Accessed at: http://ling.sprachwiss.uni-konstanz.de/pages/home/butt/main/papers/harvard-work.pdf

49. Butt, M. Lahiri, A. 2013. Diachronic Pertinacity of Light Verbs. *Lingua.* Accessed at: http://ling.uni-konstanz.de/pages/home/butt/main/papers/stability-preversion.pdf

50. Calvet, L. J. 1981. Lingvistika i kolonijalizam: mala rasprava o glotofagiji. Beograd: BIGZ.

51. Cardoso, H. C. 2006. Challenges to Indo-Portuguese across India. In: *Proceedings of the FEL X*, Mysore: Central Institute of Indian Languages, pp. 23-30.

52. Cardoso, H. C. 2007. Linguistic traces of colonial structure. In: *Linguistic identity in postcolonial multilingual spaces.* E. A. Anchimbe (ed.). Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 164-181.

53. Census reports in India 1951-2001, Language Tables. Delhi: Government of India.

54. Chand, P. (ed.) 1984. Indian Parliament, 1984. New Delhi: The Institute of Constitutional and Parliamentary Studies.

55. Chatterji, S. K. 1973. India: a polyglot nation and its linguistic problems vis-à-vis national integration. Bombay: Mahatma Gandhi Memorial Research Center, Hindustani Prachar Sabha.

56. Cheerangote, S. 2012. An Analysis on Hybridization in Arabi Malayalam. In: *International Review of Social Sciences and Humanities,* 3.1, pp. 96-103. Accessed at: http://irssh.com/yahoo_site_admin/assets/docs/10_IRSSH-223-V3N1.131230816.pdf.

57. Chaudhary, S. C. 1989. Some aspects of the phonology of Indian English. Ranchi: Jayaswal Press.

58. Chaudhary, S. 2009. Foreign Languages in India: A Sociolinguistic History. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

59. Dalrymple, W. 2002. The White Mughals. Delhi: Harper-Collins.

60. Dalrymple, W. 2009. The Last Mughal. Delhi: Bloomsbury Publishing.

61. Das Gupta, J. 1970. Language Conflict and National Development. London: University of California Press.

62. Das, P. K. 2009. The form and function of Conjunct verb construction in Hindi. Accessed at: http://pkdas.in/conjtv.pdf

63. Das, P. K. 2013. Strengthening and weakening of linguistic features: a case of complex predicates in Hindi. Accessed at: http://pkdas.in/swlf.pdf

64. Dash, A. 2004. Apabhramsha – An Introduction. Accessed at: www.languageinindia.com/july2004/anirbanapabrahmsa1.html

65. Dayal, V., Mahajan, A. eds. 2007. Clause structure in South Asian languages. Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

66. Department of Official Language. 2007. Compilation of orders regarding the use of Hindi for official purposes of the Union. New Delhi: Government of India.

67. Desphande, M. M. 1993. Sanskrit and Prakrit sociolinguistic issues. New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

68. Dittmar, N. 1997. Grundlagen der Soziolinguistik – Ein Arbeitsbuch mit Aufgaben. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

69. Downes, W. 1998. Langauge and Society. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

70. Dua, H. R. 1996. The spread of English in India: Politics of language conflict and language power. In: *Post-Imperial English: status change in former British and American colonies*. A. J. Fishman, A. W. Conrad, A. Rupal-Lopez (eds). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

71. Dvivedi, Ś. 1971. Bhāṣāvigyān aur hindī bhāṣā kā itihās. Ilahabad.

72. Edwards, J. R. 1985. Language, Society and Identity. London: Basil Blackwell.

73. Emeneau, M. 1956. India as a Linguistic Area. In: *Language* 32.1, pp. 3-16.

74. Emeneau, M. B. 1980. Language and Linguistic Area. Essays by Murray B. Emeneau, selected and introduced by Anwar S. Dil (ed.). Stanford: Stanford University Press.

75. Emeneau, M. B., Burrow, T. 1962. Dravidian borrowings from Indo-Aryan. In: *University of California Publications in Linguistics,* No. 26. Berkeley: University of California Press.

76. Everaert, C. 2010. Tracing the Boundaries between Hindi and Urdu. Lost and Added in Translation between 20th Century Short Stories. Leiden & Boston: Brill.

77. Ferguson, C. A. 1996. English in South Asia: Imperialist Legacy and Regional Asset. In: *South Asian Enlgish: Structure, Use and Users*. R. J. Baumgardner (ed.). Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, pp. 29-39.

78. Ferguson, C. A., Gumperz, J. J. (eds.). 1960. Linguistic diversity in South Asia: studies in regional, social, and functional variation (Vol. 13). Indiana University Research Center in Anthropology, Folklore, and Linguistics.

79. Field, F. W. 2002. Linguistic borrowing in bilingual contexts. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publications.

80. Filiozat, P. S. 2000. The Sanskrit language: an overview. Varanasi: Indica Books.

81. Filipović, R. 1986. Teorija jezika u kontaktu: uvod u lingvistiku jezičnih dodira. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.

82. Fishman, Joshua, 1965. Who speaks what language to whom and when. *La Linguistique* 2, 65–88. Reprinted in: Li, Wei (ed.), *The Bilingualism Reader*. Routledge, London, 2000, pp. 89–106.

83. Fishman, J. A. 1971. National Languages and Languages of Wider Communication. In*: Language Use and Social Change.* W. H. Whiteley (ed.). New Delhi: Oxford University Press, pp. 27-53.

84. Fishman, J. A. 1978. (1972[1]) Socioligija jezika. Interdisciplinarni društvenonaučni pristup jeziku u društvu. Sarajevo: Svjetlost – Zavod za udžbenike.

85. Földes, Cs. 2010. Was ist Kontaktlinguistik?, In: *Fokus Dialekt. Analysieren – Dokumentieren – Kommunizieren. Festschrift für Ingeborg Geyer zum 60. Geburstag.* H. Bergman, M. M. Glauninger, E. Wandl-Vogt, S. Winterstein (eds.). Hildesheim, Zürich, New York: Georg Olms Verlag 2010 (Germanistische Linguistic, 199-201/2010), pp. 133-156.

86. Friedlander, P.G. 2009. The Hindi Newspaper Revolution: Teaching Reading of Print and Online News Media. In: *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, Vol. 6, Suppl. 1, Singapore: National University of Singapore. pp. 254-267.

87. Gambhir, V. 1993. Complex Verb Phrase: A diachronic and synchronic view. In: *Experiences Subjects in South Asian Languages.* M. K. Verma, K. P. Mohanan (eds.). Delhi: Manohar. pp. 77-96.

88. Gandhi, M. K. 1956. Thoughts on National Language. Ahmedabad: Navajivan Publication House.

89. Gargesh, R. 2004. Indian English: phonology. In: *A Handbook of Varieties of English: Phonology.* E. W. Schneider at al. (eds.). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 992-1002.

90. Ghosh, S. C. 2009. History of education in modern India: 1757.-2007. Delhi: Orient Blackswan.

91. Glossary of parliamentary, legal and administrative terms with Hindi equivalents. 1957. New Delhi: Lok Sabha Secretariat.

92. Graham, B. 1990. Hindu Nationalism and Indian Politics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.Calcutta: Government Printing.

93. Granville, A. 1972. The Indian Constitution: Cornerstone of a Nation. Bombay: Oxford University Press.

94. Grierson, G. A. (ed.) 1967-1973 (1903-1928[1]). Linguistic Survey of India, Vol. I-XI. Delhi, Varanasi, Patna: Motilal Banarsidass

95. Grosjean, F. 2001. The Bilingual's Language Modes. In: *One mind, two languages: Bilingual language processing.* J. Nicol (ed.). Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 1-22.

96. Grosjean, F. 2011 / 2012. An attempt to isolate, and then differentiate, transfer and interference. In: *International Journal of Bilingualism* 2012, 16: 11. Originally published online 10 May 2011. Online version available at: http://ijb.sagepub.com/content/16/1/11.

97. Gumperz, J. J. 1958. Dialect differences and social stratification in a North Indian village. *American Anthropologist,* 60.4, pp. 668-682.

98. Gumperz, J. J. 1961. Speech variation and the study of Indian civilization. In: *American Anthropologist,* 63, pp. 976–988.

99. Gumperz, J. J. 1962. Types of Linguistic Communities. Reprinted in *Languages in Social Groups*, pp. 97-113.

100. Gumperz, J. J. 1964. Linguistic and social interaction in two communities. In: *American anthropologist*, Vol. 66.6, pp. 137-153. Available online at: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1525/aa.1964.66.suppl_3.02a00100/pdf.

101. Gumperz, J. J. 1968. The Speech Community. Reprinted in *Languages in Social Groups,* pp. 114-128.

102. Gumperz, John J. 1971.a Language in Social Groups. Selected and introduced by Anwar S. Dil. Stanford University Press, California.

103. Gumperz, John J., Wilson, R. 1971. Convergence and Creolization: A Case From the Indo-Aryan/ Dravidian Border in India. Reprinted in *Languages in Social Groups*, pp. 251-273.

104. Gumperz, John, 1982. Discourse Strategies. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

105. Gupta, R. 2007. Bilingual advertising in a multilingual country. In: *Language in India* 7.4. Retrieved from: www.languageinindia.com/april2007/bilingualadvertising.pdf.

106. Haugen, E. 1950. The analysis of linguistic borrowing. In: *Language* 26, pp. 210-231.

107. Haugen, E. 1956. Bilingualism in the Americas: A Bibliography and Research Guide. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

108. Hawkins, R.E. 1984. Common Indian words in English. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

109. Heller, M. 1995. Code-switching and the politics of language. In: *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching.* L. Milroy, P. Muysken (eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 158-174.

110. Hewitt, V., Rai, Shirin M. 2011. Parliament. In: *The Oxford Companion to Politics in India*. N. G. Jayal, P. Bh. Mehta (eds.). Oxford University Press, Delhi. pp. 28-42.

111. Hock, H. H. 1988. Historical implications of a dialectological approach to convergence. In: *Historical dialectology*. J. Fisiak (ed.). Berlin / New York / Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 283-328.

112. Hock, H. H. 2013. Problem in Dravidian and Indo-Aryan Historical Linguistics and their Relevance for Language Contact Debates. In: *Proceedings of International Conference on Language Contact in India: Historical, Typological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*, 6-8 February. Pune: Deccan College, pp. VIII-XXXIII.

113. Hohenthal, A. 2003. English in India: Loyalty and attitudes. Accessed at: http://www.languageinindia.com/may2003/annika.html

114. Holmes, J., Meyerhoff, M. (eds.) 2003. The Handbook of Language and Gender. Australia / Germany: Blackwell Publishing.

115. Hosali, P. 2008. Butler English: morphology and syntax. In: *Varieties of English: Africa, South and Southeast Asia, vol. 4.* R. Mesthrie (ed.). Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp.563-577.

116. Howel, A. 1872. Education in British India prior to 1854 and in 1870-71. Calcutta: Superintendent of Government Printing.

117. Hudson, R. A. 2011. (1980[1]) Cambridge textbooks in linguistics: sociolinguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

118. Huesmann, A. 1998. Zwischen Dialekt und Standard. Empirische Untersuchung zur Soziolinguistik des Varietätenspektrums im Deutschen. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

119. Hymes, D. 1974. (1971[1]) O komunikativnoj kompetenciji. In: *Kultura*, 25, pp.129-137.

120. International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED) 1997. 2006. UNESCO. Last accessed on February 2nd 2014: http://www.uis.unesco.org/Library/Documents/isced97-en.pdf

121. Jaffrelot, Ch. 2010. Religion, Caste and Politics in India. New Delhi: Primus Books.

122. Jāyasavāl, M. 1979. Mānak hindī kā aitihāsik vyākaraṇ. Ilāhābād: Mahāmati Prakāśan.

123. Johanson, L. 2002. Contact-induced change in a code-copying framework. In*: Language Change: The Interplay of Internal, External and Extra-linguistic Factors.* M. C. Jones, E. Esch (eds.). Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 285-314.

124. Kachru, B. B. 1975. Toward Structuring the Form and Function of Code Mixing: An Indian Perspective. In: *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences*, Vol. 5.1, pp. 74-92.

125. Kachru, B. B. 1978a. Toward Structuring Code-Mixing: An Indian Perspective. In: *International* Journal of the Sociology of *Language*, Vol. 16, pp. 27-46. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.1978.16.27

126. Kachru, B. B. 1978b. Code-mixing as a Communicative strategy in India. In: *International Dimensions of Bilingual Education.* J. E. Alatis (ed.). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, pp. 107-124.

127. Kachru, B. B. 1983. The Indianization of English. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

128. Kachru, B. B. 1986. The alchemy of English: the spread, functions, and models of non-native Englishes. Oxford: Pergamon Institute of English.

129. Kachru, B. B. (ed.) 1996. The other tongue: English across cultures. India: Oxford University Press.

130. Kachru, Y. 1980. Aspects of Hindi grammar. Delhi: Manohar.

131. Kachru, Y. 1989. Code-mixing, style repertoire and language variation: English in Hindi poetic creativity. In: *World Englishes* 8.3, pp. 311-319.

132. Kachru, Y. 2006. Mixers lyricing in Hinglish: Blending and fusion in Indian pop culture. In: *World Englishes* 25.2, pp. 223 – 233.

133. Kāmtāprasād, S. P. 1962. Hindī vyākaraṇ. Kashi: Nagari Pracharini Sabha.

134. Kapur, B. 1966. Ājkal kī hindī. Varanasi: Lok Prakashan.

135. Kashyap, S. C. 1994. History of Indian Parliament, vol. I. New Delhi: Center for Policy Research.

136. Kashyap, S. C. 2008. History of Indian Parliament, Vol. I & II. New Delhi: Radha Publications.

137. Katičić, R. 1992. (1972[1]). Identitet jezika. In: *Novi jezikoslovni ogledi*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga, pp. 35-54. First print: *Suvremena lingvistika* 5-6. Zagreb: Hrvatsko filološko društvo, pp. 5-14.

138. Kaul, M. N., Shakdher, S. L. 1979. Practice and Procedure of Parliament. New Delhi: Metropolitan.

139. Kaul, M. N., Shakdher, S. L. 2009. Practice and Procedure of Parliament. New Delhi: Metropolitan.

140. Kaviraj, S. 2009. Writing, speaking, being: language and the historical formation of identities in India. In: *Language and Politics in India*. A. Sarangi (ed.). Delhi: Oxford University Press, pp. 312-350.

141. Khan, A. J. 2006. Urdu/ Hindi: An Artificial Divide. New York: Algora Publishing.

142. Khubchandani, L. M. 1968. The Gender of English Loan Words in Sindhi. In: *Studies in Indian Linguistics (professor M. B. Emeneau shashtipūrti volume).* Bh. Krishnamurti (ed.). Annamalainagar: Centers of advanced studies in Linguistics, Poona & Annamalai University, pp. 180-188.

143. Khubchandani, L. M. 1969. Functional importance of Hindi and English. In: *Language and Society in India. Proceedings of a seminar*. A. Poddar (ed.). Simla: Indian Institute of Advance Study.

144. Khubchandani, L. M. 1997. Revisualizing Boundaries – A plurilingual Ethos. New Delhi: Sage Publications.

145. Khubchandani, L. M. 2011. Angrezi – our own 'home-bred' English: The phenomenon of language convergence. In: *Indian Linguistics*, vol. 72.1-4, pp. 137-144.

146. King, C. R. 1994. One Language, Two Scripts: The Hindi Movement in Nineteenth Century North India. Bombay: Oxford University Press.

147. Kloss, H. 1968. Notes concerning a language-nation typology. In: *Language problems of developing nations.* J. A. Fishman, C. A. Ferguson, J. Das Gupta (eds.). Wiley: University of Michigan, pp. 69-85.

148. Kluyev, B. 1981. India: national and language problem. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers.

149. Kothari, R., Snell, R. (eds.) 2011. Chutnefying English: The Phenomenon of Hinglish. New Delhi: Penguin Books India.

150. Krishnamurti, B. 1984. Modernization of South Indian languages: Lexical innovations in newspaper language. In: *Modernization of Indian Languages in News Media*. B. Krishnamurti, *A*. Mukherjee (eds.). Hyderabad: Osmania University, pp. 96-114.

151. Krishnamurti, B. 1998. Language, Education and Society. New Delhi: Sage Publications.

152. Krishnamurti, B. 2003. The Dravidian Languages. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

153. Krishnamurti. Masica. Sinha. 1986. South Asian languages: structure, convergence and diglossia. New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

154. Kuczkiewicz-Fraś, A. 1997. Persian elements in contemporary Hindi and their genesis. In: *Prace Językoznawcze,* MCCX (118), Krakow: Jagellonian University, pp. 47-67.

155. Kuczkiewicz-Fraś, A. 2003a. Perso-Arabic hybrids in Hindi: the sociolinguistic and structural analysis. New Delhi: Manohar.

156. Kuczkiewicz-Fraś, A. 2003b. Hybridity as reflected in language: the case of Hindi and Persian. In: *Cracow Indological Studies*, vol. IV/V. Cracow: Jagellonian University, pp. 317-327.

157. Kuczkiewicz-Fraś, A., Gil, D. 2014. A Mixed Language? Hinglish and Business Hindi. In: *Defining the Indefinable: Delimiting Hindi.* A. Kuczkiewicz-Fraś (ed.). PeterLang: Frankfurt am Main, pp. 181-204.

158. Kuiper, F. B. J. 1968. The genesis of a linguistic area. In: *Indo-Iranian Journal,* 10.2, pp. 81-102.

159. Kumar, A. 1985. Hindi-English "mixing" in scientific discourse. In: *World Englishes* 4.3, pp. 355-358.

160. Kumar, A. 1986. Certain aspects of the form and functions of Hindi-English code-switching. In: *Anthropological linguistics* 28.2, pp. 195-205.

161. Kumar, R. 2006. Negation and Licensing of Negative Polarity Items in Hindi Syntax. New York: Taylor & Francis.

162. Labov, W. 1991. (1972[1]) Sociolinguistic patterns. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

163. LaDousa, C. 2014. Hindi is Our Ground, English is Our Sky: Education, Language and Social Class in Contemporary India. New York: Berghahn.

164. Lampp, C. M. 2006. Negation in modern Hindi-Urdu: the development of nahII. A thesis. Chapel Hill.

165. LePage, R. B., Tabouret-Keller, A. 1985. Acts of identity: Creole-based approaches to language and ethnicity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

166. Lok Sabha Handbook for members (LSH). 1952-2010. New Delhi: Lok Sabha Secretariat.

167. Lutze, L. 1969. English and Hindi. In: *Language and Society in India. Proceedings of a seminar*. A. Poddar (ed.). Simla: Indian Institute of Advance Study.

168. Mackey, William F. 1968. The description of bilingualism. In*: Readings in the sociology of language*. J. A. Fishman (ed.). The Hague: Mouton, pp. 554-584.

169. Malhotra, S. 1980. Hindi-English, Code Switching and Language Choice in Urban, Uppermiddle-class Indian Families. In: *Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics* 5.2, pp. 39-46.

170. Malhotra, G. C. (ed.) 2002. Fifty years of Indian Parliament. New Delhi: Lok Sabha Secretariat.

171. Mallikarjun, B. 2004. Indian multilingualism, language policy and the digital divide. Paper presented at the *Scalla conference 2004*, Nepal. Accessed at: http://www.elda.org/en/proj/scalla/SCALLA2004/Mallikarjun-2.pdf.

172. Masica, C. P. 1976. Defining a Linguistic Area: South Asia. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

173. Masica, C. 1993. The Indo-Aryan languages. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

174. Matišić, Z. 1982. Indijski standardni jezici s posebnim obzirom na hindski. Zagreb: Phd Disertation.

175. Matišić, Z. 1984. Sanskrt i indijska civilizacija. In: *Književna smotra*, XVI/53, Zagreb, pp. 33-38.

176. Matišić, Z. 1990. Jezik i njegovi identiteti – Ponešto iz hindsko-urdskoga kompleksa. In: *Suvremena lingvistika*, 29-30., Zagreb, pp. 87-97.

177. Matišić, Z. 1992. The Future of the English Language in India. In: *Literature, Language and the Media in India.* M. Offredi (ed.), Manohar Publications, New Delhi, pp. 115-162.

178. Matišić, Z. 1996. Elementi hindske gramatike. Zagreb: Ibis grafika.

179. Matišić, Z. 2006. Hindi literature and its dialects. In: *Voices from South Asia. Language in South Asian literature and film*. Th. Damsteegt (ed.). Zagreb: Biblioteca orientalica, pp. 11-32.

180. Matras, Y. 2007. The borrowability of structural categories. In: *Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-linguistic Perspective.* Y. Matras, J. Sakel (eds.). Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 31-74.

181. Matras, Y., Sakel, J. 2007. Investigating the mechanisms of pattern replication in language convergence. In: *Studies in Language,* 31.4. pp. 829-865.

182. Matras, Y. 2009. Language contact. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

183. McGregor, R. S. 1987. Outline of Hindi Grammar with Exercises. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

184. McGregor, R. S. (ed.) 2011. Oxford Hindi-English Dictionary. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

185. McMahon, A. M. S. 1994. Understanding language change. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

186. Mehra, A. K., Kueck, G. W. (eds.) 2003. The Indian Parliament – A comparative perspective. New Delhi: Konark Publishers.

187. Mićanović, K. 2006. Hrvatski s naglaskom: standard i jezični varijeteti. Zagreb: Disput.

188. Milroy, L. 1987. Observing and analysing natural language: A critical account of sociolinguistic method. Oxford / New York: Basil Blackwell.

189. Milroy, J., Milroy, L. 1991. Authority in language. Investigating language prescription and standardisation. London / New York: Rouledge.

190. Miśra, V. 1963. Hindī bhāṣā aur sāhitya par angrezī prabhāv. Dehradun: Sahitya sadan.

191. Mitchell, L. 2010. Language, Emotion, and Politics in South India. The Making of a Mother Tongue. Ranikhet: Permanent Black.

192. Mohanan, T. 1994. Argument structure in Hindi. USA: Center for the Study of Language.

193. Montaut, A. 2016. Noun-Verb Complex Predicates in Hindi and the Rise of Non-Canonical Subjects. In: *Approaches to Complex Predicates.* L. Nash, P. Samvelian (eds.). Leiden: Brill, pp. 142-174. Accessed as: https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01313043/document.

194. Moravcsik, E. 1978. Language contact. In: *Universals of Human Language*. J. H. Greenberg (ed.). Stanford: Stanford University Press, pp. 93-122.

195. Muysken, P. 1981. Halfway between Quechua and Spanish. In: *Historicity and variation in creole studies.* A. Highfield, A. Valdman (eds.). Ann Arbor: Karoma, pp. 52-78.

196. Muysken, P., Hout, van R. 1994. Modeling lexical borrowability. In: *Language Variation and* Change, Vol. 6, pp. 39-62. Available online at: https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/16105775.pdf.

197. Muysken, P. 2000. Bilingual Speech: A Typology of Code-Mixing. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

198. Myers-Scotton, C. 1993. Common and Uncommon Ground: Social and Structural Factors in Codeswitching. In: *Language in Society,* vol. 22, no.4, 475-503.

199. Myers-Scotton, C. 1993. Social motivations for codeswitching: Evidence from Africa. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

200. Naik, J. P., Nurullah, S. 1974. A students' history of education in India (1800-1973). Delhi: Macmillan Company of India.

201. Nespital, H. 1997. Dictionary of Hindi Verbs. Allahabad: Lokbharti Prakashan.

202. Nigam, R. C. 1971. Grammatical sketches of Indian languages with comparative vocabulary and texts.[Languages included are Assamese, Bengali, Gujerati, Hindi, Marathi, Punjabi and Sanskrit.] In: *Census of India, Series 1, Part II-C(i), Social and cultural tables*. New Delhi: Government of India.

203. Ninan, S. 2007. Headlines from the Heartland. Reinventing the Hindi Public Sphere. New Delhi: Sage Publications.

204. Official Language Commission. 1956. Report of the Official Language Commission. Delhi: Government of India.

205. Orsini, F. 2002. The Hindi public sphere 1920-1940. Language and Literature in the Age of Nationalism. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

206. Pandit, P. B. 1972. India as a Sociolinguistic Area. Poona: University of Poona.

207. Pandit, I. 1986. Hindi English Code Switching. Mixed Hindi English. Delhi: Datta Book Centre.

208. Paradis, M. 1993. Linguistic, psycholinguistic, and neurolinguistic aspects of 'interference' in bilingual speakers: The activation threshold hypothesis. In: *International Journal of Psycholinguistics,* 9, pp. 133-145.

209. Parasher, S. V. 1994. Indian English: Certain grammatical, lexical and stylistic features. In: *Second language acquisition: Socio-cultural and linguistic aspects of English in India.* Agnihotra, R. K. & Khanna, A. L. (eds.). California: Thousand Oaks, pp. 145-64.

210. Parimalagantham, M. A. 2010. Compounds in Tolkappiyam and Balavyakaranam – A Comparison. In: Language in India, 9.2. Accessed at: www.languageinindia.com/feb2010/v10ifeb2010.pdf

211. Patnaik, B. N., Pandit, I. 1986. Englishization of Oriya. In: *South Asian Languages: Structure, Convergence and Diglossia*. Bh. Krishnamurti (ed.). New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, pp. 232-243.

212. Pfaff, C.W. 1979. Constraints on language mixing: intrasentential code-switching and borrowing in Spanish/English. In: *Language*, vol. 55, no. 2, pp. 291-318.

213. Phul, Ch. (ed.). 1984. Indian Parliament, 1984. Institute of Constitutional and Parliamentary Studies: New Delhi.

214. Pillai, M. Sh. 1968. English borrowings in educated Tamil. In: *Studies in Indian Linguistics (professor M. B. Emeneau shashtipūrti volume)*. Bh. Krishnamurti (ed.). Annamalainagar: Centers of advanced studies in Linguistics, Poona & Annamalai University, pp. 296-306.

215. Pollock, Sh. 2003. Sanskrit Literary Culture from the Inside Out. In *: Literary cultures in history: reconstructions from South Asia.* Sh. Pollock (ed.) Berkeley: University of California Press. pp. 39-130.

216. Pollock, Sh. 2006. The language of the gods in the world of men: Sanskrit, culture, and power in premodern India. Berkeley: University of California Press.

217. Pollock, Sh. 2011. The Language of Science in Early Modern India. In: *Forms of Knowledge in Early Modern Asia: Explorations in the Intellectual History of India and Tibet, 1500-1800*. Sh. Pollock (ed.). USA: Duke University Press, pp. 19-48.

218. Poplack, Sh. 1980. Sometimes i'll start a sentence in spanish y termino in espanol: toward typology of code-switching. In: *Linguistics*, vol. 18, no.7-8, pp. 581-618.

219. Poplack, Sh., Sankof, D., Miller, C. 1988. The social correlates and linguistic processes of lexical borrowing and assimilation. In: *Linguistics*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 47-104.

210. Prakash, Karat. 1973. Language and Nationality politics in India. Madras: Orient Longman.

211. Prasad, G. J. V. 2011. Writing India, writing English: Literature, Lanaguage, Location. New Delhi: Routledge.

212. Press in India. Annual report of the Registrar of newspapers for India under the Press and registration of books act, 1867. 1960-2009/10. Delhi: Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India.

213. Prince, A., Smolensky, P. 1993. Optimality Theory: Constraint Interaction in Generative Grammar. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

214. Puri, V. 2011. The Influence of English on the History of Hindi Relative Clauses. In: *Journal of Language Contact Vol 4*, pp. 250-268.

215. Qutbuddin, T. 2007. Arabic in India: A Survey and Classification of Its Uses, Compared with Persian. In: *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 127.3, pp. 314-338.

216. Radovanović, M. 1986. Sociolingvistika. Novi Sad: Književna zajednica.

217. Rahman, T. 2011. From Hindi to Urdu. A Social and Political History. Delhi: Orient Black Swan.

218. Rai, A. 1984. A House Divided: the Origin and Development of Hindi/Hindavi. Delhi: Oxford University Press (1991).

219. Rai, A. 2001. Hindi Nationalism. Hyderabad: Orient Longman.

220. Ramaswamy, Sumathi. 2009. Sanskrit for the Nation. In: *Language and Politics in India*. A. Sarangi (ed.). New Delhi: Oxford University Press, pp. 93-138.

221. Rampton, B. 1995. Crossing. Language and Ethnicity Among Adolescents. London: Longman.

222. Rao, B. V. R. 2003. Constitution and language politics of India. Delhi: B. R. Publishing Corporation.

223. Ricento, Th. 2000. Historical and theoretical perspectives in language policy and planning. In: *Journal of Sociolingustics* 4.2, pp. 196-213.

224. Robins, R. H. 1966. The Development of the word class system of the European grammatical tradition. In: *Foundations of Language*, 2.1, Berlin & New York: Springer. pp. 3-19.

225. Sadana, R. 2012. English Heart, Hindi Heartland: The Political Life of Literature in India. New Delhi: Permanent Black.

226. Sailaja, P. 2009. Indian English. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

227. Sankoff, G. 2001. Linguistic Outcomes of Language Contact. In: *Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. P. Trudgill, J. Chambers, N. Schilling-Estes (eds.). Oxford: Basil Blackwell, pp. 638-668. Retrieved from: http://www.ling.upenn.edu/~gillian/Interlang.doc.pdf

228. Sanyal, J. 2009. Indlish: The Book for Every English-Speaking Indian. New Delhi: Viva Books.

229. Shankar, B. L., Rodrigues, V. 2011. The Indian Parliament. A Democracy at work. New Delhi: Oxfor University Press.

230. Scharfe, H. 1977. Gramatical literature. Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.

231. Schneider, E. W. 2007. Postcolonial English: Varieties around the world. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

232. Schumann, John. H. 1974. The Implications of Interlanguage, Pidginization and Creolization for the Study of Adult Second Language Acquisition. In: *TESOL Quarterly* Vol. 8 (2), pp. 145-152.

233. Schwartzberg, J. E. 2009. 'Factors in the Linguistic Reorganization of Indian States.' In: *Language and Politics in India. (Themes in Politics.).* A. Sarangi (ed.). New Delhi: OxfordUniversity Press, pp. 139-182.

234. Sedlatschek, A. Contemporary Indian English: Variation and change. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing House.

235. Selinker, L. 1972. Interlanguage. In: *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching.* P. Jordens, L. Roberts (eds.). Vol. 10 (1-4), pp. 209-232.

236. Sharma, D. 2011. Return of the native: Hindi in British English. In: *Chutnefying English. The Phenomenon of Hinglish.* R. Kothari, R. Snell (eds.). New Delhi: Penguin Books, pp.1-21.

237. Śarmā, R. 1998. Hindī bhāṣā itihās aur svarūp. Nayī dillī: vāṇī prakāśan.

238. Shapiro, M. C., Schiffman, H. F. 1981. Language and Society in South Asia. New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

239. Shapiro, M. C. 2003. A Primer of modern standard Hindi. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

240. Sheth, D. L. 2009. The Great Language Debate: Politics of Metropolitan versus Vernacular India. In: *Language and Politics in India*. A. Sarangi (ed.). New Delhi: Oxford University Press. pp. 267-295.

241. Shohamy, E. 2006. Language Policy: Hidden Agendas and New Approaches. London/New York: Routledge.

242. Si, Aung. 2010. A diachronic investigation of Hindi-English code-switching, using Bollywood film scripts. In: *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 15.4, pp. 388-407.

243. Singh, R. 1981. Aspects of Language Borrowing: English loans in Hindi. In: *Sprachkontakt und Sprachkonflikt.* P. H. Nelde (ed.). Wiesbaden: Steiner, pp. 113-116.

244. Singh, S. 2010. English-Hindi Translation Grammar. New Delhi: Prabhat Prakashan.

245. Singh, R., Pāl, R. 2009. Hindī vyākaraṇ. Jayapur: Racnā Prakāśan.

246. Sinha, S. P. 1978. English in India: A Historical Study with Particular Reference to English Education in India. Patna: Janaki Prakashan.

247. Sinha, B. K. 1986. Contrastive analysis of English and Hindi nominal phrase. New Delhi: Bahri Publications.

248. Snell, R. 2011. Hindi: its threatened ecology and natural genius. In: *Chutnefying English. The Phenomenon of Hinglish*. R. Kothari, R. Snell (eds.). New Delhi: Penguin Books, pp. 22-36. 241.

249. Snell. R. 1990. The Hidden Hand: English Lexis, Syntax and Idiom as Determinants of Modern Hindi Usage. In: *South Asia Research,* 10.1, pp. 53-68. Retrieved from: http://sar.sagepub.com/content/10/1/53.citation

250. Sonntag, S. K. 2009. Linguistic globalization and the call center industry: Imperialism, hegemony or cosmopolitanism? In: Language *Policy*, 8.1, pp. 5-25. Retrieved from: http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10993-008-9112-9

251. Sonntag, S. K. 2013. The Political Economy of Linguistic Diversity in India. In: *The Economics of Language Policy*. CesIfo, Venice Summer Institute. Retrieved from: https://www.cesifo-group.de/dms/ifodoc/docs/Akad_Conf/CFP_CONF_VSI/VSI_2013/vsi13-elp-Wickstrom/Paper/vsi13_elp_Sonntag__19092340_en.pdf.

252. Sonntag, S. K. 2014.Depoliticizing Hindi in India. In*: Defining the Indefinable: Delimiting Hindi*. A. Kuczkiewicz-Fraś (ed.). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, pp. 95-105.

253. Spary, C. 2010. Performing Ethno-Linguistic Representation: A Study of Indian Parliamentary Ceremony and Ritual. In: *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 16.3-4, 311-336, Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13537113.2010.526847

254. Spear, P. 1938. Bentinck and Education. In: *Cambridge Historical Journal*, 6.1, pp. 78-101. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Accessed at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/3020849.

255. Spear, P. 1991. (1951[1]). Twilight of the Mughuls, Studies in late Mughul Delhi. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers.

256. Spencer, A. Case in Hindi. Proceedings of the LFG05 Conference, CSLI publications. Available online at: https://web.stanford.edu/group/cslipublications/cslipublications/LFG/10/lfg05.html, pp. 429-446.

257. Spolsky, B. 2004. Language policy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

258. Sridhar, S. N. 2011. Language contact and convergence in South Asia. In*: Language in South Asia.* B. B. Kachru, Y. Kachru, S. N. Sridhar (eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 235-252.

259. Sridhar, S. N. 2013. Movement for Deconvergence in Kannada: Linguistic and Sociolinguistic implications. *Plenary talk at the international conference on Language Contact in India*, 6-8 February: Pune.

260. Southworth, F. C. 2005. Linguistic Archeology of South Asia. London / New York: Routledge Curzon.

261. Subbarao, K. V. 2011. Typological characteristics of South Asian Languages. In: *Language in South Asia.* B. B. Kachru, Y. Kachru, S. N. Sridhar (eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 49-78.

262. Svobodová, B. 2008. Impact of English on the modern Hindī: The language od middle class speakers of the city of Delhi. MA thesis. Prague: Charles University. Retrieved from: https://is.cuni.cz/webapps/zzp/download/120064747

263. Swigart, L. 1992. Two codes or one? The Insider's View and the Description of Codeswitching in Dakar. In: *Codeswitching*. C. M. Eastman (ed.). Clevedon – Philadelphia – Adelaide: Multilingual Matters Ltd, pp. 83-102.

264. Škiljan, D. 1988. Jezična politika. Zagreb: Naprijed.

265. Škiljan, D. 2000. Javni jezik. Zagreb: Izdanja Antibarbarus.

266. Thomas, G. 1991. Linguistic purism. London & New York: Longman.

267. Thomason, S. G., Kaufman, T. 1988. Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics. California: University of California Press.

268. Thussu, D. K. 1999. Privitizing the airwaves: the impact of globalization on broadcasting in India. In*: Media, culture and society* (Glasgow: Sage Publications), 21.1, pp. 125-131, accessed via Research center of Islamic Republic of Iran on 11th May 2013 at: http://rcirib.ir/articles/pdfs/cd1%5CIngenta_Sage_Articles_on_194_225_11_89/Ingenta747.pdf

269. Tivārī, Bh. 1966. Hindī bhāṣā. Ilāhābād: Kitāb mahal.

270. Tivārī, Bh. 1969. Hindī bhāṣā par fārsī aur angrezī kā prabhāv. Vārāṇasī: nāgarī pracāriṇī sabhā.

271. Tollefson, J. W. 2006. Critical Theory in Language Policy. In: *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method*. Th. Ricento (ed.). UK: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 42-59.

272. Trudgill, P. 1983. On Dialect. Oxford: Blackwell.

273. Trudgill, P. 2000. Sociolinguistics: an introduction to language and society. London: Penguin Books.

274. Vaish, V. 2005. A peripherist view of English as a language of decolonization in post-colonial India. In: *Language Policy*, Vol. 4. pp. 187-206. Accessed on 31st January 2013 at: DOI 10.1007/s10993-005-3523-7.

275. Verma, S. K. 1978. Syntactic irregularities in Indian English. In: *Indian Writing in English*, Madras / London: Longman, pp. 207-220.

276. Vyas, Y., Gella, S., Sharma, J., Bali, K., Choudhury, M. 2014. POS Tagging of English-Hindi Code-Mixed Social Media Content. In: *Proceedings on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP).* Doha: Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 974-979.

277. Wardhaugh, R. 2002. An Introduction to Sociolinguistics. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

278. Wei, L., Auer, P. 2007. (eds.) Handbook of Multilingualism and Multilingual Communication. Amsterdam: Walter de Gruyter.

279. Weinreich, U. 1968 (1953[1]). Languages in Contact: findings and problems. The Hague: Mouton.

280. Wessler, H. W. 2014. Hindi Revisited: Language and Language Policies in India in Perspective. In: *Defining the Indefinable: Delimiting Hindi*. A. Kuczkiewicz-Fraś (ed.). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, pp. 65-79.

281. Whitney, W. D. 1881. On mixture in language. In: Transactions of the American Philological Association, 12, pp. 5-26.

282. Wichmann, S., Wohlgemuth, J. 2008. Loan verbs in a typological perspective. In: *Aspects of Language Contact. New Theoretical, Methodological and Empirical Findings with Special Focus on Romancisation Processes.* T. Stolz, D. Bakker, R. Salas Palomo (eds.), Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 89-121.

283. Wilkinson, S. I. 2011. Data and the Study of Indian Politics. In: *The Oxford Companion to Politics in India.* N. G. Jayal, P. B. Mehta (eds.). New Delhi: Oxford University Press, pp. 587-599.

284. Yule, H., Burnell, A. C., Crooke, W. 1968 (1903[1]). Hobson-Jobson: a glossary of colloquial Anglo-Indian words and phrases, and of kindred terms, etymological, historical, geographical and discursive. Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.

Websites

285. Department of Official language: http://rajbhasha.nic.in/IIContent.aspx?t=enevents; retrieved on 11th June 2012.

286. Appeal for the introduction of Tamil as a language of the high court in Tamilnadu: www.tn.gov.in/pressrelease/archives/pr2007/pr110307/pr110307_45.pdf; retrieved on 12th June 2012.

287. Constitution of India: http://lawmin.nic.in/coi/coiason29july08.pdf; retrieved on the 12th April 2012

288. The death of the last speaker of Cochin creole: http://www.openthemagazine.com/article/art-culture/the-death-of-an-indian-born-language; retrieved on the 10th April 2012.

289. Metcalfe and the white Mughals that preceded his arrival: http://www.guardian.co.uk/artanddesign/2003/aug/16/art.highereducation; retrieved on the 6th May 2012.

290. Sanskrit as an official language of Uttarakhand: http://www.hindustantimes.com/India-news/NorthIndia/Sanskrit-is-second-official-language-in-Uttarakhand/Article1-499467.aspx

291. Lokniti, a CSDS unit, dedicated to the study of elections in India: http://www.lokniti.org/

292. Lok Sabha, the website: http://loksabha.nic.in/

293. Government of India, the website: http://www.archive.india.gov.in/govt.php

294. Election Commision, the website: http://eci.nic.in/eci/eci.html

295. 50th report of the commissioner for linguistic minorities in India (2013): http://nclm.nic.in/shared/linkimages/NCLM50thReport.pdf.

296. Census report on languages, 2001, excerpts: http://web.archive.org/web/20131029190612/http://censusindia.gov.in/Census_Data_2001/Census_Data_Online/Language/Statement1.htm.

http://censusindia.gov.in/Census_Data_2001/Census_Data_Online/Language/Statement3.htm.

297. NCERT document on languages in education: http://www.ncert.nic.in/new_ncert/ncert/rightside/links/pdf/focus_group/Indian_Languages.pdf.

298. Ministry of Home Affairs, Constitutional provisions relating to Eighth Schedule: http://mha.nic.in/hindi/sites/upload_files/mhahindi/files/pdf/Eighth_Schedule.pdf.

List of Tables

The first number in the name of each table corresponds with the number of chapter as marked in the Contents, and the second number with the order of appearing within that chapter. Thus, Table 3.1 can be found in Chapter 3 and comes before the Table 3.2.

List of Graphs

The first number in the name of each graph corresponds with the number of chapter as marked in the Contents, and the second number with the order of appearing within that chapter. Thus, Graph 4.I can be found in Chapter 4 and comes before the Graph 4.II and Graph 4.III.

List of Figures

The first number in the name of each figure corresponds with the number of chapter as marked in the Contents, and the second number with the order of appearing within that chapter. Thus, Figure 4.1. can be found in Chapter 4 and comes before the Figure 4.2.

Summary in Croatian and English

Croatian:

Tema je ovoga doktorskoga rada lingvistička i sociolingvistička analiza tipova miješanja engleskoga jezika u hindski jezik. Kao uvod u temu razmatra se općenito pitanje jezičnoga kontakta i teorijske pretpostavke o djelovanju jezičnoga kontakta na strukturu jezika (uvodno poglavlje i drugo poglavlje). U trećem poglavlju predstavlja se kratak pregled jezične politike općenito u Indiji nakon njezina osamostaljenja 1947., s naglaskom na odluke o hindskome jeziku. Važno je uočiti kompleksnost indijske sociolingvističke stvarnosti, prije svega u obrazovanju. Prema obrazovnoj politici, svaki učenik u Indiji dužan je za svoga školovanja ovladati trima jezicima. Kako učenici napreduju u obrazovanju, odnosno kako idu prema visokoškolskome obrazovanju, broj se jezika u nastavi smanjuje. Pri tome sve veću ulogu dobiva poznavanje engleskoga jezika. Neke od struka moguće je studirati jedino uz dostatno poznavanje engleskoga jezika budući da je on dominantan alat u tim strukama. Sličnu situaciju moguće je pratiti i u državnim institucijama, unatoč odluci da se hindski upotrebljava u državnim institucijama na sveindijskoj razini. Mediji i pravni sustav prate takvu sociolingvističku raspodjelu moći među jezicima. Iz svega toga može se zaključiti da je engleski posljednji u nizu dominantnih jezika slijedom pretpostavki Sheldona Pollocka i Zdravke Matišić o postojanju sanskrtske civilizacije i njezinu ogledanju u jezičnoj uporabi na Potkontinentu (treće poglavlje, dodatci 2.1.-2.3.). Razumijevanje postavki sanskrtske civilizacije važno je za praćenje zaključaka u završnome šestome poglavlju kao i za razumijevanje rezultata jezičnoga kontakta između engleskoga i hindskoga. U trećem poglavlju predstavljena su i jezična pravila i odredbe kojima je uređena upotreba jezika u indijskome parlamentu, odnosno u Donjem domu (Lok Sabhi).

Sama je analiza podijeljena na lingvističku (četvrto poglavlje) i sociolingvističku (peto poglavlje) i popraćena zaključcima. Rezultati lingvističke analize odnose se na komunikacijske strategije govornika hindskoga jezika u Parlamentu i uočavanje vrste engleskih elemenata koji se miješaju s hindskim elementima u ostvaraju hindskoga jezika. U sociolingvističkoj se analizi prate izvanjezične karakteristike govornika kao što su dob, spol, politička i regionalna pripadnost itd. u razdoblju od 1950. do 2010. ne bi li se ustanovilo postojanje zajedničkih karakteristika govornika koji dijele određenu komunikacijsku

strategiju. Istraživačica polazi od teze da se odnos engleskih i hindskih elemenata u ostvaraju hindskoga mijenja od 1950. prema 2010. prema kompleksnijem unosu engleskih elemenata. U sociolingvističkoj analizi pretpostavlja da će mlađa populacija govornika u parlamentu dominirati u upotrebi engleskih elemenata u hindskome jeziku.

Utjecaj engleskoga na hindski opisan je kao EH interferencija tipa 0, 1, 2, 3 ili međutipova EH 3;1 ili 3;2. Pri tome se EH tip 0 odnosi na nulti stupanj interferencije tj. njezin izostanak, a EH tip 3 na interferenciju tipa prebacivanje kodova dok se EH tip 1 i EH tip 2 odnose na interferenciju tipa miješanje kodova. Rezultati analize potvrđuju neke od već uočenih i opisanih elemenata miješanja engleskoga koda u hindski kao i prebacivanja engleskoga i hindskoga koda. Novouočeni element je opis negacije u spoju s engleskim glagolima, a pobliže je opisano miješanje engleskih imenskih riječi kao najbrojnijih elemenata u ostvaraju hindskoga jezika u analiziranom materijalu. Statistička analiza pokazuje da u pregledanim dokumentima 2 od 3 govornika imaju elemente EH interferencije u svome ostvaraju hindskoga jezika, pretežito elemente EH tipa 1 ili EH tipa 2. Analiza također pokazuje da je broj govornika s umetnim elementima iz engleskoga jezika u porastu u odnosu na omjer materijala te da veći broj govornika nakon 2000. godine pokazuje takve karakteristike u svome ostvaraju hindskoga jezika. Govornici s engleskim elementima u hindskome govoru dolaze iz različitih krajeva Indije, ali se može pretpostaviti da većina ipak dolazi iz područja hindskoga govornoga područja, poglavito iz centralnih i istočnih hindskih saveznih država. Govornici su pretežno muškarci, s visokim stupnjem obrazovanja, u dobi od 46 do 65 godina, različitih zaposlenja. Pripadaju također različitim političkim strankama.

U završnome šestome poglavlju rada rezultati analize se preispituju iz perspektive jezične politike i jezičnih identiteta. Kako je u parlamentu omogućen simultani prijevod s engleskoga odnosno hindskoga u svakome trenutku (vidi treće poglavlje za više detalja), postavlja se pitanje zašto govornici pribjegavaju komunikaciji na hindskome jeziku s elementima iz engleskoga jezika (EH interferencija). Pretpostavka da se ne mogu sjetiti u svakome trenutku kako se nešto kaže na hindskome dovodi se u pitanje, budući da su teme rasprave poznate unaprijed te se govornici mogu pripremiti za njih. Druga pretpostavka da govornici miješanjem ili prebacivanjem kodova žele omogućiti svim sudionicima da ih razumiju ponavljanjem poruke također ne zadovoljava. Stoga se uvodi pitanje jezičnoga identiteta i društvenih funkcija jezika – osiguravanje moći, utvrđivanje te potvrđivanje društvenoga statusa govornika. Iz te perspektive nadaje se zaključak kako treba pretpostaviti da uz službenu, javnu jezičnu politiku postoji i neslužbena jezična politika koju govornici uzimaju u obzir pri odabiru komunikacijskih strategija.

Doktorski rad analiza jedan segment hindskoga korpusa političkoga diskurza. Kao takav doprinosi novim istraživanjima u istoj domeni te isto tako otvara prostor za analizu korpusa koji pripadaju drugim funkcionalnim stilovima hindskoga jezika. Rad također nudi mogućnost komparativne usporedbe utjecaja engleskoga jezika u hindskome i drugim indijskim jezicima budućim istraživačima.

interferencija engleskoga i hindskoga jezika; indijski parlament; lingvistička analiza; socio-lingvistička analiza; jezične politike; sanskrtska civilizacija

English:

The thesis analyzes types of English-Hindi interference, from socio-linguistic and linguistic perspective. In the first and second chapter, the question of interference and the influence of one language onto another variety is presented. Short overview of language policy politics in India after its independence in 1947, with an emphasis on Hindi and decisions related to its promotion, sheds light on the sociolinguistic situation in contemporary India. One should bear in mind, however, that English is but the last dominant language on the Subcontinent, if one takes into account proposal by Sheldon Pollock and Zdravka Matišić on the existence of Sanskritic culture and its reflections in language usage on the Subcontinent (Chapter 3, Appendix 2.1.).

Analysis consists of two parts: linguistic analysis (Chapter 4) and socio-linguistic analysis (Chapter 5). Both parts of analysis are followed by conclusions. Results reflect communicative strategies of Hindi speakers in the Parliament. They also show which English elements are inserted in Hindi. Analysis also introduces the non-linguistic characteristics of speakers such as their age, gender, political and regional affiliation etc. in the period 1950-2010 in order to decipher whether speakers with the same communicative strategy share same or similar non-linguistic characteristics as well. Speakers with EH elements represent constituencies of various regions in India. However, for the bigger part of them it is possible to assume that they come from Hindi speaking areas, particularly from Central and Eastern Hindi states. Speakers are mostly men, with high level of education. Many of them are aged between 46 and 65 and have various occupations. They also belong to various political parties.

English interference in Hindi is described as EH interference of type 0, 1, 2, 3 or the sub-types EH 3;1 or 3;2. EH type 0 represents the absence of English interference in Hindi while EH type 3 stands for the code-switching type of interference. EH types 1 and 2 stand for code-mixing type of interference. The results confirm some of the already described characteristics of English-Hindi interference. The new element is the description of negation in combination with English verbs. English nouns code-mixed in Hindi have been described in detail as the most numerous interfering elements. The statistical analysis of collected data shows that 2 out of 3 Hindi speakers show elements of EH interference in his/her speech pattern throughout the analyzed period (1950-2010). Those elements are mostly of EH types 1 and 2. The analysis also suggests that the number of speakers with English elements is increasing, particularly after year 2000, in comparison to the amount of analyzed data.

In the final chapter results are analyzed from the perspective of language policy and language identity. Since the simultaneous translation from English into Hindi and vice versa is available at all times in the Parliament, the question is why do speakers choose to communicate in Hindi with EH interference. The assumption that speakers cannot recollect a particular word during the speech is questionable as explanation since debate topics are known in advance and thus speakers have time to prepare for them. Another assumption that speakers try to make themselves understood by everyone in the communication act with code-mixing and code-switching as strategies is also not found as suitable explanation. Hence the question of language identity and language's social roles are introduced, having in mind particularly relations of language and power as well as of language and social status. From there it seems that the assumption of two language policies is in order. One language policy would then be overt and official and the second covert and unofficial. The assumption is that speakers base their communicative strategies taking in consideration both language policies.

English-Hindi interference; Indian Parliament; linguistic analysis; socio-linguistic analysis; language policies; Sanskritic civilization

Biography

Marijana Janjić (1983) was born in Banjaluka, Bosnia and Herzegovina. After attending Opća Gimnazija Karlovac, she enrolled as a student of the Department of Croatian language and literature and of the Department of Indology at Zagreb's Faculty of Humanistic Studies. Academic years 2003 /2004 and 2008 /2009 she had spent in India studying Hindi and Telugu with the scholarship awarded by the Government of India. Department of Indology awarded her with the Certificate of the best student for the year 2008. After the graduation she continued pursuing academic education and enrolled in 2010 as a student of post-graduation studies at the University of Zadar. She worked thus far as a Croatian, Hindi and Sanskrit teacher, had authored several articles on languages she teaches and translated several works from Hindi and English into Croatian and also from Croatian into Hindi. In the year 2015/2016, she worked on the project MemAzija at Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb as a young PhD researcher. She also organizes various events concerning Indian culture as well as translation workshops for Hindi students.