CHAPTER I

Preliminaries

1.1 Overview: The aim of the present study is to describe some aspects of the phonology of Indian English (henceforth IE) and thereby to gain an insight into and present a model for the study of various second and pidgin and creole language phonologies. Justifications and a framework for this study are presented in this chapter.

The present study makes a powerful claim that IE speakers tend to treat the orthographic representation as the grammatical underlying representation (henceforth UR) of an IE word which is derived through definite sets of rules proposed in chapters 2, 3 and 4 of this study to generate the actually observed phonetic representation (henceforth PR) of that word. This PR is often different from the PR of the same word in American or British English (henceforth AE/BE), for instance, as also noted in studies like Bansal (1969), Vijaykrishnan (1978), Pandey (1980), Sadanandan (1981) and in other studies mentioned therein. These studies have also shown that the PR of a given IE word often differs in its different regional varieties.

By examining various rule components in the derivation of an IE word, an attempt is made in this study to present an explanation of some of the peculiarities in its phonology.
In this way the present study also seeks to describe and explain the underlying similarities and the surface divergences between different regional varieties of IE. It is claimed in this study that a given IE word seems to have the same UR in its different regional varieties and the divergences between varieties noted by earlier studies are only dialectal (or idiolectal) which occur later in the course of derivation of that word and are predictable.

A theoretical framework for this study is developed in the present chapter where it is stated that in the phonology of a second language like IE, certain features from the phonology of the first language of its speakers merge with certain features of the phonology of English to give IE its distinct form. It is stated here that the language born in this manner also contains certain features which can be ascribed neither to the (IE) speaker's first language nor to English. It is argued that such features which seem to be independent of the phonologies of particular language are a part of the options available to all language learners and seem to belong to the core of the universal grammar (in the sense of Chomsky and Halle (1968), henceforth SPE). It is stated here that IE in this sense is like a child -- or pidgin and creole language where also such features can be seen.
Section 1.2 of this chapter proposes some preconditions for the unambiguous identification of IE. Section 1.3 shows that the peculiarities in the phonology of IE are systematic. A brief review of some studies of the phonology of IE is presented in 1.4. It is argued that these studies are not adequate for describing and explaining the facts of IE.

An alternative theoretical framework for the description of IE phonology is proposed in Section 1.5. It has been argued here that there are certain universal phonological principles where certain parameters are left unspecified merely indicating the available options to be marked or unmarked according to certain assumptions. Given an option, it is said there, languages have a tendency to prefer unmarked to marked structures.

Section 1.6 presents a concept of linguistic universals which sharply restrict the arbitrariness of rules and structures in natural languages. This section also suggests a point of view according to which rules in (phonologies of) natural languages, including those to be presented in this study, are seen as language specific conspiracies to achieve preferred and possible structures. The framework presented in Sections 1.5 and 1.6 is argued to be good also for the
description of the phonologies of other languages in general and of other second and pidgin and creole and child language phonologies in particular.

Section 1.7 talks about the scope of this study and the organization of chapters in it. It also describes the sources of the data used in this study and the way they have been collected.

1.2 **Identifying IE**

1.2.1 **An Instance:** The following episode from Khushwant Singh (1977) suggests the kind of English that is generally taken to be IE:

(1) "Many years ago Raymond Gram-Swing, the noted American broadcaster, came to India. I had the privilege of showing him around Delhi. At my suggestion we went to the Lok Sabha during the question hour -- the only really exciting time in Parliament. As speaker after speaker rose to ask questions and ministers fumbled with their replies, I told my guest who they were. Then someone asked a question on foreign affairs and Nehru rose to answer him:

"But...but...but...", stuttered Gram-Swing, "Your Prime Minister is speaking English". They had all been speaking English, only it did not register as such in the American's ears." (p. 114)

Besides its many other implications, the episode narrated above clearly indicates two things. First, it
indicates that English is a "living" language in India and not just a library language. It is used in forums where people from diverse first language backgrounds meet to discuss national issues and in various other contexts as well in spoken form also.

Second, the situation described above indicates that there are two kinds of Spoken English in India. One kind, viz: that spoken by Nehru, "registers" as English "in the American's ears". And the other kind, viz: that spoken by some other members of the Lok Sabha, does not register as English in the American's ears.

Wells (1982, 624) ascribes the difference between the two kinds of spoken IE to the fact that "there are Indians educated at British Public Schools whose accent is unquestionably RP. There are Indians with a fair knowledge of English whose accent is nevertheless so impervious that English people can understand them, if at all, only with the greatest difficulty".

In other words, there are Indians who have had the opportunity to learn the (native) BE pronunciation. But there are others, and naturally the majority of IE speakers belongs to this category, who have not had an opportunity to learn such a "native" pronunciation. Therefore, inspite
of "a fair knowledge of English" as stated by Wells above, their speech does not sound like English to AE/BE speakers.

It has been noted by earlier studies that "Indian English as spoken by educated people in India does not differ radically from native English in grammar (i.e. syntax) and vocabulary. It is in pronunciation that IE is different from either British or American English" (Bansal (1969, 11)). As Rubdy (1981, 20) also notes, it is in pronunciation that IE is maximally different from AE/BE or such other native varieties of English. This is one of the important reasons why there is an urgent need to study the phonology of IE.

1.2.2 Indianness of IE: Not learning the native pronunciation, however, does not seem to be the only reason for divergences between IE and certain well-known varieties of English like AE/BE. If this were the only reason, IE would not sound different from English spoken in many other parts of the world such as in Africa, South-East Asia and on several Pacific islands. Many speakers of English in these parts of the world also do not seem to have received any training in AE/BE ways of English pronunciation. Since a great majority of IE speakers also do not seem to have received such a training, IE and
the English spoken in these parts of the world should have sounded alike. But that does not seem to be the case.

IE is different not only from AE/BE in pronunciation, but also from many other Afro-Asian and Pacific varieties of English. It seems to have a distinctly individual phonological characteristic. I am going to argue in the following paragraphs that this characteristic is a consequence of its Indian context.

An explanation often forwarded for this situation of divergence of the pronunciation of IE from certain known native and non-native varieties of English comes from the "theory of interference" which suggests that the features of the first language (phonology) interfere with and obstruct the learning of the features of the second language (phonology). An explanation of this kind, such as in Wells (1982, 110), means that "where the other language is retained as the first language, English being acquired in addition, the relationship is properly one of interference (from the first language)."

Such explanations generally assume that phonological habits formed in learning the first language persist in the second language and interfere with the phonological
patterns of the latter. Therefore English (or any other second language) spoken by Indians (or any other community of speakers) is thought to sound like their first language(s). Perhaps this may be one reason why non-native varieties of English are generally named after their speaker's first language.

It will be shown in Section 1.5 of this chapter that peculiarities of a second language phonology can be explained in a better way by assuming a process of merger of features from two languages into one rather than by assuming a process of interference from the first language into the learning of the second. Yet, even though I do not agree wholly with this "interference" theory, it seems convenient to name a second language variety after the first language of its speakers for purposes of description.

Thus we have Tamilian English (described in Vijayakrishnan (1978), henceforth TE), Malayalee English (described in Premalatha (1978) and Sadanandan (1981), henceforth MLYE), Hindustani English (described in Pandey (1980), henceforth HE), Marathi English (described in Gokhale (1978)), and as I will propose in Chapter 2, Maithili speakers English (henceforth ME) and such other second language varieties.
Perhaps mother tongue features are so obvious in the phonology of the second language that such names are given also in non-linguistic remarks upon a second language as, for example, the following quote from Nehru (1963, 1) shows:

"As it is we have arrived at a stage where people talk about Punjabi English, Bengali English, Madrasi English and so forth. They say that every part of India has its own brand of English, in the way of pronunciation and so on, and it is undoubtedly so."

Nehru's observation suggests that every regional variety of IE has some obvious characteristic phonological features so that it can be called Punjabi, Bengali or Madrasi English. Such regional features of IE have been described in some detail in Bansal (1969), Babu (1971) and in individual studies of different varieties cited later in the course of this study.

These features have often been noted (pejoratively though) in non-linguistic writings too. Singh (1977, 114-5), for example, says that a Punjabi finds "le endings difficult to tongue... The Sindhi lengthens the short ġ -- "Gate (get)məGate (pet)" ... or "Shall I rape (wrap) it for you"... etc.

Sometimes such features are grossly exaggerated.
in the following instance of what Singh (p. 115) thinks to be "typical of the southerner's English":

(2) "Madras govermentta, very gudda, morning appointmentta, evening permanentta; India govermentta no gudda; morning appointmentta evening ruttrunchmentta."

The example in (2) is intended to be taken as a "classic" (joke) of the English spoken in South India and I will show in Section 4.3 of Chapter 4 that this is no more than an exaggerated caricature of typical south Indian English.

This passage has been quoted here only to show that by IE is often meant a certain kind of pronunciation of English which contains certain phonological features of one or another of several Indian languages. In the passage given in (2) also we find a profusion of geminate consonants, word-final vowels, etc., which are characteristic of some Indian languages.

Henceforth in the present study, therefore, IE will mean English spoken by such Indians who acquired the phonology of at least one Indian language before they started learning English and who have not received any training in pronouncing it in internationally accepted standard ways such as General Indian English (suggested
in Bansal and Harrison (1972) or Received Pronunciation (RP) of London or Standard American English or any other variety of English of this kind. It appears that a very great majority of nearly 20 million speakers of English in India (approximate data from preliminary census report (1981)) comes under this category and, therefore, it seems desirable to make a systematic study of its phonology.

1.3 Talking of Pan-Indian English

1.3.1 One or Many IE: The Indian Constitution recognises 14 regional languages for official purposes besides English though census of India (1971) lists about 650 regional languages and according to unofficial estimates India has more than 1500 languages. It is likely then that the first language features in the English spoken by speakers of these languages would be different. To say that IE would mean "English spoken by one who acquired the phonology of at least one Indian language before one started learning English" is to say that there are as many different IEs as the number of languages spoken as the first language in India. Earlier studies of the phonology of IE have reached similar conclusions.

Bansal (1969, 11) in his study of the intelligibility of IE felt that "even within India there are a large number of regional varieties each different from the others in
certain ways and retaining to some extent the phonetic patterns of the Indian languages spoken in that particular region." Rubdy (1981, 18) also mentions these regional differences but she feels that the difference between North and South Indian varieties of English is more obvious than that, for example, between TE and MLYE or between HE and ME, etc. Wells (1982, 631-2) also concludes that IE varies in phonological character from region to region. Such a conclusion, particularly in Wells, is based on the limitations of his framework. The principal aim of his study seems to be to describe different "accents of English" without looking into the nature and dimension of differences.

His conclusion is based partly also on the intelligibility scores obtained for IE by Bansal (1969). Bansal found that mutual intelligibility in English between Indians of different mother tongues was around 74 percent compared with 97 percent between RP speaking English people. Wells, therefore, concludes that "many of these (IE) pronunciations appear to be idiosyncratic to individual speakers, and, thus, may justifiably be regarded as errors."

1.3.2 One IE: The following chapters of the present study will show that many features noted by earlier studies as typical
of the pronunciations of certain individuals or of certain regional varieties are actually features common to all the regional varieties of English. Therefore, it does not sound proper to conclude that "these (IE) pronunciations appear to be idiosyncratic to individual speakers, and, thus, may justifiably be regarded as errors." It seems true that there are some phonological differences between the various regional dialects of IE, but it will be seen, particularly in Chapters 3 and 4, that such divergences between different regional varieties are only dialectal, attested in many other natural languages too.

I hope to be able to show that one set of phonological rules can explain the underlying uniformity and predict the possible surface divergences between different regional varieties of IE and, therefore, it seems reasonable to treat IE as "an autonomous variety of English, with its own systems, structures, and rules", contrary to the conclusion in Wells (pp. 630-1) and similar studies cited above.

One difficulty for any study exploring the underlying uniformity of IE seems to be in the fact that whereas divergences between different varieties are readily perceptible, their commonness is not. It is only to a systematic investigation with data from different varieties that this commonness reveals itself. The present study
of the phonology of IE is an exercise of this kind.

But before such an exercise is undertaken, it may be appropriate to ask if there is any prima facie evidence for the hypothesis of the underlying uniformity between different regional varieties of IE. At the level of phonology such an evidence is mainly of a perceptual nature. For example, it has been shown by experiments in Bansal (1969), and this seems to be supported also by remarks cited in (1) and (2) above, that an AE/BE speaker has similar difficulties understanding any variety of IE if he is listening to it for the first time. All other things being equal, it is not the case that an AE/BE speaker understands TE more easily than he understands HE or vice versa.

This also seems to explain a somewhat low intelligibility score for IE between Indians of different mother tongues compared with a higher intelligibility score for RP between RP speaking class of people. It has been argued that the intelligibility score of IE between Indians of different mother tongues would have been higher if their English had an underlying uniformity as seems to be the case with RP (see Bansal (1969, 117) and Wells (1982, 632)).

An argument of this kind ignores the fact that while
listening to a language for the first time, a listener, even though the speaker of the same language, may be overwhelmed by the dialectal divergences and he may not comprehend the spoken language in its entirety. The situation seems to be different in the case of RP speaking English people listening to one another's speech. Being the users of the same dialect they are likely to be acquainted with the dialectal nuances of RP, which, according to Cottle (1975, 64) "is only the dialect of the London middle class".

In that case a Welsh or a Scot or even a Yorkshire man coming to London for the first time is likely to be struck by a Londoner's RP (or Cockney) as a Delhisala by "Madrasi English". From the point of view of a non-Londoner Briton, "Londoner's RP has some obvious shortcomings. A combination of urban catarrah, affectionate moneyed eloquence, and a strong stress on the penultimate or antepenultimate syllables of long words has produced a glut of syllables with the vowel /ə/, the flat neuter noise, which dominates the first, third and fourth syllables of photographer" (Cottle (1975, 64) underlining mine).

But no one for that matter is likely to say that Yorkshire English and RP are not related dialects of the
same language. Such a conclusion would be based on the assumption that the relationship of the two dialects is rooted deeper down and that they have far too many similarities than what is indicated by short vowels in the surface structure, etc. of RP.

The intelligibility score for IE in Bansal (1969), therefore, does not seem to tell us much about the uniformity or diversity between different regional varieties of IE. What is of significance from this point of view in Bansal is the commonness of phonological features that are there in all regional varieties of English and that can be said to inhibit their intelligibility.

Bansal found (p. 66) that though IE varies from region to region, it "retains certain common patterns which mark it as distinctively Indian." Some of such common patterns (with some dialectal differences) are nonuse of weak forms of words in unstressed positions, nonuse of short vowels in unstressed syllables, difficulty with word-initial and final consonant clusters, adding vowels at the end of words, spelling pronunciation, wrongly located stress, absence of stress, segmental substitution, elision of syllables, etc.

These findings in Bansal about the commonness of certain phonological patterns in the different regional
varieties of IE seem also to be supported to a certain extent by the remarks cited in (1) and (2) above. I will show in the following chapters of the present study that some of these phonological features of IE owe to the fact that it is spoken by certain speakers of Indian languages. Some of these features will be argued to be there in the phonology of IE because it is a second language of its speakers. An attempt will be made to identify such phonological features also which are native to English and which seem to have stayed on in the various regional varieties of IE.

Thus a prima facie evidence of the distinctively systematic character of IE seems to come from the fact that several phonological processes, as mentioned above, are common to its different varieties.

It is, perhaps, due to the intuitive knowledge of such processes that one can quite often predict a typical Indian pronunciation of an English word. Hence, it appears possible to claim that there is something like a second language (IE) speaker's intuition. Therefore, in keeping with the aims of the generative grammar, an attempt will be made in the present study to formulate certain aspects of the IE speaker's phonological intuition.
1.4 **Earlier studies:** Earlier studies of the phonology of IE have made no serious attempt to investigate the systematic character of IE and therefore, it seems, they have not been able to say that IE is as "autonomous" a language variety as AE/BE or as Hindi or Tamil "with its own systems, structures, and rules".

They have called IE, like Bansal (1969, 171) for instance, "an incorrect English" or like Vijaykrishnan (1978) and Sadanandan (1981) "a dialect of English" or like Pandey (1980) "a dialect of Hindustani".

These conclusions are inevitable if the issue is approached in an adhoc manner as these studies seem to have done. Bansal takes a prescriptive approach towards IE vis-a-vis RP of London. Hence a typical prescriptive conclusion in Bansal (1969, 171) is the following: "A very common fault among IE speakers is the incorrect stressing of English words, that is stressing them differently from the usual RP pattern".

Studies like those by Vijaykrishnan, Sadanandan and Pandey within the generative phonology framework have taken a liberal descriptive attitude towards specific varieties of IE. They do not call IE deviations from RP patterns errors, even though they start the IE pronunciations that
deviate from RP. But their perspective is limited to describing surface facts.

Hence Vijaykrishnan and Sadanandan think that IE (i.e. TE and MLYE in their case) is a product of the fusion of 18th century English and an Indian language (i.e. Tamil/Malayalam). Pandey is of the opinion that HE is a result of the fusion of English of an unspecified period with the HE speaker's "Hindustani". Therefore they use the term "derived dialect" to suggest that IE is a dialect derived from the fusion of two languages. Bansal (p. 169) also thinks that IE is a result of the fusion of the patterns of BE and Indian languages.

None of these studies, however, specifies the extent and nature of such a "fusion". Vijaykrishnan argues that there has been limited "restructuring" of rules in TE, but the UR of a word in TE is the same as that in the native varieties of English such as AE/BE. Therefore he is of the opinion that TE is a dialect of English. Pandey argues that HE is a (phonological) dialect of Hindustani.

These studies have been able to describe the systematic nature of certain phonological features such as stress in the different varieties of IE to a certain extent. For example, these studies have almost conclusively shown the lack of contrastive stress seen in AE/BE in
pairs of words such as \( \text{cond}{\text{\`t}}\text{t}_N \) vs \( \text{cond}{\text{\`t}}\text{t}_V \). It has also been generally shown in these studies that all heavy syllables seem to receive some stress in IE and light syllables receive stress only word initially, if at all. In IE, therefore, a word like develop is stressed word initially to generate the PR \( \text{d}{\text{\`v}}\text{l}{\text{\`p}}_7 \) rather than \( \text{d}{\text{\`v}}\text{l}{\text{\`p}}_7 \) as in AE/BE. Similarly a word like adjective is pronounced as \( \text{ad}{\text{\`d}}\text{ekt}{\text{\`i}}\text{v}_7 \) in many varieties of IE rather than as \( \text{ad}{\text{\`d}}\text{ekt}{\text{\`i}}\text{v}_7 \) as in AE/BE. Such stress facts in IE, according to these studies, are consequences of stress rules in IE speaker's first language phonology.

Yet there are many equally systematic features of IE phonology with regard to stress and other segmental and suprasegmental facts for which those studies do not seem to have an explanation. For example, whereas it is possible for these studies to explain the location of stress in develop or América in many varieties of IE, it seems difficult for them to explain the location of stress in the same varieties of IE in astonish, aroma or syllable, etc. The difficulty in explanation of stress facts in these words seems to be in their assumption that the URs of these words in IE are the same as in AE/BE and that only the rule component has been restructured. I hope to be able to show in Chapters 2 and 3 of this study that by assuming orthography as the UR for these words in IE,
stress-facts of a large number of words in many known varieties of IE can be explained in a very simple manner.

Though such a phenomenon has not been reported so far in TE, yet going by rules in Vijaykrishnan we can not predict the PR of a word like school which is realized as \( \text{\textipa{i\textsuperscript{j}sku\textsuperscript{u}l}} \) in many varieties of IE. Similarly going by Pandey's rules we can also not predict the PR of a word like minister which is realized as \( \text{\textipa{mi\textsuperscript{n}istel\textsuperscript{u}}} \) or \( \text{\textipa{mi\textsuperscript{n}istel\textsuperscript{a}}} \) in many varieties of IE.

It seems obvious that these studies have taken a patch work approach that helps them describe certain facts of IE phonology, though not always in an economic manner as we saw in the case of stress in two sets of words above. Moreover, they do not shed any light on the unique nature of a second language phonology and thus leave a number of questions unanswered. More will be said about these studies in Chapter 3 which presents a set of stress rules for IE. At the moment it seems sufficient to say that there clearly is a need for a more systematic and serious investigation of the phonology of IE than the ones attempted so far.

1.5 An Alternative

1.5.1 A Perspective: The limited objective of these studies was to find out factors affecting the intelligibility of IE as in
Bansal and to ascertain whether stress assignment in IE is systematic as in Vijaykrishnan (1978) and other studies of stress in different varieties of IE. These studies have succeeded to the extent they have found their answers. But, as mentioned above, they leave many questions unanswered.

One would, for example, want to know why certain features particular to the phonology of English have stayed on in IE whereas certain others seem to have been replaced by the features from the phonology of the IE speaker's first language. One may also want to know why certain features which do not seem to belong either to the phonology of English or to that of the IE speaker's first language crop up at all in IE. Similarly, the nature and extent of interference, if at all there is such a thing, is left unspecified in these studies.

In order to get these answers different kinds of questions will have to be asked. Apart from asking what IE is, one will also have to ask why it is. In order to understand the nature of its phonology, the explanation will have to go deeper down into its roots.

It will have to be asked, for example, if circumstances for learning IE by an Indian are similar to those for learning Indian languages by Indians or for learning
English by most Americans and British. Another question may relate to the nature of constraints on this kind of learning by human cognitive capacity, etc. These questions may lead to others like the question of the specification of UR, the nature of rules governing the syllable and prosodic structures, etc., in IE and their divergences from native varieties like AE/BE.

In this chapter we shall discuss the two questions of rather a general nature and try to construct their answers. These answers in turn will lead us to answers of some other questions about the phonology of IE in the following chapters.

1.5.2 The Genesis: The circumstances in which an average Indian generally learns English are vastly different from the ones in which anyone learns one's mother tongue. Most Indians learn English from other Indians who have themselves learnt it from other Indians and so on. Moreover, this learning takes place mostly through formal schooling and the learner's exposure to the language is generally limited to the visual medium in the artificial contexts of the classroom.

The portrait of an Indian beginning to learn English is generally of the following kind. He is generally between five and ten years old (sometimes older) and is already
speaking his mother tongue with considerable fluency. At school he begins learning English by learning its orthography as the first thing. In this task he is aided by his teacher who has mostly the same mother tongue as the learner. Thus there appears to be a relatively heavy mother tongue phonology input compared with the meagre input of the target language through its orthography.

English orthography, as SPE (p. 49) describes it, "is a system designed for readers who know the language, who understand the sentences, and therefore, know the surface structure of sentences... A system of this sort is of little use for one who wishes to produce tolerable speech without knowing the language."

Ideally speaking, therefore, English orthography should be taught after teaching the learner at least the elementary bit of language the native way. But that appears to be an impossible exercise. In any case there is going to be no transportation en masse of learners to England, for example, neither getting an adequate number of teachers to teach the native variety at the pre-school level appears to be a possibility.

In such a situation the learners' exposure is likely to be limited mostly to books, at least in the initial stages of learning the language. Hence he must be equipped to
recognise a word and assign to it phonological, syntactic and semantic features. Since language does not seem to tolerate vacuums, it appears that English orthographic symbols are also assigned definite phonetic values in the Indian context. That seems to be the moment of birth of IE.

In other words, when an Indian learner starts learning English he possibly uses English orthography, which does not seem to have one to one correspondence with pronunciation, like the orthography of Indian languages which have greater correspondence between symbols and sounds. Such a recognition (of orthographic symbols) may also be enforced by the teacher who may be the learner's model and may insist upon "correct" pronunciation.

It appears possible to suppose that the first Indian to learn English may have learnt the native sounds of English before learning its orthography. He may have got the orthography later to recognise the English words and sentences in print (see Sinha (1978, 6)). But it should be remembered, he too is likely to have started learning English after learning at least his mother tongue. The situation for speaking in English may still have been relatively limited. It seems, therefore, likely that for want of reinforcement from native speakers and under pressure of meeting new demands such as writing of Indian
names of places and people, etc., English orthographic symbols may have started taking an invariant phonetic character in India loosing their variant (native) character.

English orthography in particular does not indicate phonetic variation where it is predictable by general rule. Thus stress placement and regular vowel and consonant alternations are not reflected in English orthography.²

There are other areas, however, not predictable by general rule where English orthography by explicit conventions insists upon a specific kind of phonological feature to given symbols. Some instances of this kind are double vowel sequences like ee, oo to realize /ii/ or /uu/ such as in deep, and boot, for which a single i or u is not enough. Another instance of conventions of this kind is the tensing of a vowel before word-final e such as in pure, acute, machine or line. Yet another area of this kind is morphology which insists, for example, in the case of BE, on -ory being pronounced with short vowels. It will be shown in Chapter 2 that apart from certain exceptions it is only in this "explicitly marked" class of conventions that the English orthography in India has retained its native phonological value.

The class where phonetic variation is supposedly predictable by general rule has undergone almost a complete
change. Major phonetic variations in this class, as mentioned above, are stress placement and regular vowel alternations. It has been shown by Bansal (1969, 17) and Gupta (1980) and others that IE does not necessarily reduce the stressless vowels to \( \tilde{o} \) on the RP pattern. It will be shown in Chapter 2 that orthography in IE in these respects has acquired a phonological value similar to that of Indian languages.

Changes of this kind in vowel alternation pattern seem to affect the syllable structure pattern of the language which in turn appears to affect stress placement, etc. A number of studies (discussed above) have shown that stress assignment in IE has moved away from AE/BE stress patterns. Chapter 3 of the present study will also show how stress facts of IE take a different direction from AE/BE when definite phonetic values are attached to orthographic symbols on the pattern of Indian languages.

It appears, therefore, that even if at any time the acquisition of English sounds preceded the acquisition of its orthography in India, the situation changed soon. Because of the circumstances peculiar to the learning of a second language like English in India, people seemed to have relatively little option but to learn English orthography first in order to learn its sounds.
We shall see in the following chapters of the present study that such a change in the learning situation appears to have significantly affected the phonological shape of IE. Changes observed in the phonology of IE (from AE/BE, etc.), thus, seem to have been induced partly by the nature of English orthography and partly because of the growing lack of reinforcement (of native sounds) from native speakers in India.

The pattern of change seems to be fairly simple and clear. Phonetic values of orthographic symbols seem to have changed from variant to certain invariant ones. It will be shown in the following chapters of this study that marked orthographic conventions in English, such as ee or oo, briefly mentioned above, are also changing increasingly in IE like the unmarked ones.

1.5.3 Language learning and language change

1.5.3.1 An Observation: Changes mentioned above are not restricted to the phonological level alone in IE. Various studies have shown that there have been systematic changes in the syntax, semantics and other levels also in IE. Some changes of this kind in the syntax and semantics of IE have been mentioned in Parasher (1979) and Rubdy (1981) and the relevant references therein. But, as already stated, change in phonology has been much more pervasive.
English has undergone such changes in other parts of the world too. And so has French or any other language in the communities of non-native speakers in erstwhile European colonies.

English, or any other language, has changed in the community of its native speakers also from what it was a hundred years ago. But there is a major difference between the change it has undergone in its native communities and that in its non-native ones. A comparison of the direction of change in AE/BE, Australian, Canadian, Newzealandish or other native varieties of English with that in Indian, Hawaiian, Jamaican, etc. varieties of non-native English shows a fundamental difference.

Whereas native varieties by and large seem to have maintained the characteristic English typology (such as contrastive stress, phonotactic combinations, phonemic inventory or basic S-V-O pattern, etc.), non-native varieties, with varying degrees of change, seem to have altered it radically. Some of them have changed the English typology to the extent of being called the pidgin/creole of a particular geographical region, such as Hawaiian Creole English (HCE) or Melanesian Pidgin English (MPE). In fact it is now being claimed for some of these (pidgin) languages, and perhaps not
wrongly, that their "only truly European character is the etymology of (their) lexical entries." (See Tinelli (1939/1981, Chapter 5)).

Something of this kind can be said about certain basilectal levels of IE too, as, for example, for the passage cited in (2) above as a sample of a "Southerner's English". But because of the background of education most of these speakers have and because of the prestige value attached to it, IE seems to have retained the core of British typological features at all levels other than phonological.

Yet a comparison of one non-native variety of English with another shows that in all cases of change their non-English features generally stand out more prominently than their English ones. For example, in no non-native variety of English (known to me) stress seems to be contrastive. Similarly most non-native varieties of English seem to have simplified the large clusters of consonants in the initial and final positions of English words (see De Camp and Hancock (1974), Bansal (1969), Schuchardt (1980), Holm and Shilling (1982), Bickerton (1981) and references therein). Bell and Hooper (1978, Chapter 2) have shown that such clusters of consonants are not very common in world's languages. The direction of change appears to be uniform
in all such varieties: increasing nativization of non-native materials.

1.5.3.2 An Explanation: The direction of change, which seems to be identical in worlds apart, suggests that this may follow from the nature of Language per se. A brief review of the available information on language learning suggests that this indeed seems to be the case.

Modern linguistics unanimously holds that language is a rule governed verbal system. Hence it is said that "the person who has acquired knowledge of a language has internalized a system of rules" (SPE, p. 3).

This may also mean that when one learns another language one learns another system of rules. This may be true to the extent the term "language" is identified with a particular language spoken in a particular community such as English or Chinese or French or Hindi, etc. There may be certain features of language present in one but not present in others. There are, for example, certain rules of grammatical gender that apply in French or Hindi but not in English. So someone learning French or Hindi in addition to English may have to learn a system of rules of grammatical gender too in addition to a system of rules where such features do not occur. In this sense learning
another language means learning another system of rules. In this sense, a person who knows, for example, both English and Hindi, can be said to have "internalized" two systems of rules.

But there is a broader sense in which the term "system" can be used. In this sense two or ten languages known by an individual can be treated as all elements of one (verbal) system created by him. This multilingual system created by the individual is likely to be essentially of the same kind as that of a monolingual. The way a multilingual uses one or another language does not seem to be different from the way a monolingual uses one or another lexical item or register or style. The process of deciding on appropriate alternatives does not appear to be different either. Different languages within an individual's knowledge are perhaps integral parts of a system he uses at will.

System (of language) in this broader sense according to Bickerton (1981, 219) "seems to depend crucially not upon complexification but on the power to abstract as units, classes of objects, classes of actions, classes of events and classes of yet more abstract kinds."

This cognitive tendency to abstract seems to be a severely limiting factor on the expansion of the system. The individual may learn any number of languages, but the
language faculty within the individual tends to process the maximum amount of new information in terms of abstractions already existing in the system. The new "units" may be created only when they are very different from the existing ones and when the individual feels compelled to create them.

In other words, it seems that new units come into existence only when they are marked (in relation to the existing one) and when they must. In such circumstances the system tends to expand and accommodate the new units (of abstraction). In all other cases there appears to be a tendency to process and abstract the new information in terms of existing ones.

This seems to happen even when an individual learns new languages from time to time. New lexical items are learnt and their semantic field seems to be adjusted mostly in terms of the nearest corresponding item already existing in the system of the learner. Thus a particular semantic field now may have a new lexical item plus all the others already with the individual to identify this field (see De Camp (1974, pp. 55-59) for a data-based discussion of this hypothesis).

So is it likely to happen in the case of syntactic, morphological and phonological components of the language
provided that the new item is markedly different from its existing counterparts and the individual feels compelled to accommodate the new item in his system. In such an eventuality the system may expand to accommodate the new item.

This process can be understood with the help of a simple example. Suppose a Guyanese is learning French and he finds the grammatical gender of French marked, marked in the sense that it does not exist in the language(s) he already knows. If it is possible for him to ignore this, i.e., if the community in which he is going to use French can overlook his not learning the gender-aspect of the language or not learning it properly, the Guyanese French learner is quite likely to ignore this.

This is what seems to have happened in the case of Guyanese French Creole (see data in Fauqueney (1974, p. 32)). Many other French creoles show this feature. In India it seems to happen quite often in the case of Bengali, Oriya and Maithili speakers of Hindi who generally seem to ignore the gender aspect of Hindi grammar perhaps because they have relatively very little of grammatical gender distinctions in their mother tongues.
Community valuation or the extent of the individual's awareness of and motivation to approximate the marked feature of the target language seem to be dynamic, rather than static, factors and may change from community to community, or individual to individual and from time to time. A community, therefore, may have from speakers with native like control (accrolectal level) to speakers farthest removed from native like control of the language (basi­lectal level). This appears to form some kind of a cline. In the case of IE such a cline can be seen in the instance of use of English in the Lok Sabha mentioned in (1) above where Nehru seems to stand on one (accrolectal) end of the cline and many other members of the Lok Sabha near the other (basi­lectal) end of the cline.

Second language learning, like the multilingual setting itself, appears to be a much more dynamic phenomenon than first language learning. The same individual may occupy different points on the achievemental cline of language. If the individual's awareness of the marked features of the target language changes, his motivation to approximate them is also likely to change. He may then make efforts to move up the cline. This seems to happen in the case of many an IE speaker. Therefore, following Rubdy (1981, 20), it seems appropriate to talk of a span of cline rather than a point of cline.
Hypercorrection, etc., can also be attributed to this kind of persistent dynamism in second/foreign language learning situations. The greater speed of eloquence in the English used by some Indians may also be traced to this aspect of second language learning.

Being able to speak in English is generally considered to be a sign of good education and a particular social status in India. Hence, an average IE speaker seems to have a tendency to show that he can speak it effortlessly and fluently, perhaps to ensure for himself the prestige and privileges given to speakers of English in India. After some time this tendency seems to take the form of a habit so that an average IE speaker can be found speaking it at a relatively rapid speed and he may not be intelligible to an average AE/BE speaker. Nehru (1963, 1) reports that "people from America or England are totally unable to understand the flow of eloquence by some Indians, who speak it with greater rapidity than any Englishman can".

The kinds of changes, that the following chapters will show, have occurred in English in India appear to be due to the Indian's unawareness of its marked features, such as contrastive stress, etc., rather than to the lack of community value of such features. In India "good English" seems to have the highest social prestige. But the native
concept of good English, such as RP of London, simply appears to be unavailable here, at least as far as Spoken English is concerned. In such a situation what seems to be generally acquired is a "good" sample of any regional variety of IE.

An example of this kind is the neutralization of $\underaccent{37}{\text{s}}$ and $\underaccent{37}{\text{x}}$ in certain varieties of IE (see Bansal (1969)). It is quite possible that the community's synchronic awareness of this phonological distinction is also neutralized. Such changes, probably consequent upon a lack of the awareness of certain phonological features of English (such as in AE/BE), appear to be true for different phonological features in varying degrees throughout IE.

A more reasonable perspective on situations of the kind sketched above, therefore, seems to be not to treat them as instances of interference. Rather a better explanation seems to be to treat such changes as a consequence of adapting the existing system to accommodate facts from the newer language.

Saying that changes in the second language phonology are consequences of interference from the first language phonology would mean that because the first language phonology of an IE speaker does not distinguish between, for example, $\underaccent{37}{\text{s}}$ and $\underaccent{37}{\text{x}}$, it would not let him make such a distinction in English either. This appears to be
false in view of the fact that there are many speakers of
English in India who have acquired such distinctions in
their speech once aware of them. Moreover saying that
this is a case of interference would mean that a parallel
unit is present in the phonology of IE speaker's first
language and obstructs his learning of the corresponding
unit in English. To think of such a hostility among
languages sounds absurd as a proposition. Such a proposi-
tion sounds misleading and illogical since there would be
no need to learn a unit if it is already present in a
speaker's phonology.

It is, therefore, logical to treat changes in a second
language phonology as consequences of an individual's effort
to adapt the existing verbal system to accommodate units from
the target language. He seems to take all such units which
appear new to him and which he must in proportion to his
motivation to take such units into his existing verbal system.
But he can not be expected to learn such units of which he
is not even aware and for which he seems to have little
motivation, if at all. Hence the language he creates as
his second language and the changes in this can best be
treated as a consequence of the process of convergence of
features from two particular languages rather than as a
consequence of interference from one into the learning of
another.
This is how languages known as pidgins and creoles also seem to have been born. The structure of the newer language changes in most communities almost solely because the host community fails to perceive some of the newness of the new language and also does not appear to feel compelled to accommodate all its newness in its existing system. Hence the guest language is almost forced to take a new shape in this community.

The new language, as a pidgin may be called, seems to retain most of the lexical entries and perceivable parts of the marked rules from the native speaker's system. In other areas the new language gets the same specifications as its abstracted counterparts already existing in the system of its users.

In Melanesian pidgin English (see Hall (1972)) and such other languages the new users' native features seem to have pervaded all parts of language, i.e., syntax, morphology, phonology, etc., excepting perhaps the semantics of words to a certain extent. In languages like IE such changes seem by and large restricted to the phonological component.

Thus the only difference between IE and a pidgin English (and any other pidgin or creole, for that matter) appears to be one of scale. The nature of change itself
seems to be very dynamic and seems to be responsive to pressures (i.e., pressure of need to communicate). One example of the consequence of this pressure, as the case appears to be, has been cited in (2) as an instance of a southerner's English. This specimen of IE in no sense appears to be different from the instance of Hawaiian Creole English cited in the prologue to this study. In a very clear sense, therefore, IE appears to be related to modern pidgins and creoles round the world.

To sum up, it is being claimed that the process of second language learning is essentially the same as that for the first language. In both cases individuals expand their cognitive systems to accommodate only what appears to them new and what they must. These parameters, i.e., of one's awareness of new items and the compulsion to learn them, are quite dynamic and they affect (different) individual's achievements in first and second languages differently.

These parameters may change from community to community, individual to individual and from time to time in any community or individual. This appears to be the most likely reason why the same language in different communities takes different shapes. Somewhere it is known as IE and somewhere else it is known as Melanesian Pidgin
English or Hawaiian Creole English. But they are the products of a language universal abstracting process working in the cognitive systems of humans.

1.6 Linguistic Universals

1.6.1 Formal Vs Substantive: A natural question to ask at this point is about the function of the abstracting process in a child. Such a question would seek to know the way a child recognises an item as marked or unmarked and the way he adapts his system in view of such items. In sum it is being asked if a child has any a priori way of treating a particular linguistic item as marked from another.

Such a question is specific to humans and demands an explanation of the process of language learning by human child and of linguistic universals. In the following paragraphs of this Section I present such an explanation.

Modern linguistics assumes that human child is "biologically programmed to have language" (see Bickerton 1981, 291-5)). It is also assumed that the cognitive capacity of a child to learn language in one community is not likely to be different from this capacity of another child in any other community.

It was said earlier in this chapter that language
crucially depends upon the individual's capacity to abstract. Bickerton (1981, 267-71) has argued, and I think correctly, that "language grew out of the cognitive system used for individual orientation, prediction, etc." He suggests that language is a vehicle through which man could conceptualize his view of things and make predictions about the same.

In either case, whether to conceptualize and/or to predict, language had to abstract as units classes of objects, actions, events and things of yet more abstract kinds. Possibly it is through abstractions of this kind that man could store all kinds of information, recall and review the past events or images and predict things to come. This way, i.e., by abstracting from a mass of details, burden on the memory could also be reduced to an insignificant degree.

Perhaps the innate capacity a human child is supposed to be born with for language learning is this power to abstract.⁵ This way he could successfully transcend the limit of here and now and could connect his present and past experiences to decide about the future and increase his chances of survival. He could abstract for example a class of items, called food stuff related with a class of actions called eating or drinking and behave accordingly.
In order to be an efficient abstracting system the "language (system) has to have two things, at least. First, it must have the capacity to code the cognitive map in such a way that processing time would be drastically reduced. Second, it must make solutions available to the species (which) will achieve not just predictability, but dissemination of predictability". (Bickerton (1981, 271) underlining mine).

Here it is being suggested that human child is "programmed" to have a language which could relate different abstract classes by simple rules (thus reducing the processing time) and which could give "concrete codes" to abstract classes (thus making dissemination possible).

This capacity of human child to make rules and classes corresponds to what SPE calls "significant linguistic universals". According to SPE (p. 4) "the significant linguistic universals are those that must be assumed to be available to the child learning a language as an a priori, innate endowment."

According to this theory a child has an innate sense of "certain formal universals regarding the kinds of rules that can appear in a grammar, the kinds of structures on
which they may operate and the ordering conditions under which these rules may apply."

Similarly a child may also have a set of substantive universals that may help him assign lexical items (of any language) "to fixed categories such as nouns, verbs, adjectives, etc."

Formal universals, thus appear to be devices that help a child process and relate a number of abstract units and substantive universals seem to help him classify these units so that the processing devices may refer to one class but not another.

To answer the question that was raised in the beginning of this section, formal universals seem to equip a child to evaluate a rule (or structure) in a natural language and substantive universals can be said to help him classify linguistic items that may be combined by rules. These innate capacities of human child seem to considerably reduce the size of grammar that he may build and the shape of linguistic outputs he may produce.

1.6.2 Arbitrariness: Thus, even though it is possible for human languages to be arbitrary, they can be arbitrary only within certain limits. For example, formal universals restrain
the arbitrariness to choosing among limited combinations of units at any given level. Similarly substantive universals restrict the arbitrariness to choosing only from a given class. Though not strictly so, formal universals seem to define what is called syntagmatic relations and substantive universals appear to do so with paradigmatic ones.

Arbitrariness in human language, therefore, appears to be restricted to a great degree in syntagmatic choices and a little less in paradigmatic ones. As a child approaches a "cultural" language, he perhaps approaches it with a certain innate sense of possible and unmarked combinations as against impossible and marked ones. A natural tendency in the cognitive system then seems to be to abstract as many items of the cultural language a child encounters as possible in terms of general unmarked structures and to take only as much of marked ones as he must.

This may be a good reason why child language is full of "incorrect" generalizations and simplifications in any community and also why marked structures are reported to be acquired late, if at all. This seems to be true also of pidgin languages. As Vijayakrishnan (1978) observes "one of the strategies found in derived dialects which it shares with pidgins and creoles, also found in the early
stages of language acquisition, is the preference to the unmarked category to the marked one". This seems to explain most differences between IE and AE/BE.

In this way it seems a learner, whether a child or adult, recognises a linguistic item or structure as marked or unmarked. This innate endowment, therefore, seems to programme the kinds of grammar an individual may build while learning a language.

1.6.3 Structural Possibilities: Arbitrariness in natural languages, therefore, appears to be sharply restricted to a limited area. Languages can be arbitrary only to the extent of choosing one or another alternative within a restricted class. For example, in cat can be replaced by r or m or h or p, etc., and made rat, mat, hat, or pat. Similar substitutions can apply to t or a. Such substitutions are finite.

English, for example, can permute the segments in cat and have act, cat as it is, or tac, but no more. Structures like *cta, *tca or *atc are not possible in English. Constraints of similar kinds operate in all natural languages. All languages have different kinds of phenomena to constrain the paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations at appropriate levels.
1.6.3.1 Eurythmicity: Rhythm or 'eurythmicity' (Prince (1983)) is one phenomenon of this kind that constrains the mutual relations of constituents at the phonological level. The influence of the phenomenon of rhythm can be seen more clearly in music. In music beats occur at almost regular intervals, as shown in (3):

\[(3) \quad \begin{array}{c}
\hline
\text{xx} & \text{xx} & \text{xx} \\
\hline
\end{array}\]

Each beat in (3) has two segments. Such an evenness, however, may not always be there. Segments may sometimes be unevenly grouped as in (4):

\[(4) \quad \begin{array}{c}
\hline
\text{xx} & \text{xxx} & \text{xx} \\
\hline
\end{array}\]

The penultimate beat in (4) dominates three segments. Other beats dominate only two each. Yet the beat with three segments generally does not upset the rhythm. Phonological devices like slur, reduction, deletion, etc., are generally motivated to maintain the rhythm.

Use of such devices is not arbitrary. They seem
to be motivated by syntagmatic constraints on the articulation of a string to maintain the overall rhythm. Rhythm in structures like (4) is maintained inspite of the presence of factors apparently detrimental to it. This 'maintenance' is made possible by phonological phenomena of the kind mentioned above.

Evenness of beats, or rhythm, is a phenomenon of this kind. Hence (5) and the like would be quite generally expected but (6) and the like only exceptionally:

(5) (a)  

\[ \begin{array}{cccc} 
  \text{xx} & \text{xxx} & \text{xx} & \text{xxx} \\
\end{array} \]

(b)  

\[ \begin{array}{cccc} 
  \text{xx} & \text{xx} & \text{xx} & \text{xx} \\
\end{array} \]

(c)  

\[ \begin{array}{cccc} 
  \text{xx} & \text{xx} & \text{xx} & \text{xx} & \text{x} \\
\end{array} \]

(6)  

\[ \begin{array}{cccc} 
  \text{xx} & \text{xxxxxx} & \text{x} \\
\end{array} \]
Beats in (5a) to (5c) occur at more or less regular intervals and dominate units of more or less similar size in a regular rising falling rhythm. Beats in (5a) dominate two or three segments at regular intervals, in (5b) they dominate two segments each with one segment occurring at intervals in a rising-falling rhythm. A similar situation is there in (5c) in a falling-rising rhythm. In (6), however, the penultimate beat dominates six segments against only two of the antepenultimate and one of the final with a very high rise and abrupt fall. The situation in (6) does not sound impossible, but it is likely to be rare and marked.

1.6.3.2 Rhythm types in Natural Languages: It seems that all natural languages also have some kind of rhythm. If a conversational situation in natural language is carefully observed, its musicality would be obvious. Some kind of prominence, of stress/tonal accent, recurs at regular intervals. This kind of, in a way monotonous, regularity can be broken only by speaking in an abnormal, staccato fashion. Some comic characters in movies sound funny because they violate this regularity.

This does not, however, mean that rhythm is alike in every language. It is not. It only suggests that every language has a rhythm which in a sense works like
a syntagmatic constraint on the articulation of (any) language. The exact manifestation of rhythm will vary from language to language. But the possibilities of such variations are limited and can be listed. Thus different kinds of stress patterns in the world's languages can be formalized in terms of iambic, trochaic, dactylic, anapaest, spondee, pyrrhic, etc. (see Hayes (1981, 3.3) for various kinds of unmarked stress patterns in natural languages.)

All of these patterns may or may not be there in a given language but it is quite possible that only one of the possible patterns may be the preferred pattern in that language.

Suppose in a string of two syllables in a language only one is to be stressed. Then only (7) or (8) is the unmarked output for that language:

(7) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\hline
\text{syllable} \\
\end{array}
\]

(8) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\hline
\text{syllable} \\
\end{array}
\]

where \[
\begin{array}{c}
\hline
\text{syllable} \\
\end{array}
\]

Similarly, if only one of the three syllables is to be stressed, then chances are that (9) or (10) is the unmarked output:
Languages that prefer the pattern of (7) can be said to have a trochaic foot; similarly languages with the pattern of (8) above can be said to have a preference for iambic, (9) for a dactyl and (10) for an anapaest. I will show in Chapter 3 of the present study that IE, AE/BE and many Indian languages seem to prefer trochaic and dactylic feet. French seems to have a preference for iambic and anapaestic feet (see Selkirk (1980)). Spondee foot of Vietnamese (see Chaudhary (forthcoming, a)) can be said to be a marked stress pattern from this point of view.

Languages that seem to have penultimate stress in a sequence of three or more syllables, such as in many words in AE/BE, IE and many other European and South-East Asian languages like Aklan (see Hayes (1981, Chapter 2)) can be said to have a trochaic or iambic foot depending upon the general preferred pattern in that language.

Following this preference most IE and AE/BE speakers will have (11) and (13) rather than (12) and (14) which show French stress patterns of the same words:

(11) árab
(13) américa
(12) aráb
(14) amerique
Foot patterns and examples given above, therefore, suggest that every language has preferred rhythmic patterns. Identifying preferred patterns can become easier by examining a situation where its converse is also possible. For example, a case like that of Ticonderoga (Kiparsky 1979) strongly suggests that AE prefers a trochaic foot rather than an iambic. 8

Such language specific preferences can be seen as stemming from (formal) linguistic universals which act like constraints on the organization and realization of segments in a phonological string. The language is arbitrary only to the extent of choosing one rather than another possible pattern. The preferred pattern in any language should, therefore, be seen as the language specific manifestation of linguistic universals. It will be shown that most phonological processes in a language seem to be motivated to maintain this pattern.

1.6.3.3 Syllable types and Conspiracies: One such process that seems to help maintain the rhythm in AE/BE is "rhythm rule" (Kiparsky (1979)). It is a process that distances two syllables of similar prominence and prevents "stress clash". Kiparsky's Rhythm Rule is given in (15):
(15) Rhythm Rule (Kiparsky (1979)):

\[ W S S \rightarrow S W S \]

Where \( S = \) strong \( W = \) weak

Therefore AE has:

(16) expect but expectation

\[ W S \]
\[ W S W \]
\[ W S \]

Similarly rules that retract stress from the heavy final syllable leftward in AE (see SPE, p. 68) appear to be another kind of process that help maintain the rhythm.

(17) a) elevate b) elevate

\[ S W \]
\[ S W \]

The leftward movement of stress in (17b) helps keep the preferred stress pattern.

3.3.1 **Conspiracies:** In fact many phonological processes in any language from this point of view would look like "conspiracies" of the language to maintain its preferred rhythm pattern. Ross (1973) holds "that the condition on the rules of English word-stress conspire to achieve "the leftward noun-stress effect." Kisseberth (1970) has described a similar conspiracy operating in Yawelmani.

Many other examples of conspiracies in phonology are
turning up. Phonological conspiracies have also been observed by Kiparsky (1976) in Finnish and Sanskrit. A number of processes like nasalisation of vowels, deletion of segments and "liaison" in French (Schane (1972)) from this point of view appear to be conspiracies of the language to maintain its preferred pattern. According to Schane, "In French the whole complex interplay of liaison and elision is intended to guarantee the C V C V pattern."

Syllable Types: Schane suggests that preferred rhythm pattern itself is the consequence of the preferred syllable type in natural languages. Kahn (1976, Chapter 2) holds that "the statement of a large number of phonological processes of English becomes simpler, intuitively more meaningful, and descriptively more adequate, if use is made of a set of rules of syllable structure assignment ordered prior to the phonological rules proper" (i.e., stress rules/accident rules, etc.). Wells (1982, 75) also feels that "Accents may differ" following "differences in the phonological structures (syllable types etc.) which are permitted."

These views crucially assume that as there are possible rhythm types so there are possible syllable types in any case of choice and that the rhythmic pattern of a language is crucially affected by its syllable structure pattern.
In other words given a string like (18) some languages would distribute it as (19a) and others as (19b).

(18) \[ CV \overset{\text{C}}{CV} CV (C) \]

(19) a) \[ CV CV CV \] b) \[ CV CV C C V \]

Languages that prefer (19a) may be called open syllable type and those that prefer (19b) may be called closed syllable type. Languages show preferences for or against consonant clusters and closed syllables (see Bell and Hooper (1978)). Most African languages (Tinelli (1939/1981)) prefer open syllable pattern. Malayalam (Mohanan (1982)), Tamil (Vijaykrishnan (1982)) and French (Schane (1972)) also prefer open syllables. Situation is uncertain in AE/BE (see Hayes (1981, Chapter 5)), but there seems to be an edge towards open syllables (Kahn (1976)). Maithili, Hindi and other North Indian languages seem to prefer closed syllables.

Once again it does not mean that languages of the open syllable type do not have closed syllables and vice versa. The distinction formalized in (19) indicates only a preference. Such preferences significantly affect the rhythm of the language.

The penultimate syllable in (19b) is a heavy syllable whereas (19a) does not have any such syllable. Modern
phonology is almost unanimous in the opinion that heavy syllables behave differently from light syllables with regard to stress/accent assignment in languages where syllable quantity plays a role in determining stress (see Hayes (1981) and Goldsmith (1976)). Languages that prefer closed syllables, or that avoid clusters of consonants in single syllables, are likely to have a whole set of rules for syllabication of consonants. The presence of such rules in a variety of IE will be shown in Chapter 2. Many other varieties of IE are also likely to have such rules. Syllabication rules of this kind conspire to create particular kinds of syllables which in turn trigger particular kinds of rhythm.

Judging from this point of view syllabication possibilities for an English word like minister are the following:

(20) a) \[\text{mi} \quad \text{ni} \quad \text{ste(r)}\]  
\[\text{mi} \quad \text{ni} \quad \text{ster}\]

b) \[\text{mi} \quad \text{ni} \quad \text{ste(r)}\]  
\[\text{mi} \quad \text{ni} \quad \text{ster}\]

Example in (20a) represents Received Pronunciation of BE, (20b) represents AE, (20c) represents a Maithili speaker's English and (20d) represents a Telugu speaker's English. Consequences of this preference in syllable type will be
dealt with in some detail in Chapter 3. Here it is being suggested that rhythm seems to be determined to a great extent by the syllable type. Perhaps this is why only \((20c)_{\text{ME}}\), has stress on the penult in \textit{minister}. All the other varieties mentioned in (20) have stress word initially.

Therefore, it appears that the kind of syllables a language prefers is closely linked with its preferred stress pattern and rhythm. And the rhythmic patterns of a language or a variety of a language crucially affects its intelligibility to speakers of other varieties or languages. Bansal (1969, 171) has noted the following factors (and their presence) in IE as the most important ones affecting its intelligibility. In descending order of frequency they are "wrongly located stress", absence of stress, segmental substitution, elision of syllables; and non-aspiration of stops in stressed initial positions.

Wells in his \textit{Accents of English} (1982, 81) has observed that "differences between accents, other than those differences which are merely realizational, typically result in words which rhyme in one accent not rhyming in another; ... in utterances spoken with one accent being potentially misunderstood by a hearer who uses another."

Perhaps that is why when IE speakers in Bansal
(1969, 17) said character they were misunderstood as saying "director", "erected" or "adapter", or why the American visiting the Loksabha (see (1) above) could not understand most members there, typical IE speakers; or why Nehru thinks most AE/BE speakers cannot understand IE.

In brief it is being suggested that there is a natural tendency in language to prefer unmarked to marked. Every natural language has some unmarked structural options which may be preferred structural pattern in that language.

Preferred patterns in a language can be seen as the language specific manifestation of linguistic universals which conspire through different kinds of rules to constrain the arbitrariness and marked structures and create unmarked structures of the preferred kind. One constraining phenomenon of this kind at the level of phonology in natural languages is their rhythmic pattern. Rhythmic pattern itself, however, is a consequence of the syllable structure pattern of a language. Hence a difference in syllable structure pattern can cause a difference in rhythmic patterns which can seriously affect the mutual intelligibility of two varieties of a language.

Hence it can be claimed that the intelligibility of IE is affected not because of "incorrect stressing" (Bansal)
or because of "individual errors" (Wells, 630) but because of a natural change in the structure of a second language. English in India seems to have changed from a marked to unmarked direction. IE has retained little of the marked feature of BE/BE and combined most of its unmarked ones with those from the Indian's native phonology. Similar changes are seen also in child language and pidgin languages.

From this point of view different regional varieties of IE appear to have enough in common to be grouped as dialects of one language. The following chapters will show that it is possible to propose one set of rules, with dialectal flexibility, for different varieties of IE. By their nature, rules proposed for IE will appear to be closer to the principles of the universal grammar (UG) and therefore less marked and simpler. It will be claimed that a description of the phonology of IE gives an insight into and a model for the description of second and pidgin language phonologies, which are yet to be described and explained by the modern linguistic theory in a consistent manner.

1.7 Technicalia

1.7.1 Limitations: Owing to the constraints of time and resources, it has not been possible to study all aspects of the phonology of IE. The present study is restricted to only
those aspects of the phonology of IE that affect its syllabic structure and rhythm (i.e., stress). It is hoped that a study of these aspects of the phonology of IE would be an indication of its shape in other aspects too. The present study will also account for some late phonetic phenomena that seem to occur after stress rules have applied and affect the surface shape of a string. Certain equally interesting aspects of the phonology of IE, such as realization of consonants, psychological reality of orthographic symbols, phonological consequences of morphology in IE, etc., are left to future research.

1.7.2 Organization: The present study is organised in a manner so as to reflect the order in which rules appear to apply to affect the syllabic and rhythmic shape of strings observed at the surface.

Chapter 2 sketches a model of syllable structure rules for IE. The data in this chapter are taken from only one variety of IE, namely Maithili speakers' English (henceforth ME). Such a restriction has been made (i) for purposes of clarity and also because (ii) the adequate kind of data from any other variety of IE were not available due to constraints of time.

Chapter 3 assumes rules of the kind shown in Chapter 2 for other varieties of IE too and proposes a
set of stress rules with Pan Indian applicability. Data
in this chapter are taken from ME and from previous studies
of stress in different varieties of IE. The rules proposed
in this chapter apply to the output of those in Chapter 2
and capture the underlying unity of different varieties
of IE and also predict their surface divergences.

Chapter 4 talks about late phonetic phenomena like
tensing of word final vowels, gemination of consonants
following stressed light vowels and elision of unstressed
vowels. These phenomena are shown to be by and large
optional and dependent upon, primarily, the speaking
tempo. But, if and when they occur, they affect the
syllabic shape of the string though not the stress
contour on it.

1.7.3 Collection of Data: As stated earlier, data for this
study are taken from previous studies of stress in
different varieties of IE mentioned earlier in this
chapter, and from Maithili speakers' English.

Twelve informants were taken from the Maithili
speaking group. The informants in this group vary in
the age range of 21 to 60. None of them had any special
training in BE/AE pronunciation except one, the oldest,
who was taught about forty five years ago for a brief
while at school by some English missionaries. But he too seems to have lost most features of native English pronunciation like other informants as would be shown by data in Chapters 2 and 3.

The twelve informants from the ME group use the same dialect of Maithili and belong to the same ethnic community. They have different middle class professions and use English in domains of the kind described in Parasher (1979).

One of the informants is a medical doctor; another a professor in agriculture science; two university lecturers, one in history and the other in zoology; one university reader in physics; one secondary school teacher of English; two insurance officials; one printer; two M.A. students, one in History, the other in English; and last, an undergraduate student of bio-sciences.

Informants read a list of 480 words some of which were repeated for purposes of inbuilt checking on pronunciation variations. The list had mono- and poly-syllabic words of different kinds taken mostly from SPE (Chapter 3) but they were put in a random order, that is without any ordering in terms of syllable-structure or syntactic category. Informants looked through the whole list once before they read it for recording.
Average reading time taken by informants was around 20 minutes. Readings were recorded on an India made portable bush cassette recorder and transcribed with the help of a tape-repeater in the Phonetics laboratory of the Central Institute of English and Foreign Languages. Pronunciations that were common to at least eight of the twelve informants were taken as representative ME data.

Data from some previous studies of other varieties of IE have also been used in Chapters 3 and 4 of the present study. The present study, therefore, appears to be equipped to make some valid claims about some aspects of the phonology of IE in the following chapters.
Notes

1. Henceforth long vowels would be represented as geminate, following the metrical convention. See Hayes (1981).

2. See SPW (pp. 48-50) for a discussion of English Orthography and phonological alternations.

3. The basic S-V-O syntactic pattern and corresponding typological features of English seem to have changed quite a bit in the "Black English" of America which is the native language of a large number of its speakers. But, in a historical perspective, speakers of the "Black English" in America can be said to be inheritors of a non-native variety of English spoken by Africans who had already learnt an African language before they learnt English. From this point of view, the "Black English" of America is a creolized variety of English like many other similar varieties, rather than a native variety spoken generally by the white Anglo-Saxon people of America.

4. This view owes to Le Page (1968) and (1979). For a detailed discussion of this view see Chaudhary (1981, pp. 1-16). A parallel view seems to be there in Bickerton's (1981, pp. 291-5) terms of "biological" and "cultural" languages where the former means the faculty of language common to all mankind and the
latter means particular (cultural) languages spoken in particular (cultural) communities, such as French or English or Hindi, etc. I have avoided using Bickerton's terms to avoid any possible confusion.

5. See Chomsky (1965, pp. 1-64) for a discussion of the "innateness" hypothesis and for the hypothesis of Language Acquisition Device (LAD) in human child. There does not seem to be any substantial difference between Chomsky's LAD hypothesis and Bickerton's hypothesis of "biological programming" of language acquisition.

6. Actors like Keshto Mukherji or Asit Sen in Hindi movies or Charles Chaplin in English sound funny often because they tend to break this monotonous evenness by speaking in a staccato fashion.

7. See 3.5 in Chapter 3 of the present study for a detailed discussion of this question with reference to IE.

8. Going by AE stress rules as in Kiparsky (1979) stress tree for Ticonderga can be either (a) or (b) as given below, but Kiparsky maintains that (a) is the preferred one:
(a) Ticonderoga
   S W W S W
   \ V
   \ S
   \ W S

(b) Ticonderoga
   W S W S W
   \ V
   \ S S
   \ W