

Helmut Nespital

## On the Relation of Hindi to its Regional Dialects

The Impact of Dialects on the Standard Language in the Speech of Hindi Speakers (with regard to Lexical, Morphological and Syntactic Features)<sup>1</sup>

1. The aim of this paper is not to give a detailed comparative study of Hindi and its various dialects with regard to their similarities and differences on the various levels of their systems, but rather to show the impact of these dialects on Standard Hindi in the speech of Hindi speakers, especially as far as deviations from or even incorrect uses of the standard language are concerned.

2. Before dealing with these speakers of Hindi in more detail it seems appropriate to show their position within the total number of persons using this language.

The speakers of Hindi in India itself may be broadly classified into the following six groups:

1. speakers of Standard Hindi as their mother-tongue;
2. speakers of Hindi whose primary language is a certain dialect of Hindi;
3. speakers of Hindi whose primary language is another New Indo-Aryan language, such as Panjabi, Gujarati, Bengali etc.;
4. speakers of Hindi whose native speech is a Dravidian language, such as Tamil, Telugu etc., or other non-Aryan language;
5. native speakers of Urdu;
6. speakers of Hindi whose primary language is English, i.e. a variety of Standard English or of English in India.

3.1. Within these groups the first group, i.e. persons who speak Standard Hindi as their primary and only Indian language—apart from using or not using English as a secondary language—is rather limited in number. They mostly belong to such families as have been living in cities or big towns in the Hindi-speaking areas for several generations, are literate and representatives of the middle class.

3.2. The overwhelming majority of Hindi speakers among the groups mentioned above consists of persons whose primary language is a certain regional—rural or urban—dialect of Hindi. Out of their total number only a minority, i.e. educated people, are *bilingual* in the sense that they master their dialect, as well as Standard Hindi, whereas the majority of them either speaks only its dialect, or the dialect and some variety of non-standard or only partly Standard Hindi.

3.3. The number of persons among Hindi speakers whose primary language is another Indian language—whether Indo-Aryan or not—is very large. The impact of their languages on their 'Hindi' is a very interesting phenomenon connected with problems of second language acquisition, languages in contact, bi- and multilingualism, interference and others. But the analysis of these phenomena is not the purpose of this paper, so that we shall deal only incidentally with certain influences of such languages, e.g. of Panjabi, on Hindi.

3.4. Speakers of Hindi whose first language is English, i.e. a variety of Standard English or of English in India, are relatively few. The impact of English on 'their' Hindi might be an interesting subject in its own right.

3.5. Native speakers of Urdu speak Standard Hindi as far as its grammatical forms and basic vocabulary are concerned because of the coincidence of these inventories in both languages. But even in the basic vocabulary the Hindi of Urdu speakers is more or less devoid of words or phrases of Sanskrit origin. This applies especially to nouns, adjectives and adverbs, and to syntagms consisting of a noun or an adjective and a functional verb, such as *honā*, *karnā*, or *denā*. In these cases Urdu speakers use words of Persian and Arabic origin instead of Sanskrit words; thus, in place of *kaṣṭ*, *spaṣṭ*, *apekṣākrī*, *uṭtar denā*, *prāṭī honā*, *parīṣram karnā* etc. Urdu speakers when speaking Hindi will normally use the corresponding Urdu lexemes and expressions *takīf*, *zāhir*, *nisbatan*, *javāb denā*, *māliim honā*, *mehnat karnā*. These usages

are clear instances of lexical interference, at least as seen from the point of view of a rather elaborate or 'Sanskritized' Hindi.

The lexical differences between Hindi and Urdu are above all conspicuous in all fields of scientific terminology, i.e. in linguistics, literary science, natural sciences, politics, economics etc.

4. As is the case with other languages Hindi, too, does not exist only in one form, but consists of several coexistent varieties, namely:

1. *Standard Hindi* (a) in its written form, (b) in its spoken form;
2. *Regional or local dialects* within the so-called Hindi-speaking 'belt'.
3. *Dialects outside the proper Hindi-speaking area that are genetically and historically closely related to Hindi*; the most striking examples of these are *Dakhini*<sup>2</sup> and, as a special urban variant of this, *Haidarābādī* *Dakhinī*, also called *Haidarābādī* *Hindī* or *Haidarābād kī Hindī*.<sup>3</sup>
4. *Pidgin-like speech varieties of Hindi* in urban centres outside the Hindi region, such as *Bombay* or *Calcutta*.<sup>4</sup>

5. Apart from these predominantly territorial varieties of Hindi there are also social and functional varieties of its standard form being characteristic of either particular social and professional groups, members of a certain age group, men or women, or of certain types of texts, speech situations and communicative conditions. Yet, the discussion of these varieties and their specific linguistic and stylistic inventories lies outside the scope of this paper. As stated above, a large majority of Hindi speakers is made up of persons whose primary language is a regional or local dialect of Hindi. Before dealing with the impact of these dialects on the Hindi of these speakers we would like to give a brief classification of these dialects.

1. *Regional dialects in a narrower sense*. These dialects are traditionally<sup>5</sup> divided into (a) a western group comprising *Hariyānī*, *Dehātī* *Khārī* *Bolī* or *Kauravī*, *Braj Bhāṣā*, *Kanaujī* and *Bundelī* or *Bundelkharī* and (b) an eastern group to which belong *Avadhī*, *Bagheltī* and *Chattisgarhī*.
2. *Regional dialects in a broader sense*. These include three groups:
  - (a) *Pahārī* with, mainly, *Garhvālī* and *Kumāonī*;

(b) *Rājasthānī* with a number of dialects, such as *Mevāṭī*, *Śekhāvāṭī*, *Jaypurī*, *Māvāṭī*, *Harāvī*, *Mevāṭī*, and *Mālvi*; and  
 (c) *Bihārī*, used as a cover term for *Bhojpurī*, *Maihiūtī* and *Magahī*.

3. *Urban dialects or forms of town speech within the Hindi region.* These urban dialects can be roughly divided into (a) 'older' ones, and (b) 'new' ones. Most of them are 'older' ones, i.e. they have already existed for several generations or even centuries with certain modifications. To these belong, for instance, the *Dialect of Old Delhi*, or the forms of town speech of cities such as *Allahabad* or *Benares*. 'New' urban speech varieties of Hindi are hardly met with. Almost the only example is the spoken variety of Hindi in Delhi that came into being after 1947, largely due to the influx of about half a million Panjabi speakers from the Western Panjab which had become a part of Pakistan.

6. In what follows we intend to show the impact of these rural and urban dialects on the standard variety of Hindi. While doing this we shall restrict ourselves in two different respects, namely: (a) with regard to the dialects we shall speak of 'western' dialects in a limited sense, i.e. comprising *Hariyānī*, *Kauravī*,<sup>6</sup> *Braj Bhāṣā*, the Dialect of Old Delhi and the modern spoken variety of Hindi in Delhi, and, on the other hand, of 'eastern' dialects referring, here, mainly to *Avadhī* and *Bhojpurī*; (b) a second limitation concerns the phenomena we are going to discuss, namely certain lexical, morphological and syntactic features, leaving aside phonetic and phonological phenomena.

When speaking generally of the 'impact of regional or local dialects' on Standard Hindi one must carefully distinguish several types of impact or influence.

7. This is especially true at the *lexical level*. On the whole there are three main possibilities, namely:

1. There does not exist any single standard word to denote a given 'object of reality', but there are only several local varieties of equal rank. As an example of this we may take the designations for 'buffalo calf' namely (a) *paṛā* being used in certain areas of Bhojpurī, (b) *parvā* as a word used in the Avadhī-speaking regions around Allahabad, or (c) *kaṛā* as

employed in the Kauravī speaking parts of western Uttar Pradesh.

2. There is a word used predominantly in the standard language, i.e. by speakers of various regions. But, side by side, there exists a regional variant. As an example of this phenomenon one could cite the words *bāḡan* and *bhāṭā* both meaning 'aubergine' or 'eggplant'. Whereas *bāḡan* is by far more common and in this sense the more standard word, *bhāṭā* is a limited regional variant used in the eastern parts of the Hindi belt.

3. The third 'possibility' is represented by such cases where, on the one hand, there is a lexeme of the standard language, and, on the other hand, there are words used instead of the standard lexeme that are purely words of a certain local dialect. Thus, a typical dialect word used in the otherwise Standard Hindi speech of speakers in Allahabad and its surroundings is *ghām* 'sun heat', belonging to Avadhī, instead of the standard word *dhūp*.

This and similar examples as well as that given under 2. with regard to *bhāṭā* are instances of *lexical interference* of a purely local or at least regional dialect on Standard Hindi. Their use should be avoided when in a given text or speech situation the standard language must be employed. But they are justified if, for example, an author in his literary works wants to depict his characters as belonging to a definite area by quoting their typical speech habits.

8. A characteristic feature of the verb systems of not only Hindi, but of all New Indo-Aryan languages is the fact that they consist only of a rather limited number of simple verb lexemes. In Standard Hindi they amount to about 1,200. Furthermore, these languages—in contradistinction to Sanskrit, the Slavonic languages, Latin or German—do not use affixes, especially prefixes, to form new verbs derived from simple verbs. Instead they use verbo-nominal expressions, i.e. syntagms consisting of a noun, adjective or adverb + a verb, such as *honā*, *denā*, *karnā*, serving here, as a functional verb. Such expressions are e.g. *prātī honā*, *uttar denā*, *kām karnā*. Another means of word formation, here of verbs, namely their derivation from nouns and adjectives, is employed to a rather limited extent in Hindi (and other NIA languages). Examples of these are verbs such as: *adhīyānā* (from *ādhrā* 'half'), *algānā* (from *alag* 'separate'), *kharacnā* (from *kharāc*)

'expenditure'). They coexist with the corresponding verbo-nominal expressions *ādhā karnā*, *alag karnā*, *khar(a)c karnā*.

By comparison with Standard Hindi the number of verbs derived from nouns and adjectives in the regional dialects is larger by far. Now, some speakers of Hindi occasionally use a verb of this kind—which may be quite common in a certain dialect—in Standard Hindi too where its use is unknown, a lexico-semanticly corresponding verbo-nominal expression being used instead. As examples we may take:

*galiyānā* 'to abuse' (connected with *gālī* f. 'abuse');  
*sīriyānā* 'to become cold' (from *sī* (= *śī*) 'cold');  
*ḍākyānā* 'to sting' (from *ḍā* m. 'sting');  
 and many others.<sup>7</sup>

Moreover, these verb lexemes, when used in Standard Hindi, are instances of lexical interference of a regional or even several regional dialects. This phenomenon does not preclude the possibility that in particular cases a certain verb of this type, provided its use becomes frequent and widespread, may after some time be accepted as a verb belonging to the standard language.

9. On the *morphological* and *syntactic level* a number of non-standard or even incorrect constructions, grammatical categories and forms are used by many speakers. In general, these phenomena can be explained by an insufficient knowledge of Standard Hindi. In particular, the reasons may be manifold, in most cases they represent different examples of intralingual interference of a regional or local dialect with the system and language units of Hindi, such as negative transfer, or lack of distinction, as we shall see in the following. We shall discuss some of these cases within the relevant word classes, such as nouns, pronouns or verbs, or within the syntactic phenomena.

### Nouns

9.1. Incorrect usages in the field of nouns in Standard Hindi, mostly due to the deviating conditions of some regional dialect, are met with in regard to all grammatical categories, i.e. those of gender, number and case.

9.1.1. In the Hindi of speakers of the eastern dialects the *gender* of many nouns deviates from that of the standard language and of the western dialects, especially of Hariyānī, Kauravī, and the speech of Old Delhi.

So, for example, the following *masculine nouns* are treated by the speakers from the Avadhī/Bhojpurī areas as *feminine*:

*pahiyā*, *takiyā*, *tauliyā*; *rūmāl*, *dard*, *baṭān*, *pen*.

On the other hand *feminine nouns* such as: *patlān*, *girgi*, *sigreṭ* are employed by 'easterners' as masculine nouns.

9.1.2. With speakers of Hindi who, primarily, use eastern Avadhī or Bhojpurī, there is the tendency to ignore the difference in gender, in so far as they quite often use the masculine gender instead of the feminine one. This applies especially to cases of agreement of (a) an attribute with a noun, or (b) certain verb forms used as predicate with regard to nouns functioning as—at least—semantic objects of a sentence. Instances of this are:

ad (a): Yah *\*bare khusī* kī bāt hai, *barē* instead of *barī*; or: kaviyō *\*ke dṛṣṭi mē*, here *ke* is wrongly used instead of *kī*;

ad (b): unhō ne yah bhūmi *\*diyā thā*, *diyā thā* for correctly *dī thī*; or *rāste mē raiyatō ne mīṅg \*kīyā thā*, instead of *kī thī*.<sup>8</sup>

From the viewpoint of Standard Hindi these usages are not only incorrect, but point to a tendency to iron out the distinction of gender as such.

9.1.3. A common deviation from the standard use is, furthermore, that in sentences with a verbo-nominal predicate, i.e. with a copula and a predicative noun, the verb does not agree with the subject as is demanded by the standard use, but with the predicative noun, e.g.: *beṭī parāye ghar kā dhan hotā hai*, instead of: *beṭī parāye ghar kā dhan hotī hai*.

9.1.4. Another widespread phenomenon of many dialect speakers is the incorrect use of the category of number, namely:

1. The use of the singular instead of the plural as in:

*cār bajā hai*, instead of: *cār bajē hāi*;

*sab śreṇī ke log the*, instead of: *sab śreṇiyō ke log the*.<sup>9</sup>

2. But there are also instances where the plural is employed instead of the singular e.g.:

*pratyek sadasyō ko cāhie*, instead of: *pratyek sadasyā ko cāhie*.<sup>10</sup>

9.1.5. As to the category of case, the most frequent deviations from the rules of Standard Hindi are these:

1. The use of the direct case—in place of the oblique case—of masculine nouns ending in a changeable *-ā*, e.g.:

\**kuā par*, instead of: *kuē par*;

\**bāglā ke bhītar*, instead of: *bāgle ke bhītar*.

2. In certain plural words of Arabic or Persian origin the oblique case form is identical with the direct case form, i.e. the oblique case is not formed by adding the morpheme *-ō*, e.g.:

in *hālāt mē*.

This is the standard use in Hindi and, above all, in Urdu.

By contrast, many speakers, for the most part of the western regions including Delhi, use the oblique plural of such words in adding *-ō* e.g.:

in \**hālātō mē*.

3. The use of the noun denoting the actor of a completed action in the nominative or direct case where, according to the rules of Standard Hindi, the noun should be put in the ergative or agentive case (=simple oblique case + postposition *ne*), e.g.:

\**bejā kahā*, instead of: *bejē ne kahā*.

This usage will be discussed in more detail under *Syntax*.

### Pronouns

10.1. A rather common non-standard use to be found in the Hindi speech of speakers from western areas, but also in the pidgin-Hindi forms of cities like Bombay, is the employment of the oblique case, masculine singular, ending in *-e*, of the possessive pronouns, i.e. *mere*,

*tere*, *tumhāre* etc., with the force of the simple oblique case of the corresponding personal pronouns *mujh*, *tujh*, *tum* etc., in connection with most postpositions excluding *ne*. This results in syntagms such as:

|                |             |                |
|----------------|-------------|----------------|
| <i>mere ko</i> | Instead of: | <i>mujh ko</i> |
| <i>mere se</i> |             | <i>mujh se</i> |
| <i>tere mē</i> |             | <i>tujh mē</i> |
| etc.           |             |                |

These non-standard forms apparently go back to Haryāṇī where syntagms like *mere sai*, *mere māh* etc., are quite commonly employed.<sup>11</sup> They might be explained as negative transfer in the form of an over-generalization of the use of *mere* etc. in combination with the postposition *māh* in Haryāṇī, where *māh* was originally a noun, and the possessive pronoun was used as its attribute. This process may also be illustrated by corresponding examples from other NIA languages, so, for example, from Bengali: *āmāder madhye* 'in our middle' > 'amidst us' > 'in us'.

The use of *mere ko*, *mere se* etc. instead of *mujh ko*, *mujh se* etc. is also evidenced in the Hindi of many inhabitants of Delhi, especially of those speakers whose primary language is Panjabi. As stated above, this usage apparently goes back to the influence of Haryāṇī. On the other hand, it is alien to Kauravī and also to the Old Delhi Speech (or *Kārkhanwārī* in its earlier forms as is testified by literary documents starting from the time of Nizām ud-Dīn Auliya and Amīr Khusrō Dihlavī. Forms like *mere ko*, *tere se* etc. are also not found in Old Dakhinī which is, predominantly, an offshoot of the Delhi speech of about 1400. Their occurrence in the present urban dialect of Haidarabad, the so-called Haidarābādī Hindī, must therefore have other reasons; it may be influenced by speakers from Delhi or from Bombay, i.e. speakers of the Bāzār Hindī of Bombay, or it may also represent an independent development. The underlying psycholinguistic factor in the spread of these forms is the tendency towards simplification: to employ *merā*, *terā* etc. not only (1) as (a) possessive pronouns and (b) the genitive case of the personal pronouns of the first and second person, singular and plural, but also (2) in their masculine single oblique case—ending in *-e*—in syntagms with postpositions.

Let us conclude this discussion by giving some examples within whole sentences:

1. from the modern non-standard urban Hindi speech of Delhi: usne mere ko kuch nahī diyā.  
 ≙ Standard Hindi: usne mujhe/mujh ko kuch nahī diyā.
2. from the Bāzār Hindi of Bombay: mere ko nāī māgtā terā kuch bhī.<sup>12</sup>  
 ≙ Standard Hindi: mujhe (mujh ko) terā kuch bhī nahī cāhiye.
3. from the Haidarābādī Hindi: jāyādā ka merā hissā mere ko de deo.<sup>13</sup>  
 ≙ Standard Hindi: jāyādā ka merā hissā mujh ko de deo.

10.2. Another striking example of interference in the form of negative transfer of regional and local dialects is the use of forms like *māine* instead of *mujhe* or *mujh ko* in sentences such as:

*māine jānā hai*, instead of: *mujhe/mujhko jānā hai* 'I have to go'.

The form *māine*, here, does not function as ergative or agentive as in Standard Hindi, but as dative. This use of *māine* is obviously influenced by Hariyānī where *mannai/mannāi* may fulfil both functions:

- (a) that of the *ergative* and (b) that of the *dative*, e.g.:  
 (a) *mannai māg liyā* 'I asked for (it)'.  
 (b) *mannai tikaṭī kharīdī sai* 'I had to buy a ticket' (liter.: 'to me (it) was to buy a ticket').

Furthermore, *māine* with the force of the *dative*, along with the more common forms *mujhe* (*mujhe*) is also found in certain areas of the Kauravī dialect and in the Old Delhi Dialect or Kārkhāndārī of today, e.g.:

*māine bāzār jānā hai.*  
*hamne khānā khānā hai.*<sup>14</sup>

This use is not documented by specimens of the Old Delhi Dialect from earlier times. Thus, it appears, that its employment in present-day Kārkhāndārī, as well as in the modern Delhi colloquial variety of Hindi, is also predominantly caused by the impact of Hariyānī.

In addition to this, the use of *māine* as a dative or indirect object may have been reinforced, especially in Delhi, through Panjabi,<sup>15</sup> where the

dative form is *māinū* the postposition *nū*—due to its partial phonetic similarity—being subconsciously identified with *ne*, although Panjabi *ne* equals Hindi/Urdu *ne*, and Panjabi *nū* corresponds to Hindi/Urdu *ko*.

### Postpositions

11. It is by no means a rare occurrence for the employment of certain postpositions and positional phrases to be contrary to that of Standard Hindi.

11.1. Speakers of the western Hindi dialects quite often use *ko* instead of *se* in sentences like:

hamne usko kahā, for correct: hamne usse kahā.

11.2. Certain speakers of the Old Delhi Dialect use *ke andar* instead of *mē*, apart from employing dialectical postpositions such as *talak*, *torī* or *svadhā* for *tak* or *sāth* in Standard Hindi.<sup>16</sup>

11.3. In certain expressions to denote possessive relations speakers of the eastern territories of Hindi use *ko* instead of the standard *ke*, e.g.:

Mohan ko do beje, hāī, instead of : Mohan ke do beje hāī.

### Verbs

12. In the domain of the verb system the most striking examples of deviation from the standard language relate to:

1. the use of certain mood forms;
2. the incorrect formation of 'compound verbs';
3. the incorrect employment of absolutes or absolutival constructions.

12.1. (1) In the speech of Hindi speakers from Delhi and its neighbouring areas forms of the second person imperative such as *dijyo*, *jāiyo*, *kaiyo* instead of: *do*, *jāo*, *kaho* are to be found rather often. They are clear instances of negative transfer from Hariyānī, Kauravī or the Old Delhi Dialect.

(2) Some speakers use the subjunctive in certain cases where the so-called conditional is to be employed and vice-versa, e.g.:

āpko cāhie thā ki unhē dekh āē.

Here, from the viewpoint of the standard language, instead of *dekh āē* the conditional I: *dekh āie* must be used;

māi cāhā hū-ki vah chuiī le leā.

Here the conditional I is wrongly employed in the dependent clause instead of the subjunctive I, i.e.: *le le*.

12.2. Hindi, its various dialects and all other New Indo-Aryan languages have various kinds of so-called 'compound verbs'. The most widespread type among these 'compound verbs' or 'verbal expressions', as we prefer to call them, is formed by a verb (1) in the form of the simple absolutive and a verb (2), so, for example, *ā jirā, uih baiñhā, cal parñā* etc.

In most cases these expressions correlate with the first verb used as an autonomous lexeme in one or several lexical meanings. Moreover, in this circumstance the verbal expression at hand is the form of the perfective verbal aspect, whereas the correlating simple verb represents the non-perfective (or: imperfective) verbal aspect and its grammatical meanings. The number of verbs in Standard Hindi used as second verbs in perfective and correlative verbal expressions amounts to over forty. Now, not each of these second verbs is or can be used with all simple verbs, their combination being dependent, generally speaking, on the lexical-semantic compatibility of the two verbs.<sup>17</sup>

Apart from these perfective and correlative verbal expressions there is quite a large number of such verbal expressions that are formed in the same way, i.e. verb (1) in the form of the simple absolutive and a verb (2), e.g. *jā milñā*, and also represent complex lexemes, although they neither correlate only with the lexical meaning(s) of their first member when used as an autonomous simple verb, nor do they express perfectiveness. Their lexical meanings are complex ones, i.e. they are based upon the individual meanings of *both* verbs in quite different ways so that they are subdivided into at least four different types.<sup>18</sup>

In many cases verbal expressions of this non-correlative type can be distinguished from those that are correlative and perfective by the second verb occurring in them. Thus, verbs such as *milñā, lagñā, kūññā, urñā, āññā* and many more, functioning as second verbs are, at the same time, i.e. by their mere presence, an indication that the verbal expression at hand is a non-correlative one.

But the matter is very often not as simple as this, for, in quite a large number of cases, one and the same verbal expression may (a) in one of its meanings have the value of a correlative and perfective expression, and (b) in another meaning represent a non-correlative and non-perfective one. As an example of this we may take *ā baiñhā*:

ad (a): Jāgrat deviyō mē ... 'ātm<sup>a</sup>-sevan kā bhāv ā baiñhā hai ... (Premchand, Godān, 312) 'A sense of egotism has spread (liter.: 'has come') among socially aware ladies...  
Here *ā baiñhā* correlates with *ārñ* in one of its lexical meanings.

ad (b): ... Moī khirkī ke sāth vālī kursī par ā baiñhā. (G. Nandā, Tin rañg, 212) '... Moī came and sat down on the chair near the window.'

Regardless of what type they belong to, wrongly formed verbal expressions or 'compound verbs' are no marginal phenomenon, but are met with quite frequently in the speech of many Hindi speakers. The main reason for this is a limited knowledge of the standard language, sometimes in addition to a different use in a regional or local dialect.

Here are some examples of verbal expressions that do not exist in Standard Hindi:

|                              |         |                        |
|------------------------------|---------|------------------------|
| laṛkī gññrā āī               | correct | ... gññrā uññgññrā gai |
| dukhiyā pukār parā           | correct | ... pukār uññā         |
| yah kām acchā ho parā        | correct | ... ho gayā            |
| māine khūb so dālā           | correct | ... so liyā            |
| vah samay par pahūc baiñhā   | correct | ... pahūc gayā         |
| śatru ne use pīche se ā dīyā | correct | ... ā liyā             |

12.3. An incorrect use of an absolutive can be seen in the following example:

āsū gais choṛkar upadravī pakre gaye.

Here, instead of the absolutive *choṛkar* the substantival infinitive *choṛne se* must be used, because, as a rule, the absolutive has to refer to the same part of the sentence as the finite verb, i.e. in passive constructions it has to refer to the patient, regardless of whether the patient is expressed by the subject or the object of the given sentence. Violations of these rules are found quite often.

### Syntax

13. Deviations from Standard Hindi in the domain of syntax are manifold. Here, we can give only a few examples.

13.1. Some speakers have difficulties in identifying the primary complement or, in most cases, subject in certain dependent clauses or in constructions with infinitive-verb forms. As an example of the latter one may take the incorrect use of the absolutive in the passive sentence given above. As an instance of the incorrect use of a verbal predicate in a dependent clause owing to the speaker's failure to identify its actual subject, the following may serve:

hamārā kartavyā<sup>a</sup> hai ki dīn-dukhiyō ki sahāyā kī jāe, where the predicate should be: *karē*

13.2 The standard use of *-jī* as an honorific particle is demonstrated by a sentence such as:

*merī māājī āī*, i.e. the use of *jī* has no influence on the verb form with regard to gender.

Now, in place of this some speakers of Hindi in Delhi and in other parts of its western dialect regions may say the following:

*merī māājī āe*, i.e., by using *-jī* the word at hand, though it is feminine, is treated as a masculine honorific plural word (!).

This use is common in Panjabi and in the Old Delhi Dialect so that its occurrence in Hindi is obviously a result of negative transfer.

13.3 The eastern dialects of Hindi such as Avadhī, or Bhojpurī, belonging to the so-called Bihari group, do not evince the use of agentive or ergative construction in connection with tense and mood forms of verbs that—apart from other semantic features—denote the relevant action as completed. In these dialects the nominative construction is used, i.e. the word denoting the actor or agent is used in the nominative case and functions as the grammatical subject, and the finite verb in the predicate agrees with the subject (in gender and

number), and not with the goal or logical object. As an example we may take the following sentence from Avadhī:

*ye cār lēthiyā jarī dihin*, meaning literally: he gave [her] four sticks', i.e. four blows with a stick.

Now quite a large number of speakers whose primary language is Avadhī or another eastern dialect also employ these nominative constructions in place of the ergative constructions when speaking Standard Hindi, an obvious consequence of negative transfer. Examples of this are sentences such as:

\* Mohan hamse bāt kiyā.

\* Ham kitāb parhe.

\* Madan rojī khāyā thā.

The correct sentences in Standard Hindi ought to be:

Mohan ne hamse bāt kī.

Hamne kitāb parhī.

Madan ne rojī khāī thī.

13.4. The use of the nominative construction in place of the ergative construction is sometimes also met with amongst those speakers of Hindi whose primary language is a western Hindi dialect or Panjabi. But these instances are limited to sentences where the actor of the completed action is a pronoun of the first or second person, singular and plural, e.g.:

*Māī apnā kām kiyā*, instead of: *māīne ...*

These incorrect uses are obviously caused by negative transfer from Panjabi, where the postposition *ne*, i.e. the ergative construction, is never used with personal pronouns of the first person, and/or also from Kauravī or the Old Delhi Dialect where both constructions, that with the nominative as well as that with the ergative of these personal pronouns, are to be found. The impact of the Old Delhi Dialect in similar cases upon the literary language, in this context upon eighteenth century literary Urdu, can be seen even in the works of a poet such as Mir Taqī 'Mir', e.g.:

gāhri karpō kī māi uḥāi thī  
sar pai bhāi ke cāpāi thī (Mīr, 236)  
Here, *māi* is employed instead of *māine*.

The use of the nominative in place of the ergative with pronouns of the first and second person is also common in the Bāzār Hindī of Bombay, e.g.:

tū bahut taklif diyā mere ko, instead of:  
tū ne mujhe/mujhko bahut taklif dī.<sup>19</sup>

13.5. As mentioned earlier, there exists, especially with Hindi speakers whose primary language is Bhojpūrī or eastern Avadhī, the tendency to use the masculine gender in place of the feminine one which results in a cancelling of the distinction of gender as such. To elucidate this point let us repeat one example:

unhōne yah bhūmi \*diyā thī, for correctly *dī thī*.

That these incorrect uses are not limited to speakers of Hindi hailing from the eastern regions, i.e. the eastern Avadhī and the Bhojpūrī areas, but are also quite common in the Bāzār Hindī of Bombay can be seen from the sentence just quoted under 13.4. above:

tū bahut taklif diyā mere ko, instead of:  
tū ne mujhe/mujhko bahut taklif dī.

The most probable explanation for this usage is that it also goes back to speakers of eastern Avadhī and Bhojpūrī who, for several generations, have been coming to Bombay to make their livelihood in this city.<sup>20</sup>

13.6. In Standard Hindi in a sentence like: *pulis ne do corō ko pakrā* the form of the verbal predicate is dependent upon the form of the goal or logical (semantic) object of the action, i.e., here, upon: *do corō ko*, which occurs in the oblique case, plural, in connection with the postposition *ko*. The finite verb takes the masculine ending, singular: *-ā*. The word denoting the actor is employed in the ergative or agentive, here: *pulis ne*, and has no influence on the verb ending. These rules of agreement concerning the finite verb are valid even in those cases where the word denoting the actor is not put in the ergative, but is wrongly used in the nominative case as in the instance given under

13.4. above: \**Māi apnā kām kiyā*, or in the poem of Mīr Taqī 'Mīr':  
gāhri karpō kī māi uḥāi thī, showing the impact of the Old Delhi Dialect of his time on literary Urdu. As sentences such as *ham kitāb parhe* spoken by Hindi speakers of the Avadhī and Bhojpūrī areas show, here the finite verb does not agree with the goal or logical (semantic) object but with the actor in the nominative: *ham ... parhe*. Now, usages are even to be found where the finite verb agrees with the word denoting the actor, although this word is not employed in the nominative, but in the ergative, e.g. in a sentence such as:

\**pulis ne do corō ko pakrā*.<sup>21</sup>

This type of construction is the regular one in a language like Nepali,<sup>22</sup> but it is to be regarded as incorrect as seen from the viewpoint of Standard Hindi.

14. The examples given so far do not cover all cases of deviations from Standard Hindi, but at least quite a large number of those that are most typical and most frequent to be met with, i.e. on the lexical, morphological and syntactic level. They show the manifold and far-reaching impact of the regional and local dialects of Hindi on the standard language in the use of many of its speakers. From the viewpoint of interference theory and contrastive linguistics these incorrect uses are interesting instances of intralingual and interlingual interference in the form of negative transfer, lack of distinction or over-generalization and others. On the other hand, they also constitute serious problems in the teaching and learning of Standard Hindi and of its use in accordance with its lexical, grammatical, and—though not dealt with in this paper—also with its phonetic and orthographic norms.

### Notes

1. The title of this paper is slightly different from the title used in the 'Abstract' and in the earlier version that was read at the Venice conference. The text of the present paper is a revised and enlarged version of the paper submitted to the conference.
2. Of the numerous publications on Dakhini see, for instance, BĀBŪRĀM SAKSENĀ 1952, ŚRĪRĀM ŚARMĀ 1964, and ŚAMATOV 1974.
3. VAŚINĪ ŚARMĀ 1981 and SCHMIDT 1981.

## LANGUAGE VERSUS DIALECT

20

4. Descriptions of these 'Bāzār Hindī' varieties are given in CHATTERJI 1931 and NĪLĀ JAGANNĀTHAN 1981.
5. GRIERSON 1916; DHĪRENDRA<sup>a</sup> VARMĀ 1950; HARDEV BĀHRĪ 1966; AMBĀPRASĀD SUMAN 1966.
6. We use the term 'Kauravī' for the regional dialect that is also called 'Kharī Boli', 'Dehāī Kharī Boli' or 'Vernacular Hindustānī'. The name 'Kauravī' used first by Rāhul Sākṛtyāyan has the advantage of being relatively unambiguous, whereas the term 'Kharī Boli' is highly polysemous. Thus, it is used to denote (a) the very same regional dialect belonging to the western group of Hindi dialects and situated mainly to the east and north-east of Delhi, (b) the urban dialect of Delhi, (c) the standard language based, mainly, on (a) and (b) and forming the common core of Urdu and Hindi, and (d) employed also as a synonym for Standard High Hindi.
7. For a more detailed discussion of these 'verba denominativa' and for more examples of them see ČERNYŠEV 1969, 68-72. Here, it may suffice to point out that not all such derived verbs as adduced by Černyšev can be regarded as mere dialect verbs. Thus, e.g., verbs such as *kaulānā*, *akulānā* or *adhīyānā* (and many others) belong doubtless to Standard Hindi (as well).
8. See ČERNYŠEV 1969, 63-65.
9. For these and further examples see HARDEV BĀHRĪ 1987, 71.
10. See note 9.
11. See, e.g., HARDEV BĀHRĪ 1966, 62.
12. NĪLĀ JAGANNĀTHAN 1981, 418.
13. SCHMIDT 1981, 75.
14. See BAHADUR SINGH 1966, 27.
15. This interpretation is given also by MAÑJU GUPTĀ 1981, 423.
16. BAHADUR SINGH 1966, 27-28.
17. For a detailed discussion of these problems and allied topics see NESPITAL 1975, 1980, 1981, 1982a, 1982b, 1983, 1985, 1990, NESPITAL (in preparation).
18. For details see NESPITAL 1982a, 1982b, 1985, 1989.
19. See NĪLĀ JAGANNĀTHAN 1981, 419.
20. NĪLĀ JAGANNĀTHAN 1981, 413.
21. HARDEV BĀHRĪ 1987, 74
22. See, e.g., SRIVASTAVA 1962, 93-94.

## Select Bibliography

- AMBĀPRASĀD SUMAN  
1966 *Hindī aur uskī up<sup>a</sup>bhāṣāō kā svarūp*, Prayāg.
- BĀBŪRĀM SAKSENA  
1952 *Dakhhinī Hindī*, Ilāhābād.
- BAHADUR SINGH  
1966 *The Dialect of Delhi*, South Asia Institute, University of Heidelberg, South Asian Studies III, New Delhi.
- ČERNYŠEV, Vladimir Aleksandrovič  
1969 *Dialekty i literaturnyj Chindi*, Moskva.
- CHATTERJI, Sumiti Kumar  
1931 *Calcutta Hindustani. A study of a Jargon Dialect*, in 'Indian Linguistics', Vol. I, Parts II-IV, 204-256.
- DHĪRENDRA<sup>a</sup> VARMĀ  
1950 *Grāmṇ Hindī*, Ilāhābād.
- GRIERSON, George Abraham  
1916 *Linguistic Survey of India*, Vol. IX, Part I: *Indo-Aryan Family, Central Group*.
- GULŠAN NANDĀ  
1985 *Tin rang*, Naī Dillī (New Edition).
- HARDEV BĀHRĪ  
1966 *Grāmṇ Hindī Boliyā*, Ilāhābād.  
1987 *Bhāṣyogy<sup>a</sup>-tā ke lie vyākaran*, in Paricarcā. Hindī bhāṣā daks<sup>a</sup>tākā vastuniṣṭh (ābjektiv) parikṣan, Naī Dillī, 66-76.
- MAÑJU GUPTĀ  
1981 *Dillī ki Hindī*, in Vi. Rā. JAGANNĀTHAN, *Prayog aur Prayog*, Dillī, 428-436.
- MĪR TAQĪ MĪR<sup>c</sup>  
1966 *Dar hajv-e-khāna-e-khud*, in *Intikhab-e-kalām-e-Mīr*, edited by Maulvī 'Abdul Haq, Alīgāth.
- NESPITAL, Helmut  
1975 *Zur syntaktischen Verwendung der Verbalaspekte in Hindi und Urdu* in 'Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung', Band 28, Heft 3/4, Berlin, 398-431.
- 1980 *Zur Aufstellung eines Seminventars der Tempuskategorie im Hindi und Urdu und zu seiner Charakteristik*, in 'Zeitschrift der Deutschen

- 1981 Morgenländischen Gesellschaft' (ZDMG), Band 130, Heft 3, Wiesbaden, 490-521.  
*Das Futursystem im Hindi und Urdu. Ein Beitrag zur semantischen Analyse der Kategorien Tempus, Aspekt und Modus und ihrer Grammemme.* Schriftenreihe des Südasieninstituts der Universität Heidelberg, Band 29, Wiesbaden.
- 1982 *Verbal Aspect and Lexical Meaning of Verbs in New Indo-Aryan*, in *Abstract of Papers presented to the Third International Conference on South Asian Languages and Linguistics*, Mysore, January 1982, 18-19.
- 1982b *Zur Kategorie des Verbalaspekts im Indoarischen*, in 'Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft' (ZDMG), Sonderdruck 1982: Supplement V, XXI. Deutscher Orientalistentag vom 24.-29. März 1980 in Berlin. Ausgewählte Vorträge, herausgegeben von Fritz Steppart, Wiesbaden, 253-67.
- 1983 *Verbbedeutung und Aspekt aus sprachvergleichender Sicht*, in 'Sprachwissenschaft', Band 8, Heft 4, Heidelberg, 357-84.
- 1985 *Zur Polysemie von Verbalausdrücken im Neuindischen*, in '23. Deutscher Orientalistentag Würzburg (1985) — Verhandlungsband', 381-92.
- 1990 *Verbal Aspect and Lexical Semantics in Indo-Aryan Languages: The Typology of Verbal Expressions ('Compound Verbs') and their Relation to Simple Verbs*, in 'Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik', Heft 15, Reinbek, 159-96.  
 (in preparation) *Dictionary of Hindi Verbs (Simple Verbs and 'Compound Verbs') and their English Equivalents.*
- NĪLĀ JAGANNĀTHAN  
 1981 *Bambāī kī Hindī*, in Vī. Rā. JAGANNĀTHAN, *Prayog aur Prayog*, Dillī, 428-36.
- PREMCAND  
 195613 *Godān*, Banāras.  
 ŠAMATOV, Azad Nasretidinovič  
 1974 *Klassičeskij Dakhini (Južnij Chindustani XVII v.)*, Moskva.

- SCHMIDT, Ruth Laila  
 1981 *Dakhini Urdu. History and Structure*, New Delhi/Chandigarh.
- ŚRĪRĀM ŚARMĀ  
 1964 *Dakhhini Hindī kā udbhav aur vikās*, Prayāg.
- SRIVASTAVA, Dayanand  
 1962 *Nepali Language. Its History and Development*, Calcutta.
- VĀŚĪNĪ ŚARMĀ  
 1981 *Haiderābād kī Hindī*, in Vī. Rā. JAGANNĀTHAN, *Prayog aur Prayog*, Dillī, 428-36.