news programs to lower their style a bit. The Turks always claim that their language is written just at it is spoken. Even if this is not true, and probably never will come true, the gap today is at least much smaller than it has been for the last thousand years.[12]

## Bibliographical references

Andrews, Walter G., Black, Najaat and Kalpaklı, Mehmet. 1997: *Ottoman Lyric Poetry.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Brendemoen, Bernt. 1989. Den tyrkiske språkreformen. In: *Svenska Forskningsinstitutet i Istanbul – Meddelanden* 14: 29-46 (Stockholm). [English summary: "The Turkish language reform."]

Brendemoen, Bernt.1990. The Turkish language reform and language policy in Turkey. In: Hazai, György (ed.): *Handbuch der türkischen Sprachwissenschaft, Teil I* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó 1990), pp. 454-493.

Hazai, György. 1973. *Das Osmanisch-Türkische im XVII. Jahrhundert. Untersuchungen an den Transkriptionstexten von Jakab Nagy de Harsány.* Budapest. Akadémiai.

Kappler, Matthias. 1995. Über die Beziehung der griechischen Bevölkerung Konstantinopels zur osmanischen Kultur im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert. In: *Thaurismata* 25: 349-361.

Levend, Agâh Sırrı. 1972. *Türk Dilinde Gelişme ve Sadeleşme Evreleri.* Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.

Lewis, Geoffrey. 1999. *The Turkish Language Reform. A Catastrophic Success.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Matuz, Josef. 1975. Die Pfortendolmetscher zur Herrschaftszeit Süleymāns des Prächtigen. In: *Südostforschungen* 34: 26-60.

Önertoy, Olcay and Parlatır, İsmail. 1977. *Tanzimat Sonrası Osmanlıca Metinler.* Ankara Üniversitesi Dil Tarih Coğrafya Fakültesi Yayınları 267.

Ritter, Hellmut. 1953. *Karagös-türkische Schattenspiele.* Dritte Folge. Wiesbaden: Steiner.

Römer, Claudia. 2008. Contemporary European Translations of Ottoman Documents and vice versa ($15^{th}$ – $17^{th}$ Centuries). In: *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 61: 215-226.

Sanjian, Avedis K. and Tietze, Andreas. 1981. *Eremya Chelebi Kömürjian's Armeno-Turkish Poem "The Jewish Bride".* Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Strauss, Johann. 1995a. Diglossie dans le domaine ottoman. Évolution et péripéties d'une situation linguistique. In: *Revue du monde musulman et de la Méditerranée* 75-76: 221-255. [*Oral et écrit dans le monde turco-ottoman*]

Strauss, Johann. 1995b. The *millets* and the Ottoman Language. The Contribution of Ottoman Greeks to Ottoman Letters ($19^{th}$ – $20^{th}$ Centuries). In: *Die Welt des Islams* 35, 2: 189-249.

Veinstein, Gilles. 1995. L'oralité dans les documents d'archives ottomans: paroles rapportées ou imaginées? In: *Revue du monde musulman et de la Méditerranée* 75-76: 133-142. [*Oral et écrit dans le monde turco-ottoman*]

12 Still, e.g., rendering long vowels in Arabic and Persian words correctly has remained one of the few shibboleths distinguishing educated from uneducated speech, and pronunciations such as *rākibi* instead of *rakībi* 'his rival' are frequently criticized by columnists in Turkish newspapers.

# Hindi bilingualism and related matters

*Claus Peter Zoller, University of Oslo*

## Introduction

The people of South Asia have always been multilingual, and monolingualism was and is the exception. This holds true for the cities, the villages and the tribal areas. A good impression of the features characterizing the Indian language situation (with regard to bilingualism, code-switching and code-mixing) can be gotten from two quotes describing quite different, yet interrelated, phenomena. Colin Masica states on the notion of dialect continuum (1991: 25): "South Asia, which bears many analogies to Europe, differs from it radically here: it is *shaped* differently. Lacking clearcut geographical units of the European type where dialectal variants can crystallize in semi-isolation, or longstanding political boundaries, the entire Indo-Aryan realm (except for Singhalese) constitutes one enormous dialectal continuum, where continued contact inhibits such crystallization, and differentiated dialects continue to influence each other. The speech of each village differs slightly from the next, without loss of mutual intelligibility, all the way from Assam to Afghanistan. Cumulatively the differences are very great, but where do we draw the dialect, let alone the language, borders?"

Suzanne Romaine sees the complex language situation in India under another perspective (1995: 9): "A foreigner who manages to learn a variety of Telugu sufficient to get by on the streets of Hyderabad will soon find out that this particular variety of Telugu cannot be used for all purposes which an English monolingual might use English for. The average educated person in Hyderabad may use Telugu at home, Sanskrit at the temple, English at the university, Urdu in business etc. He or she may also know other varieties of Telugu, or Kannada, Tamil or Malayalam for reading, dealing with servants, or other specific purposes. Many South Asians have active control over what amounts to complex linguistic repertoires drawn from different languages and varieties. In societies such as these, multilingualism is not an incidental feature of language use, but a central factor and an organizing force in everyday life."

This article consists of three parts. In the first part, the reader is introduced to various aspects of bilingualism connected with Hindi. The second part looks at code-mixing where a "foreign" and an indigenous element are joined at the level of morphology. In the literature on bilingualism the study of hybrid formations does not receive the same attention as studies at the phrase, sentence and discourse levels. However, interesting insights can also be gained from there. The third part adumbrates attempts by some linguists and other writers to

detect diachronic changes in code-switching and to identify rules for and constrictions on code-switching and code-mixing between Hindi and English.

**Background**

Romaine's organizing force and the large number of language varieties are not the only ingredients for South Asian multilingualism, code-switching and code-mixing. To put it bluntly, whereas the modern enlightened view is that people are the same, there is the traditional and still widespread view in South Asia that people are not the same.[1] The respective consequences of these differing views do not only condense in different social systems (a hierarchical caste system in case of India) but also in different attitudes towards language,[2] and, we find in case of South Asia, in an impressive polyglossia that has always existed there as far as we can look back.[3] However, the traditional Indian view always distinguished between the uniformity of Sanskrit and the multiformity of the other languages. This is e.g. expressed by a 10th century Buddhist commentator (see Pollock 2006: 44): "The great sages themselves spoke the languages of the Place[4] [*deśabhāṣā*],[5] but they were able to teach Sanskrit thanks to their extraordinary attainments. As a result while the Prakrits[6] are multiform, Sanskrit is uniform." That Sanskrit is a uniform language actually spoken by the gods is certainly a very old idea, but probably for the first time documented in the 7th century AD in the words of the literary theorist Daṇḍin: "The language called Sanskrit is the language of the gods, taught [to men] by the great sages of old." (Pollock ibid.). The Prakrits were historically followed by Apabhraṁśa (meaning 'falling down; ungrammatical language') and then by regional Indo-Aryan languages, all of which having gotten their names from the regions in which they are spoken. From the point of the history of Sanskrit it is, of course, obvious that the language has undergone very many changes. However, the old distinction between one high and prestigious, eternal and divine language and many "degraded" everyday languages of humans has, in one way or the other and in one place or another, lingered on till today. When in the first millenium AD Sanskrit was no longer in the sole possession of a minority elite nor restricted for use in Vedic liturgy, but became for around a millenium the language of court literature, the distinction was still maintained. V. Raghavan (1993: 25) remarks on the Sanskrit drama: "The higher characters speak Sanskrit; the lesser ones, women, higher as well as lower, speak the Prakrits." In the Sanskrit play *The little clay cart* (*Mṛcchakaṭika*), where differ-

1 For more on this see the introduction in Wendy Doniger 1976.
2 These attitudes may reach from Sanskrit, the language of gods (see Pollock 2006), to Panjabi which carries the stigma of an unpolished language (Rahman 1996: 193f.).
3 On recent threats facing this multiplicity see Anvita Abbi 2003, 2005, 2006, 2008.
4 That is, local idioms.
5 On the transliteration conventions see below p. 154.
6 That is the Middle Indo-Aryan languages.



ent kinds of 'lower' characters figure, different Prakrit languagess are represented.[7] In the present-day South Indian Sanskrit theatre performance tradition called Kūṭiyāṭṭam, which is perhaps the oldest existing Indian theatre form, the actors use besides Sanskrit also Middle-Indic Prakrit and the modern South Indian language Kannarese. A task for one of the actors is to translate between the three languages. Moreover, language is also communicated through dance gestures, *mudrās*, e.g. *śukatuṇḍa* 'parrot's beak' which expresses the anger or jealousy of a lover. But there are also *mudrās* conveying grammatical information like genitive case.[8]

In the Western Himalayas and in the Karakorum we may come across a shamanistic session in which someone gets possessed by a fairy. The local people would then point out that when the fairy speaks through her medium, she does *not* use the local language. In the Karakorum she uses the language Shina, which is regarded as the only language fit for sacred and poetic speech. In Hunza, where the isolate language Burushaski is spoken, it is said that when a fairy takes possession of a shaman he (or rather she through him) will talk in Shina even if the Shaman normally does not have a command of the language (Jettmar 1975: 276). So also here humans and divine beings do not use the same language. Thus it is not surprising either that in the Indian Garhwal Himalayas officiants who want to call down the fairies from the mountains or up from the subterranean kingdom of the snakes use a version of the Garhwali language that is influenced by a vernacular form of Sanskrit and Prakrit and which locals hardly understand. Here is a small example from a manuscript with the Sanskrit and Prakrit words underlined.[9] It starts with a series of greetings:

*ōm namo ādeśah ādapurus kau*
*ādeśah brahmā veśmu mayasur kau ādeśa...*
*sātt buṭi sastradhārā ko ādesaṁ*
*tav nāglog tte hilo-milo karika*
*nau vaiṇo seli volaṇ lagi hīṁ*
*Hiṅglā, Ttott, Māmotal, Moni, Johani, Kaṭkāli volaṇ lagi:*
*calā vaiṇi, mātlogaṁ jolā*

Om obeisance and respectful greeting to the Primeval Man
Respectful greeting to Brahma, Vishnu, and respectful greeting to Mayasur[10]...
Respectful greeting to the seven herbs and the thousand springs.
(Now the officiant "wakes up" the fairies)

7 More on Sanskrit and Prakrits in Sanskrit theatre in Nemichandra Jain (2005: 14) and Indu Shekhar (1977: 124ff.).
8 We do not, however, have here a fully developed sign language.
9 The manuscript is from the valley of the Alaknandā River. In the early 1980ies I had opportunity to photograph a number of such manuscripts.
10 Name of a demon who, according to a regional tradition, brought jaundice into the world.

The nine sisters got jumbled together in the world of snakes
and (the fairy named) Seli started to speak (to the fairies named):
Hiṅglā, Ttott, Māmotal, Moni, Johani, Kaṭkāli, she started to speak;
"Let's go, sisters, we go to the world of humans."

These examples, which could easily be extended, show that it is natural and normal in South Asia to use different styles of the same language – for instance in performance situations but not only as we will see – or to use different languages within the same communication frame.

## Some remarks on the history of Hindi

Hindi is an Indo-Aryan language closely related with Khaṛī Bolī which is spoken in the area of Delhi. The language goes back to Old Indo-Aryan (OIA), the dominant variety of which is Sanskrit. As any other New Indo-Aryan language, Hindi contains not only inherited OIA vocabulary but also a considerable amount of OIA loanwords which entered the language over the centuries. This borrowing process accelerated dramatically during the 19th and 20th centuries in connection with the so-called Hindi-Urdu controversy, which not only led to an ever increasing alineation between the two sister languages by overloading Hindi with Sanskrit words and Urdu with Perso-Arabic words but the alineation was also a crucial concomitant of the 1947 partition. Due to centuries of Muslim domination during which Persian was the language of arts and administration, also Hindi absorbed a considerable amount of words plus some grammatical features from Persian (and indirectly Arabic). The culturally motivated disinterest by the Muslim rulers towards things Indian led to a rather imprecise use of the terms *hindī* 'Indian language' and *hinduī* 'Hindu language'. Consequently, there exist until today many different views on which varieties and dialects belong to Hindi. Still it can be ascertained that the direct predecessor of Modern Standard Hindi (MSH) was the literary language Braj Bhāṣā from the late 15th century to the 19th century. The geographical centre of Braj Bhāṣā was (and is) south of Delhi in the area of Agra and Mathura. And until the 19th century it was Braj Bhāṣā which was understood to be *the* Hindi, and not its northern neighbour Khaṛī Bolī. Turning now to the impact of English on Hindi (and the other Indian languages), Shackle and Snell (1990: 20) point out that "... the British rulers were at first unwilling and later unable to establish their local cultural presence in terms of large-scale conversions matching those achieved for Islam by their Muslim predecessors, their impact upon the linguistic evolution of Hindi-Urdu was to prove even greater." For some time the British colonialists continued having Persian used in administration while they simultaneously drafted their new laws in English. This turned out to be untenable, and in 1800 the Fort William College in Kolkata was established in order to impart knowledge of Indian languages to British administrators. This, however, led first to a boost for writing in Urdu and then to the development of



a Sanskritized Hindi based on Khaṛī Bolī. Braj Bhāṣā gradually lost its importance and the relationship between Urdu and Hindi became more and more one of rivalry. Whereas the Khaṛī Bolī based Urdu could further evolve without rupture, Hindi was in the more difficult situation of substituting its old Braj Bhāṣā base against a new Khaṛī Bolī base. After various setbacks the movement for Hindi becoming an 'official' language gained momentum and (op. cit., p. 22) "... the Hindi movement's own fulcrum came to be located in Benares and Allahabad, the twin bases of Hindu power in Northern India ... a geographical dimension was thus given to the rift dividing Hindi from Urdu, which had its traditional bases in Delhi and Lucknow." If one compares this history of Hindi with Mejdell's (2008) model, describing shifting focusses on languages being accepted as binding standards, one observes a fundamental difference: whereas for instance in the case of English in England or in the case of the Scandinavian languages the accepted standard could move from one geographical area, where the standard was spoken, to another area, where another dialect has succeeded in becoming the new standard, in India it was the Hindi language itself, which, in a way, moved around: it started its career from a huge but ill-defined geographical space in North India, then established itself in the Braj country south of the centre of Urdu between Delhi and Lucknow, then Hindi was redrafted in Bengali language territory at the instigation of foreign colonisers, then it took its roots in the middle Ganges valley – that is: east of the Urdu stronghold – from where it has continuously expanded until today.

## Varieties of Hindi

Also present-day Hindi displays much linguistic diversity. Countries like Norway and Germany have their standard varieties, but many people – besides using dialects – speak them with different regional accents. There is also a Modern Standard Hindi (MSH) which is taught at schools over large parts of India as a first or second language, but there are indeed not so many people who speak it with a mother-tongue competence. However, in comparison to Norwegian or German the situation is more complex. Hindi is the official language of the Republic of India (it is not the 'national' language, as India does not have a 'national' language). According to the 2001 Census, Hindi is the first language of 422 million people, that is around 40% of the Indian population. And it is spoken as a second language certainly by another few hundred million people. But these figures are also deceptive because it is not at all clear what should be included under this rubric besides MSH. One estimates that within the so-called Hindi belt, which is loosely defined but extends roughly from west of Delhi to east of Benares, around 48 geographical Hindi dialects exist[11] (Abbi 2001: 20f., see also Nespital 1990 on the relation of Hindi to its

11 This figure does not take into consideration further dialect differentiations according to religion, caste and other social parameters.

regional dialects). MSH is based on a western form from the Delhi area. But people also talk of Hindustani, Kharī Bolī and Urdu. I will not enter into a detailed discussion of these rather elusive notions,[12] but would like at least to mention the following points: one noteworthy characteristic of Hindi is the existence of a network of registers and styles. One of the most important concerns the dichotomy between Hindi and Urdu. For some, Hindi and Urdu are two stylistic poles of a single language they call Hindustani: Urdu uses a Perso-Arabic script and more vocabulary from these languages, whereas Hindi uses an Indian script and contains much vocabulary from Sanskrit. However, since both languages are intimately connected with the history of the independence movement which ended in the partition of the subcontinent, there are other people who would insist that Hindi and Urdu, as bearers of distinct literary and cultural traditions, should be considered fully separate languages.[13] But also the term Hindustani is used quite inconsistently: some apply it to the pidgin forms of Hindi as they are spoken in the mega-cities of Kolkata and Mumbai; for others, for instance Mahatma Gandhi or Pandit Nehru, Hindustani would be the Hindi-Urdu that is free from the just-mentioned borrowings. To advocates of a view that sees Hindi, Urdu and Hindustani as stylistic variants of a common language (e.g. with regard to lexicon), matters of script and literary history are of less importance than the shared grammatical and lexical features of the vernacular languages of the upper Ganges valley, not to mention the unifying aspects of *shared* cultural traditions.

Besides the complex of Hindi-Hindustani-Urdu and the aforementioned regional Hindi dialects, there are still other varieties connected with Hindi. One can distinguish between urban and rural styles, between formal and informal styles, between educated and non-educated varieties etc., all criss-crossing also the Hindi-Hindustani-Urdu complex. And one can introduce yet another perspective. Concentrating now on Hindi – ignoring Hindustani and Urdu – one may distinguish three varieties, or registers:

- Urduized Hindi (which is not the same as Urdu)
- Anglicized Hindi
- Sanskritized Hindi

Urduized Hindi is used in contexts that relate in some way to the sphere of refined Muslim culture of past urban centres like Delhi or Lucknow, Anglicized Hindi relates to the sphere of the official modern world of business, work and education, and sanskritized Hindi relates to the sphere of Hindu religion, but frequently also to literature and politics. There is for instance a famous Urdu novel *Umrāv Jān Adā*, which tells the life story of a hetaera from the Lucknow

12 Frances Pritchett provides many sources on Hindi and Hindi-Urdu issues here: http://www.columbia.edu/itc/mealac/pritchett/00urduhindilinks/.

13 For more on these issues see Tariq Rahman 1996.



of the Muslim Nawabs (princes). This Urdu novel has been rendered into a quite strongly Urduized Hindi by the well-known woman writer Qurratulain Haider. A native Hindi speaker can read the Hindi rendering – and the more difficult words are explained in footnotes by the writer – but not the Urdu novel, it is too difficult for most Hindi speakers, also because of the Urdu script. This example is rather untypical since this refined North Indian Muslim culture has vanished and is now part of India's past. However, there is another area which is important and where Urduized Hindi is used, namely in the Hindi Bollywood films. I have randomly picked out from the Internet a song from the film with the Perso-Arabic title *āb e hayāt* 'water of immortality' from 1955. The title of the song is *merā dil merī jān* sung by Geeta Dutt.[14] In the following transliterated text the underlined words are of Perso-Arabic origin but are integral part of the Hindi language. Underlined words in bold face signal, from my point of view, an Urduized style in the sense that they are otherwise rarely used in Hindi.[15]

| | |
|---|---|
| *o merā dil o merī jān cāhe le le* | Oh my heart, oh my life would wish: take, take |
| *ik pyār zarā sa de de* | A love kindly give, give |
| *ye pahlī pahlī cāha* | This very first desire |
| *ye bahkī bahkī hālat* | These so much disappointing situations |
| *tū phūl hai maiṁ hūṁ raṅgat* | You're the flower, I am its colour |
| *ye jhūme jhūme* ***jannat*** | This swinging and swinging paradise |
| *pyār kī ye* ***parī*** *tere* ***dar*** *pe kharī* | This very fairy of love is waiting at your door |
| *ā idhar o jādugar matvāle* | Come over oh intoxicated magician |
| *lā iśq kī duniyā de de* | Bring the world of love, give give |
| *merā dil o merī jān …* | My heart and my life … |

We now turn to Sanskritized Hindi or *śuddh* Hindi 'pure Hindi' as it is called. The Sanskritization of Hindi has a long history as it is closely connected with Indian nationalism and the independence movement. Already in the 19th century there were clear tendencies to persianize Urdu and to Sanskritize Hindi with the unfortunate result that for many people Urdu and Islam, and Hindi and Hinduism are equated. Therefore it is also no surprise that Sanskritization was promoted by right-wing political parties like the RSS (Rāṣṭrīya Sevā Saṅgh) especially in pre-independence times, that is the first half of the 20th century. However, Sanskritization continued unabated also in post-independent India until the early 1990s. Then, with globalization and the economic liberalization, which was accompanied by an enormous expansion of the field of media, official bodies like the Central Institute of Hindi lost their influence on language

14 An example of the roughly transliterated text can be found here: http://www.hindilyrics.net/lyrics/of-O%20Mera%20Dil%20O%20Meri%20Jaan.html.

15 The translation is quite literal and does not convey the aesthetics of the original.

planning to some degree. Even though Hindi has gained more prestige in the past decades, the influence of English on Hindi has also increased.[16]

Nobody refuses to acknowledge Sanskrit as *the* classical language of India. But a large number of neologisms built with Sanskrit elements suggest that this Sanskritization is at least partly a covered Anglicization: *dūr-bhāṣ* 'tele-phone' (or even more artificial *dūr-bhāṣaṇ yantra* 'device for telephoning'), *dūr-darśan* 'tele-vision', *pṛṣṭh-bhūmi* 'background' (Sanskrit *pṛṣṭha* means 'back (of a body)' and *bhūmi* 'earth, soil').

This forced Sanskritization abated in the early 1990. However, it is also important to point out that Sanskritization need not be a bad thing *per se*. Many Sanskrit words have been accepted by Hindi speakers, and pure or *shuddh* Hindi is part of the competence of many Hindi speakers. The Sanskrit component in Hindi comprises largely the vocabulary, prefixes,[17] suffixes, participles, and compounds. *Shuddh* Hindi is not only found in speeches of politicians, but also in some Hindi newspapers, and there are quite a few leading Hindi writers who have used *shuddh* Hindi in their writings, and this in an excellent way. One of them is the influential novelist, poet, and playwright Dharmvir Bharati (1926-1997), who in 1954 published the free verse play *Andhā Yug* ('The Age of Blindness/The Blind Age'). This anti-war play with a plot based on some events of the *Mahābhārata* epic has become part of the standard repertoire of Hindi theatre and continues to be staged – despite or because of its heavily Sanskritized Hindi. The following example ist the beginning of the opening scene. Words borrowed from Sanskrit are in italics, whole Sanskrit sentences are shown in italics and bold.

[[18]*nepathya* se *udghoṣaṇā tathā mañc* par *nartak* ke *dvārā upayukt bhāvanāṭya* kā *pradarśan*. *śaṅkh-dhvani* ke sāth pardā khultā hai *tathā maṅgalācaraṇ* ke sāth-sāth *nartak namaskār-mudrā pradarśit* kartā hai. *udghoṣaṇā* ke sāth-sāth uskī *mudrāeṁ* badaltī jātī haiṁ.]

*maṅgalācaraṇ*
***nārāyanam namaskṛtya naram caiva narottamam,***
***devīm sarasvatīm vyāsam tato jayamudīyaret***

*udghoṣaṇā*
jis *yug* kā *varṇan* is *kṛti* meṁ hai
uske *viṣay* meṁ *viṣṇu-purāṇ* meṁ kahā hai:

16 Of course, Hindi was promoted as a language unifying people in their fight for independence already in the 19th century. But this had an ideological dimension and is thus different from the present situation where Hindi is accepted by an increasing number of people as "their own" language, of which they are proud.

17 E.g. spatial prefixes like 'down', 'within', 'up', or qualifying prefixes like 'good', 'without', and many suffixes typically used in derivations.

18 Here follows a stage direction.



***'tataścānudinamalpālpa hrāsa***
***vyavacchedadāddharmārthyorjagatassaṁkṣayo bhaviṣyati'***

us *bhaviṣya* meṁ
*dharm-arth hrāsonmukh* hoṁge
*kṣay* hogā dhīre-dhīre sārī *dhartī* kā.

*

[From the background of the stage a solemn proclamation, and on the stage presentation of condign dance gestures through dancers. The curtain rises together with the sound of a conch shell, and with an invocation to God the dancer raises his folded hands for salutation. His hand gestures change with the solemn proclamation.]

'Invocation'
The bard may intone the triumphal song after bowing before Nara and Nārāyaṇa,[19]
the highest among men, and before Goddess Sarasvatī[20] and sage Vyāsa[21]

'Solemn proclamation'
About that age described in this artwork
it is said in the *Viṣṇu-purāṇa*[22]

(The two Sanskrit lines are repeated in the following three Hindi lines)

Then in the future
righteousness and prosperity will disappear day by day
and the whole earth shall slowly be annihilated.

This opening scene is certainly a case of especially strong Sanskritization and other sections contain fewer Sanskrit words. I guess that this drama enjoys continued appreciation because its author did not what other promoters of a sanskritized Hindi did: he did not try to expurgate the language, and in fact the text contains also lots of common and stylistically neutral words, even a few English ones. On the other hand, puristically oriented official bodies tried in the decades after independence[23] to remove not only the "foreign" Perso-Arabic elements from Hindi but also many inherited everyday words like e.g. *se pahle* 'before' (to be replaced with *se pūrv*) or *peṛ* 'tree' (to be replaced with *vṛkṣ*) (see Mayan 1999: 37). A main problem that resulted from this policy was the frequent introduction of several Sanskrit words in exchange for one undesired

19 Nara-Nārāyaṇa is the twin-brother incarnation of god Viṣṇu on earth, working for the preservation of dharma.

20 Sarasvatī is the goddess of learning.

21 Vyāsa is the mythical author of the *Mahābhārata* epic.

22 The *Viṣṇu-purāṇa* is a religious Sanskrit text and is regarded as the most important of the eighteen *Mahā-purāṇa*s 'Great Purāṇas'.

23 Actually the first attempts started already in the 19th century.

word. Thus the word *kośiś* 'effort' (from Persian) can be replaced by Sanskrit *āyās*, *prayās*, *yatna*, *prayatna*, and *ceṣṭā*, and no Hindi speaker would be able to recognize fine semantic differences between them. Anvita Abbi (1996) has discussed the, if one can say so, low point of Sanskritization, which is found in the Hindi of application forms, for instance in application forms for food rations and supplies, deposit receipts of the banks, railway reservation etc. (p. 156). The forms she discusses abound in sometimes comic mistakes; however the Hindi of these forms "not only is non communicable but also confuses the users to the extent that they are discouraged from using it and thereby ultimately are deprived of the right to demand essential services and goods" (p. 156).

### Hindi and Indian English

We will now have a look at Anglicized Hindi. One does not find it together with Sanskritized Hindi,[24] but otherwise the phenomenon is ubiquitous. And many Indians who are not very conscious about bilingualism are not aware how frequently they use words of English origin. For instance, on the Delhi homepage of the Indian FM radiostation Radio Mirchi,[25] which is very popular among young people, there are many clips with interviews, talks, and trailers, where people constantly and quickly shift between Hindi and English words, phrases, and sentences. Those who do this at an elaborate scale are usually accomplished Hindi-English bilinguals. This is interesting because one does not speak of Hindi-Urdu bilingualism because of the shared grammar, and there exists also practically no Hindi-Sanskrit bilingualism as Sanskrit is nowadays spoken only by few people. When we look at the examples of Urduized and Sanskritized Hindi, it seems that any lexical element and quite a number of grammatical elements can be integrated into the host language, and the same may be assumed for English elements. However, this is not the case, as we will see below.

In the development from Old via Middle to New Indo-Aryan many changes occurred – like borrowing of words and changes in grammar – which are regarded to have been caused by substrate influences and by contact with other language families. As a result, for instance Hindi and Tamil have diverse kinds of commonalities which are not the result of a common origin (which is not there), but the result of a *Sprachbund* situation. For example the agglutinative tendencies in the Hindi case system or the oblique "case"[26] have parallels in Dravidian (Masica 1991: 237 and 239).[27] The Perso-Arabic (and English) influence on Hindi is not only much later but also of a different nature. Arabic and Persian being not adjacent to the Indian language area exerted a strong influence only during the centuries of the common Indo-Persian culture roughly between the 13th and the 19th century. Thus, one finds a large number of Arabic and Persian lexemes in Indian languages including Hindi,[28] but the influence of Persian grammar is quite small. This applies to an even greater extent to English. Normally, Hindi-English code-switching is studied under the perspective of English words and phrases getting inserted into Hindi sentences or Hindi sentences alternating with English sentences. However, it is also advisable to study how English elements can combine with Hindi elements at the morphological level. We will see that the range of possibilities here is rather limited, while there exists a great number of hybrid formations of Perso-Arabic elements with inherited Indo-Aryan elements. It seems natural that at the early phase of the Perso-Arabic impact on Indian languages the situation was comparable to the more recent past and the present situation of English and the indigenous North Indian languages.

I present now a series of combinations of Perso-Arabic and inherited Indo-Aryan elements and we will see that Perso-Arabic elements can be replaced by English ones only in relatively few cases. The following examples are given in transliteration, but actually the words are found in Hindi texts written in Devanāgarī script. In later sections of this article, some explanations for restrictions are suggested. Most of the following examples are taken from appendix 1 in Kuczkiewicz-Fraś (2003) which I have supplemented with the original meanings and the grammatical functions.

### Hindi affixes[29] – Perso-Arabic nouns

*ku*-rāh 'wrong course' (S. pejorative prefix + Pers. 'road'), *prati*-sāl 'each year' (S. 'each' + Pers. 'year'), barf-*īlā* 'icy, snowy' (Pers. 'ice' + H. adj.), darz-*in* 'a sempstress' (Pers. 'tailor' + H. fem.), pul-*iyā* 'a small bridge' (Pers. 'bridge' + H. dim.), gand-*ol-nā* 'to pollute' (Pers. 'smell' + H. caus. + H. inf.), tar-*āvaṭ* 'dampness' (Pers. 'wet' + H. abs.), jahāz-*vālā* 'a sailor' (Pers. 'ship' + H. an.).

### Partially grammaticalized inherited lexemes

faujī-*karaṇ* 'militarization' (Pers. 'military' + S. 'action'), gairfaujī-*kṛt* 'demilitarized' (Pers. "unmilitary" + S. 'done'), joś-*pūrṇ* 'passionate' (Pers. 'excitement' + S. 'full').

24 However, newspaper Hindi can be a terrible mishmash.

25 http://www.radiomirchi.com/delhi.

26 There are different opinions as to whether there is an oblique case or an oblique basis for other cases in New Indo-Aryan.

27 For more on this topic see e.g. the seminal article by Emeneau 'India as a linguistic area'.

28 The Arabic lexemes came via the Persian language.

29 This includes also borrowings from Sanskrit. The affixes are shown in italics.

**With Perso-Arabic formants**

bad-*calan* 'ill-behaved' (Pers. 'bad' + H. 'going'), be-*arth* 'absurd' (Pers. 'without' + S. 'meaning'), nā-*samajh* 'foolish' (Pers.(?) 'not' + H. 'understanding').
In this group one also finds a few compounds with English words: *gol*-cī 'a goal keeper' (Eng. 'goal' + Pers. an.), be-*injan* 'without engine' (Pers. 'without' + Eng. 'engine').

**With partially grammaticalized Perso-Arabic formants**

*baiṭhak*-bāz 'intriguer' (H. 'meeting' + Pers. 'player'), *bāt*-faroś 'a romancer' (H. 'speech' + Pers. 'seller'), *ciṛiyā*-khānā 'a zoo' (H. 'bird' + Pers. 'place'), *māṁs*-khor 'meat eating' (H. 'meat' + Pers. 'eating'), *bijlī*-sāz 'an electrician' (H. 'electricity' + Pers. 'maker').

Also in this group one finds a few compounds with English lexical items:[30] *kāpī*-navīs 'a copyist' (Eng. 'copy' + Pers. an.) (cf. Pers. *tarjama-navīs* 'a translator'), *faiśan*-dār 'fashionable' (Eng. 'fashion + Pers. 'having'), *pārṭī*-bāzī 'fractional' (Eng. 'party' + Pers. 'game'), *moṭar*-khānā 'a garage' (Eng. 'motor' + Pers. 'house').

Apart from some very few cases, apparently no English lexical items can combine with Sanskrit or inherited Hindi formants, whereas words of Persian origin can do this. One such exception is *philm-ī* 'filmic' with a Hindi adjectivising suffix. This fact reflects Poplack's 'free morpheme constraint' (1988: 219), "which prohibits mixing morphologies within the confines of the word." In addition, combinations of English words with Persian formants seem to be semantically limited to those English words which have become indianized: *gol*-cī 'a goal keeper' reminds a Hindi speaker of Hindi *gol* 'a ball', 'engine' and 'rifle' are found in (Online) Hindi dictionaries as *injan* and *rāifal*; *lambar* 'number' is by many not known to be an English word; 'copy', 'cartoon', 'varnish', 'fashion', 'license', 'polish' etc. again are found as *kāpī*, *kārṭūn*, etc. in Hindi dictionaries.[31] Thus, except 'middle' (and words like 'Marx' and 'pope', for which there cannot exist indigenous equivalents), hardly any non-indigenized English words – this must especially hold true for abstract words – can combine with inherited Indo-Aryan or Persian affixes. However, hybrid compounds consisting only of lexemes (and not of a combination of a lexeme

30 Note that I collected most English examples found in the appendix, whereas in case of Perso-Arabic and Hindi compounds I have only taken one example out of frequently very many examples. Thus this type of compounding with English formants is really quite moderate.

31 The Hindi Online dictionary *śabdkoś* (http://www.shabdkosh.com/) provides for English words used in Hindi both the British and the North Indian pronunciation (one can easily hear the differences).



and a grammeme) are common both in Hindi and in Indian English, and Hindi words with English affixes are found in Indian English (though this is not possible for Hindi, as we will see below).

**Hindi-English and English-Hindi compounds**

*kisān* rally 'a farmer's rally' (H. 'farmer'), *kṛṣi* export 'agricultural export' (S. 'agriculture'), *lāṭhī* charge 'a charge done with a staff (by the police)' (H. 'staff'), *ḍāk* bungalow 'a circuit-house' (H. 'postal service'). That such hybrid compounds were already common in the 19th century is shown by now outdated forms found in Yule's *Hobson-Jobson*: *agan*-boat 'a steamer' (S. 'fire'), box-*vālā* 'peddlar' (H. an.), *brahmini* butter 'ghee, clarified butter' (H. 'brahmanical'), etc.

Ashok Kumar (1986: 198) claims that Hindi-English nominal compounds are not possible, and indeed he lists some examples which definitely look weird:[32] Hindi *gṛh praveś* corresponds to English 'house entry (house warming)' but *'house *praveś*' and *'*gṛh* entry' are not possible; English 'irrigation planning' corresponds to Hindi *siṁcāī yojanā* but *'irrigation *yojanā*' and *'*siṁcāī* planning' do not exist. There is presumably a tendency to avoid compounds of English and Sanskrit words, even though the preceding paragraph provides a few examples. This assumption is supported by data from Rajendra Singh (1995b: 38), who shows that '*nayā* vicel-chancellor' 'new vice-chancellor' with Hindi *nayā* 'new' is well-formed but not so *'*navīn* vice-chancellor' built with Sanskrit *navīna* 'new'; similarly 'school-*imārat*' 'school-building' with Perso-Arabic '*imārat* is acceptable but not *'school-*bhavan*' with Sanskrit *bhavana* 'building'. Moreover, the examples given by Kumar consist of elements that appear to be semantically more interlocked than those from just above. On the other hand, Kumar claims that *ātma gyān* and 'self knowledge' are fine but not *'self *gyān*' and *'*ātma* knowledge'; however, in the Internet one finds a few 'self *gyān*s'. We are dealing here apparently with fuzzy transitions between what is tolerable and what is not: a **duniyā gyān* 'knowledge of the world' looks wrong but *gyān duniyā* 'world of knowledge' is in use and sounds fine.

Such hybrid compounds again had their predecessors in hybrid compounds with inherited words from Indo-Aryan and words from Persian and Arabic. A subclass are "intensive" synonym compounds, common examples are (Singh 1995b: 16f.): *vivāh-śādī* 'marriage-marriage' (S. – Pers.), *dhan-daulat* 'wealth-wealth' (H. – Pers.-Ar.), *śāk-sabzī* 'vegetable-vegetable' (S. – Pers.), *sneh-muhabbat* 'love-love' (S. – Pers.-Ar.), *lāj-śarm* 'shame-shame' (H. – Pers.).

32 Here and further below I have adapted Kumar's transliterations to the general standard, some information on which is given below p. 154 in the paragraph on transliteration.

**Hindi lexemes plus English participle words**

Examples: '*ghī* fried' 'fried in clarified butter', '*sāṛī* clad' 'clad in a Saree', '*dhobī* washed' 'washed by a washerman'; they form adjective phrases as in '*ghī* laden *khicṛī*' 'a certain dish full of clarified butter'. Examples with present participle: '*cappal* throwing' 'throwing of sandals', '*bīḍī* smoking' 'smoking of tobacco leaves'.

**Hindi lexemes plus English grammemes in Indian English**

Plural: *jūtā*-s 'shoes'; Genitive: *mātājī*'s son 'mother's son'; past participle: *ghusphus*-ed 'whispered'; present participle: 'she is *bak-bak*-ing (chattering) the whole day'; prefix: ex-*bīvī* 'ex-wife'; suffix: *caprāsī*-hood 'peon-hood'.

**Hindi grammemes plus English lexemes in Anglicized Hindi**

Genitive: 'hero *ke* roles' 'the roles of the hero'; plural: 'fail*oṁ kī bhīṛ*' 'a heap of files' (with oblique plural suffix *-oṁ*).

**Bilingualism and code-switching**[33]

The eminent Indian historian and writer Ramachandra Guha gave a speech in 2009 at the India International Centre in New Delhi where he deplored the fact that whereas Indian intellectuals of former generations were often active speakers of one or more Indian languages *and* of English, today they are solely active either in one Indian language *or* in English. While Mahatma Gandhi opposed the use of English – he called it an "unmitigated evil" and thought that it had "emasculated the English-educated Indian" (Guha 2009: 36) – this did not, however, detain him from using that language. He wrote his works in Gujarati, but he made sure that they were translated into English. Gandhi's strong anti-English attitude was criticized by the poet Rabindranath Tagore. Against Gandhis praise of great Indian personalities like Guru Nanak and Sant Kabir – because they used the local languages – Tagore argued (op. cit., p. 37) that they "were great because in their life and teaching they made organic union of the Hindu and Muhammadan cultures – and such realization of the spiritual unity through all differences of appearance is truly Indian." Thus, despite the occasional ambivalent or negative attitude towards English, many important figures from the times of the independence struggle saw to it that their writings were also published in English, and bilingualism and multiculturalism were regarded worthwhile to be pursued. This attitude holds true even for rightwing nationalists like M.S. Golwalkar,[34] who gave his speeches in Hindi, which then were translated into English. Guha states (p. 39): "Between (roughly) the 1920s and 1970s, the intellectual universe in India was – to coin a word – "linguidextrous". With few exceptions, the major political thinkers, scholars and creative writers – and many of the minor ones too – thought and acted and wrote with equal facility in English and at least one other language.[35] It appears that this is no longer the case."

Whether Guha's negative evaluation really holds true may, however, be questioned. Rajendra Singh remarks about contemporary bilingualism in India (1995a: 99): "A strong bilingual switches only when he wants to and a weak one when he has to ... whereas the balanced bilingual switches only for non-grammatical reasons, the weak bilingual switches for reasons of both grammatical competence and functional needs." He further points out (ibid.) that Indians who are equally competent in English and Hindi do not switch very often. Thus there appears to be a difference between past generations and the present generation with regard to language *practice*, in the sense that people prefer nowadays to write in one language only, but this does not prove a decline in bilingual competence. Yet also Singh's claim that competent bilinguals do not switch so frequently has to be questioned vis-à-vis the above-mentioned fashionable "mirchi"[36] Hinglish which combines code-switching and code-mixing and which requires a high competence in both languages. Guha rightly observes (p. 41) that "[m]eanwhile, Hindi and English have emerged as pan-Indian languages of communication and conversation. Where official attempts to promote Hindi in southern and eastern India conspicuously failed, the language has nonetheless spread through the more informal, and hence more acceptable, medium of television and film. In cities like Bangalore and Hyderabad, in Mumbai, and now even in Kolkata, Hindi is widely used as the default language of conversation between two Indians reared to speak other tongues. The spread of English owes itself to more instrumental factors – the fact that it is the language of the international marketplace, and of the larger companies and firms that operate in it. Since the best-paying and often most prestigious jobs demand a knowledge of English, there is a huge incentive to acquire it." Also this quote demonstrates the altered functions nowadays Hindi and English fulfill in comparison to those in previous generations: English as the language of the modern work world and higher education, Hindi as the language for the private domain and for issues related to Indian culture. This raises the question whether code-mixing has also changed. Indeed, this seems to be the case.

33 I use the term code-switching for switching between languages at the inter-sentence level as well as above, and code-mixing for switches below the inter-sentence level. In the literature these notions are not always clearly separated.

34 Madhav Sadashiv Golwalkar (1906-1973) was the second *sarsanghcālak* (supreme chief) of the *Rāṣṭrīya Svayamsevak Saṅgh* (RSS), a nationalist and right-wing Hindu organization.

35 Namely another Indian language, perhaps most frequently, but certainly not exclusively, Hindi (Zoller).

36 "Mirchi" means literally 'pepper' or 'chilli' and refers to the above-mentioned youth jargon which has been popularized by Radio Mirchi.

**Diachronic changes in code-switching patterns**

Concerning the use of English in Hindi Bollywood films Aung Si notes (2010: 10):[37] "… the use of English (in the form of isolated words, phrases, clauses, sentences or entire turns) was far more prevalent post-2000 than it had been in the 1980s or 1990s … The data reveal that between 1982 and 2001, the number of turns which were composed exclusively of Hindi words fell dramatically from around 85 per cent to just under 20 per cent, while the number of turns that contained at least one English word rose from 15 per cent to over 80 per cent." Especially drastic is the case of code-switching in young people's dialogues (p. 11): "While English insertions into Hindi are clearly the most abundant group in 1982, there is nevertheless a substantial amount of Hindi-English alternation. By 2001, however, young speakers had completely abandoned English insertions into Hindi (along with Hindi-only turns; data not shown), and were instead much more likely to insert Hindi words into English. The frequency of Hindi-English alternations was also higher than before. These results are strongly suggestive of the 'turnover' phenomenon … where the matrix and embedded languages swap roles." Si concludes (p. 12): "Clearly, the trend in both sets of movies [commercial and art-house] is towards a more English-intensive form of code-switching …" These trends do not, however, imply that Hindi is losing ground to English. After all, Hindi is presently still in a phase of expansion. Compared with language use in Bollywood films, language use in real life looks quite different. Even though both English and Hindi are used in upper-middle-class families in Delhi, Malhotra (1980: 42) points out that "… in situations which are related to intimacy (i.e. home, family, kindred and close friends) there is a preference for the use of Hindi, and in those related to status a preference for English … Most often a parent talking to his/her partner will switch to Hindi." Sahgal reports (1994) that Hindi speakers from elite residential areas in Delhi within their families used English "rarely" and "occasionally", but they used much English in the institutional domains. This pattern has hardly changed in the meantime. But then the increased use of English and English-Hindi code-switching in Bollywood films, in radio and TV stations like Radio Mirchi and Zee TV reflects a kind of seesaw of the new "sister languages" English and Hindi between rivalry and accomodation. After experiencing English for centuries as the language of the foreign rulers, the language is now perceived as a doorway to the modern world. Simultaneously, there is a return to the Indian "roots", for instance in the performing arts. This return is accompanied by an increasing certitude of Hindi being a language on a par with English.

37 His study is based on seven films from the 1980s, 1990s and post-2000.



**Code-mixing**

Ashok Kumar observes (1986: 196):[38] "The fact that users of code-switching can communicate effectively with each other is enough motivation to maintain that code-switching is not a matter of random or arbitrary choice of linguistic elements. Rather, it is highly systematic with some underlying rules of usage operating *throughout*... [A] set of rules or constraints[39] is in operation in all bilingual speech." In this section I will look at some such rules which are claimed to regulate code-switching and -mixing. Some observations have already been made above in the section on hybrid word formations. Regarding switching within noun phrases, Kumar finds that determiners are not switched to English whereas the head nouns and adjectives are (p. 197) and (ibid.): "In the slot of the head noun and the modifier there is an option to use either Hindi or English, but no such option holds good in the case of determiners."[40] Two examples: '*dūsre* cases' 'other cases', 'technical *śreṣṭhā*' 'technical expertise'. Not allowed are phrases like *'his/her *chavi*' 'his/her charm', *'his *sīmā*' 'his limit', and hybrid phrases with pronouns like (p. 198)[41] *'he *ghar gayā hai*'[42] 'he has gone home'. Singh (1995b: 34, see also below) has similar examples showing that specifiers have to come from the host language:[43] '*tumhāre tīnoṁ* pipe-cleaners *pheṁk dūṁ, kya*'[44] 'should I throw away all the three pipe-cleaners of yours' but neither *'your *tīnoṁ* pipe-cleaners *pheṁk dūṁ, kya*' nor *'*tumhāre* all three pipe-cleaners *pheṁk dūṁ, kya*' are possible. Thus it is not possible either to say (p. 35) *'*tumhāre* new snow boots *kahāṁ gaye*'[45] 'what happened to your new snow boots' but again it is possible to say '*tumhāre naye* snow boots *kahāṁ gaye*'. Surprisingly, the use of the English word 'new' can

38 The present article concentrates more on the grammatical (phonological, morphological and syntactical) aspects of code-switching (with focus on Hindi) than on discourse or pragmatic dimensions. The grammatical aspects appear much less well-researched than studies of the discourse or pragmatic dimensions of code-switching. The latter deal for instance with discourse strategies like situational code-switching (switch of codes vis-à-vis different interlocutors, in different surroundings like home and street etc.). Studies using discourse or pragmatic perspectives are found in Gumperz 1982, Heller 1988, and Myers-Scotton 1993a and b.

39 The notion of constraints has been effectively applied within the theoretical frame of Optimality Theory to Hindi code-switching by Bhatt (1997), who will be discussed in the next section.

40 It is also possible that the whole phrase is only Hindi or only English.

41 Grammatical abbreviations used in the following glossings are listed below p. 155.

42 *'he *ghar gayā hai*'
he house go.PP.SG.M be.PRES.SG.3

43 I have adapted in a few minor cases Singh's transliterations to the general standard and slightly changed some examples.

44 '*tumhāre tīnoṁ* pipe-cleaners *pheṁk dūṁ, kya*'
your.M.PL all.three pipe-cleaners throw-give.SUB.SG.1 INT

45 *'*tumhāre* new snow boots *kahāṁ gaye*'
your.M.PL new snow boots where go.PP.M.PL

be saved by adding a Hindi -*vālā* suffix[46] which so to say camouflages the foreign origin of the word 'new': '*tumhāre* new-*vāle* snow boots *kahāṁ gaye*'. In genitive phrases, head and modifier can freely switch, but not so the Hindi "adjectival" genitive postposition *kā* (p. 199): 'hero-heroine *kā milan*'[47] 'the meeting of hero and heroine' but *'hero-heroine of *milan*' is not possible. Other postpositions cannot be switched either for the same syntactical reason, because English uses prepositions.

Within the verb phrase hybrid formations consisting of an English noun or verb plus a small number of basic Hindi verbs like *karnā* 'to do', *denā* 'to give' are very common. In fact, these so-called conjunct verb constructions got introduced into the Indian language realm from Persian. Examples (partly from p. 199, some others from this writer): 'job *karnā*' 'to job', '*agar vah* donation *detā hai*'[48] 'if he donates (s.th.)' (corresponds to unmixed '… *dān detā hai*'), '*maiṁ yah* prove *kar saktā hūṁ*'[49] 'I can prove this' (this last example from Singh 1995b: 37). Note that in case of English past participles the ending at least can (or has to?) be dropped: '*maiṁ* demonstrate *kar detā hūṁ tab to* convince *ho jāoge*'[50] 'if I were to demonstrate it would you be convinced then' (Singh ibid.). In all these conjunct verb cases it is not possible to have an English verb instead of the Hindi one: *'*vah* makes *kām*' 'he works' sounds utterly wrong. Moreover, it is absolutely impossible to replace in Hindi compound verbs[51] a Hindi verb with an English verb: '*vah kām kar detā hai*'[52] 'he does the work for s.o.' but not possible are *'*vah kām* make *detā hai*', *'*vah kām kar* gives *hai*'.

Rajendra Singh states (1995b: 31f.): "A mixed code is a code with its own rules and constraints. An assumption that it does not have its own rules and constraints would make it difficult to explain the automatic nature of code alternation. It would also make it impossible to account for the fact that by and large speakers of such codes seem to be able to judge the well-formedness of sentences in these codes." He then demonstrates that English conjunctions

46 This suffix, which can have an adjectival function (and thus inflect like an adjective), can be redundantly added to other adjectives.
47 'hero-heroine *kā milan*'
hero-heroine GEN.POP.M.SG meeting
48 '*agar vah* donation *detā hai*'
if he donation give.PPRES.SG.M be.PRES.SG.3
49 '*maiṁ yah* prove *kar saktā hūṁ*'
I this prove make- can.PPRES.SG.M be.PRES.SG.1
50 '*maiṁ* demonstrate *kar detā hūṁ tab to* convince *ho jāoge*'
I demonstrate make- give.PPRES.SG.M be.SG.1 then MOD convince be- go.FUT.PL.2
51 They consist of more than one verbal component, typically of a lexical meaning-carrying verb stem and one finite verb that belongs to a rather small group of verbs with basic meanings. The finite verb influences semantically the verb stem.
52 '*vah kām kar detā hai*'
He work make- give.PPRES.SG.M be.PRES.SG.3



cannot be used in Hindi sentences (p. 32) as in *'*Rām* and *Śyām āye the*'[53] 'Ram and Shyam had come' etc. In case of subordinate Hindi sentences the complementizer cannot be English: '*mujhe lagtā hai ki* Rām will come tomorrow'[54] 'I feel that Ram will come tomorrow' but *'*mujhe lagtā hai* that Rām will come to-morrow' is not allowed. Obviously, complementizers and conjunctions must belong to the host language.

Rakesh Mohan Bhatt[55] argues (1997: 223f.) in a similar vein like Kumar and Singh: "Intrasentential code-switching (also known as code-mixing) is the alternate use of two linguistic systems within a clause. The linguistic interest in this verbal strategy, employed widely by multilingual speakers, is that mixers have clear, unambiguous intuitions about what is, and also what is not, a possible code-switched utterance … In other words, there is a grammar that presumably determines, and perhaps delimits the range of 'grammatical' code-switched utterances in a given bilingual context." Bhatt criticises previous attempts at identifying constraints on code-mixing as being too categorical and allowing only 'correct' or 'wrong' statements. Consequently he suggests as an alternative the use of Optimality Theory which has the advantage that (p. 224) "[t]he premise here is that a linguistic structure (e.g., code-switched constituent) that violates a particular constraint has its well-formedness 'reduced' by a certain amount." He concludes (1997: 226f.):[56] "It turns out that speakers tend not to switch subjects. Instances of the entire subject phrase being switched were very rare." However, where such a switch did take place the morphological case features of the host language had to be used as in the following example (ibid.) where the English subject is marked with the Hindi ergative case ending *ne*:[57] '*kal* supreme court-*ne* … election commission *aur sarkār ko kahā thā*'[58] 'yesterday the supreme court … had told to the election commission and the government'. Interesting is also Bhatt's observation of common switches of adverbial phrases and parentheticals (p. 231): '*śurū-śurū meṁ* they started with a bang'[59] 'right at the beginning they started with a bang', and the common

53 *'*Rām* and *Śyām āye the*'
Ram and Shyam come.PP.PL.M be.PST.PL.M
54 '*mujhe lagtā hai ki* Rām will come tomorrow'
me touch.PPRES.SG.M be.PRES.SG.3 that Ram will come tomorrow
55 Bhatt deals both with English-Kashmiri and English-Hindi code-mixing. I will concentrate only on the latter one.
56 Only those results will be discussed for which similar examples have not come before.
57 Hindi is a so-called split ergative language which means that the subject of sentences with transitive verbs receives a case ending in perfective tenses. Example: *rām soyā* 'Ram slept' but *rām-ne cāval khāyā* 'Ram ate rice (*cāval*)'.
58 '*kal* supreme court *ne* … election commission *aur sarkār ko kahā thā*'
yesterday supreme court.ERG … election commission and government OBL.POP say.PP.SG.M be.PST.SG.M
59 '*śurū-śurū meṁ* they started with a bang'
beginning-beginning in they started with a bang

switching of topicalized constituents: '*yahāṁ par*'[60] I cannot walk with so much pollution'[61] 'Here I cannot walk with so much pollution'. Comparable to Kumar's above examples '*dūsre* cases' 'other cases' versus *'his *sīmā*' 'his limit' Bhatt shows (p. 233):

'*āpkī* sister *ājkal kyā paṛhātī hai*'[62] 'what does your sister teach these days'
*'your *bahin ājkal kyā paṛhātī hai*'
*'your sister *ājkal kyā paṛhātī hai*'

He rightly argues (ibid.) that only the first sentence is correct because there is (number and) gender concord between the possessive pronoun and the predicate: *āpkī* 'your' (f.) ... *paṛhātī* 'teaches' (f.) which is required by the host language Hindi. Whereas Hindi possessives do inflect (*āpkā* m.sg., *āpke* m.pl., *āpkī* f. 'your'), English 'your' does not. However, not in every case the grammar of the host language dictates well-formedness. See the following examples (p. 234 f.):[63]

'Suresh brought flowers for his *bahin*' 'Suresh brought flowers for his sister'
*'*Sureś* for his sister *phūl lāyā*'[64] 'Suresh brought flowers for his sister'
versus (p. 237):
'*uskā* skin *bahut* dry *hai*'[65] 'his skin is very dry'
*'*uskā* skin *hai bahut* dry' 'his skin is very dry'

To explain the first two examples Bhatt suggests (ibid.) that scrambling is responsible here. Hindi allows scrambling,[66] especially spoken Hindi, but English does not. The third and fourth examples he explains with the help of a so-called Linear Precedence Constraint which ensures that the order of the main constituents follows the rules of the host language. He summarises this thus (p. 235): "Code-switching is relatively free in non-argument positions. The word order is generally dictated by the matrix language... Switched items, however, appear to obey the grammatical properties of the language they belong to." He further claims (p. 235f.) that there are no code-switching rules *per se* but that they

60 *yahāṁ par* lit. 'here on' but actually meaning 'here'.
61 '*yahāṁ par* I cannot walk with so much pollution'
here on I cannot walk with so much pollution
62 '*āpkī* sister *ājkal kyā paṛhātī hai*'
your.F sister nowadays what teach.PPRES.F be.PRES.SG.3
63 Slightly modified by me.
64 *'*Sureś* for his sister *phūl lāyā*'
Suresh for his sister flower bring.PP.SG.M
65 '*uskā* skin *bahut* dry *hai*'
his.SG.M skin very dry be.PRES.SG.3
66 Scrambling refers to the phenomenon of a relatively free word order. On scrambling in Hindi see Tara Mohanan 1994 and for Urdu see Miriam Butt 1994.



emerge out of the encounter between two languages displaying different grammatical constraints. Out of the five constraints introduced by Bhatt I suggest to look at one more (besides the Linear Precedence Constraint), namely Head-Syntax which he defines (p. 236): "Grammatical properties (e.g., Case, directionality of government, etc.) of the language of the head must be respected within its 'minimum domain'..." One example for this is the above-quoted '... supreme court-*ne*...', another is given on p. 227 and 237 where in a passive construction the English patient gets marked with the Hindi oblique case postposition *ko*: 'Election commission *ko* ... *kahā gayā*'[67] 'the election commission was told'. This case is assigned to the subject by the Hindi verb. The same constraint operates in the following two examples (p. 240): '... and he gave his *sārī jāydād* to his youngest son,...' '... and he gave all his property to his youngest son,...' and: 'first, you finish your *sārā kām*' 'first, you finish all your work'. In these two last examples the predicate is in English, therefore the Linear Precedence Constraint requires an English word order, however Bhatt notes (p. 241) that "the object complement NP of the verbs 'give' and 'finish' exhibit the Hindi word order, which is Possessive pronoun + Quantifier + Noun. The English order Quantifier + Possessive is not followed within the minimal domain of the Hindi head noun." Bhatt's conclusion from these observations is that Head-Syntax is prioritized over the Linear Precedence Constraint, and (p. 249): "Using this optimality-theoretic insight, it became possible to formalize the intuition that in code-switching, too, constraints are prioritized; they are violable in any context in which they conflict with a higher ranked constraint."

**Summing up**

Diglossia, or rather polyglossia, has been and is an omnipresent phenomenon in India. From a geographical and a sociolinguistic perspective there do exist complementary distributions with regard to different dialects within one language (for instance in case of urban versus rural Hindi) and with regard to the use of different languages (for instance in case of South Indian migrants in Delhi who use a Dravidian language at home and Hindi at work). Yet the above study, which concentrated on different registers of Hindi (Urduized, Sanskritized, Anglicized), on hybrid formations, and on Hindi-English code-switching and -mixing, has not yielded very clear tendencies related to specific groups or castes apart from the trend that Anglicized Hindi and frequent Hindi-English code-switching is preferred by young and educated urban people. Something similar holds for Sanskritized Hindi. The Hindi newspaper Navbharat Times (the title consists of a Sanskrit and an English word) is regarded as one of the best Hindi dailies, but the Hindi style is remarkably different from article to

67 'Election commission *ko* ... *kahā gayā*'
election commission OBL.POP ... say.PP.SG.M go.PP.SG.M

article and in many cases very eclectic in the eyes of language purists. So in India the norm is not monoglossia, but the norm is to frequently switch either between different registers of one language or between different languages. India likes linguistic diversity, a diversity that is much governed by grammatical rules, as we have seen. However, in order to progress towards more and deeper insights into grammatical constraints, work with large text databases will be indispensable. Concerning motivations for code-switch there are, of course, all those well-known reasons that have been discussed so many times in the relevant literature, like lack of command over one language, changing mood of a speakers, creation of emphasis, etc. Yet it is difficult to come forth with straight explanations when confronted with concrete cases of code-switching and -mixing. The mother tongue of most Indians is not Hindi or English but the one or other regional language. English and Hindi are learned not just because they are prestigious languages, they are learned because their mastery is a precondition for pursuing upward mobility. In the description of Nicholas Dirks' book (*Castes of mind: colonialism and the making of modern India*) one reads: "When thinking of India, it is hard not to think of caste. In academic and common parlance alike, caste has become a central symbol for India, marking it as fundamentally different from other places while expressing its essence. Nicholas Dirks argues that caste is, in fact, neither an unchanged survival of ancient India nor a single system that reflects a core cultural value. Rather than a basic expression of Indian tradition, caste is a modern phenomenon – the product of a concrete historical encounter between India and British colonial rule." Thus, contrary to widespread Western prejudices, possibilities for upward mobility have to be seen as an intrinsic feature of Indian societies. But the traditional ways facilitating upward mobility, Brahmanization and Kshatriyaization,[68] have lost importance. Learning Hindi and learning English have now become the two most important strategies for upward mobility in a rapidly modernizing and industrializing India.

## On transliteration

Aspirated stops and affricates are written with an *h* as in *th*, *dh*, *ch*, *jh*; retroflex stops, nasal consonants and sibilants are written with a subscribed period as in *ṭ*, *ṇ*, *ṣ*, but note that *ṛ* is a retroflex flap; *ṛ* is a syllabic *r*; *ṅ* is a velar nasal consonant, and *ṁ* indicates nasalization of the preceding vowel; *ḥ* is the so-called visarga in Sanskrit words, which is pronounced as an *h* plus a short repetition of the preceding vowel; *z* is a voiced dental sibilant found in words of Perso-Arabic origin; *g̱* and *kẖ* are voiced and unvoiced velar fricatives found in words of Perso-Arabic origin; long vowels are written with a macron, as in *ī* and *ā*.

---

68 These two terms are used in India studies to characterize traditional social processes leading, for instance, tribal or low caste groups to get integrated into these two high castes.



## General abbreviations

| | |
|---|---|
| abs. | abstract suffix |
| adj. | adjectivising suffix |
| an. | agent noun suffix |
| Ar. | Arabic |
| caus. | causative suffix |
| dim. | diminutive suffix |
| Eng. | English |
| fem. | feminine suffix |
| H. | Hindi |
| inf. | Infinitive |
| MSH | Modern Standard Hindi |
| Pers. | Persian |
| pleo. | pleonastic suffix |
| S. | Sanskrit |
| ← | borrowed from |

## Grammatical abbreviations in interlinear transcription

| | |
|---|---|
| ERG | ergative case |
| FUT | future tense |
| GEN | genitive |
| INT | interrogative marker |
| M | masculine |
| MOD | modal particle |
| PL | plural |
| POP | postposition |
| PP | past participle |
| PPRES | present participle |
| PRES | present tense |
| PST | past tense |
| OBL | oblique case |
| SG | singular |
| SUB | subjunctive mood |

## Bibliographical references


Abbi, Anvita. 1996. Don't kill my mother (tongue). In: Shivendra K. Verma and Dilip Singh (eds.), *Perspectives on Language in Society (Papers in Memory of Prof. Sriva-stava)*, pp. 155–167. Delhi: Kalinga Publications.

Abbi, Anvita. 2001. *A Manual of Linguistic Field Work and Structures of Indian Languages*. Munich: Lincom Europa.

Abbi, Anvita. 2003. Tribal languages of India: Our neglected heritage. In: *Sannidhi*, Delhi, pp. 11-19.

Abbi, Anvita. 2005. Bhārat kī janjātīya bhāṣāeṁ: hamārī upekṣit virāsat. In: *Aam Aadmi*. vol. 75, pp. 135–139.

Abbi, Anvita. 2006. Vanishing diversities and submerging identities. In: *Indian Linguistics*, vol. 67, no. 1-4; pp. 1–10.

Abbi, Anvita. 2008 Vanishing diversities and submerging identities. In: *Language and Politics*. Edited by Asha Sarangi. Oxford University Press.

Baumer, Rachel van M. and James R. Brandon (eds.). 1993 (1981). *Sanskrit Drama in Performance*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Bharati, Dharmvir. 1992 (1954). *Andhā Yug*. Allahabad: Kitāb Mahal.

Bhatt, Rakesh Mohan. 1997. Code-switching, constraints, and optimal grammars. In: *Lingua* 102: 223–251.

Butt, Miriam. 1994. Complex predicate scrambling in Urdu. In: Butt, Miriam, Tracy Holloway King, and Gillian Ramchand (eds.), *Perspectives on Word Order in South Asian Languages*, pp. 67–90. Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information (Leland Stanford Junior University).

Dirks, Nicholas B. 2001. *Castes of Mind: Colonialism and the Making of Modern India*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Doniger, Wendy. 1976. *The Origins of Evil in Hindu Mythology*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Emeneau, Murray Barnson. 1956. India as a linguistic area. In: *Language* 32, 1: 3–16.

Guha, Ramachandra. 2009. The rise and fall of the bilingual intellectual: http://casi.ssc.upenn.edu/system/files/The+Rise+and+Fall+of+the+Bilingual+Intellectual+-+AV.pdf.

Gumperz, John J. 1982. *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heller, Monica (ed.). 1988. *Codeswitching: Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Jain, Nemichandra. 2005 (1992). *Indian Theatre: Tradition, Continuity and Change*. New Delhi: National School of Drama.

Jettmar, Karl. 1975. *Die Religionen des Hindukusch*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Kuczkiewicz-Fraś, Agnieszka. 2003. *Perso-Arabic Hybrids in Hindi*. New Delhi: Manohar.

Kumar, Ashok. 1986. Certain aspects of the form and functions of Hindi-English code-switching. In: *Anthropological Linguistics* 28, 2: 195–205.

Malhotra, Sunita. 1980. Hindi-English, code-switching and language choice in urban, upper-middle-class Indian families. In: Patricia Hamel and Ronald Schafer (eds.), *Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics* 5: 39–46.

Malik, Lalita. 1994. *Socio-linguistics: A Study of Code-switching*. New Delhi: Anmol Publications.

Masica, Colin. 1991. *The Indo-Aryan Languages*. Cambridge etc.: Cambridge University Press.

Mayan, Dietmar. 1999. 'Deviant' speechplay and Hindi ideology. In: Christina Oesterheld and Claus Peter Zoller (eds.), *Of Clowns and Gods, Brahmans and Babus: Humour in South Asian Literatures*, pp. 34–49. New Delhi: Manohar.

Mejdell, Gunvor. 2006. Code-switching. In: *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*, eds. Kees Versteegh et al., Leiden: Brill, vol. II: 414–421.

Mejdell, Gunvor. 2008. Is modern *fuṣḥā* a 'standard' language. In: Zeinab Ibrahim and Sanaa A.M. Makhlouf (eds.), *Linguistics in an Age of Globalization*, pp. 41–52. Cairo: AUC Press.

Mohanan, Tara. 1994. *Argument Structure in Hindi*. Center for the Study of Language and Information, Leland Stanford Junior University, USA.

Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1993a. *Social Motivations for Codeswitching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Myers-Scotton, Carol.1993b. *Duelling Languages: Grammatical Structure in Codeswitching*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Nespital, Helmut. 1990. 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). In: Mariola Offredi (ed.), *Language versus Dialect: Linguistic and Literary Essays on Hindi, Tamil and Sarnami*. New Delhi: Manohar.



Parasher, S.V. 1980. Mother tongue-English diglossia: A case study of educated Indian bilinguals' language use. In: *Anthropological Linguistics* 22, 4: 151–162.

Pollock, Sheldon. 2006. *The Language of Gods in the World of Men: Sanskrit, Culture, and Power in Premodern India*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Poplack, Shana 1988. Contrasting patterns of code-switching in two communities. In: Monica Heller (ed.), *Codeswitching: Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*, pp. 215–244. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Raghavan, V. 1993. Sanskrit drama in performance. In: Rachel van M. Baumer and James R. Brandon, pp. 9–44.

Rahman, Tariq. 1996. *Language and Politics in Pakistan*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.

Romaine, Suzanne. 1995. *Bilingualism*. Second edition. Oxford and Cambridge (Mass.): Blackwell.

Sahgal, Anju. 1994. Patterns of language use in a bilingual setting in India. In: Rama Kant Agnihotri and Amrit Lal Khanna (eds.), *Second Language Acquisition: Socio-cultural and Linguistic Aspects of English in India*, pp. 299–306. New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Shackle, Christopher and Rupert Snell. 1990. *Hindi and Urdu since 1800: A Common Reader*. London: School of Oriental and African Studies.

Shekhar, Indu. 1977 (1960). *Sanskrit Drama: Its Origin and Decline*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.

Si, Aung. 2010. A diachronic investigation of Hindi-English code-switching, using Bollywood film scripts. In: *International journal of Bilingualism* XX(X): 1–20.

Singh, Rajendra. 1995a. Hindi-English code-mixing: Some implications for a general theory. In: *Indian Linguistics* 56: 95–105.

Singh, Rajendra. 1995b. *Linguistic Theory, Language Contact, and Modern Hindustani: The Three Sides of a Linguistic Story*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Yule, Henry, Sir. 1886 (1903). *Hobson-Jobson: A Glossary of Colloquial Anglo-Indian Words and Phrases, and of Kindred Terms, Etymological, Historical, Geographical and Discursive*. New ed. edited by William Crooke, B.A. London: J. Murray.