

“Bidirectional Transfer in the Emergence of Contact Varieties in Nagpur, India”

Master of General and Applied Linguistics

The Australian National University, Canberra

Aditi Dubey

June 2021

This thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of General and Applied Linguistics (Advanced) in the College of Arts
and Social Sciences.

I hereby declare that except where it is otherwise acknowledged in the text, this thesis represents my own original work.

All versions of the submitted thesis (regardless of submission type) are identical.

ETHICS STATEMENT

The ethics of this project were approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee of the Australian National University (2021/167) for the collection of speech data from online sources.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Aditi Dubey'.

Aditi Dubey

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Jennifer Hendriks for all her guidance and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ETHICS STATEMENT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	vii
ABSTRACT	viii
Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter 2: APPROACHES TO LANGUAGE CONTACT	4
2. Introduction	4
2.1 An Overview of Approaches to Language Contact	4
2.2 Comparison of Frameworks	17
2.3 Summary	23
Chapter 3: ANALYSIS OF THE NAGPURI HINDI AND NAGPURI MARATHI	25
3. Introduction	25
3.1 Previous Research on Language Contact Nagpur	25
3.2 Contact and Non-contact Features of NM and NH	28
3.2.1 Hindi as the Source Language	33
3.2.1.1 Grammatical Features	34
3.2.1.2 Semantic Features	41
3.2.1.3 Lexical Features	45
3.2.2 Marathi as the Source Language	47
3.2.2.1 Phonological Features	48
3.3.2.2 Grammatical Features	49
3.3.2.3 Semantic Transfer	54
3.3.2 Summary of the features of NM and NH	58
3.3 Establishing Plausible Scenarios for the Emergence of NM and NH	60
3.4 Summary	64
Chapter 4: CONTEXTUALISING	65
4. Introduction	65

4.1 The History of Nagpur: A Brief Overview	66
4.2 The Languages of Nagpur through the Ages	69
4.3 Early Evidence of Contact: The Linguistic Survey of India	73
4.3.1 Marathi in Nagpur	74
4.3.2 Hindi in Nagpur	76
4.4 Establishing Plausible Scenarios: An Update	77
4.5 Summary	84
Chapter 5: NAGPUR IN THE PRESENT DAY	86
5. Introduction	86
5.1 Linguistic Repertoires and Code Choice in Nagpur	87
5.2 Investigating Present-Day Speech in Nagpur	94
5.3 Evidence for the Present-Day Use of NH and NM	98
5.4 Summary	105
Chapter Six: CONCLUSION	107
REFERENCES	110

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Thomason and Kaufman's borrowing scale (Thomason & Kaufman 1988:74-75)	11
Table 2: Thomason's mechanisms of change (based on Thomason 2001:131-152)... ..	12
Table 3: The stability gradient of language (based on Van Coetsem 1995; 2000).....	15
Table 4: Types and order of examples presented in the analysis of contact features .	31
Table 5: The features of Nagpuri Marathi	34
Table 6: Case markers in Hindi, Marathi and Nagpuri Marathi (based on Mhaiskar 2016:85)	41
Table 7: The features of Nagpuri Hindi	48
Table 8: List of contact features in Nagpuri Hindi and Nagpuri Marathi	59
Table 9: Contact features and the mechanisms of transfer.....	63
Table 10: Number of speakers of Hindi and Marathi in Nagpur (Government of India 1891; 1911; 1931; 1951; 1961; 1981; 2001)	71
Table 11: Social and demographic dominance of different languages in Nagpur.....	72
Table 12: Number of bilingual speakers in Nagpur in 1931 (Government of India 1931).....	80
Table 13: Batibo's (2005:17-18) description of triglossia in Africa	91
Table 14: Polyglossia in Nagpur.....	92

ABSTRACT

Long-term contact between Hindi and Marathi in Nagpur, India has led to extensive transfer of linguistic features in both directions (Hindi to Marathi and Marathi to Hindi), leading to the formation of two contact varieties, Nagpuri Hindi and Nagpuri Marathi. This thesis investigates the emergence of these varieties by determining the agents of change and direction of transfer involved in the emergence process. For this purpose, the framework proposed by Van Coetsem (1988; 1995; 2000) is used. This model is speaker-focused, emphasising the role linguistic dominance plays in the mechanisms of contact-induced change. While the model provides a clear, principled approach to decipher the processes of contact-induced change, these processes must also be contextualised within the larger sociohistorical circumstances of Nagpur. This thesis, thus, examines historical sources and combines it with a Van Coetsem-based analysis of linguistic data to propose plausible scenarios that could have led to the emergence of these contact varieties. Additionally, this thesis also investigates present-day use of these varieties by using data collected through YouTube. In the absence of access to real speakers, videos provide speech data that can be examined to understand the current speech of people from Nagpur.

Chapter 1:

INTRODUCTION

Nagpur, a large Indian city that is part of the state of Maharashtra, has historically been a multilingual place. While many Indian languages are spoken here, the two major languages of city are Hindi and Marathi. There are geographical, political and historical reasons behind this. Nagpur is located at the north-eastern tip of the state of Maharashtra, placing it almost at the centre of the country. The city lies at the intersection between Marathi-dominant and Hindi-dominant regions in India, thus making it a “transitional area in terms of human and cultural geography” (Mookerjee 1955:37). Hindi and Marathi have both had a strong presence in Nagpur throughout its history, which has resulted in “a long tradition of Marathi Hindi bilingualism in the Nagpur area.” (Pandharipande, 2003:41) This long-term bilingualism in the area has led to the creation of new contact varieties of Hindi and Marathi that are specific to Nagpur. Referred to as Nagpuri Hindi (NH) and Nagpuri Marathi (NM) by Pandharipande (2003), these varieties show strong evidence of cross-linguistic influence. Moreover, the cross-linguistic influence seen in these varieties is *bidirectional*.

The term ‘bidirectional transfer’ has been used in different ways by different scholars. Pavlenko and Jarvis (2002), focusing on second language acquisition and bilingualism, use the term to discuss how bilingual speakers transfer features not just from their L1 to their L2 but also from their L2 to their L1, thus

transferring features in both directions. By contrast, Næss (2020) uses the term to discuss the transfer of features between two languages due to contact between two different speaker groups. Studying Äiwoo and Vaeakau-Taumako, Næss (2020) demonstrates how features are transferred in both directions, i.e. from Äiwoo to Vaeakau-Taumako as well as from Vaeakau-Taumako to Äiwoo. The contact varieties of Nagpur, as shall be demonstrated in this thesis, shows both types of bidirectional transfer. Thus, the term ‘bidirectional transfer’ in this thesis is used to mean linguistic transfer between two languages, Hindi and Marathi, due to contact between Hindi and Marathi speakers, as well as transfer within a group of Hindi-Marathi bilinguals who transfer features from their L1 to their L2 and from their L2 to their L1. Bidirectional transfer has been a key process in the emergence of these contact varieties.

Understanding the processes that led to the emergence of Nagpuri Hindi and Nagpuri Marathi is one of the central goals of this thesis. The question of emergence is one that has not been addressed by previous research. Pandharipande’s works (1982; 2003) on Nagpur provide detailed descriptions of Nagpuri Hindi and Nagpuri Marathi, but they are guided by a sociolinguistic focus and thus do not explain how these varieties emerged. Moreover, they are virtually the only works of research on language contact in Nagpur, making it a severely under-researched linguistic context. Many aspects of this context remain unclear. As such, this thesis aims to address the following questions:

1. Who are the agents of change responsible for the creation of these contact varieties?

-
2. What is the socio-historical context that led to the emergence and maintenance of these varieties?
 3. Are these contact varieties still used in the present-day?

Layout of this Thesis

This thesis is structured as follows: In Chapter 2, I examine the different perspectives through which situations of contact are approached. This includes a comparison of certain widely used frameworks of analysing contact-induced change in order to determine the approach best suited to answering the first of the research questions listed earlier: “Who are the agents of change responsible for the creation of these contact varieties?” I then undertake an analysis of the contact features of Nagpuri Hindi and Nagpuri Marathi in Chapter 3 in order to establish plausible scenarios that could account for their emergence. In Chapter 4, I situate these scenarios in the larger socio-historical circumstances of Nagpur in order to answer question 2: “What is the socio-historical context that led to the emergence and maintenance of these varieties?” Finally, in Chapter 5, I address question 3, i.e. “Are these contact varieties still used in the present-day?” by examining the current use of Nagpuri Hindi and Nagpuri Marathi through data collected from online sources. Chapter 6 provides a summary of the findings of this thesis and discusses avenues for future research.

Chapter 2:

APPROACHES TO LANGUAGE CONTACT

2. Introduction

This thesis investigates the emergence of contact varieties in Nagpur through an analysis of contact features along with an examination of Nagpur's sociohistorical context. The objective of this chapter is to determine what kind of approach is best-suited for this purpose. In section 2.1, an overview of different approaches is presented. The overview shows how language contact is treated in different linguistic sub-disciplines, and highlights several different perspectives within the field of contact linguistics. In section 2.2, two widely used frameworks of language contact, the Thomason & Kaufman (1988) model and the Van Coetsem (1988; 1995; 2000) model are examined in closer detail. In 2.3, key differences between the models are explored and they are compared in terms of their applicability in interpreting language contact contexts.

2.1 An Overview of Approaches to Language Contact

Language contact arises from interactions between speakers of different languages, which can lead to these speakers expanding their linguistic repertoires to include multiple languages. Speakers capable of using multiple languages may use their linguistic repertoire differently from monolingual speakers who have experienced little or no language contact. As such, it is natural and, indeed, "almost too obvious perhaps to merit stating" (Sankoff 2002:638) that the languages of bi/multilingual speakers are often (though not

always) altered in some way. Interactions between the speakers of different languages are extremely common across the globe, making bilingualism and language contact extremely common occurrences as well. It would not be wrong to say that “[m]ost, if not all, languages have been influenced at one time or another by contact with others” (Winford 2003:2).

Given that language contact is such a common occurrence, one would expect the notion that contact can affect languages, and can lead to linguistic change, to be a widely-acknowledged, well-established notion across linguistics. To an extent, this is true. One of the classic works of language contact, Weinreich’s *Languages in Contact* was published in 1953. This was one of the earliest attempts to formulate a framework to understand how language change is brought about by contact between speakers of different languages. Importantly, it focused on the bilingual individual as the locus of change. Weinreich (1953) delineated the processes of phonological, lexical and grammatical ‘interference’, i.e., the phenomena of “deviation from the norms of either language which occur in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language” (Weinreich, 1953:1). Much research has been done since then based on this notion of interference. His work, thus, greatly aided the development of language contact as a sub-discipline within linguistics.

While many linguists accept the idea that language change is a common outcome of language contact, many others do not. For instance, the decades following Weinreich’s publication saw the rise of sociolinguistics as a linguistic sub-discipline and the development of a substantial body of research devoted to

sociolinguistic variation (Hickey 2010). For linguists studying variation, contact is often seen as an unsatisfactory or unreliable explanation for change. For example, Lass & Wright (1986:203) claim that “[t]he normal condition for a language-system is to be a self-contained structural network”, arguing that changes attributed to contact are often “tendencies” that a language already had, and not the result of transfer from a second language (1986:202). In more recent times, Poplack and Levey (2010) have warned against accepting language contact as a cause for grammatical change, arguing that variation and language internal change offer more justifiable explanations. In their view, many contact-induced changes are, in fact, not changes at all but instances of variation in the speech of different speakers and, even if they are changes, they are more likely to be the result of “drift” or “internal evolution” (2010:397-398). According to Poplack and Levey (2010), contact linguists do not adequately explore the possibilities of variation or internal evolution, and their analyses must be countered by analyses through the more “capable” (2010:391) methods of variationist sociolinguistics and the comparative method of historical linguistics.

However, many other sociolinguists recognise that contact is a common process and, indeed, the study of languages in contact has been a focus for sociolinguists from a variety of perspectives. For example, Weinreich (2011) highlights how the status of German as a standard language and Romansh as a minority language in Switzerland has led to significant one-way linguistic interference from German into Romansh. Similarly, Gumperz and Wilson (1971) demonstrate how caste relations amongst the inhabitants of Kupwar, India, have led to a unique

situation where the languages show significant structural convergence but remain distinct in their vocabulary. While these are examples of contact between different languages, sociolinguistic research, especially research on sociolinguistic variation, often focuses on contact between dialects, which involves contact between mutually intelligible varieties (cf. Trudgill, Schilling & Schilling-Estes 2002; Meyerhoff 2006).

Other sub disciplines of linguistics, such as historical linguistics, also display a variety of perspectives on the question of language contact and contact-induced change. Though sociolinguists, Poplack and Levey (2010:391) argue in favour of language internal change (as opposed to contact-induced change) on the basis of a “general consensus that grammatical structure is particularly resistant to transfer”. While this focus on language internal change is, to quote McMahon (1994:200), “downright misrepresentation, since the majority of the world’s speakers are at least bilingual...and bilingualism necessarily means language contact”, it is a frequently raised concern amongst historical linguists. The ‘general consensus’ cited by Poplack and Levey (2010) seems to come from a much older tradition in historical linguistics of denying the possibility of contact-induced change. Several researchers, such as Müller (1875) and Meillet (1921) insisted that the ‘mixing’ of languages, especially of language structures, was impossible, as the structure of a language was deemed ‘impenetrable’. However, more recent perspectives in historical linguistics (Nichols 1992; McMahon 1994; Burridge & Bergs 2016) recognise the major role that contact plays in language change. Interestingly, many historical linguists approach language

contact from the perspective that social factors determine, to a large extent, the outcomes of language contact. This approach gives primary importance to the dynamics between socially dominant and non-dominant speaker groups, distinguishing between situations of superstratum, substratum and adstratum influence (Trask 2015; Burridge & Bergs 2016). In contexts where superstratum influence is relevant, a socially dominant language influences a less dominant language, whereas in situations where substratum influence is relevant, a less dominant language influences a more dominant language (Trask 2015:292). Adstratum influence involves contexts where neither of the languages is more socially dominant than the other (Trask 2015:292).

Focusing on social factors as the primary determiners of change is a common approach within the field of contact linguistics as well. This is, to an extent, a result of Thomason & Kaufman's (1988) monograph, *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*, a formidable work that "led to the re-invigorization of language contact studies and the re-valorization of language contact as a research area" (Hickey 2010:1). Prior to the publication of Thomason & Kaufman's monograph, the field of language contact had been dominated for many years by a structural focus, according to which the linguistic outcomes of language contact were determined by the structure of the languages involved (Thomason & Kaufman 1988; Winford 2003; Hickey 2010). By claiming that "[i]t is the sociolinguistic history of the speakers (not the structure of their language) that is the primary determinant of the linguistic outcome of language change" Thomason and Kaufman (1988:35) had a significant impact

on the field. Other scholars, such as Myers-Scotten (2002), with her social-dominance driven framework of codeswitching, and Johanson (2002), whose ‘code-copying’ framework rests on the distinction between the transfer of features from socially dominant to non-dominant languages and from non-dominant to dominant languages, also emphasise the crucial role of social factors in language contact.

While many studies have used Thomason and Kaufman’s (1988) framework to analyse contexts of language contact, their model has also been criticised for attributing too much to larger social factors and not taking into account the role of the individual as the locus of linguistic change (Winford, 2020). Another monograph published in the same year (1988) as Thomason and Kaufman’s, however, did focus on the bilingual individual. Van Coetsem’s (1988) *Loan Phonology and The Two Transfer Types in Language Contact* outlined a ‘speaker-focused’ framework that emphasises the importance of linguistic dominance in the mechanisms through which transfer takes place, as opposed to the focus on social dominance in other frameworks. Thomason and Kaufman (1988) and Van Coetsem (1988) are two widely used frameworks of language contact, but they are both fundamentally different in many ways and, when applied to a particular language contact context, can lead to significantly different interpretations. One of the aims of this thesis is to understand the mechanisms of contact-induced change through which the contact varieties of Nagpur emerged. In order to determine which model is more suited to fulfilling this goal, a detailed discussion of both models is required.

According to Thomason & Kaufman's (1988) approach, one must first distinguish among the various social contexts of language contact if one is to understand the nature and direction of cross-linguistic influence. The model distinguishes two main types of language contact situations: language maintenance and language shift. Language maintenance is a situation where speakers of a particular language come into contact with speakers of another language and begin to speak it as a second language, while maintaining their native language. This is contrasted with a situation of language shift, where the speakers shift to the second language, and in doing so abandon their first language. These different situations are then linked to different mechanisms of contact-induced change. Maintenance leads to the mechanism of borrowing, where speakers introduce 'foreign features' from the second language into their native language. Here, "the native language is maintained but is changed by the addition of the incorporated features" (Thomason & Kaufman 1988:37). According to Thomason and Kaufman, any linguistic feature can be borrowed and any number of features can be borrowed. What determines the nature and amount of borrowing is the 'intensity' of contact as "[g]reater intensity of contact in general means more borrowing" (Thomason & Kaufman 1988:72). Intensity, in turn, is determined by the length of time of the contact situation and the level of bilingualism among the speakers involved. Thomason & Kaufman create a 'scale of borrowing', in which different levels of borrowing are associated with different intensities of contact, as illustrated in Table 1.

Table 1: Thomason and Kaufman’s borrowing scale (Thomason & Kaufman 1988:74-75)

Degree of contact	Features borrowed
1. Casual Contact	Lexical borrowing only
2. Slightly more intense contact	Function words: conjunctions and adverbs Structure: minor phonological and syntactic features
3. More intense contact	Function words: pre/postpositions, derivational affixes, inflectional affixes, pronouns, low numerals Structure: phonemization of previously allophonic phonological features, borrowing of postpositions in an otherwise prepositional language
4. Strong cultural pressure	Major structural features: new distinctive phonological features, extensive word order change, inflectional affixes (e.g. case)
5. Very strong cultural pressure	Significant typological disruption: changes in word structure, change from flexional to agglutinative morphology, loss of phonemic contrasts

The second situation of language contact in Thomason and Kaufman’s (1988) approach, language shift, leads to *shift-induced interference*. This is the result of ‘imperfect group learning’, which is caused by a group of speakers shifting to a second or target language. More recently, Thomason (2001) revises the original (Thomason & Kaufman 1988) framework, emphasising here the notion of ‘imperfect learning’. She reformulates the distinction between shift and maintenance as a distinction between the presence and absence of imperfect learning, where imperfect learning leads to interference and fluency in the

language leads to borrowing. Additionally, she focuses in a more detailed manner on seven mechanisms of change, which are summarised in Table 2.

Table 2: Thomason's mechanisms of change (based on Thomason 2001:131-152)

Mechanism	Description
1. Code-switching	Speakers use two or more languages in a single conversation.
2. Code alternation	Speakers use two or more languages in different conversations and different contexts.
3. Passive Familiarity	Speakers acquire a feature from a language that they understand but have never spoken actively.
4. Negotiation	Speakers change their language to approximate what they believe to be the patterns of another language or dialect.
5. Second-language acquisition strategies	Speakers use material from their native language while speaking the language they are acquiring, to fill gaps in their knowledge of the target language.
6. Bilingual first-language acquisition	Speakers acquire two languages simultaneously as their first languages.
7. Deliberate decision	Speakers make active, deliberate decisions to change their language.

Thomason (2001:130) links these seven mechanisms to the presence or absence of shift-induced learning, which is essentially the dichotomy of borrowing and interference (Thomason & Kaufman 1988), but acknowledges that “the fit between them may not be precise”. As such, while the mechanism of second language acquisition is clearly categorised as shift-induced interference

(2001:146), other mechanisms cannot always be classified as either borrowing or interference. Crucially, for both Thomason and Kaufman (1988) and Thomason (2001), the transfer of particular linguistic features is not linked to a particular mechanism. As can be seen in Table 1, borrowing involves the transfer of a wide range of linguistic features, from non-basic lexicon to structural features like morphology. Similarly, Thomason (2001:31) emphasises the absence of linguistic constraints on the mechanisms of transfer, thereby implying that any kind of linguistic feature can be transferred through any of the seven mechanisms. This is quite different from how transfer is conceived of in the model proposed by Van Coetsem (1988; 1995; 2000).

Van Coetsem's (1988; 1995; 2000) framework approaches contact-induced change from its emergence at an individual level, and starts with the notion of the 'agents' of change. Van Coetsem's (1988; 1995; 2000) model focuses on the phenomenon of 'transmission', which is the transfer of materials from "one language, the source language, to another language, the recipient language" (Van Coetsem 1995:1). There are two main transfer types: Source Language (SL) agentivity and Recipient Language (RL) agentivity. In SL agentivity, the source language speaker is the agent of the transfer action and this type of transfer involves the imposition of features of the source language onto the recipient language. Conversely, in RL agentivity, the recipient language speaker is the agent of the transfer action and here, the speaker borrows items from the source language. Another key notion of Van Coetsem's framework is that of the 'stability gradient' of language, according to which, "[c]ertain language

components or subcomponents are more stable or more cohesive, while other such components are less stable or less cohesive” (1995:67). The stability of linguistic features is determined primarily by three factors: frequency, structuredness and consciousness (2000:106). Thus, features of a language that are more structured, that speakers use more often but in a less conscious, more automatic manner are more stable components. These include syntax and articulatory habits. Less stable components, on the other hand, are features of a language that are less structured, that speakers use less frequently but in a more conscious, less automatic manner, such as contentive words.

Given that the use of stable components is more automatic, these are features that speakers are likely to impose on their non-dominant language (SL agentivity). For example, a French-dominant speaker, when speaking English, may impose their unaspirated [p] onto English words that are pronounced with an aspirated [p^h], such as ‘pear’ (Van Coetsem 2000:53). Here, a phonological feature is being transferred from the source language to the recipient language by a speaker dominant in the source language. The dominant language is underscored.

SL → RL

French → English

Conversely, since less stable components are used more consciously, they can more easily be borrowed by speakers into their dominant language (RL agentivity). For instance, a French-dominant speaker may borrow English words into French (Van Coetsem 2000:53). Here, a lexical feature is being transferred

from the source language to the recipient language by a speaker dominant in the recipient language, as indicated by the underlined elements.

SL → RL

English → French

This relationship between the stability gradient, the mechanisms of transfer and linguistic dominance is summarised in Table 3.

Table 3: The stability gradient of language (based on Van Coetsem 1995; 2000)

More Stable	Less Stable
• More structured, less conscious, fewer items • Eg: grammar, phonology • Usually <u>SL</u> → RL • SL-dominant speaker as the agent of transfer SL agentivity, imposition transfer	• Less structured, more conscious, more items • Eg: Lexical (contentive) items • Usually <u>RL</u> → SL • RL-dominant speaker as the agent of transfer RL agentivity, borrowing transfer

Van Coetsem's focus on the psycholinguistic principles underlying the mechanisms of transfer in his model is one of its most important aspects. The notion of transfer as a process that happens within bilingual individuals is crucial to the model, and is supported by recent research on bilingualism and second language acquisition. For instance, Treffers-Daller & Sakel (2012:3) state that transfer is a key aspect of bilingualism and SLA, explaining how bilinguals and

L2-learners must constantly juggle between their two languages. They must switch their attention back and forth between the languages, while both the languages are ‘active’ in their minds. Since the languages are both active and available to be used, the speaker has to ‘inhibit’ or ‘deactivate’ one of the languages in situations where they are speaking the other one. However, this process “is not watertight” (Treffers-Daller & Sakel 201:24) as it is difficult to keep both languages completely separate. As a result, speakers often use features from the ‘deactivated’ language when speaking their other language. MacWhinney’s (2005, 2008) research on the mechanisms of L1 and L2 acquisition also shows that transfer is possible at any level, from phonology to lexicon to pragmatics.

A key aspect of Van Coetsem’s idea of transfer is that it is based on linguistic dominance, not social dominance. Treffers-Daller (2019:377-379) highlights the importance of differentiating between the two, specifying that the former is the dominance of a particular language in the mind of an individual, whereas the latter is the dominance of a language at a societal level. She explains that linguistic dominance is determined by relative proficiency as well as frequency of use of a language. She also states that “dominance can change over time” (Treffers-Daller, 2019:377), which is another crucial component of Van Coetsem’s framework (1995; 2000). Van Coetsem (1995:70-71) points out that “[t]here are shifts in linguistic dominance”, which means that a speaker’s L1 is not necessarily their dominant language and imposition transfer can occur from the L2 to the L1 as well. This notion is also supported by research on transfer by

bilinguals. Pavlenko and Jarvis (2002) point out that transfer can be bidirectional, i.e., from the L1 to the L2 as well as from the L2 to the L1. Pavlenko (2000:176) notes that “the stable ‘native-ness’ of one’s first language is not as immutable as usually presumed” and delineates the different situations in which L2 influence on L1 is more likely. These include situations where the speaker is highly proficient in the L2, actively and regularly engages with the L2 community and L2 speakers, and has a high amount of exposure to the L2 but a low amount of exposure to the L1 (Pavlenko, 2000:196-198). While Pavlenko (2000) does not mention this, these situations all point to the speaker being more proficient in the L2 and using the L2 more frequently than the L1, which would make the L2 the speaker’s dominant language according to Treffers-Daller’s (2019:377-379) definition of linguistic dominance discussed earlier. This suggests, therefore, that what Pavlenko (2000) is describing is a shift in linguistic dominance from the L1 to the L2. To return to Van Coetsem’s model, we see that it finds support in current bilingualism and SLA research in that it focuses on linguistic dominance and acknowledges that dominance can and does shift.

2.2 Comparison of Frameworks

The models proposed by Thomason and Kaufman (1988) and Van Coetsem (1988) are both based on dichotomies (borrowing versus shift induced interference in the former, and borrowing versus imposition in the latter), which sometimes leads to both models being cited together, as though they present essentially the same ideas (e.g. Blom, Polisšenská & Weerman 2006; Newlin-Åukowicz 2014; Kootstra & Muysken 2019). However, there are core

differences between the two frameworks. The key difference between the models is the level at which they operate. While Thomason and Kaufman's (1988) framework operates at a larger social group level, Van Coetsem's (1988; 1995; 2000) framework operates at an individual, psycholinguistic level. As such, while Thomason & Kaufman focus on degrees of intensity in language contact situations and the distinction between situations of maintenance versus situations of shift, Van Coetsem prioritises the mechanisms of transfer, SL agentivity and RL agentivity, and their links to linguistic dominance in the individual bilingual.

Since the two models operate in fundamentally different ways, they can lead to very different understandings of language contact situations, even if they are both applied to the same context. This can be seen, for example, in the analyses of contact between Asia Minor Greek and Turkish, where varieties of Greek show a significant amount of influence from Turkish. In this context, the Turkish speakers continue to speak Turkish, which leads Thomason and Kaufman to conclude that "if the Turks did not shift to Greek, all the interference must be due to borrowing" (1998:216). They categorise the context as a case of heavy structural borrowing, i.e, category 5 on their borrowing scale (see Table 1). Therefore, according to Thomason & Kaufman's analysis (1988:215-222), Greek speakers are the agents of the transfer action as they are borrowing features from Turkish into their native language. This analysis, however, has been challenged by Winford (2005:402-409). Using Van Coetsem's framework, Winford demonstrates that the instances of structural transfer from Turkish into

Greek are instances of imposition transfer by Turkish-dominant L1 Greek speakers. Examining the sociohistorical context of Asia Minor, Winford highlights the fact that many Greek-speakers were highly proficient in Turkish and used Turkish frequently, implying a shift in linguistic dominance from their native language (Greek) to Turkish. Using Van Coetsem's notion of linguistic dominance and its connection to the mechanisms of transfer (here: Source Language agentivity or imposition transfer), Winford is able to effectively analyse this context where the ancestral language is maintained, but its speakers have become more dominant in their second language. This is a situation that the Thomason & Kaufman model, which has as its core distinction the difference between group maintenance and group shift, cannot not account for.

Attempting to classify every situation of language contact as one of maintenance or shift can also lead to contradictory claims regarding the same situation, as is the case with Thomason and Kaufman's (1988) analysis of Anglo-Romani. Anglo-Romani is a mixed language that consists of Romani vocabulary set in an English grammatical frame (Meakins 2013:165). Thomason and Kaufman (1988) in one instance describe its emergence as a result of "language shift with a maintenance of Romani vocabulary" (1988:49) while in another instance explain the presence of English grammar as a product of borrowing (1988:103) which, according to their own definition, occurs in situations of language maintenance. Winford (2005:399-400) counters these "dubious" claims by providing a simple explanation: that Romani was formed through RL agentivity where English-dominant bilinguals borrowed lexical features from Romani.

The analyses of contact contexts (Asia Minor Greek-Turkish and Anglo-Romani) demonstrate clearly the difference between the models proposed by Thomason and Kaufman (1988) and Van Coetsem (1988, 1995, 2000). In Thomason and Kaufman's model, the mechanisms of transfer are determined by the type of language situation, which is, according to Winford (2020:59), its "chief weakness", as "both situations of maintenance and situations of language shift can involve differences in dominance relationships between the languages in contact". What sets Van Coetsem's framework apart is that it clarifies the difference between the mechanisms by "making more explicit the types of agency that they involve" (Winford 2020:57). By specifying that the transfer of linguistic features is always from the source language (SL) to the recipient language (RL) but either the SL speaker or the RL speaker can be the agent of change, and that the transfer of more stable features is linked to imposition or SL agentivity while the transfer of less stable features is linked to borrowing or RL agentivity, Van Coetsem's framework makes it possible not only to identify who the agents of the transfer action are but also to associate the linguistic outcomes of language contact with the types of agentivity.

Being able to identify the mechanisms of transfer, the direction of transfer, and the agents of the transfer action is extremely valuable when trying to interpret contact contexts, particularly historic contexts that must be analysed on the basis of the outcomes of language contact. This is demonstrated by Winford (2005), as well as by several other studies done of different historic contexts. For instance, Arnal (2011) examines contact-induced change in Catalan as a result

of transfer from Spanish. This context is one that has seen contact between Catalan speakers and Spanish speakers for several centuries. While historically, Spanish lexical items were the only features transferred into Catalan, the last 50 years have seen extensive evidence of structural change in Catalan, with a number of phonological and syntactic features transferred from Spanish. Since Catalan speakers continue to speak Catalan, an analysis through the Thomason and Kaufman (1988) model would lead to the conclusion that this is a context of heavy structural borrowing by the Catalan speakers. However, Arnal (2011:15-19) uses Van Coetsem's (1988; 2000) model along with sociohistorical evidence to show that it is Spanish-dominant bilingual speakers who are the agents of the transfer action, as a large number of Spanish-speakers immigrated to Catalonia in the second half of the 20th century and began to use Catalan as a second language. The ability to combine social and historical evidence with linguistic evidence to account for a wide variety of contact contexts is an important feature of Van Coetsem's model. Thomason and Kaufman's (1988) framework, because of its one-to-one correlation of language situation with the mechanism of transfer, is relatively less dynamic.

The applicability Van Coetsem's model to historic contexts is also demonstrated by Næss (2020) in her analysis of language contact between two distantly related Oceanic languages, Äiwoo and Vaeakau-Taumako, on the Reef Islands. In this context, both languages show evidence of contact-induced change, as Äiwoo shows lexical transfer from Vaeakau-Taumako whereas Vaeakau-Taumako shows structural transfer from Äiwoo. Thus, RL agentivity and SL agentivity are

both at play here, but the transfer occurs in different directions. Næss (2020:628-630) explains that what is interesting about this context is that there has been a significant shift in the demographics as well as social relations on the islands, where Vaeakau-Taumako speakers were originally the socioeconomically dominant group but then became an economically weaker, marginalised group. In terms of bilingualism, Äiwoo speakers are were more likely to speak at least some Vaeakau-Taumako but most Vaeakau-Taumako speakers did not speak Äiwoo. A Thomason & Kaufman approach would, once again, classify this as a situation of heavy structural borrowing by Vaeakau-Taumako speakers. However, this does not account for the fact that Vaeakau-Taumako speakers do not usually know Äiwoo, which would make it implausible for them to borrow structural elements from Äiwoo. Analysis through the Van Coetsem model (Næss 2020:639-640), on the other hand, shows that the structural transfer seen in Vaeakau-Taumako is the result of Äiwoo speakers acquiring Vaeakau-Taumako when it was the socially dominant language used for intergroup communication. This L2 version of the language then became the norm even amongst L1 Vaeakau-Taumako speakers due to the demographic context where Äiwoo bilingual speakers outnumber Vaeakau-Taumako speakers. It is evident, thus, that Van Coetsem's model provides the tools necessary to be able to pull apart complex contexts of language contact and can do so in a way that is supported by what is known of the socio-historical context.

In sum, comparison of the two framework reveals that while Thomason & Kaufman's approach can help understand situations of language contact

according to whether it is a situation of maintenance or shift, this distinction can sometimes lead to a “mischaracterisation” of the mechanisms involved in contact-induced change (Winford 2020:60). In this respect, the Van Coetsem model is inherently different as it offers a principled way to identify the agents of the transfer action and the direction of transfer, while allowing for these mechanisms to be contextualised in the larger sociohistorical circumstances of language change.

2.3 Summary

In this chapter, I presented an overview of the different approaches to language contact, which was followed by a more detailed discussion of the frameworks proposed by Thomason & Kaufman (1988) and Van Coetsem (1988; 1995; 2000). This section (2.1) demonstrated that language contact can be seen in many different ways, depending on what the focus of the researcher is. For many linguists, the focus is on social dominance relations between the speaker groups in a situation of contact. In this perspective, the processes of contact-induced change are determined by whether features are transferred from the language of the non-dominant group to the less dominant group or vice versa (e.g. Johanson 2002; Myers-Scotton 2002; Trask 2015; Burridge & Bergs 2016). In Thomason and Kaufman’s (1988) widely used approach, the focus is on the type of situation, i.e. whether it is a situation of language maintenance or language shift. By contrast, Van Coetsem’s (1988; 1995; 2000) approach focuses on the mechanisms of transfer that take place in the mind of an individual bilingual individual. I then compared Thomason and Kaufman (1988) and Van Coetsem’s

(1988; 1995; 2000) frameworks by comparing the different interpretations possible when the frameworks are applied to contexts of contact-induced change (2.2). This comparison revealed that, in contrast with Thomason and Kaufmans' (1988) socially-oriented model, Van Coetsem's speaker-focused approach can help identify the agents responsible for the change, particularly in contexts where the features that result from this change are the only evidence available. The context of Nagpur being investigated in this thesis is one such context. Therefore, the features of the contact varieties of Nagpur will be analysed using Van Coetsem's approach.

Chapter 3:

ANALYSIS OF THE NAGPURI HINDI AND NAGPURI MARATHI

3. Introduction

In this chapter, the linguistic features of Nagpuri Hindi (NH) and Nagpuri Marathi (NM) are examined. First, I present an overview of Pandharipande's (2003) research on language contact in Nagpur and explain the rationale behind the analysis done in this chapter (3.1). In 3.2, I take a more in-depth look at NH and NM to reveal that these varieties consist of both contact and non-contact features. Then, I discuss the features of these varieties to demonstrate the kind of transfer involved. In 3.3, the contact features are discussed in terms of Van Coetsem's framework in order to determine the mechanisms of transfer that led to the formation of these features. The information learnt in this section is subsequently used to establish plausible scenarios to account for the emergence of contact features in NH and NM (3.4).

3.1 Previous Research on Language Contact Nagpur

The language contact situation in Nagpur has not been studied by many. Pandharipande (1982; 2003) is perhaps the only one to have conducted extensive research on this context. Her works detail the multilingual situation in Nagpur, delving into both its linguistic and the social aspects. She provides an account of several features in Nagpuri Hindi and Nagpuri Marathi and demonstrates, through her own analysis, how these features formed because Hindi and Marathi

“borrowed a number of linguistic features from each other” (2003:39). The features of Nagpuri Hindi are discussed as ‘borrowings from Marathi’ and the features of Nagpuri Marathi are discussed as ‘borrowings from Hindi’.

Pandharipande’s (2003) work, titled *Sociolinguistic Dimensions of Marathi: Multilingualism in Central India*, is primarily concerned with sociolinguistic variation. The rationale behind this approach is a lack of sociolinguistic research on Marathi (Pandharipande 2003:Foreword). As such, while contact varieties are discussed in this monograph, they are not approached from a contact linguistics perspective. Pandharipande (2003) presents the results of contact, i.e, the features of the contact varieties, but then focuses more on other questions concerned with sociolinguistic variation. It is important to note that, while the book was published in 2003, it is based on research conducted before the 1980s (Pandharipande 2003:Foreword). At this time, models of language contact that could be used to analyse contact scenarios, such as those proposed by Thomason and Kaufman (1988) and Van Coetsem (1988), had not yet been established. Pandharipande (2003), thus, does not use a particular framework or contact-based theoretical approach in her analysis of the contact varieties as her primary objective is to understand “some selected sociolinguistic aspects of Marathi” (2003:14).

Pandharipande (2003:43-51) explains the emergence of Nagpuri Hindi and Nagpuri Marathi through social factors. She demonstrates the existence of four

‘codes’ in Nagpur: Puneri Marathi (PM)¹, Nagpuri Marathi (NM), Standard Hindi (SH) and Nagpuri Hindi (NH). Each of these codes has a different social function, where the contact varieties are used in more informal, colloquial contexts and are more tied to a local identity. By contrast, the standard varieties are used in more formal, official contexts and are tied to the larger linguistic identities of Hindi-speakers and Marathi-speakers. Pandharipande (2003:35-38) claims that the contact varieties NH and NM emerged because there was a need for a code to represent the local *Nagpuri* identity. According to this explanation, contact-induced language change in the languages of Nagpur occurred primarily to “facilitate” particular social functions (Pandharipande 2003:39).

Pandharipande’s (2003) observations of the contact varieties Nagpuri Hindi and Nagpuri Marathi, including their social functions, are extremely valuable. However, her explanations about the social factors involved in this contact context do not satisfactorily account for the emergence of the contact varieties. While NH and NM may have specific social meaning and have strong links to different local identities, it is difficult to comprehend how their emergence took place solely to serve a social function. According to the Van Coetsem model (see section 2.1), analysis of a contact context requires an understanding of the mechanisms of contact induced change at a much more fundamental level. At a fundamental level, the locus of change in a contact situation is the bilingual speaker. Speakers transfer features between languages. The details of this

¹ Pandharipande (2003:17) explains that the Marathi spoken in and around Pune (Puneri Marathi) is considered the standard form of the language. In order to make the nature of this variety explicitly clear, Puneri Marathi (PM) is referred to as Standard Marathi (SM) in this thesis.

transfer, such as which languages are involved, or which direction the transfer takes place in, or whether the change is diffused amongst other speakers, can be informed by social factors. However, at the point of emergence of contact-induced change, the mechanisms through which this change occurs is primarily determined by the linguistic repertoires and linguistic dominance of the speakers involved. Given Pandharipande's (2003) socially-oriented approach, her analysis does not indicate how, i.e., through which mechanisms, these contact varieties emerged. The goal of this chapter is to present the linguistic features and identify these mechanisms in order to establish plausible scenarios to account for the emergence of Nagpuri Hindi and Nagpuri Marathi. In order to do this, the features of these varieties must be examined in detail.

3.2 Contact and Non-contact Features of NM and NH

Before analysing the features of Nagpuri Hindi and Nagpuri Marathi, it is important to clarify some important aspects about the nature of these varieties. NH and NM are contact varieties but they contain both contact and non-contact features. This is something that Pandharipande (2003) does not recognise but that can be inferred from her analysis. Pandharipande (2003), in her analysis of the contact features of NH and NM, presents examples from Standard Hindi and Standard Marathi respectively to show how the contact features differ from the standard features. At the same time, she states that the standard features are also 'options' in the contact variety, thus demonstrating that the contact varieties have two variants for every feature: a contact variant and a non-contact variant. The explanation Pandharipande (2003:36-38) gives for two 'options' in these

varieties is the distinction between the identities of the people of Nagpur: their local identity is associated with the contact variant and their larger identities as Hindi or Marathi speakers are associated with the standard variants. However, this argument does not explain why two variants exist in Nagpuri Hindi and Nagpuri Marathi in the first place. The presence of these two variants can more plausibly be explained by a process of contact induced change that does not involve displacement.

In many instances of contact induced change, the contact features displace the original features of the language. For example, Arnal's (2011) study of Catalan shows that several originally Catalan features have been replaced by new features that are the result of influence from Spanish. In the case of Nagpur, however, Pandharipande (2003:36-37) highlights the fact that new features were added to the Hindi and Marathi of Nagpur due to cross-linguistic influence. This suggests that the older, original features of Hindi and Marathi were not replaced, unlike Catalan, and were instead preserved while new contact features were added to the languages. The reason they were preserved might be that they acquired distinct social functions as markers of local and regional identities, as suggested by Pandharipande (2003). However, it is important to recognise the different processes, i.e language change as well as language continuity, that led to the formation of Nagpuri Hindi (NH) and Nagpuri Marathi (NM) as distinct varieties. Pandharipande (2003) uses NH and NM as cover terms to talk about two different types of features – one that is the result of contact and one that is

the preserved feature of the original, pre-contact Hindi and Marathi spoken in Nagpur.

Nagpuri Hindi and Nagpuri Marathi, thus, contain both contact and non-contact features. The non-contact features align with the standard features, as they have not undergone contact-induced change, and are in fact taken to be standard features by Pandharipande (2003). Given that this is a situation of “centuries of mutual contact” (Pandharipande 1982:98), there is no record of the pre-contact varieties of Nagpur. As such, it is difficult to confirm whether or to what extent these varieties align with the standard varieties of Hindi and Marathi that are used outside of Nagpur as well. Since I use Pandharipande’s (2003) examples to analyse the features of Nagpuri Hindi and Nagpuri Marathi, I will also be using ‘Standard Hindi’ (SH) and ‘Standard Marathi’ (SM) to refer to the non-contact features. However, while Pandharipande (2003) indicates that the standard variety example is an additional ‘option’ for the contact variety by adding ‘NH’ or ‘NM’ to the example (along with ‘SH’ or ‘SM’), I will distinguish between the contact and non-contact features by referring to them as ‘cNM/cNH’ and ‘ncNM/ncNH’ respectively. Pandharipande additionally uses examples from Standard Hindi and Standard Marathi to demonstrate how they are the source language for the contact features. Since the source languages are also the pre-contact original varieties, I will be using ncNM/ncNH for these examples as well. The terminology and the types of examples that will be presented in my analysis of the features of Nagpuri Hindi and Nagpuri Marathi have been summarised in Table 4.

Table 4: Types and order of examples presented in the analysis of contact features

Type of Language Variety	Terms used for Examples	
	Nagpuri Hindi (NH)	Nagpuri Marathi (NM)
1. Source Language reference point	Standard Marathi (SM); non-contact Nagpuri Marathi (ncNM)	Standard Hindi (SH); non-contact Nagpuri Hindi (ncNH)
2. Contact Variant	contact Nagpuri Hindi (cNH)	contact Nagpuri Marathi (cNM)
3. Preserved Variant Standard Variety	non-contact Nagpuri Hindi (ncNH) Standard Hindi (SH)	non-contact Nagpuri Marathi (ncNM) Standard Marathi (SM)

The examples will be presented in the order shown above. This order is different from the order in which Pandharipande (2003) presents her examples. She presents the standard variety first, followed by the contact variety and the source language variety. This order does not highlight clearly the process and direction of transfer (Source Language → Recipient Language), which is why it was not adopted for this thesis. Some other modifications to Pandharipande's (2003) examples have also been made. The glossing conventions used here are slightly different. Pandharipande (2003) uses minimal glossing, choosing to translate words instead of providing a morpheme-by-morpheme description of grammatical categories. While such translations might be acceptable for elements of the sentence that are not crucial to the analysis, elements that are part of the grammatical construction being discussed are also glossed in this manner. As such, in instances where the original gloss was perceived as

inadequate, I decided to provide my own glosses (in compliance with the Leipzig Glossing Rules (2015)) for the elements in the sentence that form part of the feature being discussed. These glosses have been checked against reference grammars for Hindi (Kachru 2006) and Marathi (Dhongde & Wali 2009). Changes wherever made have been indicated through bolded text.

The features analysed in this section include phonological, syntactic, semantic and lexical features which can be classified into ‘more stable’ and ‘less stable’ features according to Van Coetsem’s (2000:31) notion that are “differences in stability” amongst the different components of a language, i.e. the notion of a *stability gradient* of language. It is necessary to understand the contact features in terms of their stability as Van Coetsem (1988; 1995; 2000) links the mechanisms of transfer to the transfer of specific features. As discussed in 2.1, the transfer of more stable features is associated with Source Language agentivity and the transfer of less stable features is associated with Recipient Language agentivity. The link between the stability gradient and the mechanisms of transfer will be discussed in more detail in 3.3. For now, it is first necessary to understand the concept of stability.

Stability is a “complex phenomenon” and the stability of linguistic components depends on a variety of factors (2000:105). *Structuredness* is one of the primary determinants of stability. Components of language like grammar and phonology are governed by rules and are, thus, more structured than components such as contentive vocabulary (2000:111). Grammar, phonology and vocabulary are, according to Van Coetsem (2000:111) the three fundamental components of

language. While vocabulary is a “semantically organised inventory of linguistic signs” (2000:111), phonology is a system of sounds through which these signs can be realised acoustically and grammar is system of rules that govern these signs (2000:111). Contentive words form part of an open list and are, hence, inherently less stable than the frame that governs them (i.e. grammar). However, lexical features that serve grammatical functions and are part of a closed list, i.e. *functors*, are more stable components. Phonology also consists of a close list of phonemes which are governed by certain rules, which makes phonology a stable component (2000:113). Stability is an “inherent feature of language” (2000:117) and, at this basic, inherent level, the stability gradient of language is as follows:

Minimal Stability	Median, Maximal Stability
secondary vocabulary	functors, primary vocabulary, grammar, phonology

(Van Coetsem 2000:117)

In this section, the features of Nagpuri Hindi and Nagpuri Marathi will be discussed and this will include a discussion of where each feature lies on the stability gradient. The features will be presented according to their source language, either Marathi or Hindi, and will thus be divided into two subsections: 3.2.1 Hindi as the Source Language and 3.2.2 Marathi as the Source Language.

3.2.1 Hindi as the Source Language

This section examines the features of Nagpuri Marathi (NM), which was formed as the result the transfer of features from Hindi. The features are grouped into

three broad categories: syntactic features, semantic features and lexical features. A list of these features is presented in Table 5.

Table 5: The features of Nagpuri Marathi

Grammatical Features	The Progressive Construction
	Future Tense Negation
	Negation of ‘To want’
	Case Marking
Semantic Features	Conjunct Verbs
	Compound Verbs
	Loan Translations
	Lexical Calques
Lexical Features	Contentive Vocabulary
	Adverbs

3.2.1.1 Grammatical Features

Many grammatical features have been transferred from Hindi into Marathi. Grammatical features, as discussed earlier, have a high degree of structuredness and are linguistic components of ‘maximal stability’. The features discussed below, thus, are all instances of the transfer of more stable components.

The Progressive Construction

In Standard Hindi (Ex. 1), the progressive aspect is indicated through the auxiliary verb *rahnā* ‘to remain’, which is used along with the tense auxiliary *hona* ‘to be’ (Kachru 2006:151). The contact Nagpuri Marathi progressive construction (Ex. 2) is very similar as it uses the verb *rāhṇe* ‘to remain’, which is a cognate of the Hindi *rahna*. Like the SH construction, another verb *asṇe* ‘to be’ is also used to indicate tense.

(1) SH, ncNH:	vo	gānā	gā	rahī	hē
	she	song	sing	PROG	PRES
	‘She is singing a song’				

(Pandharipande 2003:22 Ex. 28)

(2) cNM:	tī	gāṇa	mhaṇ-un	rāhili	āhe
	she	song	sing-CONJ.PART	PROG.F	PRES
	‘She is singing a song’				

(Pandharipande 2003:21 Ex. 26)

The is different from the progressive construction in Standard Marathi (Ex. 3) where, though *asṇe* ‘to be’ is used to indicate tense, the verb is inflected in the imperfective form to indicate the progressive aspect (Dhongde & Wali 2009:87). This kind of construction is also preserved in Nagpuri Marathi.

(3) SM, ncNM:	tī	gāṇa	mhaṇ-at	āhe
	she	song	sing-PROG	PRES
	‘She is singing a song’			

(Pandharipande 2003:21 Ex. 26)

Future Tense Negation

In Standard Hindi (Ex. 4), the future tense is indicated through verbal inflection. To negate the sentence (Ex. 5), the negative particle *nahĩ* is added before the verb.

- (4) SH, hum kal bambaĩ jāēṅge
 ncNH:
 we tomorrow Bombay go.FUT.PL
 ‘We will go to Bombay tomorrow.’

- (5) SH, hum kal bambaĩ **nahĩ** **jāēṅge**
 ncNH:
 we tomorrow Bombay NEG **go.FUT.PL**
 ‘We will not go to Bombay tomorrow.’

(Pandharipandi 2003:23 Ex. 34, 35)

The same structure is seen in the contact variant of Nagpuri Marathi (Ex. 7), where the Marathi negative verb *nāhĩ* is added before the verb, which is inflected in the same manner it is in the positive sentence (Ex. 6).

- (6) cNM: āmhi udyā mumbaĩ-lā dzāū
 we tomorrow Bombay-to go.FUT.PL
 ‘We will go to Bombay tomorrow.’

- (7) cNM: āmhi udyā mumbaĩ-lā **nāhĩ** **dzāū**
 we tomorrow Bombay-to NEG **go.FUT.PL**
 ‘We will not go to Bombay tomorrow.’

(Pandharipandi 2003:22-23 Ex. 32-33)

The non-contact future tense negation construction is quite different. Here, the positive sentence in the future tense is constructed in the same way as in the contact variant, but the placement of the negative particle is different. It occurs before the verb for ‘to go’ in the contact variant (Ex. 7), whereas it occurs after

the verb in the non-contact variant and in Standard Marathi (Ex. 9). More importantly, the verbs are inflected differently. In cNM (Ex. 7), the verb is inflected for the future tense, whereas in ncNM and SM (Ex. 9), it takes the form of the future participle.

(8) SM, NM: āmhi udyā mumbaī-lā dzāū
 we tomorrow Bombay-to go.FUT.PL
 ‘We will go to Bombay tomorrow.’

(9) SM, NM: āmhi udyā mumbaī-lā **dzā-ṇār** **nāhī**
 we tomorrow Bombay-to **go-FUT.PART.** **NEG**
 ‘We will not go to Bombay tomorrow.’

(Pandharipande 2003:22 Ex. 30-31)

Negation of ‘To Want’

In Standard Hindi (Ex. 11), the verb *cāhiye* ‘to want’ is negated by adding the negative particle *nahī̃* in front of it. Nagpuri Marathi shows two constructions, one of which has the exact same structure as the Standard Hindi construction, as it negates *pāhidze* ‘to want’ by adding the negative particle *nāhī* in front of it (Ex. 13).

(10) SH, ncNH: mujh-e cāy cāhiye
 1SG-DAT tea want
 ‘I want tea.’

(11) SH, ncNH: mujh-e cāy **nahī̃** **cāhiye**
 1SG-DAT tea **NEG** **want**
 ‘I do not want tea.’

(Pandharipande 2004:23 Ex. 39-40; glossing my own)

(12) cNM: ma-lā tʃahā pāhidʒe
 1SG-DAT tea want
 ‘I want tea.’

(13) cNM: ma-lā tʃahā **nāhī** **pāhidʒe**
 1SG-DAT tea NEG **want**
 ‘I do not want tea.’

(Pandharipande 2004:23 Ex. 36, 38); glossing my own)

It is clear that this construction is a result of the influence from Hindi as the Standard Marathi construction as well as the non-contact variant of Nagpuri Marathi are very different. Here, *pāhidʒe* cannot be used in a negative sentence; *nako* ‘to not want’ must be used instead (Ex. 15).

(14) SM, ncNM: ma-lā tʃahā pāhidʒe
 1SG-DAT tea want
 ‘I want tea.’

(15) SM, ncNM: ma-lā tʃahā **nako**
 1SG-DAT tea **want.NEG**
 ‘I do not want tea.’

(Pandharipande 2003:23 Ex. 36, 37)

Case Marking

Many of the ways Nagpuri Marathi marks case indicates influence from Hindi. For example, in Standard Hindi, in a perfective sentence, the most agent-like argument of a transitive verb is marked by the ergative case (Ex. 16). The contact variant of Nagpuri Marathi also shows case marking for the same type of sentence (Ex. 17). In Standard Marathi as well as non-contact Nagpuri Marathi,

on the other hand, ergative case is not marked if the agent is a 1SG or 2SG pronominal (Ex. 18) (Mhaiskar, 2016, pp. 85-86).

- (16) SH, ncNH: **mẽ-ne** pita dʒ ko ciṭhī likhī
1SG-ERG father HON DAT letter write.PERF.SG
'I saw a tall man'

(Mhaiskar 2016:86 Ex. 3)

- (17) cNM: **mi-ne** kalya bandlya
1SG-ERG stick.PL tie.PERF.PL
'I tied sticks.'

(Mhaiskar 2016:86, Ex. 5)

- (18) SM, ncNM: **mi** ek untṣə maṅus pahila
1SG a tall man see-PERF
'I saw a tall man'

(Mhaiskar 2016:86 Ex. 1)

In addition to marking ergativity, cNM's method of marking the dative case is also similar to that of Standard Hindi, while being different from Standard Marathi and ncNM. Standard Hindi (SH), contact Nagpuri Marathi (cNM), non-contact Nagpuri Marathi (ncNM) and Standard Marathi (NM) use the same morphemes to mark the dative and accusative case (i.e., SH: *-ko*, NM: *-le*, SM, ncNM: *la*). Additionally, SH and cNM use the same suffixes for both singular and plural forms (Ex.19-22). However, SM and ncNM make a distinction between singular and plural, using *-la* for singular forms (ex. 23) and *-na* for plural forms (Ex. 24). As such, we see that cNM has lost the number distinction that is made in ncNM due to influence from Hindi (Mhaiskar 2016:86-87).

(19) SH, radʒ **ko** dono kitabẽ khərĩdnĩ tʃahiye thĩ
 ncNH:
 Raj **DAT** both book.PL buy.INF should be.PST
 ‘Raj should have bought both the books.’

(20) SH, lədkõ **ko** bhedʒ do
 ncNH:
 boys **DAT** send give
 ‘Send the boys.’

(Mhaishkar 2016:87 Ex. 12-13)

(21) cNM: mə-**le** ka malum
 1SG-ACC how know
 ‘How can I know.’

(22) cNM: tyay-**le** bandta yete
 3PL-ACC tie know
 ‘They know how to tie’

(Mhaishkar 2016:87 Ex. 14-15)

(23) SM, ncNM: tĩ mə-**la** mulgĩ mante
 3SG.F me-ACC daughter consider-PRS
 ‘She considers me a daughter’

(24) SM, ləhan mulan- əsə sarkhə ragawət nahīt
 ncNM: **na**
 Young children- like continuously angry.PRS NEG.3PL
 OBL.ACC this
 ‘One should not continuously get angry at young children’

(Mhaishkar 2016:86 Ex. 8-9)

cNM shows other types of case marking that also seem to be the result of imposition from Hindi. Table 6 shows the different types of case marking in SM, ncNM, cNM and SH.

Table 6: Case markers in Hindi, Marathi and Nagpuri Marathi (based on Mhaiskar 2016:85)

Case	Standard Hindi		Contact Nagpuri Marathi		Standard Marathi; non-contact Nagpuri Marathi	
	Singular	Plural	Singular	Plural	Singular	Plural
Nominative	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø
Ergative	-ne	-ne	Ø, -ne	Ø, -nī	-nə	-nə
Accusative	-ko	-ko	-la	-na	-le	-le
Instrumental	-se	-se	-ne	- nī	-nə	-nə
Dative	-ko	-ko	-la	-na	-le	-le
Ablative	-se	-se	-(h)ūn	-(h)ūn	-(h)ūn	-(h)ūn
Locative	me ⁿ , pər	me ⁿ , pər	-t	-t	-t, mādhe	-t, mādhe

As can be seen, cNM also doesn't make a number distinction for the instrumental case, like SH, but unlike ncNM and SM. Additionally, cNM marks the locative case with the postposition *madhe*, which is similar to the SH *me*, as they both mean 'in'.

3.2.1.2 Semantic Features

Nagpuri Marathi shows several instances of semantic transfer, where the meaning or semantic structure underlying a particular linguistic feature has been transferred from Hindi. In terms of the stability gradient, Howell (1992:190) proposes that semantic features are, like grammatical and phonological features,

more stable. They are considered stable features in this thesis (a more detailed discussion to follow in 3.4).

Conjunct Verbs

Both Hindi and Marathi have conjunct verbs, which are constructions where a noun is followed by a verb. Several conjunct verbs in Hindi and Marathi are similar to each other in meaning but use different semantic structures. For example, in Ex. 25 ‘to take rest’, SH uses the construction ‘rest do’ and uses the word *ārām* for ‘rest’. SM, on the other hand, uses the construction ‘rest take’ and uses the verb *viśrāntī* for ‘rest’. Interestingly, Nagpuri Marathi uses the Hindi word *ārām* for ‘rest’ and also uses the ‘rest do’ construction seen in Standard Hindi. Other examples of this are shown below. Here, Nagpuri Marathi shows not only the underlying semantic structure of Hindi, but also uses contentive lexicon (i.e, the words for ‘rest’, ‘anger’ and ‘cold’.) from Hindi.

Gloss	SH, ncNH	NM	SM
(25) ‘to take rest’	ārām karnā rest do	ārām karṇe rest do	viśrāntī gheṇe rest take
(26) ‘to get angry’	gussā karnā anger do	gussā karṇe anger do	rag yeṇe anger come
(27) ‘to be cold’	thaṇḍ paṇnā cold fall	thaṇḍī padṇe cold fall	thaṇḍī asṇe cold be

(Pandharipande 2003:19 Ex. 15-17)

For this feature, Pandharipande (2003) does not indicate whether the SM construction is used in Nagpuri Marathi. As such, this is possibly an instance where the contact feature has displaced the original feature, which means that

there is no preserved non-contact variant. Another possibility is that the non-contact variant does exist but Pandharipande has not recorded its use.

Compound Verbs

Both Hindi and Marathi have compound verbs, which consist of a main verb and an auxiliary verb, which is the verb that is inflected for tense, aspect, mood, and other grammatical information (Pandharipande 2003:18). *lenā* ‘to take’ and *denā* ‘to give’ are two commonly used auxiliary verbs in Hindi. Depending on which main verbs they occurs with, *lenā* can indicate a completive meaning, a self-benefactive meaning, or internal expression, whereas *denā* can indicate internal expression or a benefactive meaning (Kachru 2006:87-88). The Marathi equivalents of these verbs, *gheṇe* (to take) and *deṇe* (to give) are also used as auxiliary verbs in compound constructions. These are referred to as ‘quasi-aspectuals’ (Dhongde & Wali 2009:66-67) or ‘explicators’ (Pandharipande 1997:418-421), and are used to encode benefaction, suddenness or intensity of action. The difference between the Hindi and Marathi auxiliaries is that while the same verb can be used as both the main verb and the auxiliary, such as in the construction *le lenā* (Ex. 28), the same cannot be done in Marathi. As such, *gheṁ ghe- ṇe* is ungrammatical in Standard Marathi (Ex. 28). In Nagpuri Marathi, however, this kind of construction is grammatical (Pandharipande 2003:18). Therefore, certain compound verbs in Nagpuri Marathi are the result of the transfer of Hindi structure. Since these constructions violate Marathi structural rules, there are no equivalent non-contact NM constructions.

Gloss	SH, ncNH	cNM	SM, ncNM
(28) ‘to take for oneself’	le lenā take take	gheūn gheṇe take take	*gheūn gheṇe take take
(29) ‘to give to someone else’	de denā give give	deūn deṇe give give	*deūn deṇe give give
(30) ‘to blurt out’	kah denā say give	mhaṇun deṇe say give	*mhaṇun deṇe say give

(Pandharipande 2003:18 Ex. 12-14)

Loan Translations

Nagpuri Marathi has some idioms that it does not share with Standard Marathi or non-contact Nagpuri Marathi. For example, ‘For anger to become cold’ is not an expression that exists in Standard Marathi, but it exists in Standard Hindi (Ex. 31) and Nagpuri Marathi (Ex. 32). The cNM expressions seem to be word-for translations of the SH expressions.

- (31) SH, ncNH: gussā ṭhaṇḍā honā
anger cold become
‘For anger to become cold’ (For anger to disappear)
- (32) cNM: ghussā/rāg ṭhaṇḍā hone
Anger/anger cold become
‘For anger to become cold’ (For anger to disappear)

(Pandharipande 2003:20 21-21a)

- (33) SH, ncNH: jān se mār ḍālṇa
life INST kill drop
‘To kill.’
- (34) cNM: dziva-ne mārūn ṭākṇe
life-INST kill drop
‘To kill.’

(Pandharipande 2003:20 Ex. 22-22a)

Lexical Calques

Nagpuri Marathi displays instances of what can be referred to as ‘lexical calquing’ (Ross 2007), wherein lexical ‘ways of saying things’ are remodeled on the model of Hindi. For instance, *milnā* (SH) and *miḷṇe* (NM) in (36) have the same range of meaning ‘to get, to meet’. However *miḷṇe* in Marathi is restricted semantically to ‘to get’. As such, the Nagpuri Marathi word has gone through a semantic expansion because of Hindi influence. Other examples of this are shown below.

SH	NM	SM
(35) bhaṭaknā - to roam around - to get lost	bhaṭakṇe - to roam around - to get lost	bhaṭakṇe - to roam around
(36) milnā - to get - to meet	miḷṇe - to get - to meet	miḷṇe - to get
(37) pakṛnā - to catch - to hold	pakaḍṇe - to catch - to hold	pakaḍṇe - to catch

(Pandharipande 2003:24-25 Ex. 41-46)

3.2.1.3 Lexical Features

While 3.2.1.2 detailed the semantic expansion of existing words or expressions in Nagpuri Marathi, this section demonstrates various instances of new lexical items being transferred into Marathi from Hindi. Pandharipande (2003) does

not indicate whether the Standard Marathi lexical features are used along with the NM features. As such, this is possibly an instance where the contact features have displaced the original feature, which means that there are no preserved non-contact variants. Another possibility is that the non-contact variants do exist but Pandharipande has not recorded their use.

Contentive Vocabulary

NM contains many lexical items that have been transferred from Hindi. These are all contentive words, which means that they are ‘minimally stable’ components.

SH	NM	SM	Gloss
Nouns			
(38) makan	makan	ghar	house
(39) sarm	saram	ladz	bashfulness
(40) aram	aram	visranti	rest
Adjectives			
(41) khali	khali	rikama	empty
(42) khas	khas	vises	special
(43) pagal	pagal	veda	special
Verbs			
(44) dar-ne	dar-ne	bhi-ne	to fear
(45) bak-na	bak-ne	baral-ne	to blab
(46) samet-na	samet-ne	avar-ne	to collect
Adverbs			
(47) bilkul	bilkul	adzibat	at all
(48) ahista ahista	aste aste	halu halu	slowly

Adverbs

In Standard Hindi, Nagpuri Marathi and Standard Marathi, adverbs are constructed by adding instrumental suffixes to nouns. Interestingly, the nouns used for adverbial constructions in Nagpuri Marathi are derived from Hindi

instead of Marathi. For example, the ‘difficulty’ adverb (Ex. 50) in Nagpuri Marathi uses *muṣkilī*, which is cognate to the Hindi *muṣkil*, instead of the Marathi word *kaṣṭā*. Additionally, the structure differs from Marathi structure. In Ex. 50, Standard Marathi does not use an instrumental suffix, but Nagpuri Marathi follows the Hindi structure and uses an instrumental suffix.

Gloss	SH	NM	SM
(49) ‘leisurely’	ārām-se rest-INST	ārām-se rest-INST	sāvkās rest
(50) ‘with difficulty’	muṣkil-se difficulty- INST	muṣkilī-ne difficulty- INST	kaṣṭā-ne effort- INST
(51) ‘happily’	khuṣi-se happiness- INST	khuṣī-ne happiness- INST	ānandā-ne happiness-INST

(Pandharipande 2003:19-20 Ex. 18-20)

3.2.2 Marathi as the Source Language

This section examines the features of Nagpuri Hindi (NH), which was formed as the result the transfer of features from Hindi. The features are grouped into three broad categories: phonological features, grammatical features and semantic features. A list of these features is presented in Table 7.

Table 7: The features of Nagpuri Hindi

Phonological Features	Loss of Phonetic Contrast
Grammatical Features	Emphatic Particle Pronoun <i>apan</i> Causative Construction Quotative Construction
	Possessive Marker
Semantic Features	Conditional Construction The verb ‘To Want’, ‘should’ Loan Translations

3.2.2.1 Phonological Features

Phonology, along with grammar, is a feature of ‘maximal stability’. In Nagpuri Hindi, no new phonemes have been transferred from Marathi, but there has been the transfer of a phonological rule. Nagpuri Hindi shows a loss of phonetic contrast between retroflex stops and flaps as a result of influence from Marathi. While Hindi has both retroflex stops and retroflex flaps Marathi has only retroflex stops. Nagpur Hindi also has only retroflex stops (Pandharipande, 2003, p. 26).

		SM		NH		SH	
(52)	Retroflex Stops	ḍ	ḍh	ḍ	ḍh	ḍ	ḍh
(53)	Retroflex Flaps					ɽ	ɽh

3.3.2.2 Grammatical Features

As discussed in 3.3.1.1, the transfer of grammatical features is the transfer of more stable linguistic components. There are several instances of this in Nagpuri Marathi.

Emphatic Particle

In Standard Marathi (Ex. 54), emphasis is marked through the emphatic particle *-ts* which is attached to the noun. Nagpuri Hindi (Ex. 55) also marks emphasis in a similar way, with the particle *-c*. This is different from the non-contact emphatic particle *hi*, which is not a bound morpheme (Ex. 56) (Pandharipande 2003:26).

- (54) SM, ncNM: to-ts gelā hotā
3SG.M-EMPH came AUX
'He (emphatic) had come.'

(Pandharipande 2003:27 Ex. 57)

- (55) cNH: vo laḍka-c nahĩ āyā thā
that boy-EMPH NEG came AUX
'That boy (emphatic) did not come.'

- (56) SH, ncNH: vo laḍka **hi** āyā thā
that boy **EMPH** came AUX
'That boy (emphatic) had come.'

(Pandharipande 1982:101 Ex. 22-24)

What is particularly interesting about the emphatic particle in cNM is its phonological form. It is /c/ a palatal stop, which means that it is phonetically different from Marathi's alveolar affricate /ts/. This indicates that the transferred feature has undergone some change in the process of transfer, possibly suggesting multiple layers of transfer.

The Pronoun *apan*

The pronoun *āpaṇ* is used in Marathi as a 1PL pronoun (Ex. 57). A very similar 1PL pronoun is used in Nagpuri Hindi, *apan* (Ex. 58). Such a pronoun does not exist in Standard Hindi where the 1PL pronoun is *ham* is used instead (Ex. 59). The NH *apan* is likely the result of transfer of the Marathi *āpaṇ*. Hindi does have a reflexive pronoun *ap*, which in its oblique form is *apne* and in the genitive is *apna* (Kachru 2006:61). Given that these forms are quite similar phonologically to *apan*, it is possible that the Marathi *āpaṇ* was adapted to *apan* in Nagpuri Hindi as it aligned more with words that were already found in the speech of the Hindi speakers and, as such, was more familiar to Hindi speakers.

- (57) SM: **āpaṇ** udyā badzār-āt dzāu
1PL tomorrow market-in will go
'We will go to the market tomorrow.'

(Pandharipande 2003:29 Ex. 66)

- (58) NH: dīdī **apan** kal bāzār jāēṅge
sister 1PL tomorrow market will go
'Sister, we will go to the market tomorrow.'

(Pandharipande 2003:29 Ex. 70)

- (59) SH, NH: dīdī kal **ham** bāzār jāēnge
sister tomorrow **1PL** market will go
'Sister, we will go to the market tomorrow.'

(Pandharipande 2003:29 Ex. 72)

NH, however does not use only *apan*. It uses both the Hind *ham* and the Marathi-derived *apan*. However, the use of the pronoun *apan* is not just a question of variation, it seems to be grammatically constrained. Looking at examples of sentences where *apan* is ungrammatical (Ex. 60, 61) and sentences where it is grammatical (Ex. 62, 63), it seems that the distinction between *ham* and *apan* is perhaps one of clusivity. In Ex. 60 and Ex. 61, *ham* is being used in an exclusive sense, whereas in Ex. 62 and Ex. 63 *apan* is being used in an inclusive sense. This is clear imposition transfer from Marathi, as Marathi has two 1PL pronouns, the exclusive *āmhi* and inclusive *āpaṇ*, whereas Hindi does not make such a clusivity distinction. Therefore, the pronoun *apan* has not displaced the original *ham*, nor is it just used as an additional option like the other cNH and cNM features, it has been reappropriated to make a clusivity distinction in NH.

- (60) NH: hamāre bacce kal ghar āēṅge
 *apne
 1PL.EXCL.POSS children tomorrow home will
 come

 ‘Our children will come home tomorrow.’
- (61) NH: hamāre liye kuch ām
 *apne
 1PL.EXCL.GEN.OBL for some mangoes
 bhijvā dijiye
 sent give
 ‘Please have some mangoes sent for us.’

-
- (62) NH: **apan** ko esi bātē zarā
1PL.INCL DAT such things a little
bhī pasand nahī
also like not
‘We do not like such things at all.’
- (63) NH: **apan** se to esa kām nahī hogā
1PL.INCL INST really such things not will
be
‘Such work will not be done by us.’

(Pandharipande 2003:29 Ex. 69, 71)

However, in Ex. 59, we can see *ham* being used in an inclusive sense as well. It seems that *ham* is used as both an inclusive and exclusive pronoun, whereas *apan* can only be used as an inclusive pronoun.

Causative Construction

Standard Marathi (ex. 64) uses a periphrastic causative construction in which the verb *karṇe* ‘to do’ is used along with the verb *lāṇṇe* ‘to attach’. Contact Nagpuri Hindi (ex. 65) uses the exact same structure, using the verb *karnā* ‘to do’ and the verb *lagānā* ‘to attach’. This construction is visibly different from the non-contact NH and Standard Hindi causative (ex. 66), which is indicated morphologically (Pandharipande 2003:30).

- (64) SM, ncNM: mī tyālā kām **karāy-lā** **lāṇle**
1SG him work **to do-DAT** **attach.PST**
‘I made him do the work.’

(Pandharipande 2003:30 Ex. 77)

-
- (65) cNH: mē-ne us-ko kām **karne-ko** lagāyā
1SG-ERG he-DAT work **to do-DAT** attach.PST
'I made him do the work.'

(Pandharipande 2003:30 Ex. 76)

- (66) SH, ncNH: mē-ne jān se kām **karwāyā**
I-ERG he-DAT INST work **do.CAUS.PST**
'I made him do the work.'

(Pandharipande 2003:30 Ex. 75)

Quotative Construction

One of the ways Standard Marathi (Ex. 67) indicates that something is being quoted is by using the quotative marker *karūn* 'having done'. As is evident in (Ex. 68), contact Nagpuri Hindi also uses the same way of forming a quotative construction, by using the Hindi equivalent of *karūn*, which is *karke* 'having done'. Such a quotative marker does not exist in non-contact Hindi. (Pandharipande 2003:31). Thus, it must be the result of imposition transfer from Marathi.

- (67) SM, ncNM: ho nāhī **karūn** śevṭī to ālā
yes no **QUOT** finally he came
'After saying 'yes' (and) 'no', finally he came.'

(Pandharipande 2003:31 Ex. 78)

- (68) cNH: mē āũṅga **karke** bol rahā thā
I will come **QUOT** say PROG was
'He said that he would come.'

(Pandharipande 2003:31 Ex. 81)

Possessive Marker

Standard Marathi uses the possessive marker *-tSa* along with an auxiliary to indicate obligation (ex. 69). Contact Nagpuri Hindi also uses a possessive marker and auxiliary for this function (ex. 70). However, in non-contact NH and Standard Hindi, obligation is expressed through the infinitive form of the verb, used along with an auxiliary verb (ex.71) (Pandharipande 2003:32).

(69) SM, ncNM: ma-la mumbaī-lā dzāy-**tSa** āhe
 1SG-DAT Bombay-OBL go-**POSS** AUX
 ‘I have to go to Bombay’

(70) cNH: mujhe bambaī jāne-**kā** hε
 1SG.DAT Bombay go-**POSS** AUX
 ‘I have to go to Bombay’

(71) SH, ncNH: mujhe bambaī **jānā** hε
 1SG.DAT Bombay **to go** AUX
 ‘I have to go to Bombay’

3.3.2.3 Semantic Transfer

Similar to Nagpuri Hindi, Nagpuri Marathi also shows several instances of the transfer of semantic features.

Conditional Construction

Standard Marathi (ex. 73) expresses the conditional aspect using the auxiliary verb *asne* ‘to be, to remain’. Contact Nagpuri Hindi uses the auxiliary verb *rahna*, which also means ‘to remain’ (Ex. 74). However, non-contact NH uses the verb *hona* ‘to be’, which is the verb used in Standard Hindi (Ex. 75) (Pandharipande 2003:28). There is, as such, an underlying semantic difference amongst the different auxiliary verbs being used in this construction, as shown in the following chart:

SM, ncNM	cNH	SH, ncNH
(72) <i>asṇe</i>	<i>rahna</i>	<i>hona</i>
- To be - To remain	- To remain	- To be

Thus, it is likely that the use of *rahna* in cNH is because of the imposition of the Marathi structure according to which a verb that means ‘to remain’ must be the auxiliary used.

- (73) SM, dzar to ālā **astā** tar mī
ncNM:
if he came **AUX (to remain)** then I
tyālā bhetlo **asto**
him met **AUX (to remain)**
‘If he would have come then I would have met him’

(Pandharipande 2003:28 Ex. 62); translation my own)

- (74) cNH: agar vo āyā **rahtā** to
if he came **AUX (to remain)** then
mẽ usse milā **rahtā**
I him met **AUX (to remain)**
‘If he would have come then I would have met him’

(Pandharipande 2003:28, Ex. 60; translation my own)

- (75) SH, agar vo āyā **hotā** to mẽ usse milā **hotā**
ncNH:
if he came **AUX (to be)** then I him met **AUX (to be)**
‘If he would have come then I would have met him’

(Pandharipande 2003:28 Ex: 60, 62, 64; translation my own)

The verb ‘To want’, ‘should’

In Standard Marathi, ‘to want’ is expressed through the verb *hone*, which also means ‘to be’ (Ex. 76). The Hindi equivalent of this verb, *honā* ‘to be’ is used in contact NH to mean ‘to want’ (Ex. 77). However, *honā* is not used in the same way in non-contact NH and Standard Hindi, where the verb *cāhiye* is used for ‘to want’ (Ex. 78) (Pandharipande 2003:34).

- (76) SM, ncNM: tu-lā kāy **hava?**
you-DAT what **want**
‘What do you want?’

(Pandharipande 2003:35 Ex. 95)

- (77) cNH: tum-ko kyā **honā?**
you-DAT what **want**
‘What do you want?’

(Pandharipande 2003:34 Ex. 93)

- (78) SH, ncNH: tum-ko kyā **cāhiye?**
you-DAT what **want**
‘What do you want?’

(Pandharipande 2003:35 Ex. 97)

Similarly, Standard Marathi uses *hone* (Ex. 79) and contact Nagpuri Hindi uses *honā* (Ex. 80) to express ‘should’. However, Standard Hindi non-contact NH use *cāhiye* to express this meaning (ex. 81) (Pandharipande 2003:34).

- (79) SM, tīn vādzeparyanta tyān- gharī yāy-lā **hava**
ncNM: three o’clock.up to they- home come- **should**
DAT DAT
‘They should come home by three o’clock.’

(Pandharipande 2003:35 Ex. 96)

-
- (80) cNH: tīn bajetak us-ko ghar āne-ko **honā**
 three o'clock.up he- home come- **should**
 to DAT DAT
 'They should come home by three o'clock.'

(Pandharipande 2003:34 Ex. 94)

- (81) SH, us-ko tīn bajetak ghar āna **cāhiye**
 ncNH: he- three o'clock.up home to **should**
 DAT to come
 'They should come home by three o'clock.'

(Pandharipande 2003:35 Ex. 98)

Therefore, it seems that the verb *honā* has undergone an expansion in meaning and use in NH because of influence from Marathi, as summarised in the chart below

SM	NH	SH
(82) <i>hoṇe</i>	<i>honā</i>	<i>honā</i>
- To be - To want - Should	- To be - To want - Should	- To be

Loan Translations

In contact Nagpuri Hindi, there exist certain expressions that do not exist in Standard Hindi or non-contact NH. Some of these expressions use contact features explained previously, such as the emphatic particle *-c* in 3.2.2.1. Moreover, these translations match word-for-word (in terms of structure and meaning) with similar expressions in Marathi. For example, the SM expression

for ‘strange, nonsense’ is a construction where ‘something’ is followed by a possessive marker and then ‘something again’ (Ex. 84). A similar construction is used in cNH. However, to express the same meaning in SH, a completely different word would have to be used.

SH	cNH	SM	GLOSS
(83) ajīb sā	kesā to bhi-c how EMPH also- EMPH	kasa tarī-ts how then-EMPH	strange
(84) ajīb/atpata	kuch kā something POSS kuch something	kāhī tSyā something POSS kāhī-ts something-EMPH	strange, nonsense
(85) zyādā-tar much- COMPR.	bahut karke a lot	bahur karūn a lot having done	mostly, often
(86) ese bhī like this also	nāhī to bhī NEG EMPH also	nāhī tarī NEG then-EMPH	anyway

3.3.2 Summary of the features of NM and NH

In this section, a list of features that have been transferred from Hindi to Marathi in Nagpuri Marathi and from Marathi to Hindi in Nagpuri Hindi were presented. The features included more stable components, such as grammatical and semantic features, as well as less stable components, such as lexical features. The grammatical features included morphosyntactic features, such as the progressive construction in NM or the emphatic particle in NH, as well as functional vocabulary, i.e. functors, such as the NH pronoun *apan*. The transfer of *apan* may seem like lexical transfer as a new lexical item is introduced to the Recipient Language, but this is not an open class, contentive item. It is a pronoun, which is a functor and, thus, a more stable component. A summary of

features transferred from Hindi to Marathi and Marathi to Hindi has been provided in Table 8.

Table 8: List of contact features in Nagpuri Hindi and Nagpuri Marathi

Hindi → Marathi (Nagpuri Marathi)	Marathi → Hindi (Nagpuri Hindi)
The Progressive Construction	Loss of Phonetic Contrast
Future Tense Negation	The Emphatic Particle
Negation of ‘to want’	Conditional Construction
Case Marking	The Pronoun <i>apan</i>
Compound Verbs	Causative Construction
Conjunct Verbs	Quotative Construction
Adverbs	Possessive Marker
Loan Translations	The verb for ‘to want, to should’
Lexical Calques	Loan Translations
Contentive Words	

The features that constitute NM and NH have been examined, but the mechanisms through which they emerged has not yet been addressed. Identifying whether the transferred features are less stable or more stable can further help identify whether their transfer is the result of Recipient Language Agentivity or Source Language agentivity. By then looking at which language is the SL and RL for each feature, we can infer whether the agents of transfer are SL-dominant speakers or RL-dominant speakers. This is demonstrated in the following section.

3.3 Establishing Plausible Scenarios for the Emergence of NM and NH

As discussed in 2.2, Van Coetsem (1988, 1995; 2000) provides a framework with which to identify the mechanisms that lead to contact induced change when only the outcomes of change are available for analysis. In the context of Nagpuri Hindi and Nagpuri Marathi, the outcomes of change are available to us and have been discussed in 3.2. Now, Van Coetsem's model can be used to gain an understanding of how these outcomes came about.

According to Van Coetsem's model there are two main mechanisms of transfer: Source Language (SL) Agentivity and Recipient Language (RL) Agentivity. As explained in Section 2.1, SL agentivity occurs when speakers dominant in the Source Language *impose* features of the SL onto a Recipient Language, and RL agentivity occurs when speakers dominant in the Recipient Language *borrow* features from the Source Language into the RL. In the context of Nagpuri Hindi and Nagpuri Marathi, a historic context several hundred years old, the agents and direction of the transfer action are not known, only the features that are the result of the transfer action are known. To link the features with the mechanisms of transfer, the stability gradient, which was discussed in 3.2, can be used.

Stability is a determining factor in transfer as "a language in contact with another language will tend to maintain its stable components" (2000:58). In Recipient Language (RL) agentivity, speakers transfer features into their dominant language. The RL tries to maintain its stable components and, therefore, RL agentivity involves the transfer or *borrowing* of less stable components.

Conversely, in Source Language (SL) agentivity, speakers transfer features from their dominant language onto their non-dominant language. Here, it is their dominant language (the SL) that is being modified, and it will try to maintain its stable components when components are being transferred to the Recipient Language (RL). As such, SL agentivity involves the transfer or *imposition* of more stable components. Table 3 (from 2.1, repeated here for convenience) summarises this.

Table 3: The stability gradient of language (based on Van Coetsem:1995; 2000)

More Stable	Less Stable
• More structured, less conscious, fewer items • Eg: grammar, phonology • Usually <u>SL</u> → RL • SL-dominant speaker as the agent of transfer SL agentivity, imposition transfer	• Less structured, more conscious, more items • Eg: Lexical (contentive) items 1. Usually <u>RL</u> → SL 2. RL-dominant speaker as the agent of transfer RL agentivity, borrowing transfer

As summarised in 3.3, the contact features Nagpuri Hindi and Nagpuri Marathi show the transfer of more stable and less stable components. The transfer of grammatical features in both languages (sections 3.2.1.1 and 3.2.2.1) indicates SL agentivity or imposition transfer. Similarly, the transfer of semantic features (sections 3.2.1.2 and 3.2.2.3) is also the result of imposition. While these may seem like instances of lexical transfer, this is not the case as new lexicon is not

introduced to the Recipient Language. There is instead a change in the way existing vocabulary is used due to the imposition of the Source Language semantic structure onto Recipient Language lexicon (Howell 1992:190). The transfer of grammatical and syntactic features from both Marathi and Hindi as Source Languages indicates evidence of imposition transfer by both Marathi-dominant and Hindi-dominant speakers.

In the features presented in 3.2, we can also see the transfer of lexical items from Hindi to Marathi (section 3.2.1.10). This list of vocabulary consists of contentive lexical items, which makes this a clear instance of Recipient Language agentivity or borrowing. Additionally, the transfer seen in the Nagpuri Marathi adverbs (section 3.2.1.3) is evidence that not only are lexical features transferred from Hindi to Marathi, they are *adapted* to the RL (Marathi). Adaptation is “adjusting or conforming SL material to the RL” (Van Coetsem 2000:69). Here, instrumental suffixes, which are a stable morphosyntactic component of the RL, have been added to nouns, which are less stable contentive lexicon from the SL. Therefore, Marathi-dominant speakers have borrowed features from Hindi and adapted them to Marathi.

The transfer of conjunct verbs (section 3.2.1.2) is a slightly more complex case which, at first glance at least, cannot be classified as either RL agentivity or SL agentivity. Conjunct verbs in Nagpuri Marathi consists of Hindi contentive words (nouns) constructed with Marathi verbs, but where the underlying semantic structure has been transferred from Hindi. This is perhaps an instance of both RL agentivity and SL agentivity occurring together. Hindi nouns have

been borrowed into the RL by Marathi-dominant speakers, while Hindi structure has also been imposed by Hindi-dominant speakers onto Marathi. A mix of both these mechanisms led to the formation of this type of construction.

The features of Nagpuri Hindi (NH) and Nagpuri Marathi (NM) show that that there has been transfer of stable features from Hindi to Marathi, which indicates SL agentivity by Hindi-dominant speakers. There has also been transfer of stable features from Marathi to Hindi, which indicates SL agentivity by Marathi-dominant speakers. Additionally, there has been transfer of lexical features from Hindi to Marathi, which indicates RL agentivity by Marathi-dominant speakers. The features along with the mechanisms of transfer they are associated with are summarised in Table 9.

Table 9: Contact features and the mechanisms of transfer

Hindi → Marathi (Nagpuri Marathi)	Marathi → Hindi (Nagpuri Hindi)
SL agentivity	SL agentivity
Grammatical Features	Phonological Features
Semantic Features	Grammatical Features
	Semantic Features
RL Agentivity	
Lexical Features	

This information can further be used to establish the following scenario to explain the emergence of the contact features of Nagpuri Hindi and Nagpuri Marathi:

Hindi-speakers in Nagpur began to acquire Marathi through contact with Marathi-speakers. In the process of acquisition, they imposed many features from Hindi onto Marathi. Marathi speakers, through contact with Hindi speakers, borrowed certain elements from Hindi into Marathi. This led to the formation of contact features in Nagpuri Marathi. Likewise, Marathi-speakers began to acquire Hindi and, in the process, imposed many elements from Marathi onto Hindi. This led to the formation of contact features in Nagpuri Hindi.

3.4 Summary

In this chapter, the contact and non-contact features of Nagpuri Hindi and Nagpuri Marathi were examined to demonstrate that these local varieties have been formed through cross-linguistic influence without a displacement of the original features. Then, using Van Coetsem's (1988; 1995; 2000) notion of the stability gradient, the contact features were analysed to identify the mechanisms and direction of transfer that led to the emergence of the contact features in NH and NM. Once these were established, a plausible scenario to account for the emergence of the contact features of NH and NM was proposed. This scenario, however, is based purely on the outcomes of language contact. The processes of contact-induced change, however, are also determined by external factors, such as "the history and social dynamics of the contact situation" (Winford, 2003:25). These external factors will be explored in the next chapter.

Chapter 4: **CONTEXTUALISING**

4. Introduction

Applying the Van Coetsem model to linguistic data collected by Pandharipande (2003), we were able to establish certain plausible scenarios regarding the emergence of the contact varieties NH and NM. However, these scenarios are based purely on the outcomes of language contact. It is now necessary to take the linguistic information we have about Nagpuri Hindi and Nagpuri Marathi and contextualise them within Nagpur's historical and social circumstances. This is an essential step as "[a] full account of interference in a language contact situation...is possible only if the extra-linguistic factors are considered" (Weinreich 1953:3). In the previous section, we made inferences about the directions of change and the types of agentivity involved by looking at linguistic data, but these processes of change are also influenced by external factors, such as the sociohistorical circumstances of the contact situation. As such, in this chapter, a brief overview of the history of Nagpur will be presented in 4.1. Historical changes will be linked to multilingualism in Nagpuri in 4.2 in order to demonstrate how power, and therefore social dominance, has shifted between different languages (mainly Hindi and Marathi) at different times in Nagpur's history. Then, more specific information about the Hindi and Marathi spoken in Nagpur pre-20th century will be examined in 4.3. This information will be combined with the results from the analysis in Chapter 3 to formulate an updated,

more comprehensive hypothesis to explain the emergence of Nagpuri Marathi and Nagpuri Hindi (4.4).

4.1 The History of Nagpur: A Brief Overview

Nagpur has been through many changes in inhabitants and rulers throughout its history. The city was first home to the Gonds, a population of aboriginal people who inhabited Nagpur for more than 200 years (Mookerji 1955:44-45). The Gonds were culturally very different from the Aryan Hindus inhabiting other parts of the country and their language, Gondi, is a Dravidian language (Mookerji 1955:44-45). While the area of Nagpur had been inhabited by Gond people since the 1500s, it was established as a city much later, in 1700 AD. A Gond king named Bakht Buland established Nagpur, and made the city the capital of the Gond kingdom (Mookerji 1955:44-45). The Gond rulers encouraged an influx of foreign agricultural settlers, offering large tracts of land for free at first, then later with slight charges. These settlers were largely from the Northern Hindi-speaking region, or from the western Marathi speaking region (Mookerji 1955:44-45). Overtime, there were more settlers working in the agricultural tracts than Gond people and the Gond people gradually became displaced (Mookerji 1955:44-45).

Several decades later, in 1743, Nagpur was taken over by the Bhonsles, a dynasty of rulers who formed a part of the Maratha Empire (Mookerji 1995:45-49). The Marathas consisted of warrior clans from the Deccan plateau region in the south-west of India (Gordon 1993:10-36). Maratha rule lasted for approximately 110 years, the first 50 of which were marked by prosperity (Mookerji 1995:45-49).

However, the second half of the rule saw the Empire falling into decline (Mookerji 1995:45-49). The Marathas had long-drawn hostilities with the British colonial rulers, who were expanding their control over India (Mookerji 1995:45-49). In the 19th century, the Marathas lost important territories such as Cuttack and Berar to the British, which led to a dwindling of resources throughout the Maratha Empire and subsequently, misrule (Mookerji 1995:45-49). Nagpur, being on the fringe of the Empire, lacked the level of organisation and power required to continue to counter British forces (Mookerji 1995:45-49). As such, in 1853 British control was established in Nagpur (Mookerji 1995:45-49).

During British rule, Nagpur was made capital of the Central Provinces, a region encompassing a large portion of central India (Mookerji 1995:50-51). The Central Provinces consisted of Hindi-speaking regions in the east and north-east, as well as Marathi-speaking regions in the south and south-west (Mookerji 1995:50-51). British rule lasted for 94 years, during which Nagpur developed into a modern city with railway lines, municipal services, and growing industry and commerce (Mookerji 1995:50-51). British rule lasted until 1947, when India gained independence (Mookerji 1995:50-51).

After independence, a constituent assembly was formed to draft a constitution and serve as the nation's first parliament. The constituent assembly formed states out of the already existing British provinces along with the states ruled by native rulers (Singh, 2007:71). Most of the area under the former Central Provinces became a part of the state of Madhya Pradesh, and Nagpur was made capital of

this state (Mookerji 1995:71). However, shortly after independence, movements for states to be reorganized on linguistic lines gained momentum in several states (Singh 2008:71). In central India, including Nagpur, a movement by Marathi nationalists to create separate Hindi and Marathi regions of the Central Provinces (now Madhya Pradesh) had been underway since 1938 (Kumar 2013:71). Unhappy with being part of a province (or later, a state) that was largely Hindi-speaking, the Marathi nationalists demanded that the Marathi region, called Vidarbha, become its own state. However, this movement was separate from a different movement in the western Marathi-speaking region of India that demanded the formation of a single Marathi-speaking state out of the existing Bombay state that would encompass all Marathi-speaking regions (Godsmark 2019). Proponents of the Vidarbha movement opposed the idea of forming one Marathi-speaking state on the grounds that Vidarbha must be recognised as a distinct state in order to have any substantial economic power, which would otherwise be unequally distributed in a larger state (Kumar, 2013). The States Reorganisation Commission, which was formed in 1956 to examine the issue of states reorganization, acknowledged the Vidarbha movement in its report, which recommended that an independent Vidarbha state be created (Ali et al., 1955). However, the government of India favoured the idea of a single Marathi-speaking state and brought the Marathi-speaking regions of the states of Madhya Pradesh and Bombay together to form a new state, Maharashtra, in 1960. Nagpur, thus, has been a part of Maharashtra for over 60 years and is now the state's third largest city.

4.2 The Languages of Nagpur through the Ages

In the case of Nagpur, a city that has gone through many changes in rule and administration, historical change has often meant a change in the languages spoken in the city as well. For instance, when the Gonds inhabited Nagpur in the 1500s, the main vernacular of the city was Gondi. However, as the Gonds were displaced, so too was their language. Over time, Hindi and Marathi, the languages of the settlers, became the principle languages of the city. Subsequently, with Maratha rule in the 1700s, Marathi became the main vernacular of Nagpur. When the Marathas lost control to the British in 1853, Nagpur was still predominantly Marathi-speaking, but under British control, it had become part of the Central Provinces, more than half of which consisted of Hindi-speaking areas. At this point, the number of Hindi-speakers in Nagpur was increasing. After India gained independence in 1947, Nagpur was made the capital of a largely Hindi-speaking state, Madhya Pradesh (Mookerji, 1995). Slightly more than a decade later, however, Nagpur became a part of the state of Maharashtra, where the official language was Marathi.

While Gondi was an important language in Nagpur's early history, it is clear that Hindi and Marathi have been the two primary languages of the city since at least the 18th century. However, this does not mean that Hindi and Marathi speakers have been equal in number or that the two languages have been equal in terms of social power. In order to compare the position of these languages in Nagpur over the course of the city's history, it is necessary to consider the concepts of social and demographic dominance. Demographic dominance refers to linguistic

dominance purely in terms of the number of speakers, i.e., which language has more speakers. Census data from 1891 to 2001 (Table 10) shows the number of Hindi-speakers and Marathi-speakers in Nagpur from the late 19th century. As is evident, the population of Marathi speakers in Nagpur has historically been significantly larger than the population of Hindi speakers. What is interesting is that the ratio between the two has been relatively stable over the centuries. For example, while both populations show a substantial increase over the years, at no point does the number of Hindi-speakers show a drastic increase in population while the Marathi-speaking population remains remain the same, or vice versa. Both the populations have increased at roughly the same pace, and Marathi speakers have consistently and substantially outnumbered the Hindi speakers, so that Marathi has been the demographically dominant language in Nagpur.

Table 10: Number of speakers of Hindi and Marathi in Nagpur (Government of India 1891; 1911; 1931; 1951; 1961; 1981; 2001)

Year	Marathi	Hindi
1891	540,052	105,873
1901	574,090	111,288
1903	540,050	105,900
1911	635,893	107,263
1931	712,528	149,795
1951	928,263	157,159
1961	1,149,128	172,611
1981	1,831,980	362, 576
1991	2,402,898	460,199
2001	4,067,637	642,687

Demographic dominance, however, is different from social dominance. Social dominance refers to the position of the language at a societal level. The socially dominant language, for example, is usually used in the domains of government administration and formal education. Marathi has been the demographically dominant language in Nagpur, but it has not always been the socially dominant language. During Gond rule (1500-1743), Gondi was initially the demographically and socially dominant language. However, as Marathi and Hindi speaking settlers became the dominant group in Nagpur, those two languages became demographically dominant, and Gondi language remained in use only among the ruling class (Mookerji 1995:45). During Maratha rule,

Marathi was both the socially and demographically dominant language in Nagpur. It is possible that this situation persisted during colonial rule as well, though the colonial rulers used English for all official purposes. When Nagpur became capital of Madhya Pradesh in 1947, Hindi became the socially dominant language by virtue of being the official language of the state. However, in 1960, Marathi once again became the socially dominant language with the inclusion of Nagpur into the state of Maharashtra, where Marathi was the official language.

Clarifying which languages were socially and demographically dominant during the different stages of Nagpur's history, as depicted in Table 11, is necessary as this information is required to revisit the plausible scenarios established in Chapter 3 in an attempt to account for the emergence of the contact varieties in section 4.4.

Table 11: Social and demographic dominance of different languages in Nagpur

Period	Gond Period (1500- 1743)	Maratha Period (1743- 1853)	Central Provinces (1853- 1947)	Madhya Pradesh (1947- 1960)	Maharashtra (1960- Present)
Dominance					
Demographic	Marathi Hindi	Marathi	Marathi	Marathi	Marathi
Social	Gondi	Marathi	Marathi	Hindi	Marathi

This section has examined the history of the languages of Nagpur to demonstrate the importance of both Hindi and Marathi in Nagpur. Given that both these languages have been spoken in the same city for centuries, it is clear that Hindi and Marathi speakers have also been in contact for centuries. This context of long-term contact, it will be argued, has a bearing on our understanding of how

the contact varieties Nagpuri Hindi and Nagpuri Marathi are likely to have emerged, as will be discussed in section 4.4. Before turning to this topic however, it is important to establish whether early contact between Hindi and Marathi speakers could have led to cross-linguistic influence.

4.3 Early Evidence of Contact: The Linguistic Survey of India

From sections 4.1 and 4.2, we can infer that Hindi and Marathi speakers in Nagpur have been in constant contact with each other since the 1500s. It is, thus, possible that bilingualism in the population of Nagpur stretches back several centuries. The contact features of Nagpuri Hindi and Nagpuri Marathi discussed in Chapter 3 are clearly the result of Hindi-Marathi bilingualism. If this bilingualism has existed in Nagpur for such a long period of time, it is possible that the contact features emerged several centuries ago as well. There is, in fact, historical evidence that suggests this to be the case. This historical evidence comes from *The Linguistic Survey of India* (henceforth LSI), a large survey of Indian languages conducted by George Abraham Grierson, a British official, and published between 1903 and 1928. The LSI is a collection of language specimens and descriptions of the various languages and dialects found on the Indian subcontinent. It covers all of northern and central India and a large number of language varieties, making it an extremely invaluable source, and perhaps the only one of its kind to document the linguistic diversity in India during the early decades of the 20th century. The survey consists of 11 volumes arranged according to language family and region. Looking for the language variety of a particular area thus entails selecting the volume that deals with that

language family and then looking for mention of the area. Since Marathi and Hindi are the focus of this thesis, I searched the volumes that dealt with those languages for any references to Nagpur. Marathi is the subject of Volume 7 of the LSI (Grierson, 1905), which includes mention of the particular variety of Marathi spoken in Nagpur. Hindi is the subject of two volumes of the LSI (Volume 6: Eastern Hindi (Grierson 1904), and Volume 9: Western Hindi and Panjabi (Grierson 1916)), and the Hindi of Nagpur falls under the purview of Western Hindi. Grierson's descriptions of Hindi (1905) and Marathi (1916) in Nagpur include two features, one discussed in section 4.3.1 for Marathi and one discussed in section 4.3.2 for Hindi, that I suggest are the result of contact-induced change. These features, while only two in number, provide valuable evidence for early cross-linguistic transfer in Nagpur.

4.3.1 Marathi in Nagpur

Grierson's (1905:248) survey discusses several different dialects of Marathi, including *Nagpuri*, the dialect spoken in and around Nagpur. According to Grierson (1905:248), Nagpuri is essentially the same as *Varhadi*, another dialect of Marathi that is spoken in the same region of the Central Provinces and Berar. Varhadi, in turn, is very similar to the *Dakhani* dialect, which is the dialect spoken in and around the Poona (present-day 'Pune') area (Grierson 1905:217). In fact, Grierson remarks that Marathi is, on the whole, "a remarkably uniform language" (Grierson 1905:1). However, Grierson does note some features that distinguish the Marathi spoken in the Central Provinces (where Nagpur was located at the time) from other dialects of Marathi, one of which is potentially a

contact feature. In the description of this Marathi's vocabulary (1905:22), Grierson mentions that *bhēṭ^ana* is used for *miṭ^ana*, which he observes is “unusual”. In other dialects of Marathi, Grierson (1905:222) explains, *bhēṭ^ana* means ‘to meet’, while *miṭ^ana* means ‘to get’. However, in the Marathi of this region *bhēṭ^ana* can be used to mean ‘to get’. This is interesting as one of the contact features of NM analysed in section 3.2 was the semantic extension of *miṭ_{ne}*, which is the same as *miṭ^ana*², but written using different transliteration conventions. In NM, *miṭ_{ne}* is used to mean both ‘to get’ and ‘to meet’, thus aligning it with the meaning of the Hindi *miṭnā* discussed in Ex. 39 and repeated here for convenience:

SH	NM	SM
(39) <i>miṭnā</i> - to get - to meet	<i>miṭ_{ne}</i> - to get - to meet	<i>miṭ_{ne}</i> - to get

Grierson's description says that *bhēṭ^ana* (using the conventions in this thesis, *bhēṭ_{ne}*) is also used to mean ‘to get’. This suggests imposition transfer of the Hindi *miṭnā*, which means both ‘to get’ and ‘to meet’. Looking at evidence from the LSI, as well as the evidence from Pandharipande (2003) examined in Chapter 3, we see that the words *bhēṭ_{ne}* and *miṭ_{ne}* can both be used to mean either ‘to get’ or ‘to meet’, which indicates influence from Hindi, where a single word *miṭnā* is used for both these meanings, whereas Marathi uses *bhēṭ_{ne}* and *miṭ_{ne}*

² In this thesis, I follow the conventions used by Pandharipande (2003). Grierson's method of transliteration slightly different and is explained in the introductory volume of the LSI (Grierson 1927:xvii-xviii)

in more specific ways. This can be understood more clearly with the help of examples 83 and 84.

Meaning	SH	NM	SM
(87) ‘to get’	milnā	miḷṇe, bhēṭṇe	miḷṇe
(88) ‘to meet’	milnā	miḷṇe, bhēṭṇe	bhēṭṇe

In sum, there is early evidence from Grierson’s survey (1905) of contact, specifically, of transfer of semantic features from Hindi, which implies SL agentivity by Hindi-dominant speakers, from as long ago as 1905. While Grierson recognised that this feature distinguished Nagpuri from other dialects of Marathi, he was unable to identify it as influence from Hindi. When it comes to the Hindi spoken in Nagpur, however, he does acknowledge that it is a variety that has formed through contact, as explained in the following section.

4.3.2 Hindi in Nagpur

While Grierson (1905) described the Marathi in Nagpur as a variety that was very similar to other varieties of Marathi, his description of the Hindi spoken in Nagpur (Grierson 1916:558) speaks of a variety of Hindi that is different from other dialects of Hindi. However, this variety of Hindi is “not a sufficiently distinct speech to be called a dialect in its proper sense” (1916:558). He calls Nagpuri Hindi a “broken” dialect, one that has a significant amount of “admixture of Marathi” (1916:558). To account for this ‘mixture’ of languages, he explains that there are many Hindi speakers in Nagpur whose ancestors hailed from the north, but who now live in Nagpur where the socially dominant

language is Marathi. As such, Grierson describes contact-induced change, even if he does not use these terms himself. The sample of Hindi from Nagpur in the LSI also shows evidence of contact. In the sample, we can see the emphatic particle *-c*, a contact feature of Nagpuri Hindi that was discussed in section 3.2.2.2.

(89)	Āge	thōṛ- ēch	din-mē	nanhē	pōryā-nē	apani
	Afterwards	a-few	days-in	the-younger	son-by	his-own
	sab	dhan	sāwḍī			
	all	fortune	was-collected			

(Grierson 1916:559)

While represented as *-ēch*, this is *-c³* which is an example of structural transfer from Marathi into Hindi and indicates SL agentivity by Marathi-dominant speakers.

Thus, along with evidence of imposition transfer by Hindi-dominant speakers onto Marathi (4.3.1), Grierson’s survey from the early twentieth century also provides early evidence of contact in the form of imposition transfer by Marathi-dominant speakers onto Hindi.

4.4 Establishing Plausible Scenarios: An Update

In sections 4.2 and 4.3, it was established that Marathi and Hindi have been spoken in Nagpur since the 16th century, and that there is evidence for contact-induced transfer between the two languages from the early 20th century.

³ Grierson separates the word into *thōṛ-ēch*, whereas the correct morpheme boundary would be marked as *thōṛē-ch*.

Previously, in Chapter 3, features of the contact varieties NM and NH were analysed using the Van Coetsem model to then formulate hypotheses to explain the emergence of these varieties. The information learnt from historical sources can now be combined with the hypotheses established in Chapter 3 to add nuance to our understanding of the plausible processes that were involved in the formation of NM and NH.

Based on the analysis of the features of NM in Chapter 3, it was hypothesised that this variety was formed through source language agentivity by Hindi-dominant speakers, i.e, as a result of Hindi-dominant speakers acquiring Marathi and, in that process, imposing features of their dominant language, Hindi, onto Marathi. This hypothesis is further strengthened by historical evidence, which shows that Marathi has been the demographically dominant language, as well as the socially dominant language during certain key periods in Nagpur's history. During the Maratha rule of Nagpur (1743-1853), for example, Marathi was both the demographically and socially dominant language. It is, therefore, likely that many Hindi speakers would have been motivated to acquire Marathi during this time. The acquisition of Marathi as an L2 by L1 dominant speakers of Hindi, thus, is a plausible scenario that can account for the emergence of the contact features in NM.

In the case of NH, however, the hypothesis made based solely on the analysis of the contact features does not entirely align with the sociohistorical information obtained about Nagpur. The conclusion drawn from the linguistic analysis was that NH was created as the result of source language agentivity by Marathi-

dominant speakers, i.e, as a result of Marathi-dominant speakers acquiring Hindi and, in the acquisition process, imposing structural features of Hindi onto Marathi. Evidence from the LSI (Grierson 1905, 1916) shows that one of these contact features has existed since before the 20th century, implying the possibility of other contact features existing during that time as well. However, Marathi was both the socially and demographically dominant language in Nagpur from the mid-18th to the mid-20th century. This simple sociohistorical fact does not suggest an obvious reason for a large number of Marathi speakers to have acquired Hindi during this time. The long-term presence of Hindi in Nagpur makes it plausible that some Marathi-speakers did acquire Hindi, but the acquisition of Hindi by Marathi-dominant speakers is unlikely to be solely responsible for the emergence of NH. There is, however, an alternative possibility. It is possible that the Marathi-dominant speakers responsible for the creation of NH were not, in fact, solely L1 Marathi speakers but instead, a large proportion were L1 Hindi speakers who spoke Marathi as their L2. The emergence of NM was explained (in section 3.3) as the result of L1 Hindi speakers acquiring Marathi during Maratha rule. Given that Marathi was the dominant vernacular of the city in this period, it is not only likely that many Hindi-speakers acquired Marathi, there is, in fact, census data that demonstrates this to be true. Table 10 shows information regarding bilingualism amongst the population of Nagpur, taken from the Census of India conducted in 1931. It is clear from the table that a large proportion of L1 Hindi speakers in Nagpur spoke Marathi, whereas the number of L1 Marathi speakers who spoke Hindi is, by comparison, quite small. While this evidence comes from 1931 and, therefore,

many years after Maratha rule (mid-18th to mid-19th century), it is possible that this was a persistent situation of bilingualism, i.e., that L1 Hindi-speakers first began acquiring Marathi during Maratha rule and this Hindi-Marathi bilingualism continued to be prevalent amongst L1 speakers of Hindi in the 20th century, when this census was conducted.

Table 12: Number of bilingual speakers in Nagpur in 1931 (Government of India 1931)

L1	Hindi	Marathi
Marathi	25,704	712,528
Hindi	149,795	52,470

During Maratha rule, it is likely that L1 Hindi speakers were using Marathi very frequently and were becoming more and more proficient in the language. Over time, it is possible that their dominant language shifted from their L1, Hindi, to their L2, Marathi. As discussed in section 2.1, a speaker's dominant language is not necessarily their L1, it is merely the language that they are more proficient in and that they use more frequently (Treffers-Daller 2019). Crucially, linguistic dominance can change across a speaker's lifetime (Treffers-Daller 2019; Van Coetsem 2000), as a result of which speakers can start imposing features from their L2 (their dominant language) onto their L1 (cf. Pavlenko 2000). If L1 Hindi speakers in Nagpur became Marathi-dominant, they could then impose features from Marathi onto Hindi, thus contributing along with the L1 Marathi dominant speakers to the formation of NH. According to this scenario, NH could have emerged as the result of SL agentivity by Marathi-dominant bilingual speakers

of Hindi, a large number of whom were L1 Hindi speakers, and a number of whom were L1 Marathi speakers.

The formation of NH, in large part as the result of a shift in linguistic dominance by L1 Hindi/Marathi dominant speakers, is similar to the case of Asia Minor Greek, which was formed as the result of L1 Greek speakers becoming dominant in Turkish (discussed in section 2.2). In both the analysis of Asia Minor Greek by Winford (2005), as well as the analysis of Nagpur Hindi advanced here, a shift in linguistic dominance is identified as the key factor that led to the emergence of these contact varieties. Such an analysis is possible only through a framework that is dynamic and is able to account for scenarios of dominance shift, such as the model proposed by Van Coetsem (1988; 1995; 2000). Other frameworks, such as the one proposed by Thomason & Kaufman (as discussed in section 2.1) do not take into consideration the possibility of a shift in linguistic dominance. Thus, in their analysis of Asia Minor Greek, Thomason & Kaufman conclude that it was formed through structural borrowing by Greek speakers. Similarly, if applied to case of contact varieties in Nagpur, their framework would lead to the conclusion that NH was formed through structural borrowing by Hindi speakers, while NM was formed through structural borrowing by Marathi speakers. As argued in this thesis, however, the contact features of NH and NM were formed through imposition transfer by Marathi-dominant and Hindi-dominant speakers respectively. In chapter two, the psycholinguistic processes underlying imposition transfer (i.e. that it is a process of transfer from speaker's dominant language to their non-dominant language) were discussed.

Then, in chapter three, the linguistic features of NH and NM were examined to demonstrate how they were formed through the process of imposition. Further, evidence from Nagpur's history (discussed in this chapter) was shown to account for a scenario where a large number of Hindi-dominant speakers spoke Marathi as a non-dominant language and large number of Marathi-dominant speakers (both L1 and L2 speakers of the language) spoke Hindi as a non-dominant language. There is, therefore, linguistic, psycholinguistic and sociohistorical evidence that points to Hindi-dominant speakers creating NM and Marathi-dominant speakers creating NH.

The explanation suggested here to account for the emergence of NH and NM differs considerably from the explanation provided by Pandharipande (2003) discussed in section 3.1. While she does not use a particular model of contact, Pandharipande (2003), like Thomason and Kaufman (1988), associates L1 speakers of the language with the formation of contact features in that language. In other words, Pandharipande (2003) attributes the formation of NH to Hindi speakers and the formation of NM to Marathi speakers, in both cases attributing the existence of contact features in these contact varieties to 'borrowing'. Having proposed these explanations, she is then puzzled by the fact that Hindi and Marathi do not converge fully into one language, and explains this 'pull' away from convergence purely through social factors, according to which the distinct identities of the people of Nagpur as Hindi-speaking or Marathi-speaking serve to keep the two languages separate (Pandharipande 2003:36-40). This explanation does not, however, focus on the actual mechanisms that led to the

formation of the contact varieties and, as such, does not consider the notion that the contact varieties of Hindi and Marathi emerged in the acquisition process so that the contact features in NH can be attributed to Marathi-dominant speakers, while the contact features in NM can be attributed to Hindi-dominant speakers. Understanding that her analysis is guided by this rationale of explaining the pull away from converge helps shed a new light on certain important aspects of her presentation of the features of Nagpuri Hindi and Nagpuri Marathi, namely her presentation of two ‘options’ for each feature.

Most of the features of Nagpuri Hindi and Nagpuri Marathi have two variants, one of which aligns with the form of that feature seen in the standard variety, and the other of which is a contact feature that is noticeably different from the standard variant. Pandharipande (2003:36-38) explains the existence of two variants through social factors, linking the non-contact features to a pull *away* from convergence that arises out of a need to keep the Marathi-speaking and Hindi-speaking identities of the speakers separate, and contact features to a pull *towards* convergence that arises out of a need to establish a local ‘Nagpuri’ identity and that is associated with the contact features. In section 3.2, I suggested that Pandharipande uses NH and NM as cover terms for two different types of features: the preserved features of the original pre-contact language, and the features that have emerged through contact. Taking into consideration the emergence of NH and NM as proposed in this section, this argument can further be strengthened by associating the two different types of features to two different speaker groups: dominant and non-dominant speakers of Marathi and Hindi. As

established in this chapter, bilingualism has been historically prevalent amongst the speakers of Nagpur, which means that Hindi and Marathi in Nagpur have been spoken as both a dominant and a non-dominant language by different speakers. While the imposition by non-dominant speakers led to the formation of contact features, these features did not replace the original features in the speech of the dominant speakers. Both sets of features were preserved, resulting in two options for several constructions. For example, in NM, the non-contact variant is the feature of Marathi-dominant speakers that has been preserved, while the contact variant is the feature that has emerged through imposition by Hindi-dominant speakers. Similarly, in NH, the non-contact variant is the feature of Hindi-dominant speakers that has been preserved, while the contact variant is the feature that has emerged through imposition by Marathi-dominant speakers. Such an analysis is, once again, the result of focusing on the speakers and the processes that lead to contact-induced change.

4.5 Summary

Van Coetsem's speaker-focused framework has been key to interpreting the context of language contact in Nagpur. In Chapter 3, the model was used to establish plausible scenarios for the emergence of NH and NM based purely on the outcomes of language contact. In this chapter, these scenarios were contextualised within the sociohistorical circumstances of Nagpur. Sociohistorical information confirmed the scenario originally proposed (in section 3.4) for the emergence of NM, in which it was suggested that imposition transfer by L1 Hindi speakers led to the formation of NM. The scenario

originally proposed for the emergence of NH, i.e. that it was formed through imposition transfer by L1 Marathi speakers, was modified in order to align with our understanding of sociohistorical context of Nagpur. In the case of NH, suggesting the additional scenario of a shift in linguistic dominance in L1 Hindi speakers helped create a more plausible hypothesis to account for the emergence of NH.

Chapter 5: **NAGPUR IN THE PRESENT DAY**

5. Introduction

This chapter deals with the third and final research question addressed in this thesis: How are the contact varieties used in the present day? Since Pandharipande's (2003) work is based on research conducted before the 1980s, and as she is one of the only researchers to have studied this context, the only data currently available about language use in Nagpur is more than 40 years old. This does not necessarily mean that this data is no longer reflective of the speech of people currently in Nagpur, but situations of contact can sometimes go through major changes. For instance, Kulkarni-Joshi (2016) revisited the well-known contact context of Kupwar, India and found that speech in Kupwar is drastically different from how it was described by Gumperz and Wilson (1971) in their original study of the village. This is due, in part, to changes in the social circumstances of Kupwar, which were presented by Gumperz and Wilson (1972) as the primary factors behind the contact-induced change seen in the languages of Kupwar. Kulkarni-Joshi (2016) additionally found major methodological issues in the original study that call into question Gumperz and Wilson's presentation of the original data. It is, thus, important to verify the linguistic context of Nagpur through newer investigations. My study of present-day speech in Nagpur involves first understanding the factors that influence language use (section 5.1) and then using this information to determine a suitable method of

investigating language use (section 5.2). In Section 5.3, I discuss current language use in Nagpur.

5.1 Linguistic Repertoires and Code Choice in Nagpur

Before examining the use of the contact varieties Nagpuri Hindi and Nagpuri Marathi in the present day, it is first necessary to consider the factors that affect language use in Nagpur. Pandharipande (2003), in her analysis of speech in Nagpur, notes that the languages of Nagpur serve different social functions and are thus used in different contexts. The standard varieties are used in all official domains, as well as for interactions with Hindi and Marathi speakers who are not from Nagpur. Additionally, the standard varieties are usually used only by educated speakers (2003:47-51). By contrast, Nagpuri Marathi (NH) and Nagpuri Hindi (NM) are local codes, they “stand for the people, culture and society in the Nagpur area” (2003:43). In informal communication amongst people from Nagpur, NH and NM are primarily used, as they “indicate closeness between the speaker and hearer” (2003:47).

This situation in Nagpur, where the languages are clearly divided into ‘local’ and ‘standard’ codes could be considered, and Pandharipande (2003:50) does liken it to, a situation of diglossia. Ferguson’s (1959:325) classic definition of diglossia is a situation where “two or more varieties of the same languages are used by some speakers under different conditions”. One of the varieties is a ‘high’ (H) variety, which is used in formal, sometimes only written, contexts, has a high level of prestige and is used as a literary language, and the other variety is a ‘low’ (L) variety, which is used in informal, spoken contexts and is

sometimes the language of a particular speech community (as opposed to being a standard language that is widely used). This foundational notion of diglossia has been further developed by other scholars. While Ferguson's (1959) definition of diglossia was restricted to different varieties of the same language, Fishman (1967) expanded the notion to include situations where different languages are involved. He discussed the relation between bilingualism and diglossia, outlining four possible situations: speech communities with both diglossia and bilingualism, with diglossia but without bilingualism, with bilingualism but without diglossia, and neither diglossia nor bilingualism (Fishman 1967).

Pandharipande (2003:50-51) uses both Ferguson (1959) and Fishman's (1967) definitions of diglossia to describe Nagpur, explaining that the speech community in Nagpur uses "different varieties of the same language in different contexts", which aligns with Ferguson's (1959) definition, but also bringing in Fishman's (1967) notion of diglossia as "the codes available to speech community include[ing] two independent languages". However, it is not clear in this explanation what exactly the relationship between the different varieties and different languages is in Nagpur. While Pandharipande (2003), as mentioned earlier, does describe the linguistic situation of Nagpur as one involving four codes which are used in different contexts, how exactly these four codes fall within the frameworks of Fishman (1959) and Ferguson (1967) is not clarified. Part of the reason for this might be that the situation of Nagpur cannot fully be captured by these frameworks.

Ferguson's (1959) framework can be partly applied, as the standard varieties of Hindi and Marathi can be seen as H varieties, and local varieties (Nagpuri Hindi and Marathi) as L varieties, but this would not account for the relationship between Hindi and Marathi. Similarly, Fishman's (1967) framework can also be partially applied, as Nagpur's context can be seen as one of bilingualism (Hindi-Marathi) with diglossia, but this would not account for the relation between the local varieties and the standard varieties. 'Diglossia', then, is perhaps not the most appropriate term to use for the Nagpur context.

Nagpur's linguistic context is quite complex, and it must be fully understood in its complexity before it can be defined. The present-day speech community of Nagpur uses several different languages and language varieties: (Indian) English, Standard Hindi and Standard Marathi, Nagpuri Hindi and Nagpuri Marathi. Pandharipande discusses English with reference to its influence on the Marathi language (see Pandharipande 2003, sections 5.1, 6.2.1) but does not include it as one of the 'codes' spoken in Nagpur. However, given the larger context of multilingualism in India and the relationship between English and Indian languages, English must be considered as an important language in the speech community of Nagpur.

English is one of the two 'languages of the union' of India and, particularly in the modern, globalised economy, is considered a language of wealth, power and status. A large number of Indians, particularly from more privileged socio-economic backgrounds, speak English along with other Indian languages. Mohanty (2010) describes multilingualism in India as a hierarchy with English

at the top, followed by other major vernacular/Indian languages, and minority languages at the bottom, thus creating a “double divide between English and major languages and between major languages and the indigenous and tribal minority (ITM) languages” (2010:140). In Nagpur, these other Indian languages are, for most of the population, Hindi and Marathi.

The standard variety of Hindi is the other ‘language of the union’ of India and is used widely throughout the country as a *lingua franca*. In particular, it is the language of much popular media and media (such as Bollywood movies) created in Hindi are consumed by people all over the country. The standard variety of Marathi is the official state language and is used in education, regional media and in administration and bureaucracy. Along with these standard varieties of Hindi and Marathi, the speech community of Nagpur also uses the local varieties, Nagpuri Hindi and Nagpuri Marathi, in informal conversation within the community.

Given the multiple languages and language varieties used in Nagpur, the term ‘polyglossia’ (Platt 1977) is perhaps more suited than ‘diglossia’ to describe its context. Polyglossic situations are those that “involve the use of a continuum with possibly more than one H variety, one or more M(edium) varieties, one or more L varieties” (Platt 1977:367). Another term that can be considered is ‘triglossia’, in which “three languages are spoken by the same community, each with a distinct and complementary role” (Batibo 2005:16). Batibo (2005:17-18) uses the notion of triglossia to discuss multilingualism in African countries, where the three languages involved are typically an ex-colonial language, a

dominant indigenous language and a minority language. Batibo classifies languages as H and L based on their position in society, as well as their position relative to each other.

Table 13: Batibo's (2005:17-18) description of triglossia in Africa

H	Official Language (former colonial language)		
	National lingua franca	H	
L	Regionally dominant indigenous language	L	H
	Minority languages (inter-ethnic communication)		L

Multilingualism in Nagpur, however, involves more than three languages varieties and is, thus, not a triglossic context. Nonetheless, Batibo's (2005) classification of languages (as shown in Table 13) is a useful one that, in combination with Platt's (1977) notion of polyglossia, provide a comprehensive framework to describe the linguistic context of Nagpur. Nagpur's polyglossic situation, therefore, consists of three H varieties: (Indian) English, Standard Hindi and Standard Marathi, where Marathi is an L language compared to Hindi; along with two L varieties: Nagpuri Hindi and Nagpuri Marathi, as demonstrated in Table 14.

Table 14: Polyglossia in Nagpur

H	English (former colonial language)		
	Standard Hindi (national lingua franca)	H	
L	Standard Marathi (regionally dominant language)	L	H
	Nagpuri Marathi and Nagpuri Hindi (local varieties)		L

The question of how to describe the speech community as a whole is an important one, but language use in the speech community as a whole is not the same as language use at an individual level. Notions of diglossia, triglossia and polyglossia “focus on multilingualism at the macro-societal level” (Lim & Ansaldo 2015:37). When it comes to the language use of individual speakers, their individual linguistic repertoires play a key role. Schiffman (1996:54) defines repertoire as “an individual’s particular set of skills (or levels of proficiency) that permit him or her to function within various registers of (a) language(s).” An individual’s linguistic repertoire may or may not contain all the language varieties that are used in the larger speech community. Pandharipande (2003:45) demonstrates this to be true of the speech community in Nagpur, explaining that not every individual in the speech community has equal competence in all varieties. According to her description, while the Nagpur

community is largely bilingual, not every individual is equally bilingual. Some people consider themselves more as monolingual speakers of Hindi or Marathi. As such, monolingual Marathi speakers have a higher proficiency in the two Marathi varieties Standard Marathi and Nagpuri Marathi, whereas monolingual Hindi speakers have a higher proficiency in the two Hindi varieties, Standard Hindi and Nagpuri Hindi. There are also bilingual speakers, who are proficient in all four codes.

For individuals in Nagpur, thus, language use is determined both by domains of speech, as well as individual linguistic repertoires. The people of Nagpur, largely, “claim two identities, i.e., regional and linguistic” (Pandharipande 2003:59), wherein their regional identity is their identity as *Nagpuri*, which includes the use of the local varieties (Nagpuri Hindi and Nagpuri Marathi) and their linguistic identity is their identity as either Marathi-speakers or Hindi speakers.

For most educated Marathi-speaking individuals, their repertoire consists of Standard Marathi, used in more formal, official contexts, such as education, regional media or written communication, and Nagpuri Marathi, used in informal contexts such as at home or with peers and friends. For most of them, their repertoire will also contain Nagpuri Hindi, to be used in the markets or when speaking to a non-Marathi speaker, and many of them will also be proficient in Standard Hindi, with some individuals having a more passive knowledge of the language, mainly through popular media or exposure to the speech of Hindi-speakers, while others use it more actively, in contexts of

education or inter-state communication. Additionally, English will form a part of the linguistic repertoires of many individuals, depending on the kind of education they have received.

For most educated Hindi speakers in Nagpur, their repertoire consists of Standard Hindi, used in more formal contexts, in inter-state communication, and heard through popular media, and Nagpuri Hindi, used in informal contexts such as at home or with peers and friends. They also likely speak Nagpuri Marathi to communicate with the larger Marathi-speaking population of Nagpur. Many of them might have passive competence in Standard Marathi, through exposure to the language as part of living in a Marathi-speaking state, and others might be more proficient in Standard Marathi, having acquired it through education. With Hindi speakers as well, English will be a part of the linguistic repertoire of more privileged individuals who have been educated in English. While this understanding of language use in Nagpur has been formed primarily through information provided by Pandharipande (2003), as well as literature on multilingualism in India as a whole (Mohanty 2010), evidence from recent speech data is required to confirm the actual present-day language use of the people of Nagpur. This evidence is presented in the subsequent sections.

5.2 Investigating Present-Day Speech in Nagpur

One of the primary goals of this chapter is to examine present-day speech in Nagpur, particularly the use of Nagpuri Hindi and Nagpuri Marathi. As highlighted in Chapter 3, NH and NM include both contact and non-contact features. Since the exact difference between the non-contact features of NM and

NH and the standard varieties SM and SH is unclear (see 3.2), the only way to confirm NH and NM use is through evidence of the use of the contact features by the speakers of Nagpur. The usual course to examine the speech of a community is to record speakers, either through interviews or ethnographic observation or other methods used by researchers in linguistics (ex. Koutlaki 2001; Hoffman & Walker 2010; Cheshire, Kerswill, Fox, & Torgersen 2011). However, this thesis was written at a time when international travel was not feasible, making it impossible to conduct any research in Nagpur. As such, alternative methods had to be used.

In the absence of recorded natural speech, researchers have used audio-visual media, such as television, film or radio, featuring the speakers they are studying. For example, McConvell and Meakins (2007) use dialogue from a film featuring Gurindji speakers to demonstrate how the Gurindji-Kriol mixed language emerged through codeswitching among these speakers. Wang et al. (2020) use TV and radio interviews as well as recordings of natural conversations to investigate the use of the Mandarin Chinese *buguo* ‘but’ as a contrastive discourse marker in structured speech versus natural speech. Such avenues were explored as methods for this thesis as well. However, while it was possible to use media such as TV, radio or film as sources for speech data, this approach was found to be unsuitable for the goals of this thesis. Firstly, in the case of television and film, finding media specifically from Nagpur proved to be difficult. While there is much Marathi-language and Hindi-language media available, it was quite challenging to identify media that is set in Nagpur or has

speakers from Nagpur. More importantly, TV, film and radio all share one crucial disadvantage: they are public, sometimes formal, forms of media and, thus, are domains of H variety speech. Unsurprisingly, the Marathi and Hindi used in these forms of media is mostly Standard Marathi or Standard Hindi, which are not the varieties under investigation here. Given that the objective of this chapter is to examine the use of Nagpuri Marathi and Nagpuri Hindi, in other words L varieties, mainstream media could not be used as a source for this kind of speech.

In order to find a source of speech data that was from Nagpur and included the use of NH and NM, YouTube vlogs were considered. While there is an abundance of content of various different kinds on YouTube, a particular form of content called ‘vlogging’ consists of casual, informal videos where the creator (YouTuber) records moments from their daily life, shares personal stories or discusses particular topics or themes, such as fashion or general life advice. While the question of whether YouTubers present ‘authentic’ versions of their lives in videos is a complex one, vlog-style content does offer a glimpse into their day-to-day lives and, crucially, into their informal speech, which is the domain where we would expect to find NH and NM being used. Hence, I identified particular YouTube channels and examined the speech in their videos to look for instances of NH or NM use. Three channels were selected for this purpose. They were selected based on the following criteria:

1. The vloggers are native to Nagpur.

-
2. Their videos are at least partly in Hindi or Marathi.

The channels selected are YoutubewaliAarti, InsaneJackie and NG Vines. They are referred to as Tia, Inja and Neal, respectively. Tia is a lifestyle, fashion and vlogging channel run by a 32-year old educated woman. Her videos usually consist of daily vlogs, style ideas, and personal stories. While she currently resides in Mumbai, she is originally from Nagpur and only moved to Mumbai at the age of 22. With family members still in Nagpur, she visits the city often and still considers herself a person from Nagpur. She makes many videos with members of her family, particularly her mother, her maternal grandmother, and sometimes her father. Her videos are a mix of Hindi, English and Marathi. Inja also makes videos of the ‘daily vlog’ style, where he films outings with his friends, particular events in his life, or shares personal stories. He is a young educated man, perhaps in his early 30s (mention of his age could not be found), who is a current resident of Nagpur. His vlogs often feature his friends, but the speech heard in the videos is mostly his. His videos are mostly in Hindi, with English frequently mixed in.

As Inja and Tia’s videos mostly consists of casual, ‘vlog’-style content, often involving conversations with friends or family, they are good sources to use to listen to speech in different domains and with different interlocutors. The third channel, on the other hand, is quite different in that it contains scripted dialogue instead of the more natural speech seen in Tia and Inja’s videos. Neal’s channel does not feature Neal himself. His is a parody account whose main content is short clips from popular Bollywood and Hollywood films that are dubbed over

with funny dialogues in Marathi to accompany the movie scenes. Specifically, many of the videos are dubbed into Nagpuri Marathi. As such, it is a good source to listen to speech that is perceived as ‘typically’ Nagpuri, even if the speech here is scripted.

The videos examined from these three channels revealed some interesting findings about the language use of their creators, which can then be used to make inferences about the patterns of language use in the larger Nagpur community. The observations made from these videos are explored in the following section.

5.3 Evidence for the Present-Day Use of NH and NM

Tia, Inja and Neal’s videos show clear use of the contact features of Nagpuri Hindi and Nagpuri Marathi, thus confirming that these varieties are still used in the present day. Moreover, their videos show how the language use of an individual is determined by their linguistic repertoire as well as the domain in which they are speaking. This can be demonstrated by observations made from their videos.

The role that linguistic repertoires and linguistic domains play in determining language choice is very clear in Inja’s videos. His content is primarily in Hindi, with some English mixed in, but no instances of him speaking Marathi have been observed. His repertoire, thus, consists primarily of Hindi and English. The Hindi he uses is primarily the standard variety (SH). However, there are instances where he uses contact Nagpuri Hindi. For example, in one of his videos

where he is talking to a friend, he uses the first person plural pronoun *apan*, a feature of Nagpuri Hindi discussed in section 3.2.24.

- (90) cNH: **apan** lēt̪ ho gaye
 1PL.INCL late be PERF.PL
 ‘We are late.’

(InsaneJackie, 2021a)

Another feature of cNH, the possessive marker used in an imperative construction, is also observed in a video of his.

- (91) cNH: dil pe hāth rakhne-**ka** kahne-**kā** sab
 heart on hand put-**POSS** say-**POSS** everything
 sahi he bro
 okay is bro
 ‘Put your hand on your heart and say “everything is okay,
 bro”’

(InsaneJackie, 2021b)

Along with the imperative construction, the possessive marker is also used in obligative constructions in NH (section 3.2.1.1). This feature is also observed in Inja’s speech.

- (92) cNH: **Usne-c** bola tha kēse likhne-**kā**
 3SG-EMPH say.PERF AUX how write-**POSS**
 ‘He (emphatic) told (me) how to write (how one is
 supposed to write).’

(InsaneJackie, 2021c)

Though there are these clear examples of NH use in Inja’s speech, most of the time, Inja uses Standard Hindi (SH). A probable reason for this is the domain in

which he is speaking. While YouTube vlogs are intended to be causal and informal, designed to create a certain sense of friendship and connection with the audience, these videos are still forms of public media. Given that he is speaking publicly, to a wide audience, Inja's choice of the standard variety (instead of the more 'local' contact variety) is understandable. Moreover, there is evidence that shows that Inja's use of Standard Hindi in videos is a conscious decision. Example 88 shown above, along with the possessive marker, also includes the use of the cNH emphatic particle (discussed in section 3.2.2.2). Inja is talking to his friends when he says this sentence. At this exact moment in the video, the phrase "My real speech" appears as a caption. This is interesting as it implies that that his speech at other times, i.e. when he is talking to the audience in Standard Hindi, is less "real". Inja's explicit categorisation of one form of speech as his 'real' speech indicates that the selection of codes is a conscious choice. However, the other examples of cNH use in his speech occur when he is addressing the audience, leading to the conclusion that while a speaker might select which code to use consciously depending on the domain, features from the other code can, nonetheless, slip into their speech. Inja's marking the use of the emphatic particle with a caption but not indicating any of the other instances of NH use in this way suggests the possibility that some contact features, such as the emphatic particle, are somehow more obviously different from the standard, and thus prompt an explanation, whereas other features are not as noticeable.

Similar to Inja's language use, Tia's language use is also determined by her linguistic repertoires and the domains she speaks in. Tia's linguistic repertoire, however, is broader than Inja's. Tia's speech is primarily a mix of Standard Hindi, Standard Marathi and English. Her multilingual repertoire can be explained by the fact that she was brought up in a multilingual household, as her father is primarily Hindi-speaking while her mother is primarily Marathi-speaking. While both her parents speak English, her fluency in English is likely also the result of an English education. Tia, like Inja, uses primarily Standard Hindi and English when addressing her audience in her videos as she is also communicating with a wide audience and is thus likely avoiding the use of the local varieties. Very few instances of the use of the contact varieties were noted in her speech. One instance was the use of the word *bilkul* which is a feature of NM's lexicon (Discussed in Ex. 50 and repeated here for convenience).

SM	NM	SH	Gloss
(50) adzibat	bilkul	bilkul	at all

Tia uses this word in conversation with her grandmother.

- (93) cNM: nāhī nāhī **bilkul** nāhī
 no no **at all** no
 'No, no, not at all.'

(YoutubewaliAarti, 2021, 9:07)

The only other instance of the use of a contact feature noted in study was also in a conversation between Tia and her grandmother. Here, it is the grandmother who uses the NM progressive construction (discussed in 3.2.1.1).

(94) NM: nāhī āṭhv-un **rāhila**
NEG remember-CONJ.PART **PROG.3SG.M**
'I am not able to remember'

(YoutubewaliAarti, 2021, 1:59)

Unlike Inja, Tia's language is determined by a third additional factor. Along with linguistic repertoire and linguistic domains, Tia's speech is determined by her interlocutor. For instance, Tia's family members often feature in her videos and her speech changes depending on who she is talking to. In videos involving her mother or her maternal grandmother, she speaks to them primarily in Marathi. In videos involving her father, she speaks to him in Hindi. When both her mother and father are present together, her speech is mixed. When she is speaking to the camera, i.e. to her audience, she speaks in Hindi. In all three instances, except when she is talking to her grandmother, her speech also includes English. Thus, the differences in Tia's speech can be ascribed to the influence of the people she is addressing, which can be understood through 'audience design'.

Audience design is the notion that speakers design their speech for their audience (Bell, 1984:159). According to Bell (1984:159), "Differences within the speech of a single speaker are accountable as the influence of the second person and some third persons, who together compose the audience to a speaker's utterances". For example, Bell (1984:163) discusses several instances where speakers of local or regional dialects shift to standard varieties when speaking to outsiders or strangers. In Tia's case, she changes her speech not just when speaking to strangers (her YouTube audience) but also when speaking to people she is familiar with. She does this in order to accommodate to the interlocutor's

linguistic repertoire. When addressing primarily-Marathi speaking people, such as her mother and grandmother, she speaks in Marathi, whereas when addressing her primarily Hindi-speaking father, she speaks in Hindi. She does not use English when speaking to her grandmother because her grandmother likely does not speak the language, whereas her parents do. Her choice of Hindi and English to address the audience can be attributed to the fact these are widely spoken languages in India and thus, she uses them to reach a wider audience. If she were to speak primarily Marathi in her videos, her viewership would be limited to only to Marathi-speakers. Therefore, in videos featuring her mother and grandmother, she constantly switches from Marathi to Hindi when speaking to the audience and also adds English subtitles to the Marathi speech, or sometimes even verbally translates from Marathi to Hindi or English. Audience design can account for these choices that she makes regarding her language use.

The language used in Neal's videos can also be explained through audience design. Neal's speech, however, is designed for an audience that is completely different from Tia's. First, there is the inherent difference in the nature of content of their channels, as Tia's videos often involve talking to an interlocutor, whereas Neal's videos consist of scripted dialogue voiced by Neal alone. Considering the language used with the audience of the videos, we noted that Tia uses Standard Hindi in order to reach a broader audience. Conversely, Neal is not concerned with a broader audience; he creates more specific content that is targeted at a Marathi-speaking audience. As explained in 5.1, Neal makes parody videos of popular movies using funny dialogue in Marathi, particularly

certain varieties of Marathi such as Nagpuri Marathi. Neal, therefore, makes videos where speech that is considered characteristic of Nagpur is used for comedic effect, and the videos usually have titles along the lines of *Nagpur Cha...* as in ‘Nagpur’s ...’ followed by the name of a character or film, such as *Nagpur Cha Harry Potter* ‘Nagpur’s Harry Potter’, in this way informing viewers that the video consists of Harry Potter, but as if he were from Nagpur. These videos are, thus, replete with Nagpuri Marathi features. Some examples of this include use of the NM progressive construction, the same feature seen in section 3.2.1.1.

- (95) cNM: tu khoṭa bol-un **rāhila**
 2SG lie tell-CONJ.PART **PROG.2SG.M**
 ‘You are lying.’

(The NG Vines, 2021a, 0:30)

- (96) cNM: khara-ts bol-un **rāhilo**
 Truth-EMPH tell-CONJ.PART **PROG.1SG.M**
 ‘I’m telling the truth (emphatic).’

(The NG Vines, 2021a, 0:30)

- (97) cNM: ikḍe pah-un **rāhili**
 here look-CONJ.PART **PROG.3SG.F**
 ‘She is looking here.’

(The NG Vines, 2021b)

NM’s particular way of marking the ergative case (discussed in 3.2.1.1) was also observed in Neal’s videos.

- (98) cNM: tu-**ne** nāshṭā kela kā

2SG-ERG breakfast ate Q
'Did you eat breakfast?'

(The NG Vines, 2021a)

In 3.2.2.3, the semantic expansion involved in the use of the word *bhēṭne* was discussed. It was found that in NM, *bhēṭne* is used to mean both 'to get' and 'to meet'. As such, it is used in instances where the word *miḷne* (to get) would be used in Standard Marathi. The use of *bhēṭne* to mean 'to get' was observed in Neal's videos as well.

(99) cNM: dāhvī-le kitī percentage **bhēṭli** hoti
2SG-in how much percentage **get** AUX
'What was your percentage score in the 10th grade?'

(The NG Vines, 2021b)

Neal's extensive, intentional use of Nagpuri Marathi to portray a character as being from Nagpur demonstrates not only that NM is still used in the present day, but that it is a distinct, recognisable form of speech associated with Nagpur. This, in a way, confirms the present day relevance of NM, while also strengthening the notion that NM is closely tied to a local Nagpuri identity.

5.4 Summary

In sum, Inja, Tia and Neal's videos show that the contact varieties Nagpuri Hindi and Nagpuri Marathi are still in use in the present day. One of the factors that determines their use is the linguistic repertoires of individual speakers. Inja is a clear example of this, as his linguistic repertoire does not include Marathi and thus, he does not use Nagpuri Marathi. In Section 5.1, the use of NM and NH was also linked to linguistic domains. Examining the speech of actual speakers,

however, shows that code choice is more complicated than just a question of domains. While Inja and Tia do demonstrate that the use of standard varieties is preferred in the domain of public media (i.e. YouTube videos), Neal's use of Nagpuri Marathi in the same domain shows that the audience the speech is addressed to can play an equal, if not more important role, in determining code choice.

Chapter Six: CONCLUSION

This thesis was motivated by one primary goal: to understand the contact context of Nagpur. This is a context that sees two varieties, Nagpuri Hindi and Nagpuri Marathi, which have contact features that possibly emerged centuries ago and are still used in the present-day, but did not displace the non-contact features, which also continue to be used. This is, thus, an extremely fascinating context. However, research on the languages of Nagpur being limited almost entirely to the works of a single scholar (Pandharipande 1982; 2003), this context is also one that merits much more interest and study than what is currently available.

This thesis was aimed at addressing several different elements of the context of Nagpur. First and most importantly, this thesis investigated the question of emergence of the contact varieties. Through an examination of two sources of data that are almost a century apart: Pandharipande (2003) and Grierson's Linguistic Survey of India (1905; 1916), I formulated a plausible scenario to account for the emergence of Nagpuri Hindi and Nagpuri Marathi. I proposed that NH and NM emerged in the mid-19th/early 20th century during the rule of the Marathi Empire in Nagpur. According to my hypothesis, Nagpuri Marathi emerged through the imposition of Hindi features onto Marathi by Hindi-dominant L1 speakers of Hindi, while Nagpuri Hindi emerged through the imposition of Marathi features onto Hindi by Marathi-dominant L1 and L2 speakers of Marathi. This hypothesis was supported by evidence from historical

sources that show evidence of Hindi-Marathi contact in the early 20th century, as well as through information about the sociolinguistic circumstances during that time that justifies the acquisition of Marathi by L1 Hindi speakers along with the shift in linguistic dominance amongst these speakers.

This thesis additionally provides insight into the present-day linguistic circumstances of Nagpur by demonstrating that Nagpuri Hindi and Nagpuri Marathi are still used in the present day. Further, I discussed how Nagpur is a polyglossic context, where the speech community as a whole uses five languages: English, Nagpuri Hindi, Standard Hindi, Nagpuri Marathi and Standard Marathi, but language use at an individual level is determined by the individual's linguistic repertoire, the different domains of the languages and the role played by the interlocutor.

Thus, this thesis sheds light on aspects of the Nagpur context that have not previously been addressed. However, there is a great amount of future research that can (and should) be done. Firstly, the analysis of NH and NM done in this thesis is based primarily on Pandharipande's (2003) data, which was collected several decades ago. I did provide some examples from my study of YouTube videos, but these are relatively quite few and only offer glimpses into the speech of people in Nagpur. More speech data from Nagpur would be extremely beneficial, as currently all understanding of this context is based a single source, which can be problematic (as demonstrate by Kulkarni-Joshi 2016). One of the central claims made in this thesis is that what Pandharipande (2003) refers to as 'standard' variants in NH and NM are actually preserved features of pre-contact

varieties. Pandharipande (2003), concerned with sociolinguistic variation, focuses on how the standard features are used in particular contexts, mostly by educated speakers. However, in order to fully understand whether Nagpuri Hindi and Marathi consist of the contact varieties and the standard varieties, as opposed to the contact varieties and the preserved varieties, it is necessary to collect data from uneducated speakers who are not likely to be proficient in the standard varieties.

Another avenue of future research is to investigate other contact contexts in India. An extremely linguistically diverse country with multilingualism so common that “[i]f one draws a straight line between Kashmir and Kanyakumari and marks, say, every five or ten miles, then one will find that there is no break in communication between any two consecutive points” (Pattanayak 1981: 44, cited in Mohanty 2010:133), India potentially contains dozens of contact contexts like Nagpur. An approach that focuses both, on the individual speaker and the larger sociohistorical context, was central to this thesis and could be used to understand other contact contexts as well.

REFERENCES

Primary Sources

- INSANEJACKIE 2021a. The Adventure At Farmhouse Nagpur | Daily Vlogs | Nagpur Farmhouse Vlog | Hingna.
- INSANEJACKIE 2021b. I Lost Everything in COVID-19
- INSANEJACKIE 2021c. Pawri (Party) Ho Rahi Hai Vlog | Pawri Ho Rahi hai | Cross Over Café Vlog | Daily Vlogs.
- GOVERNMENT OF INDIA. 1891. Census of India. Calcutta: Office of The Superintendent of Government Printing.
- GOVERNMENT OF INDIA. 1911. Census of India. Calcutta: Office of the Supertintendent of Government Printing.
- GOVERNMENT OF INDIA. 1931. Census of India. Nagpur: Government Printing.
- GOVERNMENT OF INDIA. 1951. Census of India.
- GOVERNMENT OF INDIA. 1961. Census of India. Bombay: Director, Government Printing and Stationery.
- GOVERNMENT OF INDIA. 1981. Census of India. Office of the Registrar General.
- GOVERNMENT OF INDIA. 2001. Census of India. Office of the Registrar General.
- THE NG VINES 2021a. Nagpur Cha Gully Boy | Gully Boy Funny Marathi Dubbed Video | The NG Vines. YouTube.
- THE NG VINES 2021b. Nagpur Cha Sairat | विदर्भाचा परश्या आणि आर्ची | सैराट कॉमेडी | Sairat Comedy Marathi Dubbed Video.
- YOUTUBEWALIAARTI 2021. My Indian Grand mom guesses Bollywood Actors! (2021) BOLLYWOOD QUIZ! YouTube.

Secondary Sources

- ALI, S. F., KUNZRU, H. N. & PANIKKAR, K. M. 1955. Report of the States Reorganisation Commission. Delhi: Government of India Press.
- ARNAL, A. 2011. Linguistic changes in the Catalan spoken in Catalonia under new contact conditions %J Journal of Language Contact. 4, 5-25.
- BATIBO, P. H. M. 2005. *Language Decline and Death in Africa : Causes, Consequences and Challenges*, Clevedon, UNITED KINGDOM, Channel View Publications.
- BLOM, E., POLISŠENSKÁ, D. & WEERMAN, F. 2006. Effects of age on the acquisition of agreement inflection. *Morphology*, 16, 313-336.
- BURRIDGE, K. & BERGS, A. 2016. *Understanding Language Change*, London, UNITED KINGDOM, Taylor & Francis Group.

-
- CHAMBERS, J. K., TRUDGILL, P., SCHILLING, N. & SCHILLING-ESTES, N. 2002. *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change*, Chichester, UNITED KINGDOM, John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated.
- CHESHIRE, J., KERSWILL, P., FOX, S. & TORGENSEN, E. 2011. Contact, the feature pool and the speech community: The emergence of Multicultural London English. 15, 151-196.
- DHONGDE, R. V. & WALI, K. 2009. *Marathi*, Amsterdam, NETHERLANDS, THE, John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- FERGUSON, C. A. 1959. Diglossia. *WORD*, 15, 325-340.
- FISHMAN, J. A. 1967. Bilingualism With and Without Diglossia; Diglossia With and Without Bilingualism. *Journal of social issues*, 23, 29-38.
- GODSMARK, O. 2019. Searching for Synergies, Making Majorities: The Demands for Pakistan and Maharashtra. *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies*, 42, 115-133.
- GORDON, S. 1993. *The Marathas 1600–1818*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- GRIERSON, G. A. 1904. *Linguistic Survey of India (Vol.6 Indo-Aryan Family, Mediate Group, Specimens of the Eastern Hindī Language)*, Calcutta, Superintendent of Government Printing.
- GRIERSON, G. A. 1905. *Linguistic Survey of India (Vol. 7 Indo-Aryan Family, Southern Group, Specimens of the Marāṭhī Language.)*, Calcutta, Office of the Superintendent of Government Printing.
- GRIERSON, G. A. 1916. *Linguistic Survey of India (Vol. 9, Pt. 1 Indo-Aryan Family, Mediate Group, Specimens of Western Hindī and Pañjābī)*, Calcutta, Superintendent of Government Printing.
- GUMPERZ, J. J. & WILSON, R. 1971. Convergence and creolization: A case from the Indo-Aryan/Dravidian border. In: HYMES, D. (ed.) *Pidginization and creolization of languages*. Cambridge: CUP.
- HICKEY, R. 2010. Language Contact: Reconsideration and Reassessment. In: HICKEY, R. (ed.) *The Handbook of Language Contact*.
- HOFFMAN, M. F. & WALKER, J. A. 2010. Ethnolects and the city: Ethnic orientation and linguistic variation in Toronto English. *Language variation and change*, 22, 37-67.
- HOWELL, R. B. 1993. German immigration and the development of regional variants of American English: Using contact theory to discover our roots. In: SALMONS, J. (ed.) *The German language in America, 1683-1991*. Madison, WI: Max-Kade Institute for German-American Studies.
- JOHANSON, L. 2002. Contact-induced change in a code-copying framework. In: JONES, M. C., ESCH, E. & HERMAN, V. (eds.) *Language Change : The Interplay of Internal, External and Extra-Linguistic Factors*. Berlin/Boston, GERMANY: De Gruyter, Inc.
- KACHRU, Y. 2006. *Hindi*, Amsterdam, NETHERLANDS, THE, John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- KOOTSTRA, G. J. & MUYSKEN, P. 2019. Structural Priming, Levels of Awareness, and Agency in Contact-Induced Language Change. 4, 65.
- KOUTLAKI, S. A. 2002. Offers and expressions of thanks as face enhancing acts: *tæ'arof* in Persian. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34, 1733-1756.

-
- KULKARNI-JOSHI, S. 2015. Religion and language variation in a convergence area: The view from the border town of Kupwar post-linguistic reorganisation of Indian states. *Language & Communication*, 42, 75-85.
- KUMAR, A. 2013. Article 371(2) and the Receding Demand for Vidarbha State. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 48, 71-76.
- LASS, R. & WRIGHT, S. 1986. Endogeny Vs. Contact: Afrikaans Influence on South African English. *English World-Wide*, 7, 201-223.
- LIM, L. & ANSALDO, U. 2015. *Languages in Contact*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- MACWHINNEY, B. 2005. Extending the Competition Model. 9, 69-84.
- MACWHINNEY, B. 2008. A unified model. In: ROBINSON, P. & ELLIS, N. C. (eds.) *Handbook of cognitive linguistics and second language acquisition*. New York: Routledge.
- MCCONVELL, P. & MEAKINS, F. 2007. Gurindji Kriol: A Mixed Language Emerges from Code-switching. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 25, 9-30.
- MCMAHON, A. M. S. 1994. *Understanding language change*, Cambridge; New York, NY, USA; Cambridge University Press.
- MEILLET, A. 1921. *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale*.
- MEYERHOFF, M. 2015. *Introducing Sociolinguistics*, London, UNITED KINGDOM, Taylor & Francis Group.
- MHAISKAR, R. 2016. Language Contact and Language Change: A Study of Case Marking in Nagpuri Marathi. *Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute*, 76, 83-92.
- MOHANTY, A. K. 2010. Languages, inequality and marginalization: implications of the double divide in Indian multilingualism %J. 2010, 131-154.
- MOOKERJEE, S. 1955. *The Growth of Nagpur, India*. Ph.D., Indiana University.
- MÜLLER, F. M. 1875. *Lectures on the science of language*, London, Longmans Green.
- MYERS-SCOTTON, C. 2002. *Contact linguistics: bilingual encounters and grammatical outcomes*, New York; Oxford; Oxford University Press.
- NÆSS, Å. 2020. Bidirectional Borrowing of Structure and Lexicon: The Case of the Reef Islands. In: GRANT, A. P. (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Language Contact*. 1 ed.: Oxford University Press.
- NEWLIN-ÅUKOWICZ, L. 2014. From interference to transfer in language contact: Variation in voice onset time. *Language Variation and Change*, 26, 359-385.
- NICHOLS, J. 1992. *Linguistic Diversity in Space and Time*, Chicago, UNITED STATES, University of Chicago Press.
- PANDHARIPANDE, R. 1982. Counteracting Forces in Language Change: Convergence vs. Maintenance. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences*, 12.
- PAVLENKO, A. 2000. L2 Influence on L1 in Late Bilingualism. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 11.
- PAVLENKO, A. & JARVIS, S. 2002. Bidirectional Transfer. *Applied Linguistics*, 23, 190-214.

-
- PLATT, J. T. 1977. A Model for Polyglossia and Multilingualism (With Special Reference to Singapore and Malaysia). *Language in Society*, 6, 361-378.
- POPLACK, S. & LEVEY, S. 2010. Contact-induced grammatical change: A cautionary tale. In: AUER, P. & SCHMIDT, J. E. (eds.) *Volume 1 Theories and Methods*. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter Mouton.
- SANKOFF, G. 2002. Linguistic Outcomes of Language Contact. In: CHAMBERS, J. K., TRUDGILL, P., SCHILLING, N. & SCHILLING-ESTES, N. (eds.) *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change*. Chichester, UNITED KINGDOM: John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated.
- SCHIFFMAN, H. 1996. *Linguistic Culture and Language Policy*, London, UNITED STATES, Taylor & Francis Group.
- SINGH, M. P. 2008. Reorganisation of States in India. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 43, 70-75.
- THOMASON, S. G. 2001. *Language contact*, Edinburgh; Washington, D.C., Edinburgh University Press.
- THOMASON, S. G. & KAUFMAN, T. 1988. *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*, Berkeley, University of California Press.
- TRASK, L. 2015. *Trask's Historical Linguistics*, London, UNITED KINGDOM, Taylor & Francis Group.
- TREFFERS-DALLER, J. 2019. What Defines Language Dominance in Bilinguals? 5, 375-393.
- TREFFERS-DALLER, J. & SAKEL, J. 2012. Why transfer is a key aspect of language use and processing in bilinguals and L2-users. 16, 3-10.
- WANG, Y., SHU-ING, S., SCHAMS, W. & HSUN-CHEN, C. 2020. Mandarin Chinese buguo ('but') as a metacoherence marker in TV/radio interview talks. *Language and Linguistics*, 21, 104-144.
- WEINREICH, U. 1953. *Languages in Contact : Findings and Problems*, Berlin/Boston, GERMANY, De Gruyter, Inc.
- WEINREICH, U. 2011. *Languages in Contact : French, German and Romansh in twentieth-century Switzerland*, Amsterdam, NETHERLANDS, THE, John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- WINFORD, D. 2003. *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics*, Malden, MA, Blackwell Pub.
- WINFORD, D. 2005. Contact-induced changes : Classification and processes. *Diachronica*, 22, 373-427.
- WINFORD, D. 2020. Theories of Language Contact. In: GRANT, A. (ed.) *The Oxford handbook of language contact*. New York, NY Oxford University Press.