

UNIVERZITA KARLOVA
FILOSOFICKÁ FAKULTA
ÚSTAV ČESKÉHO JAZYKA A TEORIE KOMUNIKACE

Diplomová práce

Nora Melnikova

**Bidirectional transfer in Hindi/Urdu speakers
with Czech as a Second Language**

Prof. Dr. Barbara Mertins

2019

Poděkování

Děkuji tímto vedoucí diplomové práce, Prof. Dr. Barbaře Mertins, za její laskavost a trpělivost, a své rodině, přátelům a judoka za neustálou podporu. Především bych však chtěla poděkovat svým přátelům, kteří se účastnili tohoto výzkumu a bez nichž by tato práce nikdy nevznikla.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my guide, Prof. Dr. Barbara Mertins, for her kind patience, and my family, friends and judoka for their incessant support. Last but not least, I want to express my deep gratitude to my friends who participated in this research and without whom this thesis would not have been possible.

Prohlášení

Prohlašuji, že jsem diplomovou práci vypracovala samostatně, že jsem řádně citovala všechny použité prameny a literaturu a že práce nebyla využita v rámci jiného vysokoškolského studia či k získání jiného nebo stejného titulu.

Declaration

I declare that this MA thesis contains no material that has been submitted previously, in whole or in part, for the award of any other academic degree or diploma. Except where otherwise indicated, this thesis is my own work.

Nora Melnikova

V Praze, 17. 7. 2019

Klíčová slova

Bidirekcionální jazykový transfer, osvojování druhého jazyka, mezijazykový vliv, hindština, urdština, výuka češtiny jako druhého jazyka

Key words

Bidirectional language transfer, cross-linguistic influence, L2 acquisition, Hindi, Urdu, Teaching Czech as a Second Language

Abstrakt

Tato práce si klade za cíl zkoumat vlivy hindštiny/urdštiny na češtinu pokročilých mluvčích, jejichž prvním jazykem je hindština/urdština, a zpětný vliv češtiny na jejich první jazyk.

V této oblasti zatím neexistuje žádný výzkum, přestože je čeština již dlouho vyučována jednak jako cizí jazyk v Indii na Dillíské univerzitě, jednak jako cizí/druhý jazyk v České Republice. Praktickým záměrem této práce je shrnout základní poznatky ohledně výuky češtiny pro rodilé mluvčí hindštiny/urdštiny, aby byly k dispozici vyučujícím češtiny v Indii i v České Republice, popř. i vyučujícím jiných slovanských jazyků.

Za tímto účelem byla provedena analýza jazykového materiálu získaného od deseti rodilých mluvčí hindštiny/urdštiny, kteří žijí v České Republice po dobu nejméně pěti let. Tato analýza je založena na nahrávkách jejich jazykové produkce v podobě neformálních rozhovorů. Získaná jazyková data byla porovnána se standardními gramatickými popisy obou jazyků a byla provedena chybová analýza. Na základě kontrastivní analýzy byly identifikovány a kategorizovány chyby zapříčiněné jazykovým transferem v oblastech fonetiky/fonologie, morfosyntaxe, lexika a sémantiky.

Abstract

The aim of this project is to examine the influence of Hindi/Urdu on Czech in advanced Hindi L1 speakers of Czech as a Second Language, as well as the influence of Czech on their respective L1. This is the first project of its kind. So far, there has been no research on Hindi/Urdu L1 speakers of Czech, in spite of the fact that dozens Hindi/Urdu L1-speakers enroll in Czech language courses in India every year and thousands of Hindi/Urdu L1-speakers are permanent or long-term residents of the Czech Republic and have acquired Czech at various levels of proficiency. The practical objective of this thesis is to provide first empirically based insights for teachers of Czech as a Foreign/Second Language to Hindi/Urdu L1-speakers in India and in the Czech Republic, as well as for teachers of other Slavic languages.

The study analyzes the language production of 10 Hindi/Urdu L1 speakers who have lived in the Czech Republic for at least 5 years. The analysis is based on recordings of informal conversations. The obtained linguistic data was compared with standard grammatical descriptions of Hindi/Urdu and Czech in order to perform error analysis. With the help of contrastive analysis, errors caused by language transfer were identified and categorized according to the following language domains: phonetics and phonology, morphosyntax, and semantics.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
1. Theoretical background.....	1
1.1 Definition.....	1
1.2 History of transfer research.....	2
1.3 Important works on transfer.....	4
2. Methodology.....	4
2.1 Participants.....	4
2.1.1 A brief outline of migration.....	4
2.1.2 Snowball sampling.....	5
2.1.3. Participant data.....	6
2.2 The elicitation method.....	10
2.3 Problems of error analysis in regard to “Hindi”.....	12
2.3.1 Modern Standard Hindi.....	12
2.3.2 Hindi and Urdu.....	13
2.3.3 Multilingualism.....	14
3. Phonological and phonetic transfer.....	14
3.1 Vowels.....	15
3.1.1 The vowel systems of Hindi and Czech.....	15
3.1.2 Diphthongs.....	16
3.1.3 [ɪ] versus [ɛ].....	17
3.2 Consonants.....	17
3.2.1. The consonant systems of Hindi and Czech.....	17
3.2.2 Consonant clusters.....	19
3.2.3 Assimilation.....	20
3.2.4. Palatals.....	20
3.2.5 Sibilant affricates.....	21
3.2.6. Trills and flaps.....	22
3.2.7 Postalveolar and alveolar fricatives.....	22
3.2.8 Labiodental and velar fricatives.....	23
3.2.9 Stress.....	23
4. Morphosyntactic transfer.....	25
4.1 Nouns.....	25
4.1.1 Gender.....	25
4.1.2. Suffixes.....	26
4.1.3 Case system.....	26
4.2 Verbs.....	30
4.2.1 Present tense.....	30
4.2.2 Past tense.....	31
4.2.3 Future tense.....	33
4.2.4 Aspect.....	34
4.2.5 Mood.....	35
4.2.6 Reflexivity.....	36
4.2.7 Voice.....	37
4.2.8 The verb “to have”, obligation.....	37
4.2.9 Verbs of liking.....	38
4.2.10 Verbs of knowledge.....	38
4.2.11 Verb-object case relationship.....	39
4.2.12 Verbo-nominal predicates.....	39
4.2.13 Verbs of motion.....	39
4.2.14 “It can be said”.....	40
4.2.15 Verbs of speech and knowledge + languages.....	40
4.2.16 Underproduction of verb forms.....	40
4.3 Adjectives.....	41
4.4 Pronouns.....	42
4.4.1 Declension.....	42
4.4.2 Subject pronouns.....	42
4.4.3 Indefinite and negative pronouns.....	43
4.4.4 The reflexive pronoun.....	43
4.5 Numerals.....	44

4.6 Adverbs.....	44
4.6.1 Adverbs of place.....	44
4.6.2 Adverbs of time.....	45
4.7 Adpositions.....	46
4.7.1 The adposition “from”.....	46
4.7.2 The adpositions “in”, “at”.....	46
4.7.3 Adposition deletion.....	47
4.7.4 Adposition insertion.....	47
4.8 Conjunctions.....	48
4.9 Particles.....	48
4.9.1 Particles “hī”, “bhī”.....	49
4.10 Indirect speech.....	49
4.11 Word order.....	50
5. Semantic transfer.....	51
5.1 Borrowings.....	51
5.2 Code switching.....	52
6. Results.....	53
Conclusion.....	55
Bibliography.....	56

List of abbreviations

decl.	declinable
indecl.	indeclinable
f.	feminine
m.	masculine
n.	neuter
sg.	singular
pl.	plural
nom.	nominative
acc.	accusative
instr.	instrumental
dat.	dative
abl.	ablative
gen.	genitive
loc.	locative
voc.	vocative
erg.	ergative
pron.	pronoun
pers. pron.	personal pronoun
poss. pron.	possessive pronoun
adj.	adjective
adv.	adverb
prep.	preposition
postp.	postposition
neg.	negation
inf.	infinitive
ind.	indicative
pres.	present
imp.	imperative
subj.	subjunctive
cond.	conditional
imperf.	imperfect
perf.	perfect

part.	participle
i.p.	imperfect participle
p.p.	past participle
emph.	emphasis
coll.	colloquial

Introduction

This study examines bidirectional language transfer between Hindi¹ and Czech. For our purpose, the term transfer will be used to denote specifically negative transfer, which is the focal point of this work. However, positive transfer undoubtedly plays a significant role in the acquisition of Czech by Hindi L1 speakers as well. This study analyzes the influence of Hindi on Czech in advanced Hindi L1 speakers of Czech as a Second Language, as well as the influence of Czech on their L1. It is the first project of its kind. So far, there has been no research on Hindi L1 speakers of Czech, in spite of the fact that dozens of Hindi L1 speakers enroll in Czech language courses in India every year (at the Department of Slavonic & Finno-Ugrian Languages, Delhi University) and thousands of Hindi L1 speakers are permanent or long-term residents of the Czech Republic and have acquired Czech at various levels of proficiency. The practical objective of this project is to provide first empirically based insights for teachers of Czech as a Second/Foreign language to Hindi L1 speakers in India as well as in the Czech Republic. The author is not a linguist, and not a specialist in either Hindi or Czech grammar. She is looking at the subject rather from the point of view of a teacher of Czech as a Second Language with a 5-year experience of full time teaching Czech to Hindi L1 speakers at Delhi University in India and a 7-year experience of teaching Hindi to Czech L1 speakers at university level in the Czech Republic. She combines her teaching experience, which allows her to make predictions regarding the areas where transfer usually occurs, contrastive analysis of Hindi and Czech, based mainly on expert writing in the field of Hindi and Czech grammar, and language data elicited from Hindi L1 speakers of Czech. The contrastive analysis is limited to areas which show the occurrence of language transfer, based on the analysis of the collected linguistic material. Errors caused by language transfer are identified and categorized according to the following language domains: phonetics and phonology, morphosyntax, and semantics.

1. Theoretical background

1.1 Definition

Language transfer or crosslinguistic influence is a term that usually refers to the influence of a person's first language on the acquisition and use of second language(s), but it can also refer to the influence of the second language(s) on the first language or other languages that the person is acquainted with. According to Rod Ellis, transfer is a "learning strategy by which the learner uses

¹ Further on, the term "Hindi" will be used for both Hindi and Urdu, as they are grammatically almost identical on the spoken level, and as the vast majority of our participants are Hindi speakers. Urdu will be explicitly mentioned only in cases where it differs from Hindi on the spoken level.

his or her knowledge of one language as a resource for formulating hypotheses about the forms, structures, functions, meanings, rules and patterns of another”.² The role transfer plays is clearly observable on the differences in language acquisition speed and the acquisition route, depending on the distance between the first language and the target language. From the point of view of Second Language Teaching, the consequences of transfer can be detrimental to language acquisition (errors, under/overproduction of the target language structures), but can also facilitate it, resulting in its higher speed. However, transfer is not directly proportional to proficiency in the target language.³ In the 1960s and 1970s, many authors working in the field of language acquisition started abandoning the term “transfer” because of its perceived links to behaviorism and structuralism, which were by then considered outdated.⁴ Many publications therefore use the term CLI (crosslinguistic influence) instead.⁵ Apart from forward transfer (L1 to L2), we can also observe lateral transfer (L2 to L3) and reverse transfer (L2 to L1). Transfer coincides with other factors such as developmental sequences, universal learning principles, the perception of language distance etc.⁶ It extends to all levels of language, from phonetics and phonology to pragmatics and conceptual thinking.

1.2 History of transfer research

Odlin⁷ summarizes the recent history of language transfer studies as a history of controversies. He describes how the importance of transfer in SLA studies did not face strong challenges until the late 1960s, when two claims that were widely accepted in the preceding period came under attack. According to the first claim, second language learning was poles apart from first language acquisition. Contemporary linguistics was heavily influenced by behaviorist ideas and understood transfer from the first language as the influence of old language habits that have to be replaced by new ones. The second claim concerned contrastive analysis and its ability to predict the occurrence of transfer. These ideas were developed by linguists such as Robert Lado and Charles Fries, who as a consequence attributed crucial importance to the production of distinct materials for students with different L1s.

The attack on this line of thought came in the 1970s. It was aimed at contrastive analysis that often failed to correctly predict problems of second language acquisition. It was suggested that

² Ellis (1994), 314, cited in Jarvis and Pavlenko (2008), 9.

³ Jarvis and Pavlenko (2008), 11-12.

⁴ Odlin (1989), 22.

⁵ Even the most significant recent study of transfer, Jarvis and Pavlenko (2008) uses this term; however, we stick to the original term “transfer” because of its comprehensibility and the fact that the perceived links of the term to behaviorism might have been obvious to previous generations, but have mostly fallen into oblivion by now.

⁶ Jarvis and Pavlenko (2008), 12.

⁷ Odlin (1989), 15-24.

contrastive analysis should be used only to explain errors, not to predict them. Apart from that, the newly emerging error analysis brought to light many other types of errors that could not be related to language transfer. At the same time, astonishing similarities were found between first and second language acquisition. Based on results of longitudinal studies of second language acquisition, the concept of developmental sequences was established and became a crucial aspect of transfer studies. Stephen Krashen and other scholars have gone so far in their critique to insist that transfer played only negligible role in grammar acquisition. Among the shortcomings that characterize the thinking of the language transfer “deniers”, Odlin mentions their focus on error, oblivion to the fact that transfer works together with universal developmental sequences, and overemphasis on morphology and syntax. He states, however, that the 1970s and 1980s brought new empirical studies that added enough convincing evidence for the significance of transfer.⁸

Jarvis and Pavlenko⁹ add their perspective and mention more recent developments. They differentiate four overlapping phases of transfer research, each of which continues till now.¹⁰ During the first phase that started in mid to late 1800s, transfer was recognized and investigated as a variable that affects other processes, such as SLA. The research concentrated on identifying cases of transfer and their scope, and quantifying its effects.¹¹ In the second phase, starting in mid to late 1970s, transfer was investigated as a process in itself, and its causes, constraints and directionality were examined. The third phase, fully developed in the 1990s, formed theories to explain transfer in broader context with respect to social, mental and other circumstances. Theoretical models and hypotheses were constructed and tested. The fourth phase consists, according to Jarvis and Pavlenko, in the “development of precise physiological account of how the phenomenon takes place in the human brain”.¹²

Regarding the more recent¹³ developments in the study of transfer, Jarvis and Pavlenko claim that apart from the expansion of the findings from the previous periods, there have been new findings in existing areas of research, new areas of research,¹⁴ and new theoretical accounts of transfer (e.g., growing recognition of the relevance of linguistic relativity, widespread acceptance of the multicompetence framework in bilingualism research, unparalleled revival of research on language attrition, and language processing models).

⁸ Odlin (1989), 23-24.

⁹ Jarvis and Pavlenko (2008), 4-19.

¹⁰ Jarvis and Pavlenko (2008), 5-6.

¹¹ Our thesis belongs to this type of research which produced many empirical studies that were then further used in the subsequent phases.

¹² Jarvis and Pavlenko (2008), 6.

¹³ I. e., after Odlin (1989).

¹⁴ Jarvis and Pavlenko (2008), 13 mention especially transfer in discourse, perception and comprehension, topics, directionality, the number of languages considered, areas of language use, etc.

1.3 Important works on transfer

Deliberations on transfer have probably existed since the birth of language. The philologists and Sanskrit scholars Friedrich Max Müller (1861) and William Dwight Whitney (1881) were the first of the more recent scholars who wrote explicitly on transfer. However, the first crucial contributions to transfer studies were made in the 20th century by Charles Fries (1945), Uriel Weinreich (1953) and Robert Lado (1957). Over the next decades, they were followed by works of Susan Gass and Larry Selinker (1983, 2008), Eric Kellerman and Mike Sharwood Smith (1986), Terence Odlin (1989), Rod Ellis (2008), Jarvis and Pavlenko (2008), and many others. A few shorter empirical works specifically directed at bidirectional transfer have recently appeared as well, e.g., by Aneta Pavlenko and Scott Jarvis (2002), Amanda Brown and Marianne Gullberg (2008), Alison Gabriele (2009) and Aasa Moattarian (2013).

2. Methodology

This chapter discusses the methods that have been chosen to elicit and analyze language data used in our study. It explains the reasons behind these choices and identifies their drawbacks.

2.1 Participants

The choice of participants and methods to elicit their language production were determined partly by the aim of the project, partly by the limits given by the circumstances of data collection. The aim of the whole project was not only to examine the influence of L1 (Hindi) on L2 (Czech), but also the reverse transfer. For that reason, it was crucial to choose respondents who have been staying in the Czech Republic for the longest possible period, as it has been confirmed that the probability of reverse transfer increases with increasing proficiency in L2.¹⁵ The choice of less proficient learners would have yielded far more examples of language transfer from L1 to L2. However, the high level of proficiency of our participants enabled us to identify the areas where the influence of L1 on L2 is most persistent and causes errors even after many years of language acquisition.

2.1.1 A brief outline of migration

The number of Indians who settled down in Czechoslovakia before 1989 was extremely small. In the 1990s, after the opening of the borders, primarily economic migrants from the Indian subcontinent started passing through the Czech Republic, which has since then played the role of a

¹⁵ Jarvis and Pavlenko (2008), 40.

transit country on the way to Western Europe, in particular Germany. The migrants from India were mostly uneducated Punjabi L1 speakers with a predominantly agricultural background and often gruesome migration stories. The migrants who for some reason did not manage to proceed on their westward journey and stayed in the Czech Republic found occupation mostly in the then not very sophisticated Czech restaurant industry. The few Hindi L1 speakers who came in the 1990s and early 2000s and settled down in the Czech Republic were either professionals sent by their company, or students who came to pursue higher studies, usually coming from an educated middle class background. Most of them stayed because they found a Czech life partner or a good job opportunity. The majority of our respondents is a part of this immigration “wave”. In the last few years, the demographics of Hindi L1 speakers in the Czech Republic has changed dramatically. Czech Republic and especially Prague have been very recently discovered by Indian tourists¹⁶ and have since become a very popular tourist destination. Apart from that, it is also slowly becoming a popular place for professionals to spend a couple of years of decent life while being employed by a local branch of one of the multinational companies, mostly in the IT area. Some of these professionals start appreciating the buying power the multinational companies provide, along with relatively low cost of living, safety, functionality of public services, moderate climate, and free health care and education for their children, and decide to stay long-term. This will hopefully provide a much greater scope for future research of cross-linguistic influence relatively soon.

2.1.2 Snowball sampling

Due to the limited number of Hindi L1 long-term residents in the Czech Republic, the number of the respondents was set at ten, which also suited our intention to do qualitative rather than quantitative research. The vast majority of Indian immigrants to Czech Republic have been until very recently men, which shows in our sample as well (nine men and one woman). Because of their low discoverability and possible unwillingness to participate in an identity-based research, the snowball (chain) sampling was used, which is a non-probability sampling technique used in sociology in case of hidden populations. Hindi L1 speakers who had been in a friendly/professional relationship with the interviewer recruited respondents from among their friends and acquaintances (who were mostly acquainted with the interviewer as well). The setback of this approach lies in the homogeneous background and social status of respondents recruited through snowball sampling. In our case, it means that the respondents are almost exclusively university educated and fluent in English. The consequence is a high probability of a distorting transfer from English that has to be

¹⁶ During the tourist season 2016.

kept in mind. All instances of apparent transfer from Hindi to Czech or vice versa were reviewed to determine if transfer from English played any role in the process.

2.1.3. Participant data

As a follow up after the interview, the participants were sent a questionnaire with the following 14 questions. For the purpose of this thesis, all data has been fully anonymized. To protect the identity of the respondents (and as per the wish of some of them), the transcribed recordings were not included in the thesis.¹⁷

Questionnaire

1. What is your age category? Please mark one.

25-30, 30-35, 35-40, 40-45, 45-50, 50-55, 55-60

2. What is your occupation?

3. Where did you live before coming to Czech Republic (state/s and city/cities)?

4. What is your mother tongue?

5. What other languages do you speak fluently?

6. What other languages do you know on basic level?

7. How many years have you lived in the Czech Republic? Please mark one option.

5-10, 10-15, 15-20, 20-25, 25-30, more

8. How many years have you studied Czech language in intensive courses?

9. How many years have you studied Czech language in non-intensive courses?

10. What language/s do your parents speak together on a daily basis?

11. What language/s did your parents speak with you and your siblings on a daily basis?

12. What language (languages) do you speak with your partner on a daily basis? For how many years?

13. What languages do you speak with your friends (according to frequency)? 1., 2., 3.

14. What languages do you speak at work (according to frequency)? 1., 2., 3.

15. In what languages do you watch news, films, videos, etc.?

16. In what languages do you read books, newspapers, reports, etc.?

¹⁷ It is a matter of fact that the full transcripts of the recordings could have been fully anonymized only theoretically, considering the low number of Indians living in the Czech Republic on a long-term basis.

Table 1. Linguistic information regarding the participants

	BD (m.)	BK (m.)	GB (m.)	EK (m.)	ND (m.)
1. Age	45-50	30-35	40-45	30-35	45-50
2. Occupation	Business	Validation engineer	Engineer	Shop manager	Software engineer
3. Previous residence	Bangalore, Karnataka, India	Narnaul, Haryana, India	Dubai, UAE Karachi, Pakistan	New Delhi, India	Shahdol, Madhyapradesh India
4. Mother tongue	Hindi	Hindi	Urdu	Kumauni ¹⁸	Bengali, Hindi
5. Fluency	Hindi, English, Czech	English, Czech	Arabic, English, Czech	Hindi, English, Czech	Hindi, English, Czech
6. Basics	Other Indian languages	Punjabi, French		Punjabi, Slovak	Punjabi, Russian
7. Time spent in the Czech Republic (yrs)	20-25	10-15	15-20	10-15	25-30
8. Intensive Czech course	0	1 year	0	1 year	1 year
9. Non-intensive Czech course	0	0	0	0	3 years
10. Parents together	Hindi	Hindi	Urdu, Pashto	Kumauni, Punjabi	Bengali
11. Parents with children	Hindi	Hindi	Urdu	Hindi	Bengali, Hindi
12. Partner (years)	Czech, English (20 years)	Hindi (6 years)	English, Czech (approx. 20 years)	English, Slovak, Czech (several years)	Czech (15 years)
13. Friends (according to)	Hindi, English, Czech	English, Hindi, Czech	Urdu, Czech, English	Hindi, English, Czech	Hindi, Czech, Bengali

¹⁸ A language spoken in Uttarakhand, listed under Hindi in the Census of India 2011 languages section.

frequency)					
14. At work	English, Czech, Hindi	English, Czech	Czech, English	Czech, Hindi, English	Czech, English
15. Listening	Hindi, English, Czech	English, Hindi	English, Czech	English	Hindi, English, Czech
16. Reading	Hindi, English, Czech	English	English, Urdu	English	Hindi, English, Czech
Elicited material (Czech)	18:64 1613 words	12:35 min. 700 words	10:15 min. 1316 words	11:18 min. 684 words	12:31 min. 1172 words
Elicited material (Hindi)	10:58 1325 words	12:06 min.	8:02 min. 1292 words	22:57 min.	23:15 min.
	SL (m.)	SS (m.)	NT (m.)	TD (f.)	UV (m.)
1. Age	35-40	30-35	40-45	30-35	35-40
2. Occupation	IT support	Marketing, filmmaking	Business	Recruitment	Entrepreneur
3. Previous residence	New Delhi, India	New Delhi, Pune, India	Germany Mumbai, Indore, India	New Delhi, India	Mumbai, India Bratislava, Slovakia (15 months)
4. Mother tongue	Hindi	Hindi, English, Punjabi	Hindi, Sindhi	Hindi, English	Gujarati, Hindi
5. Fluency	Punjabi, Haryanvi, English, Czech	Czech, Slovak	Hindi, English, Czech	English, Hindi, Czech	Hindi, Marathi, Urdu, Czech, Slovak
6. Basics	Sanskrit	Marathi, Sanskrit, French	German	Spanish	Russian
7. Time spent in the Czech Republic (yrs)	10-15	5-10	15-20	25-30	15-20
8. Intensive	1 year	1 month	0	2 months	0

Czech course				Czech school from grade 2 to grade 6	
9. Non- intensive Czech course	2 years	6 months	6 months	0	0
10. Parents together	Hindi	Hindi, Punjabi	Sindhi	Hindi	Gujarati
11. Parents with children	Hindi	Hindi, English, Punjabi	Hindi, Sindhi	Hindi, English	Gurajati, Hindi
12. Partner (years)	Hindi (several years)	English, Slovak (mixed with Czech), Hindi (approx. 10 years)	English mixed with Czech/Hindi (15 years)	English (10 years)	Slovak, Czech (several years)
13. Friends (according to frequency)	Hindi, English, Punjabi	English, Czech/Slovak, Hindi	English, Czech, Hindi	Czech, English	English, Hindi, Czech
14. At work	English, Czech, Hindi	English, Hindi, Czech	Czech, English	Czech, English	English, Czech
15. Listening	English, Hindi, Czech	English, Czech, Hindi	English, Hindi	English, sometimes Czech	English, Hindi
16. Reading	English, Hindi, Czech	English, Hindi	English, Hindi	English	English, Czech
Elicited material (Czech)	14:27 min. 1137 words	10:30 min. 953 words	8:59 min.	7:09 min.	20:01 min. 1740 words
Elicited material (Hindi)	14:18 min.	9:48 min.	8 min.	16:44 min.	19:46 min.

2.2 The elicitation method

No incentives were given to the participants to take part in the research. The success of the elicitation process depended solely on the social capital of the researcher and on the generosity of the participants. For that reason, the time, place and the extent of the interview were chosen to be of maximum convenience to the respondents. The time frame was set at 20 minutes of recording, approximately 10 minutes of Czech and 10 minutes of Hindi. The time and place of the recording was determined by the respondents themselves.¹⁹

Researchers working on bidirectional transfer have used a variety of methods to elicit language data. Their suitability for the current project varies. The available methods can be roughly divided into two groups – eliciting written or oral data. One way to obtain written material is via translation, as Aasa Moattarian (2013) did in her study of bidirectional influence between Persian and English in Persian L1 English learners. In her study, half of the participants translated a letter from their L1 to L2, and the other half did a reverse translation. This method enabled her to analyze language influence in different language subsystems while preventing the participants from avoiding problematic structures and making them produce the desired target form (Moattarian 2013:41). The possibility of avoiding problematic grammatical forms raises a justified concern. Nevertheless, in our case the disadvantages that this approach brings outweigh its advantages. Our aim was to cover as many language subsystems as possible as well, but due to the aforementioned unavoidable brevity of the interviews, we did not have enough time at our disposal. The scheduled 20 minutes would not allow us to obtain the necessary amount of written output. Apart from that, a translation task is methodologically problematic. The claim that the participants have the same text at their disposal, only in different languages, is dubious – one of the texts is necessarily a translation of the other, along with inevitable traits of language transfer.

Another possibility would have been to use event description, which is usually employed to target a specific grammatical form, as was done by Alison Gabriele (2009) in her bidirectional study of learners of English and Japanese. This would undoubtedly be an appropriate option for further research. However, at this preliminary stage it is necessary to do the mapping of the bidirectional transfer between Hindi and Czech on as many levels of language as possible, which does not leave the space for targeting a specific grammatical phenomenon.

¹⁹ The interviews happened in a cafe (3), in a tearoom (1), in a restaurant (1), at a bar (2), at home (1) or at workplace (2).

Another option would be free writing on a given topic, which would enable us to cover more language subsystems. However, that would not offer a solution to the problem of possible avoidance of complex structures and vocabulary (and of the time limitation).

Apart from all the above mentioned, the elicitation of written material would in our case bring another unwelcome consequence, related to the learning process of the respondents. About a third of them attained a one-year intensive Czech course, but the rest of the respondents²⁰ gained their language competency through gradual language acquisition in second language environment rather than through systematic language learning. As a consequence, their self-confidence regarding their Czech language skills, especially writing, is very low. This might lead to the undesirable activation of affective filter, resulting in insufficient amount and low quality of language production.

Having considered all the above-mentioned potential drawbacks, the conclusion was to concentrate on eliciting oral output. The aim was to elicit as much output within the available time as possible. Many of the respondents showed low self-confidence regarding their knowledge of Czech combined with the fear that their Hindi has fallen prey to language attrition. To reduce the affective filter resulting from the anxiety of not being able to perform in any of the required languages, combined with being aware of the fact that they are participating in a linguistic survey and their language production is being recorded, the decision was made to make the circumstances of the interview as natural as possible. The interview was therefore given a form of an informal dialogue between the interviewer and the respondent in a situation similar to “meeting an old friend/close friend’s friend”. Regarding its execution, the interview was thus bordering on participant observation. The same can be said about its aims. In the words of Diane Larsen Freeman and Michael H. Long:²¹ “in participant observation, the researchers take part in the activities they are studying. They do not approach the study with any specific hypotheses in mind; rather they take copious notes on whatever they observe and experience.” Although we did have a few hypotheses at the beginning of the research, most of the findings materialized as a result of the analysis of the obtained language data.

It came as a surprise that in case of some respondents, the affective filter seemed to work strongly even when they were using Hindi. They seemed to feel insecure regarding the knowledge of their L1 that they have been using only with their partner or a few friends over the past many years. The informal setting had other benefits – most of the respondents were ready to talk longer than the set amount of time and overcame their anxieties regarding the fact that their speech is being recorded. To standardize the interview to a certain degree, the questions asked by the interviewer revolved

²⁰ With the exception of TD who studied in a Czech school.

²¹ Larsen Freeman and Long (1991), 60.

around similar topics each time – first arrival in the Czech Republic, job, family, and daily life. Discussing realities of the life in the Czech Republic with a Czech L1 speaker was aimed at facilitating cases of reverse transfer from Czech to Hindi, using the observer effect. For that reason, the interview was preceded by a small talk in Czech, which also served the purpose to put the respondent at ease and eliminate the need to cut out the first few minutes of the recording. For the above-mentioned reason, the interview in Hindi followed after the interview in Czech. However, as expected, this approach also had its disadvantages, which was confirmed after evaluating the elicited material. Everyday topics and simple questions enabled the participants to evade more complex vocabulary and grammar and in some cases even create an illusion of a perfect command over both the languages in question.²²

Almost all the Czech parts of the interviews and some of the Hindi parts were transcribed,²³ using oTranscribe.²⁴ During the transcription process, all errors were marked. After the transcription was done, error analysis was performed to single out errors resulting from transfer, which were then classified into categories according to language domains.

2.3 Problems of error analysis in regard to “Hindi”

2.3.1 Modern Standard Hindi

Elicited and transcribed speech was compared with Modern Standard Hindi (MSH) and Standard/Non-standard Czech,²⁵ as it has been defined and outlined by grammars and dictionaries that are considered to be standard in Hindi/Czech Second Language Teaching.²⁶ This is absolutely non-problematic in the case of Czech, which is a comparatively homogeneous language, with its slightly more than 10 million L1 speakers and very well codified standard and non-standard variants. Nevertheless, in case of Hindi, the comparison with MSH is extremely problematic. The area where Hindi is spoken is enormous. The so called “Hindi Belt” or “Hindi-Urdu Region” comprises of National Capital Territory of Delhi and nine North Indian states: Haryana, Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, Bihar, Jharkhand, Chattisgarh, Uttarakhand and Himachal Pradesh. In the 2011 Indian census²⁷, more than population of 528 million Indians declared Hindi as their first language (“mother tongue” in the language of the census, defined as “language spoken in childhood by the

²² E.g., in case of TD whose Czech and Hindi is almost error free on the basic spoken level.

²³ Regarding Hindi material, only passages with evidence of language transfer have been transcribed. In case of TD, the same has been done for both the languages (because of her impeccable knowledge of both), as well as in case of NT, who found time to meet only a few days before the deadline.

²⁴ “oTranscribe,” accessed between January 1 and May 31, 2019, <https://otranscribe.com/>.

²⁵ Based on the vernacular of Prague where all of the respondents live.

²⁶ Hindi: Montaut (2004), McGregor (1993), McGregor (1995); Czech: Štícha (2018), Filipec et al. (2003).

²⁷ Census of India 2011, http://www.censusindia.gov.in/2011Census/C-16_25062018_NEW.pdf, 6.

person's mother to the person").²⁸ The census report lists 40 dialects (including "others" and "Hindi" itself) under the Hindi section, some of which (e.g., the dialects of Rajasthan in the West, the dialects of Bihar in the east and the Pahari dialects in the North) could under different circumstances be classified as languages, not dialects. Modern Standard Hindi is based on the mixed dialect of 17th-century Delhi (Khari Boli) and its postulation as the language of most of North India was rather a political decision aimed at the creation of a national language of independent India than a purely linguistic one. MSH can be characterized as "the dialect spoken by educated urban speakers in casual conversation."²⁹ While comparing the elicited language production to Modern Standard Hindi, it is necessary to keep in mind that the Hindi L1 Czech speakers come from different parts of the Hindi belt. It therefore becomes immensely difficult to mark something as "incorrect" Hindi, as it might be just a manifestation of uncodified colloquial language or dialect and not an error resulting from language transfer (from Czech, English or other languages).³⁰

2.3.2 Hindi and Urdu

The snowball method has resulted in recruiting only one Urdu speaker, whereas the original aim was to examine language production of both Hindi and Urdu L1 speakers. Nevertheless, it opens the question of the relationship of Hindi and Urdu and the relevance of his participation in the research. The relationship between Hindi and Urdu is an issue related to the historical development of Modern Standard Hindi. Almost 51 million Indians declared Urdu as their first language, and another 13 millions Urdu L1 speakers live in Pakistan. The linguistic situation is rather peculiar – Hindi and Urdu are considered different languages in the sociocultural sense, but their spoken forms show only negligible differences in the vocabulary and grammar. At the same time, the written variants of both can in extreme cases (academic writing or religious literature) become mutually unintelligible, because they draw vocabulary from two different registers (Sanskrit in the case of Hindi and Arabic and Persian in case of Urdu). Masica (1991:27) defines them as "different literary styles based on the same linguistically defined dialect"(Khari Boli). Apart from that, they are both written in a different script – Hindi in Devanagari and Urdu in a modified Perso-Arabic script. In spite of all these differences, for the purpose of this study, which is based solely on the colloquial form which is almost identical, Urdu speakers are just as relevant as Hindi speakers. Nevertheless, we use the term "Hindi" for both in our study, as has been stated above, because the vast majority of the respondents are Hindi speakers, and Urdu is mentioned only in cases where the spoken form differs from Hindi.

²⁸ Census of India 2011, http://www.censusindia.gov.in/2011Census/C-16_25062018_NEW.pdf, 3.

²⁹ Ohala (1983) cited in Masica (1991), 92.

³⁰ Whenever we identified an "error" in Modern Standard Hindi" as a manifestation of a dialect, it was considered irrelevant for the study of transfer. In problematic cases, the comparative study of Indo-Aryan languages by Colin Masica (Masica 1991) was consulted.

2.3.3 Multilingualism

Another phenomenon, peculiar to the Indian subcontinent, that has to be taken into account is the very common occurrence of (often passive) multilingualism, especially pertinent to city dwellers due to mass migration. Apart from the knowledge of one's own language/dialect, it is very common for the inhabitants of India to be acquainted with Modern Standard Hindi, an adjacent language/dialect and at least some level of English. As a part of the colonial legacy, English still plays the role of lingua franca in India and is considered the language of prestige and status. This has been only reinforced by the globalization, increasing presence of multinational companies on the Indian market and also massive emigration resulting in the existence of a numerous Indian diaspora populations, especially in English speaking countries such as Great Britain and the United States. This multilingualism can pose another difficulty when trying to detect the influence of L1 and vice versa. As most of the respondents are well-educated professionals well versed in English, it is especially this second language which is likely to interfere with their Czech acquisition.

3. Phonological and phonetic transfer

Keeping the above-mentioned restrictions in mind, the obtained language material has been analyzed with respect to the phonological (and phonetic) transfer. In general, it can be stated that “non-native” pronunciation as a symptom of phonological and phonetic transfer is an area that shows the most significant influence from one's L1 to L2, and is the most resistant to change. This has proven right for our study as well. There has been an immense number of findings in the Hindi – Czech direction in Hindi L1 speakers, but hardly any in the opposite direction. Author's previous experience with teaching Czech to Hindi L1 speakers made her aware of the most striking difficulties that the students of Czech experience, as far as pronunciation is concerned. It was relatively straightforward to link these recurring mispronunciation patterns and the findings based on the elicited data to the contrastive analysis of both the languages, classify them and identify possible pitfalls for Czech L2 learners. Attention was paid mainly to pronunciation errors resulting in a realization of a different phoneme according to IPA (e.g., český [tʃeskɪ] vs. češky [tʃeʃkɪ]). Nevertheless, pronunciation errors that do not result in a perception of a different phoneme by a native speaker, but are identified as “non-native” pronunciation (e.g., insufficient palatalization), occur very often as well and will be also occasionally mentioned.

The phoneme systems of Czech and Hindi show a great number of similarities. On the other hand, there are also many differences that could potentially prove productive in regard to language trans-

fer. Let us systematically analyze the particular differences and see if they indeed influence the acquisition of Czech in Hindi L1 speakers.

3.1 Vowels

3.1.1 The vowel systems of Hindi and Czech

Let us first introduce phonology systems of both the languages, starting with vowels. Hindi has ten basic vowels.³¹

The Hindi vowel system

Transliteration	Devanagari	IPA
a	अ	ə
ā	आ	ɑ:
i	इ	ɪ
ī	ई	i:
u	उ	ʊ
ū	ऊ	u:
e	ए	e:
o	ओ	o:
ai	ऐ	ɛ: ³²
au	औ	ɔ:

Czech, on the other hand, has five monophthongs, each of which has a short and a long version, and three diphthongs.

The Czech vowel system

Czech phonetic transcription	IPA
a	a
á	a:
i	ɪ
í	i:
u	ʊ

³¹ See Shapiro (2003), 285 (with small alterations).

³² Shapiro (2003), 284: „Diphthongal realizations [...] are common in eastern and many nonstandard western dialects.”

ú/ů	u:
e	ε
é	ε:
o	o/ɔ
ó	o:/ɔ:
a	aɔ̃
eu	eɔ̃
ou	oɔ̃/ɔɔ̃

3.1.2 Diphthongs

Based on contrastive analysis, it seems that problems with the acquisition of Czech vowels will most likely be scarce as the vowel systems show great resemblances. The non-existence of diphthong [oɔ̃/ɔɔ̃] in Hindi seems to be an issue. How do the Hindi L1 speakers deal with this problem? The collected data shows that the pronunciation of [oɔ̃/ɔɔ̃] does cause difficulties, which leads to simplification,³³ e.g. in SS: “dovolen[u:]” instead of “dovolen[oɔ̃/ɔɔ̃]”, “s holk[u:]” instead of “s holk[oɔ̃/ɔɔ̃]”,³⁴ GB: “sel[u:], sel[u]” instead of “cel[oɔ̃/ɔɔ̃]”, BK: “dl[ɔ]ho” instead of “dl[oɔ̃/ɔɔ̃]ho”. The diphthongs [eɔ̃] and [aɔ̃] occur sporadically and only in loanwords. When they do occur, they tend to get simplified to a single vowel as well (SS: “[vəʔ]eroškola” instead of “[fʔ]aeroškole”).

The parallel between the long and short vowel pairs should result in very few errors in vowel length (there is no short “ε” and “o” in Hindi). Our data corresponds with this assumption to a great extent, with the exception of a few errors (shortening). Surprisingly, they occur even in vowels that have their long counterpart in Hindi. SL: vr[a]tyl instead of vr[a:]til, mjes[ɪ]ců instead of mēs[i:]ců, BD: př[ɪ]stý instead of př[ɪ:]šτί). However, these are exceptions rather than a rule. Errors concerning vowel length are in general very rare in the Czech language production of Hindi L1 speakers, especially compared to students with L1 where the vowel length is determined by subsequent phonemes (German).

³³ The same phenomenon can be observed in the Romani ethnolect.

³⁴ It might be of interest that SS is married to a person from Slovakia. Slovak language does not have the diphthong “ou” and uses “ú” instead, however, not in instr. sg. f., which is the second of the above-mentioned cases. That means that we might have encountered a transfer from Slovak and its overgeneralization. Anyway, this is one of the features that make the Hindi L1 speakers sometimes sound like speakers of a Moravian dialect. For the next instance, see the shortening of vowels.

3.1.3 [ɪ] versus [ɛ]

As far as contrastive analysis of the vowel systems is concerned, no phoneme substitution should be expected. Nevertheless, our data analysis shows that it does occur, though rarely, namely in case of the mispronounced vowel i/y [ɪ] (B: “tad[ɛ]” instead of “tad[ɪ]”, “někd[ɛ]” instead of “někd[ɪ]”). However, this could be nothing else than a result of an excessive imitation of one aspect of the central Bohemian dialect, i.e., the open pronunciation of i(y)/í(ý). This mispronunciation can complicate understanding, e.g., SL answers a time question (kd[ɪ], when) wrongly as a location question (kd[ɛ], where). Nasalization occurs in Czech only sporadically in cases of lax pronunciation. At the same time, it is an important aspect of the Hindi vowel system. However, there is no evidence of this trait of Hindi affecting the pronunciation of Czech vowels in any way.

3.2 Consonants

Regarding consonants, the situation is more complex. The contrastive analysis will follow the Hindi alphabet pattern, as it is based on linguistic criteria. Hindi alphabet has 37 consonants, the organization of which reproduces the order of the Sanskrit alphabet, developed by Panini in the 4th century BC. The alphabet of Sanskrit is arranged systematically, based on the locus of pronunciation. It consists of five groups of five consonants (gutural, palatal, retroflex, dental and bilabial), each of which contains a voiceless unaspirated, a voiceless aspirated, a voiced unaspirated and a voiced aspirated stop and a homorganic nasal. These 25 consonants are followed by three approximants, a flap, and four fricatives. Apart from these, Hindi has developed two retroflex flaps (aspirated and unaspirated) from retroflex stop consonants (mostly functioning as their allophones in certain environments). Modern Standard Hindi has also acquired two loan phonemes:³⁵ a voiceless labiodental fricative [f] and a voiced sibilant [z]. To get a better idea about the overlaps and differences from the Czech alphabet, the Czech consonant system has been arranged in a similar order and the differences between the two systems have been highlighted.

³⁵ Urdu has three more: uvular voiceless stop [q], voiceless uvular fricative [χ] and voiced velar fricative [ɣ].

3.2.1. The consonant systems of Hindi and Czech

The Hindi consonant system³⁶

stops:	voiceless	voiceless aspirated	voiced	voiced aspirated ³⁷	nasals:
velar	k क [k]	kh ख [kʰ]	g ग [g]	gh घ [gʱ]	ṅ ङ [ŋ] ³⁸
retroflex	ṭ ट [ʈ]	ṭh ठ [ʈʰ]	ḍ ड [ɖ]	ḍh ढ [ɖʱ]	ṇ ण [ɳ]
dental	t त [t]	th थ [tʰ]	d द [d]	dh ध [dʱ]	n न [n]
bilabial	p प [p]	ph फ [pʰ]	b ब [b]	bh भ [bʱ]	m म [m]
(uvular	q क [q])				

palatal sibilant affricates:

voiceless	voiceless aspirated	voiced	voiced aspirated	nasal:
c च [tʃ]	ch छ [tʃʰ]	j ज [dʒ]	jh झ [dʒʱ]	ñ ञ [ɲ]

approximants:

y य [j]	l ल [l]	v व [v]
---------	---------	---------

flaps: plain **voiced aspirated**

retroflex r̥ ढ [ɾ] **r̥h ढ [ɾʰ]**

alveolar r र [r]

fricatives: voiceless voiced

postalveolar ś श [ʃ]

retroflex ṣ ष [ʂ]

alveolar s स [s]³⁹ z ज [z]

labial f फ [f]

glottal h ह [h]

(uvular **kh ख [χ])**

(velar ḡ ग [ɣ])

The Czech consonant system

stops: voiceless voiced nasals:

³⁶ Wherever the classification of particular phonemes was problematic, I tend to follow the IPA classification.

³⁷ “The series of so-called voiced aspirates should now properly be considered to voicing mechanism of murmur, in which the air flow passes through an aperture between arytenoid cartilages, as opposed to passing between the ligamental vocal bands“. Shapiro 2003, 286.

³⁸ The velar and the palatal nasal occur as allophones of the dental n that occur in consonant clusters before homorganic stops.

³⁹ Masica, p. 99: „A s/ʃ distinction is now well-established in the overall systems of Standard Hindi-Urdu, but ʃ is found exclusively in loanwords from Sanskrit, English, and above all, Persian. No distinction is made in ordinary speech between Sanskrit ṣ and ś in tatsamas, both merging with the Persian ʃ, although there is naturally a retroflex allophone before retroflex consonants.“

velar	k [k]	g [g]	n [ŋ] ⁴⁰
palatal	ṭ [c]	ḍ [ɟ]	ñ [ɲ]
alveolar	t [t]	d [d]	n [n]
bilabial	p [p]	b [b]	m [m]
(glottal	ʔ [ʔ])		
sibilant affricates:	postalveolar voiceless	voiced	alveolar voiceless voiced
	č [tʃ]	dž [dʒ]	c [ts] dz [dz]
approximants:			
j [j]	l [l]		
alveolar trills:	voiceless	voiced	
apical: r [r]	laminal: ř [r̝] ř [r̞]		
fricatives:	voiceless	voiced	
postalveolar	š [ʃ]	ž [ʒ]	
alveolar	s [s]	z [z]	
labiodental	f [f]	v [v]	
velar	ch [x]	ɣ [ɣ]	
glottal		h ě [h]	
syllabic consonants:	r [r]	l [l]	m [m]

3.2.2 Consonant clusters

As was stated above, the differences in consonant systems offer a much more fertile ground for analysis than the vowel systems. Generally speaking, it can be said that Hindi and other modern Indo-Aryan languages, unlike their ancient predecessors such as Sanskrit, show a much lower frequency of consonant clusters than Czech. The reason for the loss of consonant clusters can be argued,⁴¹ nevertheless, it is a matter of fact that clusters of more than two consonants are extremely rare in Hindi and occur solely in direct loanwords from Sanskrit (tatsama). On the other hand, clusters of two and more consonants are very common in Czech. While looking at the elicited data, it becomes evident that Hindi L1 speakers occasionally facilitate the pronunciation of large Czech clusters by inserting an additional vowel, e.g., in words like “urduštyna” instead of “urdština” (GB, probably also influenced by the existence of the word “urdū”). Some Czech consonant clusters consist only of two consonants which is not unusual in Hindi, but their particular combination does not

⁴⁰ Just like in Hindi, the velar nasal is an allophone of the alveolar nasal that occurs in consonant clusters before velar stops.

⁴¹ We can mention the concept of the Indian Sprachbund – the Indo-Aryan languages have lived for thousands of years in a close relationship with the Dravidian languages in the Southern part of India that have never favored any consonant clusters.

occur in Hindi. Hindi allows only for a very limited number of consonant combinations in a cluster (most of them involving the alveolar flip [ɾ] or a preceding homorganic nasal). Again, there is a tendency to insert an additional vowel (GB: “[vɪd]aná” instead of “[v]daná”, “[vetʃ]eštynu” instead of “[ftʃ]eštině”, SS: “ch[ats]eš” instead of “ch[ts]eš”, which actually is a three consonant cluster from the point of view of Hindi phonology). This happens also in the case of the syllabic consonant [ɾ], e.g., EK: “t[ar]valý”, “b[ar]zo” instead of “t[ɾ]valý”, “b[ɾ]zo”.⁴² Avoiding consonant clusters that do not exist in Hindi can also take the form of cluster simplification, especially consonant dropping in case of the initial “[f]” (SL: “[ʃ]echno” instead of “[fʃ]echno”, SS: “[s]távám” instead of “[fs]távám”, BD: “[k]olu” instead of “[ʃk]olu”). This is one of the cases when a transfer error coincides with an intralingual error, as the simplification occurs also in the speech of L1 speakers, especially in the colloquial form and young age, e. g.: “ještě nechci [s]távat” instead of “ještě nechci [fs]stávat”, I don’t want to get up yet. It is possible that in some cases, an error of a Hindi L1 grown up can fossilize also due to communication with their Czech L1 children.

3.2.3 Assimilation

The question of assimilation is particularly interesting, especially the assimilation of one-phoneme prepositions. Our material shows that L1 speakers of Hindi, which uses neither prepositions, nor the Czech type of regressive assimilation, try to avoid the unfamiliar consonant combination and assimilation by using the longer variant of the one-phoneme preposition (e.g., “ve” instead of “v”, such as SL: “[ve] Dillí”, “[ve] Belgie” instead of “[v] Dillí, [v] Belgii”, “[ve] centru”, “[ve] plánu”, “[ve] Indie” instead of “[f] centru”, “[f] plánu”, “[fʃ] Indii”; GB: “[ve] Pákistánu”, “[ve] čestynu”, “[ve] začátek”). Hindi does not use the glottal stop [ʔ], which is commonly used in Czech and less commonly in Moravian dialects. The absence of the glottal stop prevails also in the elicited material (GB: “[ve]nglisky” instead of “[fʔa]ngličtině”). This factor contributes to the occasional resemblance of Hindi L1 speakers’ pronunciation to the pronunciation of speakers of Moravian dialects, especially when reinforced by their longer stay in Moravia. E.g., the absence of the glottal stop again features very strongly in the speech of SL who spent several years in Brno, Moravia. In other cases, the respondents did use the glottal stop, but did not assimilate and used the Hindi vowel [ə] to avoid the clash of a voiced and voiceless consonant (SS: “[vəʔ]eroškola” instead of “[fʔ]aeroškole”).

⁴² It is interesting that we encounter a similar phenomenon in Hindi borrowings from Sanskrit (tatsamas). The original Sanskrit syllabic consonant ɾ is pronounced in Hindi as [ri] (and [ru] in other New Indo-Aryan languages such as Oriya).

Unlike in Czech, final devoicing does not play a big role in Hindi, though it occasionally occurs. The effects of this can be seen in our data as well (e.g., EK: “kdy[ʒ]” instead of “kdy[j]”, SL: “náze[v]” instead of “náze[f]”).

3.2.4. Palatals

If we look at the consonant system as a whole, we can notice two significant differences, i.e., a complete absence of aspirated and retroflex consonants in Czech. However, this is a source of difficulties for Czech L1 speakers learning Hindi rather than the other way round. The Hindi consonant system has both dental and retroflex stops and nasals, while Czech has only one set of alveolars, but even this causes problems mainly for Czech L1 Hindi learners who are often unable to distinguish between the two Hindi sets, while the reverse case causes no such confusion. Nevertheless, there is a set of stops that does not exist in Hindi and poses a great difficulty for Hindi L1 Czech learners, namely the voiceless and voiced palatal stop, and the palatal nasal, which does occur in Hindi solely before homorganic sibilant affricates, never independently. Based on the elicited material and on personal experience, it is possible to make the claim that this is one of the most often recurring pronunciation errors that occurs even in the speech of learners who have spent more than 20 years in the Czech Republic with Czech life partners (BD, ND). There are different ways in which Hindi L1 speakers avoid the pronunciation of the Czech palatal stops and nasal or substitute them with Hindi phonemes. One way to avoid them is to use the dental/alveolar stop followed by [j] instead, e.g. in “[tj]ežký” instead of “[c]ežký”, “u[dj]elávám” instead of “[j]elávám” (BD), SL: “posledn[j]e” instead of “posled[n]e”, “Brn[j]e” instead of “Br[n]e”, BK: “upln[j]e” instead of “úpl[n]e”, “hodn[j]e” instead of “hod[n]e”. This solution appears extremely often in the speech production of respondents residing in Czech Republic for 5-10 years, such as SS or SL. The substitution with Hindi phonemes includes either dental stops, sometimes slightly palatalized (e.g., SL: “vrá[ɽ]il” instead of “vrá[c]il”, “[ɽ]isíce” instead of “[c]isíce”, “dě[ɽ]i” instead of “dě[c]i”, “zemje[ɽ]elské” instead of “zemje[j]elské”, “ro[ɽ]iče” instead of “ro[j]iče”), or with a much lower frequency palatal sibilant affricates (BK: “te[ɽ]” instead of “te[c]”, SS: “de[ɽ]i” instead of “de[c]i”, BD: “te[ɽ]ko” instead of “te[c]ko”).

3.2.5 Sibilant affricates

There is another exceptionally persistent difficulty in pronunciation, resulting from the absence of sibilant affricates ([tʃ], [dʒ], [ts], [dz]) in Hindi. There is a tendency to replace the alveolar voiceless affricate with a corresponding alveolar sibilant, which can persist many decades, if it is not pre-

vented at an early stage of learning, especially by making learners aware of the constituents of [ts], which both exist in Hindi. This evident pronunciation error can then have a disturbing effect even in learners on advanced proficiency level, e.g., BD (“vždy[s]ky” instead of “vždy[ts]ky”, “ří[s]t” instead of “ří[ts]t”,), or GB (“sedmná[s]t” instead of “sedmná[ts]t”, “ofi[s]iální” instead of “ofi[ts]iální”, “dě[s]kama” instead of “dě[ts]kama”). This simplification sometimes transfers also to the voiceless postalveolar sibilant affricate (BD: “spole[ʃ]ný” instead of “spole[tʃ]ný”).

3.2.6. Trills and flaps

The difference between the Czech alveolar apical trill [r] and the Hindi alveolar flap [ɾ] does not cause any obvious pronunciation or understanding problems for either Hindi L1 learners of Czech or Czech L1 learners of Hindi, especially when compared to other bidirectional language exchanges, e.g., between Hindi and English with its alveolar approximant [ɹ]. Nevertheless, the laminal, partially fricative alveolar trill ř ([r̥]/[r̥]) poses a problem to literally every student of Czech language (even Czech L1 speakers learning Czech), and Hindi L1 speakers are no exception. It is one of the cases when a transfer error concurs with an intralingual error. The typical substitutes while pronouncing this consonant are [ʒ] (SS: “[ʒ]ekl” instead of “[r̥]ekl”, even “p[ʒ]ed” instead of “p[r̥]ed”, SL: “samo[zr̥]ejmě” simplified to palatalized samo[ʒ]ejmje, [rtʃ] (SL: “p[rtʃ]ijel” instead of p[r̥]ijel), [ʃ] (SL: “bakalá[ʃ]” instead of “bakalá[r̥]”), SS: “t[ʃ]i” instead of “t[r̥]i”, GB: “p[ʃ]ijedou” instead of “p[r̥]ijedou”).

3.2.7 Postalveolar and alveolar fricatives

Two of the Czech postalveolar and alveolar sibilant fricatives, the voiced postalveolar ž [ʒ] and the voiced alveolar z [z] show potential for pronunciation errors as well. Ž [ʒ] is very often replaced by palatal sibilant affricate [dʒ], such as in “[dʒ]iju” instead of “[ʒ]iju”, “po[dʒ]íváme” instead of “po[ʒ]íváme”, “[dʒ]enou” instead of “[ʒ]enou” (GB), “man[dʒ]elku” instead of “man[ʒ]elku”, “udr[dʒ]itelný” instead of “udr[ʒ]itelný” (SL), “tak[dʒ]e” instead of “tak[ʒ]e” (BK), etc. Sometimes it is even replaced by the approximant [j]: ND: “takje” instead of “tak[ʒ]e”, UV: “proto[j]e instead of “proto[ʒ]e”, The situation regarding the voiced alveolar z [z] is more complex, as it exists in Hindi as a loan phoneme from Farsi. Nevertheless, our material bears witness to a phenomenon unexpected by those unacquainted with the peculiarities of the Hindi script. Some speakers pronounce [z] as [dʒ], e.g. SL: “me[dʒ]i” instead of “me[z]i”, “navi[dʒ]ucího” instead of “nava[z]ujícího”, “[dʒ]ačala” instead of “[z]ačala”, “[dʒ]emjedjelské” instead of “[z]emědělské”. As has been mentioned above, the reason for this can be found in the Hindi script. Some Hindi speakers, especially

from less educated strata and rural background, pronounce \bar{z} [z] as the same Devanagari character without the subscript dot (\bar{z} [d̪]), and this gets reflected also in their pronunciation of the Czech fricative [z]. However, we have also observed an alternative pronunciation that is closer to the original, namely [z] > [dz], such as in “[dz]nám” instead of “[z]nám” (SL), “[dz]mjenyla” instead of “[z]měnila”, “me[dz]inárodní” instead of “me[z]inárodní” (BK).

Voiceless postalveolar and alveolar sibilant fricatives also constitute a problematic area not only in respect to transfer, but their situation in Hindi itself is rather complicated, as mentioned above, which is only reinforced by the fact that some non-standard speakers use only one sibilant phoneme⁴³ ([ʃ/s]). This aspect of Hindi phonology shows even in our data ([ʃ] instead of [s], SL: “my[ʃ]lím” instead of “my[s]lím”, SS: “ča[ʃ]” instead of “ča[s]”, “po[ʃ]lali” instead of “po[s]lali”, “čá[ʃ]to” instead of “ča[s]to”; or the other way round, BD: “v[s]ichni” instead of “v[ʃ]chni”, “e[s]te” instead of “e[ʃ]tě”, BK: “kdy[s] jezdý[s]” instead of “kdy[ʃ] jezdí[ʃ]”. This fuzziness sometimes transfers even to the voiced sibilant fricative (SL: “ro[ʒ]hodl” instead of “ro[z]hodl”, BK: “pení[ʒ]e” instead of “pení[z]e”).

3.2.8 Labiodental and velar fricatives

Another difference between the consonant systems of both languages is the existence of the voiced approximant v \bar{v} [v]⁴⁴ in Hindi versus the labiodental voiced fricative v [v] in Czech. This difference results in pronunciation errors that cause the perception of a “non-native” accent by native speakers (such as in SL, BK, BD, GB: “d[v]a” instead of “d[v]a”, BK: “[v]esnice” instead of “[v]esnice”, SS: “s[v]ažák” instead of “s[v]ařák”, etc.).

Some Hindi phonology experts claim the existence of a velar fricative ch [x] in Hindi.⁴⁵ Nevertheless, based on the author’s experience with teaching Czech to Hindi L1 speakers, the conclusion had to be made that the Hindi consonant \underline{kh} \bar{x} is in reality an uvular fricative [χ], qualitatively different from the Czech velar fricative. The loan uvular fricative is however very often pronounced as the native stop kh \bar{kh} [kh] without the subscript dot, just like as in the case of the loan sibilant z \bar{z} [z] and the native stop j \bar{j} [d̪]. The elicited material shows the influence of this native pronunciation on the Czech velar fricative. For example, SL, NT: “Če[k^h]á[k^h]” instead of “Če[x]ách”, SL: “[k^h]arita” instead of “[x]arita”, SS: “[k^h]ci” instead of “[x]ci”, BD: “po[k^h]ázíme” instead of “po[x]ázíme”. Alternatively, glottal voiced [ɦ] (ND: “ku[ɦ]ám” instead of “ku[x]ám”) or even [k] is used (UV: “v Čechá[k]”).

⁴³ Shapiro (2003), 286.

⁴⁴ However, it can be also pronounced as voiced bilabial fricative or labiodental voiced fricative.

⁴⁵ Shapiro (2003), 286.

3.2.9 Stress

Last but not least – stress or accentuation definitely deserves due attention. In Czech, the stress is almost always on the first syllable of the word. There is an exception in case of one-syllable prepositions that take over the stress, though not always if the word has four or more syllables, and some one-syllable words that never stand at the beginning of a sentence (mi (to me), ti (to you), jsi (you are), etc.). Long words can have secondary stress on every odd syllable. Stress has no phonemic value and has no relation to the length of vowels or number of consonants in the syllable. On the other hand, in Hindi the situation is much less transparent. Starting with ancient Indian literature composed in Sanskrit, the stress is defined by the length/weight of a syllable, defined in different ways.⁴⁶ Most authors, such as Ohala (1983) use a version of Grierson’s stress rule laid down for vernacular New Indo-Aryan languages in general, summarized in Ohala (1983:93) and quoted by Shapiro (2003: 287): “Assign stress to the penultimate syllable if it is long, if it isn’t, keep moving backward until you find a long syllable. (If no such syllable is found, the accent is thrown back as far as possible but no further than preantepenultimate if it ends in a long vowel.)” The phonemic status of stress has been disputed. Montaut⁴⁷ explains the length (heaviness) of a syllable in the following way: “A syllable is heavy relatively to another one if it contains more moras (*mātrā*). A short vowel counts for 1 mora, a long vowel or short vowel + consonant for 2, a long vowel followed by a consonant for 3, a short vowel followed by two consonants equally for 3, a long vowel followed by two consonants for 4.” The different positioning of stress in Czech and in Hindi does occasionally result in incorrect positioning of the accent in our material, though in some of the participants who have been exposed to Russian, the influence might come from there (UV). E.g., UV: *pamatuju*, Bulhary. Also ND: *osláva*, *zakazany*, SL: *pomahali*, *od začatku*, *vitana*, GB: “Motorola”, SL: “stipendium”.⁴⁸ As we can see, the stress on the penultimate syllable is the most common, resembling the Romani ethnolect of Czech. Nevertheless, as we have mentioned above, it occurs only occasionally.⁴⁹

In this chapter, the most substantial cases of phonological and phonetic transfer from Hindi to Czech in Hindi L1 long-term Czech users have been identified. It has been shown that the transfer, manifesting itself as pronunciation errors, affects the consonant system of Czech much more extensively than the vowel system. Among others, two areas have been identified as especially problematic for Hindi L1 speakers in regard to pronunciation and should be paid special attention by teachers of

⁴⁶ One of the common definitions of a long syllable, used in ancient as well as more recent poetry, is a syllable either containing a long vowel, or a consonant cluster in the end, or both.

⁴⁷ Montaut (2004), 40.

⁴⁸ I would like to thank Prof. Dr. Liudmila Khokhlova for making me aware of the importance of stress in Hindi Second Language Teaching.

⁴⁹ I.e., a couple of times per interview in about a half of the interviews.

Czech as a Second Language: the Czech palatals (the voiceless and voiced palatal stop [c], [ɟ] and the palatal nasal [ɲ]) and the Czech alveolar voiceless affricate [ts].

4. Morphosyntactic transfer⁵⁰

The category of parts of speech has proven to be non-functional in many contexts and even distort the comprehension of linguistic phenomena. However, it will be useful for our analysis, because it will enable us to structure the different phenomena that occur in the field of morphosyntactic transfer. We will proceed in the way the parts of speech are usually ordered in grammars of the Czech language, starting with the declinables.

From the perspective of declension, Czech is by far richer than Hindi. In this regard, it would be more appropriate to compare it to the synthetic Old Indo-Aryan languages, such as Sanskrit with its eight cases, and a slightly higher number of declension paradigms in masculine, feminine and neuter genders than Czech.⁵¹ The biggest difference is that Modern Czech cannot really boast the Sanskrit dual. By contrast, Hindi has only two case forms, direct and oblique, and we will see the repercussions of this incompatibility of both systems for the Hindi L1 Czech learners.

4.1 Nouns

4.1.1 Gender

Regarding nouns, there are two main areas that are problematic for Hindi L1 Czech learners. One of them is gender, and the other, not surprisingly, the Czech case system, which is far more complex than the Hindi one. The first issue, gender, is quite straightforward. Hindi has only two genders, masculine and feminine, whereas Czech has three, masculine, feminine, and neuter. The gender distribution is naturally different in both languages, which causes transfer related errors. To give a few examples,⁵² UV says: “nějaký práce”, some work, where -ý is a masculine adjective ending, indicating that the speaker assumes that the word “práce”, work, is a masculine. “Práce” is indeed a masculine in Hindi (kām, m.), but a feminine in Czech. Other examples: ND: “jiný hlavu”, different head, where the ending -ý is a masculine adjective ending, but “hlava” is feminine in Czech, unlike in Hindi (sar, m.). BK: “můj (adj. m.) vesnice (noun f.)”, “z malého (adj. m.) vesnice (noun f.)”,

⁵⁰ In this chapter, the standard academic transliteration will be used for Hindi and the Czech phonetic transcription for Czech.

⁵¹ Upon being introduced to the Czech case system, Hindi L1 speakers often mention their intimidating experience with Sanskrit at school.

⁵² We will disregard pronunciation errors in the examples in this and the following chapters, because they do not play any role regarding the problems we are discussing, to prevent unnecessary confusion regarding the meaning of the quoted words/sentences.

small village, from small village. Again, village is a masculine in Hindi (gā~v, m.). BD: “dlouhá (adj. f.) příběh (m.)”, long story; story (kahānī, f.) is a feminine in Hindi, “taková (adj. f.) zvyk (noun m.), such a habit, because habit is a feminine in Hindi (ādat, f.). UV: “moje (poss. pron. f.) jazyk (m.)”, my language; language is a feminine in Hindi (bhāṣā, f., zubān, f.). SS: “takový (adj. m.) zkušenost (noun f.)”, such an experience; experience is a masculine in Hindi (anubhav, m.).

It is necessary to mention yet another factor that can cause the use of a wrong adjective ending. In Hindi, the typical adjective ending is -ā in masculine (direct form sg.) and -ī in feminine, whereas in Czech it is the other way round, -ý is the masculine adjective ending (nom.) and -á the feminine adjective ending (nom.).

An instance of reverse transfer in the area of gender was observed as well. The loanword “e-mail” is mostly used as a feminine in Hindi, but it is always a masculine in Czech. While speaking Hindi, EK uses the word “e-mail” as a masculine twice, which is characteristic for Czech, using the perfect participle with a masculine ending (“maĩ ne e-mail likhā (p.p. m.) hai”, an e-mail has been written by me). However, he immediately corrects himself and uses a feminine ending, which is typical for Hindi (“maĩ ne e-mail likhī (p.p. f.) hai”).

4.1.2. Suffixes

Errors concerning Czech suffixes occur in our data only seldom, as in UV: “účetník”, accountant, with the more common suffix -ík instead of “účetní” with the suffix -í. However, these phenomena are probably a consequence of overgeneralization and probably have nothing to do with language transfer, as there is hardly any resemblance between Czech and Hindi noun suffixes.

It might be worth mentioning that the recorded Czech data hardly show any instances of diminutives, which occur comparatively rarely in Hindi, but are very common in Czech. It seems that diminutives are avoided by Hindi L1 speakers, or used wrongly. E.g., SL makes an error, when he uses the diminutive “plánek” (plan, map) instead of “plán” (plan, intention).

4.1.3 Case system

One of the biggest challenges for many learners of Czech as a Second Language is the Czech case system, and Hindi L1 speakers are not an exception. Hindi can be characterized as an analytic language. As we have mentioned above, it has only two cases⁵³ and two genders. Each of the genders has just two basic paradigms – one for words ending in vowels and one for words ending in

⁵³ Direct and oblique (also called the direct and the indirect case); the vocative forms are almost identical with the oblique, except for a plural nasalization.

consonants⁵⁴. Czech, on the other hand, has seven cases (nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, vocative, locative and instrumental), and each of the three genders has four basic declension paradigms.

The analysis of the elicited speech production shows that concerning morphosyntax, case endings are probably the biggest difficulty that Hindi L1 learners have to face. Incorrect case endings occur comparatively often (usually once in every few sentences) even in case of the most advanced participants. The underlying problem is the fact that the Hindi oblique (indirect case) corresponds more or less to six cases in Czech. That requires the learners to acquire the ability to be able to identify which Czech case ending to use, based on the syntactic and semantic situation. The occurrence of these errors begs the question what the rules that govern the incorrect use are. Does the frequency of particular cases and case endings in the Czech language play any role? Computational linguistics provides us with information regarding the frequency of cases. Frequency of particular types and tokens has an influence on language usage in general,⁵⁵ and the less common case endings might fall prey to overgeneralization in an unfamiliar syntactic/semantic situation and be replaced by the more frequent ones, especially when L1 doesn't provide any clues.⁵⁶ František Čermák mentions the percentage representation of case distribution in the SYN2005 corpus: nominative 29,1%, genitive 27,5%, dative 3,6%, accusative 19,2%, vocative 0,35%, locative 11,8%, and instrumental 8,5%.⁵⁷

Taking into account the limits of this work, it is not possible to list all the types of incorrect endings. For that reason, we have decided to provide a list of the most common errors, along with typical examples.

Nominative, accusative

In Czech, direct object takes the form of accusative. On the contrary, in Hindi, direct object takes the direct form (which corresponds to the Czech nominative), unless it denotes a particular person, or there is emphasis on the fact that the object is a particular thing. The analysis of the elicited Czech language data shows that in case of direct object, nominative often occurs in the place of accusative. This seems to be a result of transfer working along with possible misgeneralization due to the higher frequency of nominative in Czech.

Here are some examples of a general non-living object in nominative instead of accusative. BK: “pak jsem studoval na ČVUT elektrotechnika (nom.)” instead of “pak jsem studoval na ČVUT

⁵⁴ Including minority vowel endings, mainly in tatsamas (words adopted directly from Sanskrit).

⁵⁵ Bybee (2013), 59.

⁵⁶ Andersen (1983), 222.

⁵⁷ Čermák (2017), 238.

elektrotechniku (acc.)”, then I studied electrical engineering at Czech Technical University, “hledal jsem práce (nom.)” instead of “hledal jsem práci (acc.)”, I searched for work, SS: “mám rád sobota (nom.)” instead of “mám rád sobotu (acc.)”, I like Saturday, GB: “používají urdština (nom.)” instead of “používají urdštinu (acc.)”, they use Urdu.

Nevertheless, nominative occasionally occurs instead of accusative even when the direct object is a particular person, which is ungrammatical in Hindi. NT: “máme jeden zaměstnanec (nom.)” instead of “máme jednoho zaměstnance (acc.)”, we have an employee, UV: “já mám Indové (nom.)” instead of “já mám Indy”, I have Indians, EK: “mám ještě teďka jeden student (nom.)” instead of “mám ještě teďka jednoho studenta (acc.)”, I have one more student now. We can again assume that misgeneralization is at work here.

However, instances of accusative endings being used in words that play the role of the subject of the sentence, i.e., instead of nominative endings, occur as well, although they are much less common. E.g., SS: “jde zprávu (acc.)” instead of “jde zpráva (nom.)”, a message comes, UV: “co je tady rodinu (acc.)” instead of “co je tady rodina (nom.)”, what is the meaning of family here. GB: “tři Pákistánce (acc.)” instead of “tři Pákistánci (nom.)”, three Pakistanis, “bráchy (acc.?) taky podnikají” instead of “bráchové (nom.) taky podnikají”, brothers are also entrepreneurs, though “bráchy” might probably be an alternative nominative plural ending of a different paradigm rather than accusative plural.

Genitive

In most syntactic/semantic situations where the Czech genitive case is used, Hindi uses the oblique form. Nevertheless, this does not apply to the Czech numerative (numerative genitive), i.e., genitive plural that is used with all numerals except for one, two, three and four (see chapter 4.5).

Apart from that, we have encountered several cases of use of nominative and even accusative endings instead of genitive endings. E.g., BK: “do Džajpur (nom.)” instead of “do Džajpuru (gen.)”, to Jaipur, GB: “od začátek (nom./acc.)” instead of “od začátku (gen.)”, from the beginning, “z angličtinu (acc.)” instead of “z angličtiny (gen.)”, from English, “od ženu (acc.)” instead of “od ženy (gen.)”, from my wife. The percentage representation of genitive nears that of nominative in Czech. However, nominative and accusative are usually taught at a much earlier stage, which might be the reason for its occasional replacement with these two cases, an error resulting from learning going hand in hand with the fact that the speakers’ L1 provides no guidance whatsoever regarding cases.

Dative

The dative case (indirect object) is always expressed through the oblique form in Hindi (plus the postposition “ko” or its equivalent). Nevertheless, even in this case, nominative endings sometimes replace the dative endings in the elicited Czech language data. E.g., SS: “píšu můj klient (nom.)” instead of “píšu mojemu klientovi”, I write to my client, “já jsem dal taky masáž doktor (nom.)” instead of “já jsem dal taky masáž doktorovi (dat.)”, I also gave a massage to the doctor, GB: “kvůli práce (nom./gen.)” instead of “kvůli práci (dat.)”, because of work. It is not unexpected, when we consider the percentage representation of dative in Czech.

Vocative does not occur in the elicited data.

Locative

In Hindi, the locative case is always expressed through the oblique form. Locative has an approximately three times lower representation in Czech than nominative, which might explain its very frequent replacement with nominative in the speech production of Hindi L1 learners. To quote a few examples, EK: “a co o víkend (nom.)” instead of “a co o víkendu (loc.)”, and what about the weekend, BD: “jsou na gymnázium (nom.)” instead of “jsou na gymnáziu (loc.)”, GB: “ve začátek (nom.)” instead of “na začátku (loc.)”, at the beginning, “v Roztoky” instead of “v Roztokách”, in Roztoky. In BD: “na kolej (nom./acc.)” instead of “na koleji (loc.)”, at students' dorm and UV: “na Staromák (nom./acc.)” instead of “na Staromáku (loc.)”. However, this error might have been caused by the ambiguity of the preposition “na”, which is used with both locative and accusative.

Instrumental

Again, we encounter cases where nominative is used instead of the much less common instrumental (e.g., UV: “s můj nejlepší kamarád (nom.)” instead of “s mým nejlepším kamarádem”), with my best friend. And again, frequency can be suspected along with a learning error.

Apart from the above mentioned types, there are examples of case endings being substituted seemingly randomly (frequency might have played role in some of them, but certainly not in all). E.g., BD: “protože jsem se neučil tady žádný školou (instr.)” instead of “protože jsem se neučil tady v žádný škole (loc.)”, because I did not study here in any school, GB: “v urdštinu (acc.)” instead of “v urdštině (loc.)”, but: “do anglický školce (loc.!)” instead of “do anglický školky (gen.!)”, to an English preschool, UV: “měl jsem obchodě (loc.!)” instead of “měl jsem obchod (acc.!)”, etc. Even singular and plural endings sometimes get confused, as in EK: “ten (sg.) policajti (pl.)” instead of “ten (sg.) policajt (sg.)”, that policeman. The only thing that can be stated with certainty is that the

case system must be very confusing for someone whose L1 declension is based on mere two forms, and that case endings indeed represent one of the biggest challenges for Hindi L1 learners of Czech.

4.2 Verbs

At first sight, the Czech and Hindi verb systems show a lot of differences. Czech has only three tenses, present, past and future, whereas Hindi uses habitual and progressive present, (past) imperfect, three perfect tenses and future tense. Apart from that, there are many linguistic phenomena in Hindi that Czech does not know, e.g., compound verbs, conjunct verbs, markers of secondary aspect and Aktionsart such as frequentative, durative, inceptive, conjunctive participle/absolutive (though Czech used to use transgressive), etc. On the other hand, Hindi lacks Czech reflexive verbs, and most importantly, aspect. Our analysis will first concentrate on verb tenses, and then on aspect, mood, reflexivity, etc.

4.2.1 Present tense

The Czech synthetic present tense has the potential to become another area for the manifestation of language transfer. However, the verb flexion does show some similarities. Though the Czech synthetic verb forms in present tense resemble rather those of Sanskrit than the compound forms of Hindi, the distribution of endings is alike. Both Czech and Hindi endings are governed by number (singular and plural) and person (1st, 2nd and 3rd). There are only two differences – in Hindi, gender plays a role even in the present tense, and there are three hierarchically ranked forms of the second person (tū, tum, āp) in Hindi compared to only two (ty, vy) in Czech. The Hindi habitual or general present is a compound tense, formed by the imperfect participle and the present of the auxiliary verb “to be” (honā). E.g., “tum kartī ho”, you (informal feminine) do. The Hindi progressive present is comprised of the verb stem, the perfect participle of the verb “to stay” (rahnā) and the present tense of the verb “to be” (honā). E.g., “tum kar rahī ho”, you (informal feminine) are doing. On the other hand, the present tense in Czech is synthetic and consists of the verb base, the present suffix and personal endings. E.g., “ty děl-á-š”, you (sg. informal) do/you are doing. There are five stem suffixes in Czech, corresponding to five conjugation classes (-e, -ne, -(u)je-, -í, -á).

As has been mentioned above, the endings in both languages follow the same number/person pattern, the difficulties therefore seem to prevail only on the initial stages of language acquisition. This can be clearly seen especially in the language production of SS who has spent the least time in the Czech Republic among our participants. SS: “Živana vstáváš (2nd person sg.)” instead of “Živana vstává (3rd person sg.)”, Živana gets up, “ona chceš (2nd person sg.) mléko” instead of “ona

chce (3rd person sg.) mléko”, she wants milk, “jako režisérka tam učíš (2nd person sg.)” instead of “jako režisérka tam učí (3rd person sg.), she teaches there as a film director, “oni (3rd person pl.) není (3rd person sg.) spokojený (3rd person pl. non-standard)” instead of “oni nejsou (3rd person pl.) spokojený”, they are not satisfied. Nevertheless, it occasionally happens even to more experienced speakers (UV: “já mám tady Indové (nom. pl.), který studuje (3rd person sg.) tady” instead of “já mám tady Indy (acc. pl.), který tady studujou (3rd person pl.)”, I have Indians here who study here, BD: “taky spolupracuje (3rd person sg.)” instead of “taky spolupracuju (1st person sg.)”, I also collaborate, “oni (pl.) neodpovídá (3rd person sg.)” instead of “oni neodpovídají (3rd person pl.)”, they do not respond.

The influence of the Hindi compound (analytic) form on the Czech synthetic form manifests itself in transfer errors, e.g., SS: “jsem (auxiliary) nemluvím”, “nahĩ (neg.) boltā (i.p.) hũ (auxiliary)” instead of “ne-mluv-í-m (negation-verb stem-present suffix-ending 1st person sg.)”, [I] do not speak. GB: “všichni jsme (auxiliary) mluvíme urdštinu”, “ham sab urdũ bolte haĩ (auxiliary)”, instead of “všichni mluvíme urdsky”, [we] all speak Urdu.

Another source of errors are the five Czech verb classes, based on the five different stem suffixes, which do not have a counterpart in Hindi. As a result, the suffixes get occasionally distorted. For example, the suffix in the -(u)je class gets simplified to converge with the rest of the verb classes, such as in SS: “potřeb-u-me” instead of “potřeb-uje-me”, we need, imitating “nes-e-me”, tiskn-e-me, pros-í-me, děl-á-me. Or, the classes get mixed up, as in SS: „my jsme ukázeli” instead of “my jsme ukázali”, we showed (ukázat, -á class), imitating a verb from a different verb class (“překáželi”, překážet, -í class, we obstructed), or in SL: “to já plán-u” instead of “to já plán-uju” (plánovat, -(u)je class), I am planning that, imitating -e class (“nes-u”).

4.2.2 Past tense

Czech has only one past tense, whereas Hindi has imperfect past tense, continuous past tense and three perfect tenses used for the past. The Czech past tense is a compound tense which is formed by the active participle and the present of the auxiliary verb “to be” (e.g., “dělala jsem”, I did). The imperfect past tense in Hindi is formed by the imperfect participle and the past tense of the auxiliary verb “to be” (e.g., “maĩ kartĩ thĩ”, I did). The perfect past tense is formed by the ergative postposition “ne” and the perfect participle (e.g., maĩ ne kiyā, I did). The perfect past tense has three forms, the simple perfect (sometimes also termed perfective, or aorist⁵⁸), the present perfect and the pluperfect. The simple perfect uses the perfect participle, the present perfect the perfect participle and the present tense of the auxiliary “to be”, and the pluperfect the perfect participle and the past

⁵⁸ Montaut (2004), 103-104.

tense of the auxiliary “to be”. The endings in all the above-mentioned past tenses are governed by person, number and gender. The Czech past tense and the Hindi past imperfect tense endings correspond to the gender of the logical subject, the Hindi past perfect tense uses the ergative construction,⁵⁹ within which the verb agrees with the logical object (i.e., the grammatical subject), e.g., aurat (logical subject f.) ne (erg. postp.) pānī (grammatical subject, m.) piyā (p.p., m.), “by the woman water was drunk”.

We can observe the disagreement between the predicate and the logical subject even in the elicited material. E.g., SS: “[ona] (f.) mēl (m.) strach (m.)” instead of “[ona] (f.) mēla (f.) strach (f.)”, she was afraid. In Hindi, the dative construction would be used,⁶⁰ in which verb endings also agree with the grammatical, not the logical subject, just like in the ergative construction: “us ko ḍar (m.) lag rahā thā (m.)”, “to her fear was happening”. Or, EK: “až jste tam [vy (f.)] končil (m.) v Delhi” instead of “když jste [vy (f.)] tam skončila (f.) v Delhi”, when you finished in Delhi, which would translate into Hindi as “jab āp ne Dillī mẽ kām (m.) khatm kiyā (m.)”, when you finished your work in Delhi. These agreements, erroneous from the point of Czech grammar, could be theoretically explained in this way as manifestations of language transfer.

However, this explanation is rather unconvincing, especially when we encounter other examples of subject – predicate disagreement with no possible influence of transfer. E.g., SS: “to (n.) byl (m.) hezké (n.) instead of “to (n.) bylo (n.) hezké (n.)”, that was nice, in Hindi: “vah (m.) sundar (m./f.) thā (m.)”.

Another difficulty lies in the fact that the auxiliary verb “to be” is used in the 1st and 2nd person, but omitted in the 3rd person, both singular and plural. Hindi uses the auxiliary verb either in all persons (in the imperfect tense and two of the perfect tenses), or in none of them (in the simple perfect tense).

Some examples of the errors resulting from the confusion regarding the use of the auxiliary (corresponding to both perfect and imperfect past in Hindi): SS: “tam masíroval” instead of “tam jsem masíroval”, I massaged there, UV: “pracoval” instead of “pracoval jsem”, I worked, “já studoval tam” instead of “já jsem tam studoval”, I studied there, BD: “tak pracoval pro její lidi” instead of “tak jsem pracoval pro její lidi”, so I worked for its people.⁶¹

⁵⁹ The ergative construction is a distinctive feature of Hindi that has developed from a Sanskrit form which is usually incorrectly termed the passive.

⁶⁰ In this thesis, we concentrate on negative transfer and the resulting errors, mainly because of space restrictions. Nevertheless, the dative construction is one of the examples where positive transfer can be observed. It is used in similar situation in both languages (expression of like and dislike, such as in “ta kniha se mi (dat.) líbí”, “mujhe (dat.) vah kitāb pasand hai”, “to me that book is agreeable”, I like that book). It has a broader scope of use in Hindi though (Czech “já (nom.) mám hlad”, I have hunger, versus Hindi: “mujhe (dat.) bhūkh hai”, “to me hunger is”).

⁶¹ However, the errors in this area could also be a consequence of the influence of other languages, like English that does not use the auxiliary, or rather Russian, especially in UV who has had work interactions with Russian speakers.

Occasionally, the structure of the Hindi imperfect/continuous past tense manifest itself in the Czech past tense, creating incorrect forms with auxiliary “to be” in the past tense. For example, BD: “taťka byl (past tense of the auxiliary) bydlet (active participle) na Urísa”, “pāpā urīsā mẽ rahte (imperfect participle) the (past tense of the auxiliary)”, “Daddy was lived in Orissa”, instead of “taťka bydlet v Uríse”. UV: “všechno bylo (past tense of the auxiliary) fungovalo (active participle)”, “sab kām kartā (imperfect participle) thā (past tense of the auxiliary)”, instead of “všechno fungovalo”, everything was working (“doing work”).

4.2.3 Future tense

The situation regarding the future tense is quite different. The future tense in Hindi is synthetic, whereas there are two types of future in Czech, the analytic future of the imperfective verbs (the future of the auxiliary “to be” plus infinitive, e.g. “budu pracovat”, I will work) and the synthetic future of the perfective verbs (which is grammatically their present). The errors in the construction of the future tense forms are a consequence of the absence of perfective and imperfective verbs in Hindi. Hindi L1 Czech speakers therefore often create hybrid forms, such as the future of the auxiliary “to be” plus the infinitive or present of a perfective verb, as in BD: “jak to lidi bude (the future of the auxiliary “to be”) přežít (infinitive of a perfective verb)” instead of “jak to lidi přežijou”, how will the people survive,⁶² or SS: “to bude (the future of the auxiliary “to be”) začne (the future (grammatically present) of a perfective verb)”, “it will will start”, instead of “to začne”. Or even: “my jsme (the present of the auxiliary “to be”) budeme (the future of the auxiliary “to be”) vidět (infinitive)”, “we are will see”, instead of “my uvidíme (the future of a perfective verb)”.

Difficulties regarding endings appear even in future tense, e.g., EK: “ale pak tady nebude (3rd person sg.) studenti (pl.)” instead of “ale pak tady nebudou (3rd person pl.) studenti (pl.)”, but then there will be no students here, BD: “lidi najde (3rd person sg.)” instead of “lidi najdou (3rd person pl.)”, people will find, GB: “[oni (pl.)] bude (3rd person sg.)” instead of “oni (pl.) budou (3rd person pl.)”, they will be. The reason might be overgeneralization, stemming from the more frequent occurrence of the 3rd person singular.

Future tense of perfective verbs in Czech can carry the meaning of an action performed out of necessity, such as in: “Houskový sním, ale radši mám bramborový”. “I eat bread dumplings (if there are no other dumplings available, but I am not particularly fond of them), but I prefer potato ones.” Future lacks this function in Hindi. Therefore the Hindi statement of BD: “maĩ gulāš bhī khā lūgā”,

⁶² This case is very probably a manifestation of a language transfer from English, facilitated by the confusion regarding perfective and imperfective verbs.

I eat even guláš (when necessary), “sním i guláš”, while explaining his relationship to Czech food, can be considered a manifestation of reverse language transfer.

4.2.4 Aspect

An extensive use of aspect in the form of perfective and imperfective verbs compensates for the comparatively simple Czech tense system. It is needless to say that it provides Hindi L1 learners of Czech, who are not familiar with synthetic forms of perfectivity,⁶³ with plentiful opportunities to err. The perfective verbs differ from their imperfective counterparts mostly in either prefix or suffix, of which there are many different types. E.g., perf. “letěla”, she flew vs. imperf. “přiletěla”, she came flying, or perf. “dostala”, she got, vs. imperf. “dostávala”, she used to get. Moreover, the present form of the perfective verbs expresses future, as has been mentioned above, which further complicates the matter. We will mention just a few examples of the most common types of errors.

BD: “dneska lital (imperf.)” instead of “dneska letěl (perf.)”, today he flew, ND: “holka se dávala (imperf.) jedno víno” instead of “holka si dala (perf.) jedno víno”, the girl had one glass of wine, UV: “udělám (perf.) takový věci” instead of “dělám (imperf.) takový věci”, I will do such things instead of I do such things, EK: “mě furt potká (perf.) tam” instead of “mě furt potkává (imperf.) tam”, he will always meet me there instead of he always meets me there, SL: “jakmile on končil (imperf.) tady studium” instead of “jakmile tady skončil (perf.) studium”, as soon as he finished his studies here, BK: “pak jsem končil (imperf.) studium, pak jsem začínal (imperf.) pracovat” instead of “pak jsem skončil (perf.) studium, pak jsem začal (perf.) pracovat”, then I finished my studies and then I started working.

This type of errors is relatively common. They sometimes hinder understanding as well.⁶⁴ For example, the interviewer asked the participant: “A malej půjde (the future tense of a perfective verb, grammatically present) do školy?” And the young boy will start going to school? BK understood: “And the young boy goes (the present form of an imperfective verb meaning present) to school? The answer was: “Ne, do školky.” No, he [goes] to preschool.

Sometimes, hybrid forms appear, as in BD: “udjelávám taková chyby” instead of “dělávám takovou chybu”, I regularly make a mistake of a certain kind, where “děl-at” is the imperfective verb meaning “to do”, “u-dělat” is the perfect counterpart meaning “to finish doing”, and “děl-ávat” is the marked habitual form meaning “to do regularly”. The hybrid form “u-děl-ávat” obviously does

⁶³ In Hindi, the system of perfect tenses and the compound verbs serve this purpose.

⁶⁴ The format of our study unfortunately did not give us many opportunities to examine errors in comprehension.

not really make any sense. However, the combination of the perfect and habitual elements does make sense in Hindi.⁶⁵

4.2.5 Mood

Subjunctive/conditional

Concerning mood, Hindi has subjunctive, counterfactual and imperative, whereas Czech uses conditional and imperative. The Czech conditional consists of special forms of the auxiliary verb “to be” (bych, bys, by...) and the active participle. This construction is much more complicated than the construction of the Hindi subjunctive (a simple form inherited from the old verbal finite paradigm of active present⁶⁶) or counterfactual (imperfect participle). This might be the reason why in the language production of Hindi L1 speakers, the Czech conditional sometimes gets replaced by the future form, such as in SS: “já jsem chtěl, že budu sednout (fut., correctly “budu sedět”)", “maĩ cāhtā thā ki maĩ baiṭhū~ (subj.), instead of “já jsem chtěl, abych seděl (cond.)/sedět (inf.)”, “I wanted to sit”. BD: “hlavně ona bude (fut.) spokojená, to je důležitý”, “aham hai ki vah khuś ho (subj.)”, instead of “hlavně aby ona byla (cond.) spokojená”, the main thing is that she is happy.

The subjunctive form is also used to express polite request in Hindi, such as in “If you have any work, would you give it to me?” Czech can also use conditional in this situation in the form of question. Hindi L1 speakers might again try to use future (and indicative) instead of subjunctive: UV: “máte (ind. pres.)⁶⁷ nějaký práce, tak dáte (fut.) mně” “agar āp ke pās koī kām ho (subj.), to use mujhe de dē (subj.)”, instead of “kdybyste měla nějakou práci (cond.), dala byste (cond.) mi ji?”

Imperative

There are six ways to express command and request in Hindi, one of which is the subjunctive form that we have just referred to. There are three forms of imperative, corresponding to the above mentioned three hierarchically ranked forms of the second person (intimate/contemptuous, familiar for equals/inferiors and polite for equals/superiors).⁶⁸ There are only two such hierarchically ranked forms in Czech (familiar and polite). This distinction concerning polite address can create difficulties for Hindi L1 learners, especially while sociocultural aspects are also at play here. Within our data, we found one example of this issue, resulting in an inconsistency in address. GB speaks about his son being lazy to learn English. His son requests GB to speak Czech to him, because he

⁶⁵ Hindi has marked habitual aspect as well, but it has an analytic form: the perfect participle sg. m. of the verb plus the imperfect participle of the full meaning verb “to do” plus the auxiliary “to be” (e.g., “ham kiyā (perf. part.) karte (imperf. part.) the (auxiliary)”, we used to go).

⁶⁶ Montaut (2004), 114-115.

⁶⁷ The indicative present seems to be a transfer from English.

⁶⁸ Montaut (2004), 72, 114.

(GB) “knows Czech”. “Ty umíš [česky], tak mi [to] řekněte česky”, you know (familiar form) [Czech], so say (polite form) [it] to me in Czech. This inconsistency could be interpreted as a consequence of a sociocultural difference. In Modern Czech, parents are always addressed with the familiar form, whereas in Modern Standard Hindi mostly with the polite form. GB, quoting his son, sticks to the Czech familiar form of address in indicative. Nevertheless, when it comes to the imperative, he switches to the polite form. It is plausible to say that he might consider the use of the familiar form of imperative in the child – parent relationship even more inappropriate.

4.2.6 Reflexivity

Another area that has to be mentioned, because it provides ample opportunities for language transfer, is reflexivity in verbs. Reflexive verbs are a peculiar type of verbs that does not exist in Hindi. They consist of the base verb and a free morpheme “se” or “si”. The free morpheme “se” is extremely polyfunctional. Its function ranges from a pronoun (“vidět se”, to see oneself) to a component of reflexive verbs (such as *oblékat se*, to get dresses, dress “oneself”) and a constituent of semantically non-reflexive intransitive verbs (*roztrhat se*, to get torn) to a semantically empty formal function (*smát se*, to laugh). There are even formally reflexive, but semantically transitive verbs, such as *strefit se*, to hit (the target). Reflexive verbs with the morpheme “si” are less common and can express interest in the action, satisfaction, action performed for oneself, reciprocity, a part of one’s body/mind, etc.⁶⁹

Hindi L1 speakers often omit the free morpheme, such as BK: “jednou za šest měsíců [se] potkáme,” “ham chah mahīnō mẽ ek bār milte haĩ”, we meet once in six months, “já [se] taky stydím”, I am also shy, TD: “co jsem [si] přál”, what I wanted, UV: “pamatuju [se]”, I remember, EK: “neučí [se]”, “já jsem [se] tady narodil”, “pak jsem [se] přestěhoval”, etc. On the other hand, the free morpheme is sometimes wrongly used with non-reflexive verbs, e.g., BD: “my se pocházíme”, we come (from), “on se studoval”, he studied, “oni si měli tady kancelář”, they had an office here. However, mistaking one of the morphemes for the other one is more common: ND: “jsme se dávali dárky” instead of “jsme si dávali dárky”, we gave each other gift (reciprocity), “oni si střídají” instead of “oni se střídají”, they take turns, BD: “lidi se dovolí víc věcí” instead of “lidi si dovolí víc věcí”, people take more liberties, GB: “až se vylepší svoji angličtinu” instead of “až si vylepší svoji angličtinu” when he improves his English (a part of his knowledge). Another error that can occur is the use of the longer form of the reflexive pronoun, e.g., UV: “učil jsem sebe”, literally: I taught myself, instead of “učil jsem se”, I learned.

⁶⁹ Štícha (2013), 271, 429-432.

4.2.7 Voice

Although passive voice is present in both the languages, its form differs. In Czech, there are two types of passive. The reflexive passive is formed through adding the free morpheme “se” to the verb (“auto se opravuje”, “the car repairs itself”, the car is being repaired). The paraphrasal passive is formed with the auxiliary verb “být”, to be, and the passive participle.⁷⁰ In Hindi, passive is formed with the perfect participle and the auxiliary verb “jānā”, “to go”. The paraphrasal passive does not occur even once in the Czech speech production of our participants. Its underproduction⁷¹ could be a consequence of its relatively infrequent occurrence in spoken language in general and the unfamiliarity of the participants with the rare passive participle.

4.2.8 The verb “to have”, obligation

The verb “to have” (“mít”) does not exist in Hindi. To convey the relationship of possession, structures such as “us ke pās ... hai” (... is near him/her), 2) “us kā ... hai” (genitive construction, his/her ... is) or “mujhe ... hai” (dative construction, to me is ...) are used. This can also reflect in Czech of Hindi L1 speakers, e.g., in ND, though Czech does not provide any substitute for the genitive postposition *kī*: “je to dvanáct procent alkoholu”, “vah bārah pratiśat alcohol *kī* hai (genitive construction)”, it has twelve percent of alcohol, instead of “má dvanáct procent alkoholu”. Apart from conveying the meaning “to have”, “mít” is also used as a modal verb. Modal verbs and the expression of obligation in general are another intriguing topic. “Mít” communicates the meaning of the English “should”. While we have not noticed any errors concerning “mít” in the sense “to have” in our recordings, it seems that the use of “mít” as “should”, “to be supposed to” is hard to embrace for Hindi L1 speakers. For example, BD and GB use the Czech expression for “must” (“muset”) instead. BD: “on to ví přesně, kde je hranice, jak to musí (3rd person sg. “muset”) říct ne” instead of “on ví přesně, kde je hranice, kdy má (3rd person sg. “mít”) říct ne”, he knows exactly, where the limit is, when he should/is supposed to say no, GB: “tak musím (1st person sg. “muset”) už mluvit v urduštynu” instead of “tak mám (1st person sg. “mít”) už mluvit urdsky”, should/am I supposed to speak Urdu now? In Hindi/Urdu, this kind of obligation would be expressed either via subjunctive (milder obligation), or through the use of a fossilized form “cāhie”, “is needed”, used with the dative construction (stronger obligation). In this case, GB could say: “kyā mujhe ab urdū bolnī cāhie”, should/am I supposed to speak Urdu now? It is undeniable that the Czech use of the verb “to have” (which does not even exist in Hindi) in this context must appear

⁷⁰ Hádková (2006), 154-157.

⁷¹ Although we do not have any similar data at disposal produced by Czech L1 speakers to determine if this is really a case of underproduction.

like an alien concept to a Hindi L1 speaker.⁷² It is hence not surprising that this it is avoided. On the other hand, the dative construction with “cāhie” can be translated with both “mít” and “muset”, depending on the context. “Muset” is moreover etymologically related to the English “must”, which probably also makes it sound more familiar, although the modus is different, which contributes to “mít” being replaced by “muset”.

4.2.9 Verbs of liking

Verbs of liking in Czech, such as “mít rád” (to love, to like), “líbit se” (to like, to find agreeable) do not exactly semantically correspond to their counterparts in Hindi, such as “pyār karnā” (to love) “pasand honā/ānā” (to like, to find agreeable) or “acchā lagnā” (to like, to find agreeable). The overlapping of their semantic fields leads to transfer related errors. EK for example intends to say “if you like it there” in the sense of “if you find it agreeable”, not in the sense of “if you love it”. He would probably use the expression “acchā lagnā” in Hindi (“agar āpko vahā~ acchā lagegā”). However, he says “a když máte rádi tam”, which in this context conveys an excessively strong meaning (“to love”), instead of the correct and more moderate “a když se vám tam bude líbit”. The English translation of both “mít rád” and “líbit se” as “to like” seems to have contributed to this confusion.⁷³

4.2.10 Verbs of knowledge

Another common problematic issue is the difference between “znát” (to know) and “vědět” (to know). “Znát” is used with accusative (“Znám tu osobu”, I know that person), whereas “vědět” is used with a dependent clause (“Vím, kde je Praha”, I know where Prague is). In Hindi, there are two different ways of expressing knowledge. One of them is via the dative construction with a dependent clause (“mujhe mālūm hai ki...”, it is known to me that...). The other one is via the nominative construction which can be used either with accusative, or with a dependent clause (“main jāntā hū~ ki...”, I know that..., or “main use jāntā hū~”, I know him/her). This arrangement does not provide any help when faced with the choice between “znát” and “vědět”, as ca be seen in UV: “neznám, co to je” instead of “nevím, co to je”.

⁷² Although some familiarity with the concept might have been established after the encounter with the English “to have to”.

⁷³ The use of sequence of tenses in the quotation, which does not exist in either Hindi or Czech, corroborates this assumption.

4.2.11 Verb-object case relationship

The last area to discuss are the differences concerning the verb-object case relationship in Czech and Hindi. Distinct verb-object case relationships in both languages result in errors such as SS: “nerozumím všechno (acc.)”, “maĩ sab kuch (acc.) nahĩ samajhtā” instead of “nerozumím všemu (dat.)”, I do not understand everything, EK: “jedna paní vám (dat.) pozdravovala”, “ek aurat ne āpko (dat.) namaste kahā” instead of “jedna paní vás (acc.) pozdravovala”, one lady said hi to you, etc. Some verbs are used with different parts of speech, e.g., GB: “mluvím angličtinu (noun)” “maĩ āgrezī (noun) boltā hū” instead of “mluvím anglicky (adj.)”, I speak English.

4.2.12 Verbo-nominal predicates

The verbo-nominal predicates (or “conjunct verbs”) is a populous category in Hindi that does not exist in Czech. Hindi L1 speakers of Czech try to construct similar predicates in Czech as well, in particular in connection with the verb “to answer”, in Czech “odpovědět”, in Hindi “javāb denā”, literally “to give an answer”, or “to ask”, in Czech “ptát se”, in Hindi “savāl pūchnā”, literally “to ask a question”. This results in expressions such as EK: “ptám to otázka brzo”, “maĩ yah savāl jaldī pūch rahā hū”, I am asking this question soon, instead of “ptám se brzo”, or BD: “oni se dali odpoveď na hindstině”, “unhō ne hindī mẽ javāb diyā”, they answered (literally “gave answer”) in Hindi, instead of “odpověděli hindsky”, BD: “dát odpoveď na tento jazyk”, to give answer in this language, instead of “odpovědět v tomto jazyce”, “dávají odpoveď jenom na čestinu”, they give answer only in Czech, instead of “odpovídají jenom česky”, etc.

4.2.13 Verbs of motion

Just like English, Hindi also has only one expression for going somewhere, either by means of transport, or on foot (jānā). The same applies for bringing something by means of transport or on foot (lānā). Nevertheless, Czech differentiates between the both. That is how the following errors arise: ND: “jsem přinesl”, “maĩ lāyā hū”, I brought (on foot), instead of “jsem přivezl [from the United States]”, I brought by means of transport, BD: “já jsem nikdy nejel na klub”, I never went to the club (by means of transport), instead of “já jsem nikdy nešel do klubu” (on foot/place of entertainment), GB: “vybíráme, jaký restaurace pojedem”, we choose which restaurant to go to, instead of “vybíráme, do jaký restaurace půjdeme” (on foot/place of entertainment).

4.2.14 “It can be said”

There is a particular phrase in Hindi to convey the meaning of “it can be said”, “one can say”: “kah sakte haĩ” (literally meaning “they can say”). In Czech, there is a similar phrase: “dá se říct”, which literally means “it can be said”. Our data shows that the Hindi phrase found its way into the Czech of Hindi L1 speakers, e.g., BD: “jak se to říká česky, jako meaning můžou říct”, “usko cek mẽ kyā kahte haĩ, meaning kah sakte haĩ”, how to say that in Czech, one can say meaning, instead of “jak se to řekne česky, dá se říct meaning”. Or GB: “tak oni žijí, můžou říct, jako sami”, “kah sakte haĩ ki ve akele rahte haĩ”, one can say that they live alone, instead of “tak oni žijí, dá se říct, jako sami”.

4.2.15 Verbs of speech and knowledge + languages

When speaking about languages, Czech verbs of speech, e.g., “mluvit” (to speak), and knowledge, e.g., “učit se” (to learn) are used with adverbs (“mluvím česky (adv.)”, I speak Czech, “učím se česky (adv.)”, I learn Czech). On the other hand, Hindi verbs of speech and knowledge are used with feminine names of languages (“hindī”, “cek”). This situation leads to a huge amount of errors, such as in EK: “mluví taky fakt výborný (adj.) hindský (adj.)”, “vah bahut acchī (adj.) hindī (noun)⁷⁴ boltā hai”, he speaks great Hindi, instead of “mluví fakt výborně (adv.) hindsky (adv.)”. BD: “oni se dali odpověď na hindštině”, “unhō ne hindī (noun) mẽ javāb diyā”, they answered in Hindi, instead of “oni odpověděli hindsky (adv.)”, GB: “umí angličtinu (noun)”, “vah āgrezī (noun) jāntā hai”, he knows English, instead of “umí anglicky (adv.)”. On the other hand, overgeneralization from the verbs of speech and learning to other verbs generates another set of mistakes, such as BD: “my mícháme vždycky česky (adv.) a anglicky (adv.)”, we always mix Czech and English, instead of “my mícháme vždycky češtinu (noun) a angličtinu (noun)”.

4.2.16 Underproduction of verb forms

Although this study is not based on quantitative analysis, it can be stated that the Hindi language production of Hindi L1 speakers seems to show less complex structures than the production of native speakers living in a Hindi speaking environment, probably due to language attrition. It also seems to contain less grammatical forms that do not exist or are not commonly used in Czech, i.e., absolutives (conjunctive participles), compound verbs and other markers of secondary aspect and Aktionsart mentioned above. For example, GB uses altogether 7 compound verbs in his 8-minute Hindi account, two absolutives, no passives, and none of the above mentioned markers; ND uses 8 compound verbs, one absolute, no passives and no markers in 8 minutes; BD uses 6 compound

⁷⁴ “Hindī” can be either noun or adjective.

verbs, no absolutes, no passives, and no markers within the same time. If one analyzes comparably long interviews in Hindi, the occurrence of these phenomena is higher (e.g., interview with the Hindi writer Mridula Garg: 8 compound verbs, 3 absolutes, 3 passives, 3 different markers of secondary aspect and Aktionsart, and many other complex grammar phenomena absent from the speech production of the participants). This can be partly attributed to language attrition and the resulting simplification, but partly probably also to language transfer from Czech.⁷⁵

4.3 Adjectives

We have already mentioned the gender related difficulties pertaining to adjectives. To give at least one example, SL: “české (n.) zemědělské (n.) univerzita (f.)” instead of “česká (f.) zemědělská (f.) univerzita (f.)”, Czech agricultural university. Apart from that, adjectives suffer from the same declension problems as nouns. However, Hindi L1 learners of Czech seem to face an additional hurdle – they often seem to mistake adjective for adverbs and vice versa. In Czech, the adverbial ending -e sounds similar to the neutral singular adjective ending -é (e.g., “pěkné” (nice) vs. “pěkně” (nicely)). On the other hand, in Hindi, the nominative masculine plural and oblique masculine singular form of declinable Hindi adjectives is identical with the form of some Hindi adverbs (“acche” (good) vs. “acche (se)” (well)). The following errors do not fall under these two types of (almost) identical forms. However, their mere existence might have created an environment of confusion and uncertainty. SS: “konečný”, final, instead of “nakonec”, finally, GB: “hlavní”, main, instead of “hlavně”, mainly, “po dlouho (adv.) době” instead of “po dlouhé (adj.) době”, after a long time, BD: “on to ví přesný (adj.)”, “he knows it exact”, instead of “on to ví přesně (adv.)”, he knows it exactly.

Another specifically Czech phenomenon is the number of adjective suffixes that separate the stem from the endings, while the adjective endings in Hindi follow the word stem without any mediation. This discrepancy can generate errors such as the following one, using only a (soft) adjective ending instead of a suffix plus a (hard) adjective ending: NT: “houb-í [polévka]” instead of houb-ov-á [polévka]”, mushroom soup.

Last but not least, the formation of comparative and superlative is distinct in both languages, corresponding to their specific character. The comparative and superlative in Czech are synthetic, mostly formed regularly with the use of comparative suffixes -ejší, -ější, -ší, -čí (krásný > krásnější) and the prefix nej- plus comparative in case of superlative (nej-krásnější). In Hindi, the

⁷⁵ Unfortunately, given the limits of this study, it is not possible to follow this immensely intriguing line of research more closely.

formation is analytic, using the postposition “se” (from) in comparative and “sab se” (from all) in superlative. E.g., “vah sundar hai”, she is beautiful, “vah anikā se sundar hai”, she is more beautiful than (“from”) anikā, “vah sab se sundar hai”, she is the most beautiful (she is “beautiful from all”). This distinction results in the following errors: BK: “hezký než my”, “ham se sundar”, “pretty” than us, instead of “hezčí než my”, prettier than us, “víc špatný”, “zyādā kharāb”, more bad, instead of “horší” (irregular), worse, or GB: “nej-poslední” (with the superlative prefix, but without the comparative suffix), instead of “nejposlednější”, “the very last”.

4.4 Pronouns

4.4.1 Declension

Regarding declension, the situation of pronouns is similar to that of nouns and adjectives. Hindi uses only two different case forms, nominative and oblique, and the semantic cases are differentiated through postpositions. The direct forms of personal pronouns are “yah”, “ye” (this, these) and “vah”, “ve” (that, those) and “is”, “in” and “us”, “un” in oblique. There is one common form for both genders, unlike in Czech. The Czech case endings are therefore again perceived as user unfriendly and become a cause of uncounted errors. It is an extremely common problem and our recordings show many cases.

E.g., BK: “to (nom. n. sg.) asi neznáš” instead of “toho (acc. m. sg.) asi neznáš”, you probably do not know him, EK: “když mluvím s ní (instr. f. sg.)” instead of “když mluvím s ním (instr. m. sg.)”, when I talk to him, “ten vaši (nom. m. pl.) student (nom. m. sg.)” instead of “ten váš (nom. m. sg.) student (nom. m. sg.)”, that student of yours, BD: “budeme všechny (nom. f. pl./acc. m. pl.) dohromadě” instead of “budeme všichni pohromadě (nom. m. pl.)”, all of us will be together, ND: “přijdou všechny (nom. f. pl./acc. m. pl.) kamarády (acc. m. pl.)” instead of “přijdou všichni (nom. m. pl.) kamarádi (nom. m. pl.)”, all friends will come, UV: “moje (nom. f. sg.) právník” (nom. m. sg.) instead of “můj (nom. m. sg.) právník” (nom. m. sg.), my lawyer, SL: “každý (nom. m. sg.) [sestra (nom. f. sg.)] má dvě” instead of “každá (nom. f. sg.) [sestra (nom. f. sg.)] má dvě”, “har ek (indecl.) bahin ke do haĩ”, each sister has two, SS: “to je naši (acc. f. sg./nom. m. pl.)” instead of “to je naše (nom. n. sg.)”, that is ours (neuter).

4.4.2 Subject pronouns

Another very frequent error is the overuse of subject pronouns. Regarding omissibility of pronouns in Hindi, Monaut⁷⁶ states: “All forms ... are omissible if the referent is easily recoverable from the

⁷⁶ Montaut (2004), 72.

context or the communicational situation.” However, in Czech they are not only omissible, but the subject-pronoun deletion happens on regular basis, unless the referent is emphasized. This naturally results in a multitude of Czech sentences with a redundant subject-pronoun. For example, ND: “předtím já (pers. pron.) jsem žil” instead of “předtím jsem žil”, before that I used to live, SL: “tak pak on (pers. pron.) to končil” instead of “tak pak to ukončil”, he finished it then, BK: “za několik rok on (pers. pron.) bude mluvit hezky česky než my” instead of “za několik roků bude mluvit lépe česky než my”, in a couple of years he will speak Czech better than us, BD: “potom on (pers. pron.) se stěhoval někde” instead of “potom se někam stěhoval”, thereafter he moved somewhere, “a my (pers. pron.) jsme bydleli taky patnáct let v Bangalore” instead of “taky jsme bydleli patnáct let v Bangalore”, we also lived in Bangalore for fifteen years. However, there are also situations when the subject-pronoun deletion happens in Hindi, but not in Czech, e.g., in case of the anaphoric personal pronoun “to”, “it”, which can be in some contexts omitted in Hindi, but not in Czech. E.g., SS: “bylo [] těžké” instead of “bylo to (pers. pron.) těžké”, “[] muškil thā”, it was difficult.

4.4.3 Indefinite and negative pronouns

Indefinite and negative pronouns can also cause confusion, as we can see on examples. E.g., SS: “nikdo”, no one, instead of “někdo”, someone. In Czech, one vowel makes all the difference (and as we have mentioned above, the difference in their pronunciation is relatively small in the central Bohemian dialect). In Hindi, on the other hand, “someone” translates as “koī”, and “no one” as “koī nahī”, literally “someone no”.

4.4.4 The reflexive pronoun

It is a bit surprising to see that the reflexive pronoun “someone’s own” that is not present in English, but exists in both Hindi and Czech, is sometimes replaced with possessive pronouns. The reflexive pronoun “someone’s own”, “svůj”, “apnā” is used in place of possessive pronouns, when the object is possessed by the subject of the sentence. This rule, peculiar to both the languages, has not been applied in the following sentences. SS: “já pošlu moje animátory” instead of “já pošlu svoje animátory”, I will send my animators, “píšu můj klient” instead of “píšu svému klientovi”, I am writing to my client. This phenomenon is probably on the rise due to the influence of English, and the decline of the reflexive possessive pronoun can be observed in Czech of Czech L1 speakers as well.

4.5 Numerals

We can start this chapter with out usual complaint – unlike in Sanskrit (and Czech), none of the Hindi numerals follow the declension paradigm.⁷⁷ That is why for example BK does not hesitate to say: “před šest (nom.) rokama” instead of “před šesti (instr.) rokama”, six years ago, or “před dva (nom.) rokama” instead of “před dvěma (instr.) rokama”, two years ago.

In Czech, numerals one and two are gender sensitive, which is not the case in Hindi. Therefore, we can encounter errors like BK: “dva (m.) sestry (f.)” instead of “dvě (f.) sestry (f.)”, two sisters, SS: “jeden (m.) žena (f.)” instead of “jedna (f.) žena (f.)”, one woman, BD: “jedna (f.) kluk (m.)” instead of “jeden (m.) kluk (m.)”, ND: “dvě (f.) panáky (m.)” instead of “dva (m.) panáky (m.)”, two shots, SL: “obě (f.) [kamarády (acc. m.)]” instead of “oba (m.) [kamarády (acc. m.)].

Another peculiarity of the Czech language is that it uses genitive plural after numerals higher than four, whereas Hindi uses nominative (e.g., “pět studentů (gen. pl.)” (five “of students”), “pā̃c chātr (nom. pl.)”). Hindi L1 learners often use the nominative construction in Czech, e.g., BD: “tam byli pár studenti (nom. pl.)” instead of “tam bylo pár studentů (gen. pl.)”, there were a few students, “dohromady my (nom.) jsme pět”, we are five altogether, instead of “dohromady je nás (gen.) pět”, GB: “tak už [my (nom.)] jsme pět”, so we are already five, instead of “tak už je nás (gen.) pět”, SL: “tam jsou jako víc Indové (nom.)”, there are more Indians there, instead of “tam je jako víc Indů (gen.)”.

4.6 Adverbs

Indefinite and negative adverbs follow the same pattern as adjectives, which creates identical problems, e.g., BD: “nikde”, “kahī̃ nahī̃”, nowhere (“somewhere no”) instead of “někde”, “kahī̃”, somewhere.

4.6.1 Adverbs of place

There are several adverbs in Hindi that have only one form, whereas Czech has two forms, which can be misleading. This applies especially to the adverbs of place, where Czech makes a distinction between adverbs of location and adverbs of direction. In this way, the Hindi adverb of place “kahī̃” translates as either “někde” (“somewhere” in the sense of location) or “někam” (“somewhere” in the sense of direction). E.g., BD: “potom on se stěhoval někde (location)” instead of “potom on se stěhoval někam (direction)”, then he moved somewhere. The same applies to yahā̃/idhar (here), GB: “potom jsem šel tady (location)” instead of “potom jsem šel sem (direction)”, thereafter I came here, BK: “oni tady (location) přijedou” instead of “oni sem přijedou (direction)”, they will come

⁷⁷ Except for the aggregatives, to be precise, which take the form of oblique plural.

here; and other adverbs, such as “nīce” (down), e.g. SS: “zpátky dole (location)” instead of “zpátky dolů (direction)”.

Some adverbs of place have the same form as adverbs of means in Hindi, but not in Czech, e.g., “sīdhe” means both straight (“rovně”) and directly (“rovnou”), SS: “nejde [to] rovně” instead of “nejde [to] rovnou”, it does not happen directly, GB: “přišel jsem rovně k ní” instead of “přišel jsem rovnou k ní”, I came directly to her. There is one more phenomenon peculiar to Hindi that is worth mentioning – the verb of existence, “to be”, can implicitly mean “to be here”. E.g., BD: “[mluvíme márváří], když je babička”, we speak Marwari, when our grandmother is there, instead of “[mluvíme márváří], když je tam (there) babička”.⁷⁸

4.6.2 Adverbs of time

Adverbs of time are often expressed through other means in Hindi, which shows also on the speech production of our participants. For example, the adverb “teḍ” (“now”) is often replaced with a literal translation of Hindi “is vaqt” (“at this time”),⁷⁹ e.g., in BD: “to době (is vaqt) hodně kouká na televize”, nowadays, she watches TV a lot, instead of “teḍ se hodně kouká na televizi”/“v poslední době (recently) se hodně kouká na televizi”. Or SL: “hodně Indů tam žijou, na ten čas (is vaqt)”, many Indians live there nowadays, instead of “hodně Indů tam žije, v dnešní době”.

In the same way, the adverb “pořád” is replaced by “každý čas”, “har vaqt”, all the (“every”) time, e.g., SS: “každý čas mluví mluví mluví”, “har vaqt bāt kartā hai”, all the (“every”) time speaks, speaks and speaks, or “každou sekundu”, “har second”, every second: “já jsem byl každý sekund (“har second”, every second) na mobile”, I was on my mobile all the time. SL also replaces the adverb “nakonec”, in the end, by a noun with preposition (“na konci”), reflecting the Hindi expression “ākhir mẽ” (or the English expression, or both).

In Hindi and English, the adverb and the adposition “pahle” (“before”) have the same form. However, this is not the case in Czech, which again causes errors. See SS: “když šel tady jako před (prep., “pahle”)” instead of “když jsem tam jel předtím (adv., “pahle”)”, when I went there before. The same applies to the adverb “předem” (in advance): “oni neřekli před (prep., “pahle”)” instead of “oni to neřekli předem (adv., “pahle se”)”, they did not say it in advance.

Sometimes, we can observe direct translation from Hindi (probably reinforced by the knowledge of a similar form in English) instead of using specific Czech expression, e.g. UV: “první krát”, “pahli bār”, first time, instead of “poprvé”, NT: “jeden krát”, “ek bār”, one time, instead of “jednou”, once.

⁷⁸ See the famous Bollywood movie “Main hū~ na”, which literally means “I am, no” and could be translated as “Don’t worry, I am here for you”.

⁷⁹ “Is vaqt” is used along with the Hindi expression for now, “abhī”.

4.7 Adpositions

4.7.1 The adposition “from”

Hindi, unlike Czech and English, uses postpositions instead of prepositions. They always follow the oblique form of declinables. The semantic fields of the Hindi postpositions and Czech prepositions overlap to a great extent. We can therefore assume that positive transfer happens on a large scale. Nevertheless, cases of negative transfer can be found as well. The Hindi postposition “se”, from, corresponds with two Czech prepositions, “z” (+ gen.) and “od” (+ gen.), which creates the necessity to decide which preposition to use. BD: “pocházíme od Rádžasthán” instead of “pocházíme z Rádžasthānu”, “ham Rājasthān se haĩ”, we come from Rajasthan, GB: “já jsem od Pákistán” instead of “já jsem z Pákistānu”, “maĩ Pākistān se hũ”, I am from Pakistan.

4.7.2 The adpositions “in”, “at”

Apart from “from”, there are two more postpositions that are predominantly used with spacial and temporal relations, “mẽ”, in, which corresponds to the Czech “v” (+ loc.) and “par”, at/on, that corresponds to the Czech “na” (+ loc.). However, the correspondence is not absolute, as we can see on examples of (negative) transfer, UV: “na obchodě”, “dukān par”, in the shop, instead of “v obchodě”, or ND: “v začátku”, “śurū mẽ”, in the beginning, instead of “na začátku”. It seems that this discrepancy has caused a more general confusion, which has led to errors even in cases where both languages use the same adposition, such as in: BD: “ta’ka byl bydlel na (at/on) Urísa”, “bābā Uṛīsā mẽ (in) rahte the”, papa used to live in Urisa, instead of “ta’ka bydlel v (in) Uríse”, “bydlíme na (at/on) Kalkatě”, “ham kolkaṭā mẽ (in) rahte haĩ”, we live in Kolkata, instead of “bydlíme v (in) Kalkatě”.

The preposition “na” refers to location when used with locative, but it refers to direction when used with accusative. This seems to create an additional confusion for the Hindi L1 Czech speakers, such as SL: “já jsem byl na letiště (acc./nom.)”, “maĩ airport gayā thā”, I went to the airport, instead of “já jsem byl na letišti (loc.)”. In the language production of the Hindi L1 speakers, the preposition “na” (Hindi “par”, English “on”) automatically replaces the preposition “po”,⁸⁰ when the topic concerns talking “on” the phone. UV: “práce ... na telefon”, “kām ... phone par”, work ... on the phone, instead of “práce ... po telefonu”, “keḍ’ mluvíím na telefon”, “jab maĩ phone par bāt kartā hũ”, when I speak on the phone, instead of “když mluvíím po telefonu”.⁸¹

⁸⁰ The preposition “po” is otherwise mostly used in the sense of “after”.

⁸¹ This might be even reinforced by the English use of “on”.

4.7.3 Adposition deletion

There are situations in Hindi when the postposition is omitted, in particular in case of direction/time information. E.g., “vah savere (obl., no postp.) apne (obl.) gā~v (obl., no postp.) jāegā”, in the morning, he will go to his village. Hindi L1 speakers sometimes apply this rule to Czech as well, e.g., NK: “devět já spím”, “nau baje (obl., no postp.) māi sotā hū~”, at nine o’clock I sleep, instead of “v devět spím”, “jdu pět ... práce”, “pāc baje kām par jātā hū~”, at five o’clock I go to work, instead of “jdu v pět ... do práce”. However, the omission of a preposition happens even in cases where there is a postposition in Hindi. Is it because the concept of an adposition preceding the noun is still perceived as too alien? NK: “vīkendu já spím”, weekend par (!) māi sotā hū~”, I sleep on the weekend, instead of “o vīkendu spím”, BD: “vyráběli Indie”, “Inḍiyā mẽ (!) banāte the”, they produced ... in India, instead of “vyráběli v Indii”, ND: “byl jsem Dallasu”, “māi Dallas mẽ (!) thā”, I was in Dallas, instead of “byl jsem v Dallasu”.

Transfer is at work also in the following statements, ND: “kouká anime”, “vah anime (no postp.) dekhtā hai”, he watches anime, instead of “kouká na anime”, “koukām anglický filmy”, “māi āgrezī filmē dekhtā hū~”, I watch English films, instead of “koukām na anglický filmy”. In Czech, koukat (“to watch”, coll.) and other verbs of vision are used with the preposition “na”, whereas in Hindi they use direct object. The influence of transfer is probably reinforced by the existence of the same structure in English (to watch, see etc. with direct object).

4.7.4 Adposition insertion

To express possession or attribute, Czech uses (apart from other means) the adnominal genitive. In this context, Hindi uses the postpositions kā (m. sg.), kī (f.) and ke (m. pl.). E.g., “bahin (f.) kā kuttā (m. sg.)”, sister’s dog, “bahin (f.) kī billī (f. sg.)”, sister’s dog. It seems that Hindi L1 speakers sometimes try to fill in a preposition that the feel could correspond to this genitive postposition, e.g., NK: “učitel z angličtiny”, “āgrezī kā adhyāpak”, teacher of English, instead of “učitel angličtiny (gen.)”, SS: “studenti pro malby”, “citrkalā ke chātr”, students of (here: for) painting, instead of “studenti malby (gen.)”. Again, it is quite possible that the influence of English plays a role here as well.

The participants sometimes try to use the same adposition as in Hindi, e.g., SS: “s (with) metro”, “metro se (with)”, by metro, instead of “metrem (instr., no adp.)”.⁸² SS: “já šel pro (for) filmový festival”, “main film festival ke lie (for) gayā thā”, I went to the film festival, instead of “já šel na

⁸² The postposition “se” can mean either “from”, as mentioned above, or “with”, “by the means of”, as is the case here.

filmový festival”, UV: “jenom pro (for) pár tejdnu”, “sirf kuch haftō ke lie (for)”, only for a few weeks,⁸³ instead of “jenom na pár tejdnu”.

4.8 Conjunctions

Conjunctions apparently do not cause too many issues. However, the Hindi conjunction “ki”, usually translated as “že” (that), can be also sometimes used as “jestli” (if) or to introduce an object subordinate clause (indirect speech). SS: “že rozumím nebo nerozumím”, “ki maĩ samajhtā hū~ ki nahĩ”, if I understand or not, instead of “jestli rozumím nebo nerozumím”; “nepíšu, že kolik stojí”, “maĩ nahĩ likhtā ki vah kitne kā hai”, I do not write how much it costs, instead of “nepíšu, kolik stojí”. Another similar case is that of the Hindi conjunction “jab” (when), which corresponds to both “až” and “když” in Czech. The difference between the two conjunctions in Czech is rather subtle, but “až” can only be used with future tense. EK: “až jste ... skončila v Delhi”, “jab āp ne Dillī mẽ kām khatm kiyā”, when you finished your work in Delhi, instead of “když jste skončila v Delhi”.

4.9 Particles

The particle “to”⁸⁴

Hindi has a few frequently used particles that are very difficult to translate into Czech or English. We have observed their traces in our elicited data as well. One of them is the particle “to”, which can be occasionally translated as “but”, “after all”, “indeed” in English and “ale”, “přece”, “vždyt” in Czech. It is used either as a topicalizing particle, or as an argumentative particle. On the other hand, “to” is a very common demonstrative pronoun in Czech meaning “that”.

At the first sight, it is obvious that in the language production of Hindi L1 speakers, “to” occurs much more often than in the language of Czech L1 speakers. It appears redundantly and at unexpected places. In some cases, it seems to retain the original emphatic role that it played in Hindi. E.g., in BD: “já jsem to nikdy nebyl tam”, “maĩ to kabhĩ nahĩ thā vahā~”, I have (certainly) never been there, instead of “já jsem tam nikdy nebyl”. UV: “už to budu tady”, “ab to maĩ yahā~ rahūgā”, from now on I will be here (and nowhere else), instead of “už budu tady”; “von to mluví perfektně”, “vah to bahut baṛhiyā boltā hai”, he speaks perfectly (unlike someone else), instead of “von mluví perfektně”, SS: “teď to už cítím lepší”, “ab to merī tabīyat behatar hai”, but now I feel better, instead of “teď už se cítím lépe”. Elsewhere, its function is rather unclear, e.g., SL: “ale on to začal doktorský studium, ale tam tak stipendium to bylo málo”, but he started his Ph.D. but the

⁸³ Probably reinforced by the use of the same adposition in English.

⁸⁴ See Montaut (2004), 283-288.

scholarship there was too small, instead of “ale on začal doktorský studium, ale stipendium tam bylo malé”, SS: “já jsem to masíroval”, I massaged, instead of “já jsem masíroval”, etc.

4.9.1 Particles “hī”, “bhī”⁸⁵

The clitic particles “hī” and “bhī” are considered to be complementary. “Hī” has a restrictive (exclusive) meaning (“only”), whereas “bhī” has an inclusive meaning (“too”). They correspond to the Czech expressions “jenom” and “taky” respectively. The difference is that in Czech, these lexica are adverbs and precede the word they specify, whereas the Hindi clitic particles follow them. This results in following errors, BD: “hindí jenom”, “hindī hī”, only Hindi, instead of “jenom hindí”, “tam byli pár studenti jenom”, “vahā~ kuch hī chātr the”, there were only a few students, instead of “tam bylo jenom pár studentů”, GB: “jeden [z nich] je Anil taky”, “ek [un mẽ se] Anil bhī hai”, one [of them] is also Anil, instead of “jeden [z nich] je taky Anil”, “má trošku strach taky”, “us ko thoṛā dar bhī hai”, he is a bit afraid too, instead of “má taky trošku strach”.

4.10 Indirect speech

Another interesting field of syntax is the direct/indirect speech that has its own rules in different languages. In Czech (as well as in English), while referring to someone else’s statement, indirect speech is used. E.g., “řekla mi, že nemůže přijít”, she told me that she couldn’t come. Hindi does use both direct and indirect speech, which reflects on the language production of Hindi L1 Czech speakers. The problematic part is that the direct speech is introduced with a conjunction “that” (“ki”), which in Czech (or English) indicates exclusively the entry of indirect speech. ND: “pak jako říkal (3rd person), že to je moje (poss. pron. 1st person)”, “phir usne kahā ki yah merā hai”, then he said that it was his (literally: then he said that this is mine), instead of “pak jako říkal (3rd person), že to je jeho (poss. pron. 3rd person)”. SL: “pak si zase jako vymyslel (3rd person), že možná se vrátím (1st person)”, “phir us ne soch liyā ki maĩ śāyad laũ āũgā”, then he decided that he would return (literally: then he decided that I will return), instead of “pak si zase jako vymyslel (3rd person), že se možná vrátí (3rd person)”. SS: “on psal (3rd person), že nemůžu dneska (1st person)”, “us ne likhā thā ki maĩ āj nahī ā saktā”, he wrote that he couldn’t come today (literally: he wrote that I couldn’t come today), instead of “on (3rd person) psal, že nemůže (3rd person) dneska”. This error is bound to cause misunderstandings, because direct speech introduced by the conjunction “that” is simply unthinkable in Czech.

⁸⁵ See Montaut (2004), 288-296.

4.11 Word order

The unmarked word order in Hindi is the rigid SOV order. Nonetheless, alternative orders are extremely frequent, especially in spoken language, where statements are mostly marked.⁸⁶ In spoken language, adverbs of place and time sometimes follow after the verb even in sentences that are not strongly marked. The basic word order in Czech is SVO, but the word order is relatively free (for example compared to English), because the syntactic relations are conveyed through inflection.

Without going much into details because of the limited scope of this study, we will analyze examples of sentences captured in our recordings that defy the Czech word order, and try to identify the underlying problems. The first, expected type of problems results from the discrepancy between unmarked word orders of both languages: GB: “rok 2001 přišel jsem (V)”, “maĩ 2001 mẽ āyā thā”, I came in 2001, instead of “přišel jsem v roce 2001”; SL: “to (O) mi nabídnu (V)” (unmarked), she offered it to me, instead of “nabídla (V) mi to (O)”. However, this kind of mistakes is not very common. The same discrepancy between the two unmarked word orders and the resulting confusion regarding the correct placement of the verb in Czech is probably responsible for the occasional incorrect placement of the verb in a sentence. E.g., SL: “jakmile on (S) končil (V) tady (adv.) studium (O)”, “jaise hĩ us ne (S) yahā~ (adv.) paṛhāĩ (O) khatm kĩ (V)”, as soon as he finished his studies here, instead of “jakmile tady (adv.) skončil (V) studium (O)”. BD: “oni si vyráběli (V) tady (adv.) boty (O)”, “ve yahā~ (adv.) jũte (O) banāte the (V)”, they produced shoes here, instead of “oni si tady (adv.) vyráběli (V) boty (O)”. GB: “ona (S) trošku (adv.) umĩ (V) hindĩ (O)” versus “she knows a bit of Hindi”, “vah (S) thoṛĩ (adj., a bit) hindĩ (O) jāntĩ hai (V), instead of “ona (S) umĩ (V) trošku (adv.) hindsky”.

We have already mentioned that adverbs of place and time sometimes appear at the end of a Hindi sentences. This word order is not permissible in Czech sentences. Nonetheless, Czech sentences produced by Hindi L1 speakers often follow this pattern, either as a result of transfer from Hindi, or from English (or both). BD: “já (S) jsem se (V) vždycy chodil (V) tam (adv. of place)”, “maĩ (S) hamešā (adv.) jātā thā (V) vahā~ (adv. of place)”, I (S) always used to go there (adv. of place), instead of “já (S) jsem tam (adv. of place) vždycy chodil (V)”, GB: “ona (S) je taky tam (adv. of place)”, “vah (S) bhĩ vahā~ (adv. of place) hai (V)/vah bhĩ hai (V) vahā~ (adv. of place)”, she (S) is (V) also there (adv. of place), instead of “ona (S) je (V) tam (adv. of place) taky”, time”, etc.

There is a special rule regarding the word order in Czech sentences, sometimes called the “second position rule”. Clitics can not stand at the beginning of the sentence. They always take the second position, not necessarily after the very first word, but certainly after the first compact information. E.g., “Přišla jsem (2) (clitic – auxiliary “to be”) domů v pět”, I came home. “Včera odpoledne (1)

⁸⁶ Montaut (2004), 274-275.

jsem (2) (clitic) přišla domů v pět”, yesterday afternoon, I came home at five. As there is no such rule in Hindi, the “second position rule” is not always followed by Hindi L1 learners. For example, GB: “tak přišel (2) jsem (3!) (clitic) rovně k nim”, so I came directly to them, instead of “tak jsem (2) (clitic) přišel rovnou k ní”, “potom našel (2) jsem (3!) (clitic) nabídku, tak pracoval (2) jsem (3!) (clitic) s nima”, then I found an offer so I worked with them, instead of “potom jsem (2) (clitic) našel nabídku, tak jsem (2) (clitic) s nima pracoval”, SL: “pak si zase jako vymyslel, že možná (2) se (3!) (clitic) vrátím”, then he decided that he might come back, instead of “pak si zase jako vymyslel, že se (2) (clitic) možná vrátí”, SS: “a potom nechtěl (2) jsem (3!) (clitic)”, and then I didn’t want, instead of “a potom jsem (2) (clitic) nechtěl”.

5. Semantic transfer

Regarding lexicon, we find a few cases of transfer from Hindi to Czech, but we also find quite a few Czech borrowings in the materials recorded in Hindi and even some examples of Czech Hindi code switching.

5.1 Borrowings

Our respondents used borrowings from Hindi only very rarely⁸⁷ (EK: “je to jako fakt fukrā”, “he is indeed a fukrā”, where fukrā is a colloquial expressing for a useless and lazy person). The literal translation of Hindi expressions and ideas occurs as well. ND: “můj hlas je takový, jak se říká, tak vysoko, že každý to slyší”, my voice is, how to say that, so high that everyone hears it, where “ū̃cī” (high) in Hindi means high as well as loud. Or SL “možná na deset měsíců”, maybe for ten months, “lagbhag das mahīnō ke lie”, instead of “asi na deset měsíců”, approximately for ten months. The root of the error here is the partial synonymity between the words “asi” (“lagbhag”, approximately, but also “śāyad”, maybe) and “možná” (“śāyad”, maybe). Or TD: “když necvičíš jazyk” instead of “když neprocvičuješ jazyk”. Both “cvičit” and “procvičovat” translate as “abhyās karnā” in Hindi and “to practice” in English, but “cvičit” is used with physical exercise and “procvičovat” with practicing a skill in Czech. Another example of this phenomenon is the above-mentioned case of “come” and “bring” (4.2.13).

⁸⁷ Unlike borrowings from English that very often occur in the recordings in Czech and even much more often in the recordings in Hindi. However, that is not the subject of our study. In general, an immense amount of transfer from English to both Hindi and Czech can be observed in the analyzed material (and even some from other languages such as Slovak or Russian). Let us just mention a few examples. From English: UV: “tajemství (noun) informace” instead of “tajná (adj.) informace”, secret information. From Slovak: UV: “keď chceš”, if you want, instead of “když chceš”, SS: “já som bol”, I was, instead of “já jsem byl”, etc. From Russian: UV: “budeme mluvit po česky”, we will speak in Czech, instead of “budeme mluvit česky”, etc.

Unlike morphology, not even mentioning phonetics and phonology, that are the last to yield to the influence of the second language, larger units such as words are the first to enter the language system. Borrowings from Czech appear comparatively often in the elicited material in Hindi, but they are usually limited to are region specific areas (food, festivals), or involve topics that the speaker encountered for the first time in the second language (bureaucracy). E.g., GB speaks a about his experience with Czech food while borrowing the following names of meals and drinks that either do not exist or are not common in India: “guláš” (goulash), “svíčková” (tenderloin), “omáčka” (gravy), “rajská” (tomato gravy), “vývar” (broth), hrachová” (pea soup), “husa” (goose), “zelí” (sauerkraut), “basa piva” (a case of beer). The same applies to NT: “vepřový” (pork), “bábovka” (marble cake), “buchta” (cake), “kapr” (carp), “bramborový salát” (potato salad), etc. SS talks about places near his new house and festivals that happen there while using local terms, such as “nádraží” (railway station), “lesopark” (forest park) and “betlém” (wooden Nativity scene). NT also talks about festivals using Czech terms, “Velikonoce” (Easter), “Vánoce” (Christmas), “hody hody doprovody” (Czech Easter rhyme). On the other hand, EK has to deal a lot with Czech bureaucracy associated with immigration and business. He moved to the Czech Republic when he was in his early twenties and never had to deal with these areas of life in India, either in Hindi or in English. That is why he uses Czech borrowings, such as: “trvalý [pobyt]”, permanent [residency], “český vláda” (correctly “česká vláda”), Czech government, “živnostenský list” (trade license), “webová stránka” (webpage), “služby” (services), “notářský” (notary), “finanční úřad” (revenue authority). Nevertheless, he uses other words from his daily life in Prague as well, some of them that do not have a Hindi counterpart because the concept does not exist in India, such as “čajovna”, (tea room), and some of them that do exist in Hindi, like “majitel” (owner), “zamilovaný” (in love), “rodina” (family).⁸⁸

5.2 Code switching

There is an immense amount of code switching from Hindi to English and many borrowings from English to both Hindi and Czech. However, code switching from Hindi to Czech does occasionally happen too. E.g., EK is asked in Hindi: “yah sab kaise kar lete ho,” how do you manage to do all this? Though he spoke Hindi until now, he switches into Czech: “svobodný život, krásný svobodný život,” free (single) life, beautiful free life. Then he adds in half Hindi, half Czech: “koī rodina, rodina hai nahī,” I do not have any (Hindi) family (Czech). UV also mixes Hindi and Czech, though he spoke Hindi until now: “words bhūl jātā hoon, Czech ke words mujhe yād rahte haī. Jak

⁸⁸ EK works as a shop manager cum assistant and speaks Czech with his customers every day; he has probably the most exposure to Czech among our participants at this moment.

to říkáme doporučit, po anglicky,” I forgot words, I remember Czech words (Hindi, English). How to say recommend in English (Czech)? Or: “Agar yahā koī sundar laṛkī ho, to můžete doporučit,” If there is any beautiful girl here, then (Hindi) you can recommend (Czech).

6. Results

The aim of this study was to identify areas that are problematic from the point of view of errors resulting from language transfer. Attention was paid to language transfer from the L1 of the Hindi L1 Czech learners onto the L2 that they have acquired on different levels, and to the influence that the acquired L2 exerts on their L1. Apart from the language data that was elicited for the purpose of analysis, details regarding the research participants’ language abilities, learning process and language use were collected as well. This data made it possible to differentiate to some extent between the individual Hindi L1 Czech speakers. Finally, it was possible to draw general and particular conclusions for language transfer from Hindi to Czech, and even some conclusions regarding the impact of reverse transfer.

Let us now summarize the results of the analysis of the elicited linguistic data. As has been already stated above, the phonological and phonetic transfer from Hindi to Czech plays an immense role even in the language production of long-term Czech users, while the role of reverse transfer on this level is negligible. We have seen that the transfer manifest itself mainly in the form of pronunciation errors affecting Czech consonants. Apart from the laminal alveolar trill “ř”, which is the bugbear of the majority of Czech learners, the Czech palatals and the alveolar voiceless affricate proved particularly treacherous for Hindi L1 Czech learners. The area of morphosyntax provides a broader scope for transfer, especially the chapters on nouns and verbs. As has been shown, the Czech declension system with its additional gender and five additional case forms poses probably the gravest obstacle for Hindi (or any other analytic language) L1 learners. The Czech conjugation system resembles the Hindi one in the sense that the individual forms are linked to person, number and gender. However, the Czech compensation for its mere three tempora in the form of aspect seems to be a concept that is perceived as alien even by speakers of high proficiency level. The distinction between perfective and imperfective verbs is understandably extraordinarily difficult to grasp by L1 speakers of a language that uses perfect tenses and compound verbs for the same purpose. On the top of that, the Czech tense forms are synthetic, whereas the Hindi ones are compound except for the future tense, which is ironically synthetic in Hindi and compound in Czech.⁸⁹ The existence of reflexive verbs is another nut that is hard to crack, especially since their

⁸⁹ Or identical with the present form in case of perfective verbs.

use is often not semantically based. On the other hand, after having used a very complex verbal system with its compound and conjunct verbs, rich range of participles and different markers of secondary aspect, the Hindi L1 speakers must feel the lack of modes of expression they are used to from their L1.

Concerning other parts of speech, the difficulties do not seem to be so overwhelming; however, attention should be paid to details such as gen. pl. after numerals above five, etc. There is obviously the problem with prepositions versus postpositions. Czech and English L1 students of Hindi often complain that it is difficult for them to make a sentence when the adposition follows *after* the noun. In the same way, we can observe that Hindi L1 Czech learners often omit the preposition, maybe for the same reason. Another persistent problem is the word order, which is different in both the languages. This is further complicated by the fact that it is not strictly fixed in either of them and plays around with different levels of emphasis. Semantic transfer, as we have seen, plays an important role even in learners on advanced proficiency level.

Except for transfer (and we are already going beyond the scope of our study here), L1 attrition is clearly observable in the elicited material, and it seems to be directly proportional to the number of years spent in the Czech Republic and apparently also to the years spent with a Czech (Slovak) partner/s. It manifests itself in a slower pace of speech, loss of vocabulary and its replacement with English words,⁹⁰ and underproduction of complex structures (maybe especially those that do not have a counterpart in Czech as a consequence of positive transfer, as has been shown in the comparison with a native speaker, 4.2.16).

After having conducted the interviews, the respondents were asked to fill out a questionnaire regarding the languages that they have encountered in their life and the ways that they have learned and used them. The questionnaire also contains questions verifying their answers concerning their first language(s). The information obtained through the questionnaire helped make sense of particular errors caused by transfer. It helped discover cases of transfer from English (which was unproblematic given the fact that all the respondents speak English), but also other languages, such as Russian and Slovak in case of UV, Slovak in case of SS, and a Moravian dialect in case of SL. Place of birth and advanced proficiency level in other Indian languages also helped identify forms and expressions that differ from Modern Standard Hindi (Bengali in case of ND, Punjabi influences in the speech of SS, Mumbai Hindi in the language of UV, Pahari pronunciation of EK, etc.). The length of stay in the Czech Republic had a significant influence on the quantity of errors, as we have already mentioned (especially if we compare the language production of a person who has

⁹⁰ All these factors testify to the fact that this is not a case of foreigner talk (apart from the fact that the respondents are perfectly aware of the fact that the interviewer is an advanced Hindi speaker herself).

spent 25-30 years acquiring Czech, such as ND, and someone who has been in the Czech Republic for mere 5-10 years, such as SS).⁹¹ However, to draw more substantial conclusions based on both the collected linguistic material and the questionnaires, the elicitation would have to be more extensive. Another point that should be included in this kind of study is the coexistence of transfer errors and developmental errors. However, this was unfortunately out of scope of this thesis.

Conclusion

It can be stated that the study has fulfilled its aim regarding the identification of the most persistently problematic areas of the Czech language for Hindi L1 learners, from phonetics and phonology to semantics, and has thereby hopefully reached its goal to provide a few useful insights for teachers of Czech as a second language to Hindi/Urdu L1 speakers. However, some of the aspects of the methods that were used to elicit the data, especially the limited extent of the interviews, and the use of spoken language and topics connected to everyday life, were most probably not sophisticated enough for the reverse transfer to fully manifest itself. If the reverse transfer should be the focus in future studies, a much longer and possibly written assignments would probably serve the cause in a better way. The method used also did not provide an opportunity to analyze another intriguing field, pragmatics. Pragmatics and especially politeness seems to be a promising domain, as it apparently shows great differences in both languages/cultures. Nonetheless, a preliminary study with a limited scope in a field that has not been subject to much research probably should not set its goals too high.

⁹¹ For example, the only woman in our group, TD, has spent most of her life living in the Czech Republic (25-30 years), as she moved to Prague with her parents when she was four. Both the languages, Hindi (that she learned from her parents) and (especially) Czech, are impeccable on the spoken level. Apart from the language attrition affecting her Hindi, the only minor errors she made were on the semantic level, where even native speakers often unwittingly err (like in all other areas of speech).

Bibliography⁹²

- Andersen, Roger W. Transfer to somewhere. In *Language transfer in language learning*, edited by Susan M. Gass & Larry Selinker 177-201. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1983.
- Brown, Amanda, Marianne Gullberg. Bidirectional Crosslinguistic Influence in L1-L2 Encoding of Manner in Speech and Gesture. Study of Japanese Speakers in English. *SSLA* 30 (2008): 225-251.
- Bybee, Joan L. "Usage-based Theory and Exemplar Representations of Constructions". In *The Oxford Handbook of Construction Grammar*, edited by Thomas Hoffmann and Graeme Trousdale 49–69. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Čermák, František. *Korpus a korpusová lingvistika*. Praha: Karolinum, 2017.
- Ellis, Rod. *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Filipec, Josef, František Daneš, Jaroslav Machač and Vladimír Mejstřík. *Slovník spisovné češtiny pro školu a veřejnost*. Praha: ÚJČ AVČR, 2003.
- Fries, Charles. *Teaching and learning English as a foreign language*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1945.
- Gabriele, Alison. Transfer and Transition in the SLA of Aspect. A bidirectional Study of Learners of English and Japanese. *SSLA*, 31 (2009): 371-402.
- Gass, Susan and Larry Selinker (eds.). *Language Transfer in Language Learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1983.
- Gass, Susan and Larry Selinker. *Second Language Acquisition. An Introductory Course*. New York and London: Routledge, 2008.
- Hádková, Marie and Jessica Jane Maertín. *The Course of Czech Grammar*. Dubicko: Infoa 2006.
- Jarvis, Scott and Aneta Pavlenko. *Crosslinguistic influence in language and cognition*. New York: Routledge, 2008.
- Kellerman, Eric and Mike Sharwood Smith (eds.). *Crosslinguistic influence in second language acquisition*. Oxford, UK: Pergamon, 1986.
- Lado, Robert. *Linguistics across cultures*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1957.
- Larsen Freeman, Diane and Michael H. Long. *An introduction to Second Language Acquisition research*. London and New York: Longman, 1991.
- Masica, Colin. *The Indo-Aryan Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- McGregor, Ronald Stuart. *Outline of Hindi Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

⁹² In the bibliography, I always use both full first and second name of a person. Firstly, although this is not the case here, I often cite Indian authors, whose second names often stand just for the name of their community or their gender. Secondly, some readers (including the author of this thesis) automatically presume that the author of a publication is male when the full first name is not given, either due to being raised in a patriarchal society, or in a language environment that endows female names with specific feminine endings, or both.

- McGregor, Ronald Stuart. *Oxford Hindi-English Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Moattarian, A. Bidirectional Crosslinguistic Influence in Language Learning: Linguistic Aspect and Beyond. *International Journal of Linguistics* 5, no. 4 (2013): 38-49.
- Montaut, Annie. *A Grammar of Hindi*. München: LINCOM Studies in Indo-European Linguistics, 2004.
- Müller, Friedrich Max. *Lectures on the science of language*. New Delhi: Munshi Ram Manohar Lal, 1861.
- Odlin, Terence. *Language transfer: Cross-linguistic influence in language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Ohala, Manjari. *Aspects of Hindi phonology*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1983.
- Pavlenko, Aneta, Scott Jarvis. Bidirectional Transfer. *Applied Linguistics* 23/2 (2002): 190-214.
- Saville-Troike, Muriel. *Introducing Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Selinker, Larry. Language transfer. *General linguistics*, 9 (1969): 67-92.
- Shapiro, Michael C. "Hindi." In *The Indo-Aryan Languages*, edited by George Cardona and Dhanesh Jain 276-314. Oxon: Routledge, 2003.
- Štícha, František. *Velká akademická gramatika spisovné češtiny*. Praha: Academia, 2018.
- Weinreich, Uriel. *Languages in contact*. The Hague: Mouton, 1953.
- Whitney, William Dwight. On mixture in language. *Transaction of the American Philological Association*, 12 (1881). 5-26.

Internet resources:

Census of India 2011, last modified June 21st 2019. http://www.censusindia.gov.in/2011Census/C-16_25062018_NEW.pdf.

“oTranscribe .” Accessed between January 1 and May 31, 2019. <https://otranscribe.com/>.