

LANGUAGE SCENARIOS IN INDIA: A GRAMSCIAN PERSPECTIVE

Dilip Chavan

Associate Professor, Department of English,
School of Languages, Literature and Culture Studies
SRTM University

Najeeb Washaly

Research Scholar, Department of English,
School of Languages, Literature and
Culture Studies, SRTM University

Abstract

This article deals with the question of language in the Indian context from a Gramscian perspective. It attempts to address issues related to language neglect and minority language, as well as the status of linguistics, sociolinguistics and politico-linguistics in India. Besides, this article will shed light on the questions associated with linguistic state and linguistic identity. It will urge scholars to investigate and challenge the problems of language politics in India such as linguistic hegemony, linguistic deprivation, and linguistic variation and so on.

Keywords: language, Indian context, Gramsci, sociolinguistics and politico-linguistics

LANGUAGE SCENARIOS IN INDIA: A GRAMSCIAN PERSPECTIVE

- Dilip Chavan

- Najeeb Washaly

Introduction

Humanities and social sciences were planned for better world in future and a better change in the society. The purpose is to make people think along some different lines. Gramsci has been extremely important in the development of many disciplines in the second half of the 20th century. He is referred to in cultural studies, women studies and translation studies. So, Gramsci has contributed to the development of these disciplines, and his ideas were found useful in the development of these studies. One discipline which is related to language is sociolinguistics. Unfortunately, linguistics departments have been neglected in India. Moreover, many teachers of English literature do not like linguistics as a topic or subject, as they do not enjoy this domain. They teach English grammar along with many ideas from the domain of language education and language training and skills and many other ideas under globalization. So, they are made to teach something from this domain for that reason. Hence, they need to develop their own understanding of language studies and language education.

In addition, Gramsci was the one who happened to be a student of linguistics like many other 20th or 19th century cultural and political thinkers such as Foucault and Althusser. However, Gramsci was different, he was a linguist. There are two books available on Gramscian perspectives on language written by Peter Ives. Gramsci himself wrote a few books on the idea of standardization of the Italian language, and he was able to write about his own language. He wrote another article which was about the question of grammar; something that was unlikely, as how a political and philosophical thinker is writing on the idea of grammar, since we do not know a political philosopher generally writing on grammar as such. Peter Ives in his book Language and hegemony in Gramsci states, "Gramsci's discussions of grammar provide a nuanced appreciation for such dynamics and how they can be used metaphorically to understand how coercion and consent operate, which is central to his theory of hegemony" (10). In addition, in his second book

Gramsci's politics of language: Engaging the Bakhtin circle and the Frankfurt school, Ives states:

Yet Gramsci's academic training was in linguistics, and he continually refers to the importance of the study of language throughout his well-known *Prison Notebooks*, the last of which is dedicated to grammar, and there is substantial evidence that the concept of *hegemony* – the most widely used Gramscian concept – is fundamentally rooted in Italian linguistics. (3)

However, Gramsci had to write on the question of grammar primarily because he thought that the idea of restructuring our own assumption about language was a precondition for any sociocultural transformation.

Thus, it is obvious that Gramsci was looking for some sort of change in the society, and since he did have some training in linguistics, he could think of the question of language in terms of social transformation. So, how is the question of language relevant to any kind of transformation in the society? One needs to understand that language is not just a matter to be discussed in the classroom or a matter to be addressed by a linguist or a lexicographer or a grammarian or a sociolinguist or so. It is something which is part of our life.

Linguistic Hegemony

Gramsci is known for the development of the concept of hegemony. There is something called linguistic or language hegemony. So, what is hegemony for Gramsci? Gramsci differentiated between political dominance and cultural dominance. There is a distinction between political dominance, which is achieved by means of force, and cultural dominance, which is achieved by certain cultural and ideological apparatuses. For Gramsci, any situation in any society could be a hegemonic situation, even a family situation. In India, if you visit a traditional family, you will find that it is generally the male member who is the head of the family officially and legally. It is the head of the family who is found to be reading newspaper in the morning. This is also the scenario of middle class family that the male member watches political news. Such a situation in which the head of the family is supposed to be reading political news and the other members of the family are supposed to be cooking or doing other works is very clearly a sort of stereotypical picture of patriarchal hegemony. Maybe you will not find such situation as a political situation

since we think that politics is something related to the government, the assembly or the parliament and other formal domains. Thus, even a domestic situation is marked by some sort of politics or power relationships, and hence, Gramsci helped us understand such relations and situations. Peter Ives argues that Gramsci “pays great attention to language as a political issue, for example, to government policy around language, educational language curricula and everyday language practices” (5). He, further, points out

Yet the idea that we have totally free choice over the language we use, the words we speak, is clearly misleading ... We may adopt phrases, terms, attitudes or even languages even if they are awkward for us, because we know they will be met positively. (7)

So, hegemonic condition is a universal phenomenon where someone or some social groups or a certain section of a society are dominant not by virtue of economic privileges or political rights, but because of certain cultural tenets. Somebody can be superior by virtue of the language he or she speaks. Therefore, language is not only for communication.

Besides, Gramsci helped us understand that dominance is not always political or economic, it is not always by war or imperialism or institutionalised politics. Domination is not something that operates on high levels. Rather, it is an experience that one can have even in a very small or tiny situation such a family or a classroom. Norman Fairclough was one of those who have read Gramsci's book. His interpretation of class and power in contemporary Britain was based on different sources including Gramsci's remarks on common sense and ideology (42,108). Besides, he has focused on language education in schools and the contribution of critical language study to social emancipation. He argues:

... critical language study (CLS) might contribute to the emancipation of those who are dominated and oppressed in our society... to help increase consciousness of how language contributes to the domination of some people by others, because consciousness is the first step towards emancipation. (233)

Therefore, what Gramsci was trying to argue for in his life is that people need to break hegemony by social transformation, that they need to liberate themselves from cultural and ideological dominations, and the way to do that is to break the hegemonic condition. And the

question here is: Can language be a hegemonic condition? Some scholars say 'Yes' it is a hegemonic condition. It has a lot to do with hegemony, a lot to do with dominance in society. That is the case, any speech situation, any language situation becomes or potentially becomes a hegemonic situation.

In other words, language is no longer a democratic experience, no longer a tool for democratization of a society. And the question here is: if we have to democratise knowledge, how are we going to use language? Whether we will use language for democratising knowledge or using language for hegemonising knowledge? Thus, hegemony should be challenged. We need to reorient our own understanding of language education and language policy, even our own understanding of linguistics and sociolinguistics.

Language Scenario in the Indian Context

India had experienced a very intense kind of conflict over the question of language in the past, in the ancient times, in the mediaeval times, and also in the modern times. During the fifties of the 20th century, all had to fight for linguistic state. The state of Maharashtra, for example, was formed in the year 1960 as a linguistic state, and many other states such as Andhra Pradesh. Similarly, Tamil Nadu came into existence on the basis of the idea of linguistic state. But there was a battle fought in Mumbai and around Mumbai for this state. Even in Chennai, also, the long strive went on between two linguistic communities. Several people had to sacrifice for the sake of formation of such a state. So, that itself makes an interesting enquiry one can also now undertake after fifty or sixty years of the formation of these states in India. One can undertake a project to look back and see whether the idea of linguistic state really brought to be useful for the development of society or not.

Nevertheless, one could see a kind of division in Andhra Pradesh and Telangana recently. In both the states, the Telugu language is used. So, what makes people rethink the idea of linguistic state? Why is there a demand for a separate state even when the same language is used in both the states? For example, there has been a demand for Vidarbha. It is the same Marathi language used in Vidarbha and the rest of Maharashtra. But, despite this kind of sharing linguistic communities, there are other issues that make people rethink the idea of linguistic identity.

So language is something which is integral part in our life. One cannot afford to neglect the question of language, and again the question of language cannot be simply reduced to the idea of grammar or Vocabulary or structure that the linguist has been doing for quite a long time. The structure of language has been a kind of preoccupation for the linguist. Teachers, also, do that while teaching the structure of modern English Language. They are primarily concerned with the structure of English Language. But the debate on language these days is essentially a political debate. Tabish Khair¹ and a few other scholars have a political position on Indian English fiction. His critique of fiction is essentially a political critique. It is primarily a political analysis of Indian English fiction.

So, likewise the debate on language these days is a political one. If you just google the word or phrase such as language and politics or language and power you will find several books dealing with language from power perspective, from Foucaultian perspective, and from Gramscian perspective. So, it is a new area of language study. Still there are questions that need to be addressed such as: What are the problems that are pertinent to the Indian situation regarding the question of language? How should we be looking at the language scenario in India today? So, there is a need to address these problematic issues in linguistics in the Indian context.

Sociolinguistics emerged as an independent branch of inquiry into language in the sixties. William Labov was one of the founders of sociolinguistics.² In *The Social Stratification of English in New York City* Labov states:

As in so many other studies of North American speech communities, there is a sharp division between black and white: African-Americans do not participate in the sound changes that are active in the majority population. (252)

He points out that the “difference in sociolinguistic behaviour corresponds to a difference in the sharpness of social stratification in England and America, and reinforces the view of sociolinguistic variation as a sensitive indicator of social structure” (259). On the other hand, Labov undertook a massive project studying the varieties of English used by black slums dwelling

¹ Tabish Khair is an Indian poet, novelist and critic.

² William Labov is Professor of Linguistics and Psychology at the University of Pennsylvania.

children in the city of New York. He came up with his own conclusions that changed the perception of several scholars. Hence, his book *Language in the Inner City: Studies in the Black English Vernacular* on New York black children's use of English language gave rise to what is called corpus linguistics. Labov revealed a shocking fact that black children living in the slums of New York could speak English more effectively than the white middle class children living in the localities of New York do. This conclusion was based on massive survey of New York City. So, Labov's conclusion shocked the world, and gave rise to many scholarly projects and studies subsequently. He, further, states:

To say that the BEV [Black English Vernacular] is a system completely different from other English systems is of course absurd. The great majority of the rules of BEV are the same as the rules of other English dialects. But within that overall similarity, there may be subsets of rules which are not easily integrated into other English grammars, and some of these subsets may be located at strategic points, close to the grammatical core. (37)

Sociolinguistics and the Language Problem in India

In the case of India, there are many domains in which many works can be done, since many students and researchers are obsessed with literary studies. The exploration of the relationship between language and politics in India has been a long felt need. Presently, what we need is scholars in sociolinguistics to study the complexities in language in Maharashtra. Sociolinguistics can help our students of language, teachers, society and the policy makers to develop their own understanding of language scenario in Maharashtra state in particular and in India in general. So, any talk on language today calls for certain kinds of reconsiderations. Scholars need to reconsider their own thought and understanding of language and linguistics.

The sociolinguist who was trying to develop this branch of knowledge a few decades ago had to dissociate himself from the assumptions on which linguistics was based. It was like an intellectual battle that had been engaged with, then they came out with their own understanding of language as use not as structure. So, sociolinguistics shifted the focus from structure to use. Thus, what is studied or taught in sociolinguistics is the way language is used by people not the way language is written by authors in the books. This shifting has changed the understanding of

scholars, and they started looking at the language aspects which were not considered worthy of any serious study.

Besides, understanding the history of language in India is essential. There is a need for political history of languages in India. It can be said that there is no political history of languages. Yet, in India, some language histories did suffer from several institutionalised prejudices such as that all Indian languages are an outcome of Sanskrit. This is what any scholar of Indian language will tell you. William Jones³ refers to the linguistic diversity of India, and his propositions on languages will make you think along some different lines. Sanskrit remains a fundamental part of reference when we raise the question of Indian languages. At least scholars need to reconsider what Sanskrit was, and whether it did obstruct the development of many other languages. They need, also, to know what sort of relationship did really exist between Sanskrit and Prakrit. There is a tendency in scholars to mystify or to depoliticise or invisibilise the sort of enmity between Sanskrit and many other languages, which were neither recognised nor encouraged by the Sanskritist tradition. There is some kind of peculiar relationships between these languages.

Moreover, the regional style of using language was important. The democratic treatment of language gives rise to many regional languages. Buddhism was largely responsible for the script of many regional languages. It is not easy to find a script for a language. So, one may call for a political orientation of the language scenario in India. Also, the following question should be addressed: What is the state of regional languages in India today?

Politico-linguistics: The Case of India

It is worthy to note that the conservative nature of linguistics makes scholars dislike it. Therefore, sociolinguistics becomes a different discipline from linguistics. Sociolinguistics takes care of the societal factors while studying language scenario in any given society. Sociolinguistics had to develop its own methods, its own tools, and its own styles while undertaking studies of

³ Sir William Jones was an Anglo-Welsh philologist, a puisne judge on the Supreme Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal, and a scholar of ancient India, particularly known for his proposition of the existence of a relationship among European and Indo-Aryan languages, which he coined as Indo-European.

language. However, sociolinguistics has failed to address the issue of power and politics. So, scholars moved to Politico-linguistics to explain why language becomes an issue in any given society. Hence, politico-linguistics is where you look at language and politics together. What we need in India today is a kind of political perspective on language. And the question here is: How are we going to develop this kind of perspective that will help us understand language?

In addition to the political question of language, the linguistic turn is very frequently used in the modern theory, and the idea here is the question of language, particularly the way it was defined and described and analysed by some of the early 20th century linguists such as Shashor, Gramsci, Volishino, and Backtin. Their debates on language brought to be very much useful in the development of post-structuralism and post-colonialism. Such scholars developed the question of language in colonial and postcolonial context. There is a lot of intertextuality seen in the debate on language. It can be seen how it emerged as a discourse informed by several disciplines not just a single discipline. When you speak about language today, you need to be careful and take cognition of theoretical discourses and theories and many thinkers of sociolinguistics. It is a very complex phenomenon, as it is difficult to make a statement about language today. William Gould in Hindu nationalism and the language of politics in late colonial India argues that:

In explaining this process, the concept of a dialogue through a mixture of political languages, ideologies and contextual meanings is central. Different social groups and sects would respond to these ideologies and languages of politics in variable ways – demonstrating that the UP Congressmen's relationship with Hindu nationalism was multifaceted.

So, language is not simply a means of communication, it is no longer a structure or a social construct. It is, rather, a political tool of a certain kind in any given society. William Gould (2004) says, "Political languages and ideologies in UP were not necessarily closely related to social or 'class' interests" (11).

Thus, looking at language politically is something that is still to be done or developed. There is a book on language politics in India by Robert King entitled "*Nehru and the Language Politics of India*". Robert D. King has established a need to develop a political perspective on the language scenario in India, and such a perspective will involve the study of language, culture and politics

all together. According to Robert D. King, descriptive linguistics says nothing about the social uses of language and public effects of language and about “language politics” or “language planning.” He argues:

Nothing in the Indian tradition recognized language as a social or political force; indeed as a “force” of any kind. Language was; it simply was. The Indian grammatical tradition made language important. It did not make of language political catalyst, or a means of unifying a country or for carving up a country into state units.

So, one can undertake a project on the demand for a separate state in Maharashtra like Vidarbha. Then, what could be the linguistic aspect of such a demand? What could be the language side of this entire demand of separate Vidarbha? If at all Vidarbha is made a separate state, what could be the political language scenario in Vidarbha? So, there could be many ideas the moment you think of language as it is practised in a society, or as it is planned by the government, and doing such inquiry is politico-linguistics. Therefore, politico-linguistics is nothing but developing some sort of scholarship on the idea of language and its relation to politics. Veena Naregal had made a wonderful work on the idea of language politics in Maharashtra. She has written a book entitled “*Language, Politics, Elites and the Public Sphere: Western India Under Colonialism.*” She argues:

By the time the vernacular discourse became preoccupied with developing a modern, literary aesthetic, the grounds for the arguments in favour of cultivating modern Marathi forms had altered from the concerns emphasised within early native discourse. An emphasis in the earlier arguments had been upon developing vernacular vocabularies that would help the extension of modern, self-reflexive, nationalist discourse. (214-5)

Naregal helps us understand the language scenario in colonial India. She has shed light on language and exploitation in society, language and inequality in the society and the upper-caste hegemony. Yet, the question of inequality is seen as an economic issue. But, if there is an economic or social inequality in a society, how can we relate it to language? Steve Jones points out:

For Gramsci, this policy simply reinforced existing inequalities by ensuring that dialect-speaking children had no access to the national culture with its systems of academic and

bureaucratic preferment. Moreover, for Gramsci, the horizons of someone who could speak only in a local language would always be constrained by their surroundings. (35)

Accordingly, there is another demand to relate economic or social inequality to language. This is the role of politico-linguist to raise the question of language in the context of political sense. Gramsci pointed out that language is an everyday experience, and that exploitation is an everyday experience as well. We have to know: first what does this exploitation have to do with language? Then, how can language be studied in the context of exploitation?

Moreover, the so-called personal issues becomes political. For this reason, linguistic issues are now seen as political issues. They have moved to a more sophisticated understanding of language where we think of re-orientation of our own thought and understanding of language. This re-orientation approach to language will help us solve some of the fundamental issues and problems in the society. It has its own mandate. It looks for better change in the society. It looks for a society free from any kind of discrimination or exploitation.

Thus, what we are trying to develop in this article is a kind of political theory of language and a political perspective on language. And while doing so, Gramsci, again, is an essential point of reference, because he was a linguist and a political thinker. So when you read Gramsci's views on language, you read a political thinker reflecting on the question of language. Consequently, doing language in this sense calls for some sort of position in these theoretical perspectives. Language studies without having any grounding in such theories is difficult. These are not only theoretical frameworks useful for literary studies but for language politics as well.

Another question is: how do you see the rise of Maharashtra Navnirman Sena? Maharashtra Navnirman Sena was formed as a political party having its own linguistic agenda forty years ago. Again, a new outfit came up, a new political party came up, and it has its own language agenda. It is bounded to the state, limited by the state territory. So, how do you, as a teacher of language or as a teacher of literature, see or look at the rise of a political party in Maharashtra which has its own linguistic agenda? When this party has a position in the issue of language, we need to analyse it and have a say on it. Why does a political party in Maharashtra have non-Marathi speaking people in Mumbai and Nagpur? Thus, this question our primary engagement in day-to-day life.

Every person has to address this question in Maharashtra as how to address a political question of language.

Again, the term political needs to be understood. The idea now is seen widely after Foucault's understanding of knowledge and power. Every situation can be seen as a political situation, can be seen as a situation marked by some sort of power politics if not the institutionalised party power politics. So, every situation is marked by power relations even within the family, which otherwise is seen free from politics or political affairs. Therefore, even family can be seen as an institution, which is marked by some sort of power relationship.

Hence, when we look at the question of language from a political point of view, we do not simply restrict our study to what the political parties say about language. If you are doing language and gender in a certain situation, it also becomes a political study of language, because gender is essentially a political question not just a social or domestic or cultural question, even it is not a cultural problem. Thus, we need to rethink, redefine, and rework our understanding of the political question of language, and Foucault did help us with this regard.

Language Deprivation

However, language can help us grow, it can help us develop some sort of democratic ethos. Likewise, language can be counter-productive and counter-revolutionary. It can be very regressive where one language emerges as a threat to other languages, or when one language emerges as a tool for establishing domination over the rest in the society. The census in India now reflects that not more than 15% of Indians are in a position to use English. It is a raw and mistaken understanding of English literacy in India. Ajit Kumar Mohanty from JNU argues that 3% of Indians are able to use English with some adequate competency. It is really shocking since English was introduced to India two hundred years ago and this 3% is very low and it reveals that only a small section of Indians can speak English meaningfully. So, the complex grammatical rules of English obstructed entry of the masses into the privileged world of "correct" English

Besides, many do not have the vigour to address the question of language in India. Many people are going to suffer from linguistic deprivation. If a person cannot speak a certain language or the language he or she speaks is not recognised as proper or standard language, then he or she

has to suffer from linguistic disability. You have to suffer because you are unable to use a certain language or the language you are using is not considered a language at all. People will laugh at you if you use a certain variety of Marathi, they will laugh at you if you used wrong English. Hence, Gramsci will make you rethink the idea of correctness, the way English is supposed to be used or the way it has been decided by the authority.

When we tell a person that he or she is not using/speaking English or Marathi or any other language correctly, you are exercising a tremendous amount of violence on him/her. Involving violence with language makes people hate it. That is why many students refuse to speak English. Thus, classroom becomes a hegemonic situation when you expect students to speak English in a desirable way. Some scholars in England argue that only 3-5% of British population can speak RP (Received Pronunciation). We, teachers and professors of English in India, are expected to teach RP. But English is not used in the world in a standard manner. So, what is language for us as English Teachers? For us it a matter of study, for Gramsci language is an everyday experience; it is not just a philosophical issue. For him, it is a matter of everyday use, and when you have language as an everyday experience there is so much cultural politics involved in it.

Language Neglection

Language has been neglected very often. When we are placed in a nation like India, we should take care of both literature and language while we are studying or teaching our students in schools and colleges. We are expected to focus on communication skills during teaching language and literature. So, language is something that should not suffer any neglection. The question of language in India is also neglected. Thus, we need to address the issue of language in India particularly state language.

Minority Language and Language Variation in India

We find some scholars have been talking about minority languages, the languages of tribal groups, the languages used by small sections of society, and the languages used by those living in the borders. Also, there other language aspects such as gender, caste, class, identity, nationality,

and religion. So, these are the issues commonly dealt with in the domain of sociolinguistics. Peter Ives and Rocco Lacorte (2010) state:

Gayatri Spivak's influential essay "Can the Subaltern Speak?" grapples with the subaltern studies utilization of Gramsci's conception of the "subaltern" but totally ignores Gramsci's own concentration on this very question of subaltern speech ... Gramsci's insight into language, politics and translation can also potentially shed light on how this rich historical analysis can be brought to bare on the changing situation in India today. (7)

There was no facilities in the earlier times for the study of the aspects minority language. It was a discipline which was so obsessed with the idea of structure, of the standard varieties of language. When you teach English to students, you teach them grammar a certain variety of English. So, sociolinguistics allows you to think of minority languages and that there are many Englishes.

Similarly, there are many varieties of Marathi language, all are eligible to communicate your ideas. But, if you ask a friend teaching Marathi in the Marathi department: can the people living in slums in Nagpur, or the poor children or the children from backward society speak Marathi effectively? So, if you put a question like this whether the children belonging to such a society can speak Marathi effectively, of course, he or she will say 'No'. In his autobiography, Dadoba complained that even forty-five years after the publication of his grammar, nobody had ever attempted to use Marathi according to the rules he had prescribed. Hence, the moment a Marathi teacher says this, his or her own opinion is neither based on scholarship nor free from linguistic prejudices. This entire understanding of language was based on certain dissatisfactions with the way linguists were dealing with the question of language.

Moreover, every section of the society for some peculiar reasons has its own style of using language. Now, there is a great debate on gender and language, but you cannot find even a single book in Marathi about gender and language. How do women speak language? How do people living in the slums speak language? How do children coming from medium school speak English? Such questions need survey study to understand the different styles of language. Thus, the Gramscian understanding of language as an everyday experience shifted the attention from language as structure to language as use. In traditional linguistics, language was seen as structure,

something that needs to be analysed. But language is not only structure, it is also use. Gramsci, also, argued that language is a human institution, not just the faculty of the mind or a biological capacity.

Thus, there is a need to understand questions such as: How do we look at the idea of language variation? How do we see the person who speaks a certain language differently? Why do we tend to call a certain style of language wrong? So the problem here is a complex one. The moment you call it wrong, the person who speaks it get depressed or felt marginalised. Steve Jones states

For the neogrammaticists, phonic change was governed by exceptionless laws, and it was therefore logical for them that certain sorts of speech represented the highest development of the language. By contrast, the neolinguists were concerned with social factors in explaining how dominant speech communities, such as urban elites, exerted influence over regional dialects, and over the language of the urban and rural poor. (35)

There is so much symbolic violence involved in language since violence is not only of a physical kind. Thus, there is a lot of symbolic violence in our day-to-day life. There are many prejudices practised against people using Marathi language varieties in Vidarbha region. Also, there is the problem of language and caste in India. Language is influenced by patriarchal structures, and we need to address this issue i.e. discrimination on the basis of caste as well as on the basis of language. These queries lead us to another issue which is language endangerment.

Language Endangerment and Linguistic Imperialism

Here, we need to answer the following question: what are the most threatened languages? There are scholars who are looking at the language loss in the world from two different points of view. One is more innocent or naïve non-political point of view represented by David Crystal. The other is more political and they prefer to use the term linguistic genocide instead of language death. Many languages have disappeared due to the ethnic cleansing of minorities all over the world. A certain community is targeted because of the language it speaks or any other discriminatory reasons, particularly those who are politically powerless, who are culturally weak and marginalised, whose voices are not heard in any society, or who are not respected or given any recognition. The languages of such sections in the world are called minority languages. So there

are many languages which are now dying. Some reports reveal that about four languages are dying every week. This is something we need to understand as how people look at such phenomenon, and what is the more sophisticated perspective on the idea of language loss in the world.

Of course the most threatened languages are the tribal languages in India and the rest of the world. So what is language endangerment? What does language endangerment have to do with globalization, imperialism and power politics? This is a political question, and you need to be trained in political science and sociolinguistics to have a more sophisticated position on the language scenario in India. Again, we need to differentiate between mother tongue and dialect and know how to address the question of language variation. However, the entire idea of language loss has been debated, and there are two perspectives:

(1) Linguistic Imperialism Perspective

(2) Language Death Perspective

Many languages in India are experiencing the heat of globalization. They are being threatened and marginalised. They are on the verge of extinction. Globalization becomes an essential reference while addressing the language scenario in India. Globalization is associated with imperialism. There are two terms that we often refer to viz. imperialism and colonialism. What we are experiencing today is some sort of imperialist politics. Any thought of language calls for this process of globalization. Globalization is seen as an economic process, something to do with the financial world.

The coming of English as a medium of education in rural areas makes language become a great issue. Globalization has made us engage with the question of language. So, how can we look at globalization? What are the views that the theorists hold on globalization? There are a variety of views on globalization, and we need to address these views critically. Nowadays, different parts of the world are experiencing and facing globalization. So, how are the different sections of the Indian society experiencing globalization? Globalization does not have a uniform impact on the Indian society. Reports on Higher education show that the tribal sections are much behind, and that the gap between the tribal and the rest of society in terms of education has increased.

Conclusion

This article dealt with the language scenarios in India from a Gramscian perspective. It addressed the question of language in the Indian context and attempted to shed light on the problems of language in India today regarding linguistics, sociolinguistics, and politico-linguistics. It, also, highlighted the challenges that lead to the calling for a linguistic state and the other language politics agenda. These, this article showed that there had been a need to understand the status of language in India.

Works Cited:

- Fairclough, Norman. Language and power. Longman, London, 1989.
- Gould, William. Hindu nationalism and the language of politics in late colonial India. Vol. 11. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Gramsci, Antonio. Selections from the prison notebooks (ed and trans by Quintin Hoare). London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1971.
- Ives, Peter. Gramsci's politics of language: Engaging the Bakhtin circle and the Frankfurt school. University of Toronto Press, 2004.
- ____ Language and hegemony in Gramsci. London: Pluto Press, 2004.
- Ives, Peter & Rocco Lacorte (eds.) *Gramsci, Language, and Translation*. Lexington Books. 2010.
- Jones, Steve. *Antonio Gramsci*. Routledge. 2006
- King, Robert Desmond. *Nehru and the language politics of India*. Oxford University Press, USA, 1997.
- Labov, William. Language in the inner city: Studies in the Black English vernacular. No. 3. University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972.
- Labov, William. The social stratification of English in New York City. Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Naregal, Veena. Language, politics, elites and the public sphere: Western India under colonialism. Anthem Press, 2002.