UNIVERSITY OF VAASA

Faculty of Philosophy

English Studies

Heidi Anttila

"You come-come, memsaab"
Code-switching in *Sherni* (1988), *Raja Hindustani* (1996) and *Dus* (2005)

Master's Thesis
Vaasa 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

UNIVERSITY OF VAASA
Faculty of Philosophy
Discipline: English Studies
Author: Heidi Anttila
Master's Thesis: "You come-come, memsaab"
Code-switching in *Sherni* (1988), *Raja Hindustani* (1996) and *Dus* (2005)
Degree: Master of Arts
Date: 2015
Supervisor: Tiina Mäntymäki

ABSTRACT

Tämä tutkielma käsittelee englannin kielen käyttöä kolmessa erilaisessa Bollywood-elokuvassa. Materiaalina ovat *Sherni* (1988), *Raja Hindustani* (1996) sekä *Dus* (2005). Tarkoituksena on tutkia, miten suhtautuminen englannin kieleen on muuttunut Bollywood-elokuvissa. Teoriapohjana on kulttuurintutkimuksen jälkikoloniaalisia ja globalisaatioon liittyviä näkemyksiä sekä kielentutkimukseen liittyviä teorioita kaksikielisyydestä ja koodien sekoittamisesta (koodinvaihto, engl. code-switching). Lähtökohtana on tutkia, miten englanti on toisaalta muistutus kolonialismista, mutta toisaalta hyöty nykyisessä globalisoituneessa maailmassa. Tutkittujen kolmen elokuvan kielimaailmat ovat keskenään melko erilaiset, mutta yhtäläisyytenä on tietty kaksijakoinen suhtautuminen englantiin. *Sherni*ssä englantia on melko vähän, ja suurimmaksi osaksi kieli esiintyy negatiivisena vallankäytön välineenä. Kuitenkin jo tässä vanhimmassa elokuvassa myös sankarihahmo käyttää englantia tavalla, joka viestii ”maailmanmies”-identiteetistä. *Raja Hindustani* esittää toisaalta jopa puhtaampaa esikoloniaaliseen historiaan kaipaavaa asennetta, mutta englantia on enemmän, ja sillä on selvästi oma paikkansa globalisoituneen kaupungin statussymbolina. *Dus* puolestaan on hyvin vahvasti kaksikielinen elokuva. Englantia käytetään hyvin paljon, ja sankarit käyttävät sitä itse asiassa enemmän kuin elokuvan terroristit. Hienoisia eroja on havaittavissa kielten käyttötarkoituksissa: pääsääntöisesti englanti liittyy ammattilaisuuteen, toimintaan ja huumoriin, kun taas Hindi-Urdu esiintyy vahvemmin vakavuutta vaativissa ja henkilökohtaisissa tilanteissa sekä runollisuutta vaativissa kohtauksissa. Johtopäätöksenä on, että englannin kielen käyttö elokuvissa ilmaisee poliittista suhtautumista kolonialistiseen menneisyyteen, ja ajan kuluessa englannin kieleen liittyy yhä vähemmän negatiivisia konnotaatioita. Toisaalta englannin omaksuminen osaksi Intian kulttuuri-identiteettiä on auttanut itsenäistymisessä, ja on suuri hyöty globalisoituneessa maailmassa.

KEYWORDS: code-switching, language-contact, postcolonialism, globalization, language in film, Bollywood

1 INTRODUCTION

For me the topic of English in Bollywood films has been intriguing since the first time I saw *Raja Hindustani* (1996) when I was perhaps 11 years old. I found myself surprised at the importance of the language contrast between the countryside where mostly Hindi is used and the city where English is a status symbol. When the heroine Aarti first discovers that Raja, the hero who has lived his whole life in the small town of Palankhet, cannot understand any English, she laughs in disbelief. Aarti's stepmother later uses Raja's ignorance of English as a weapon to separate the lovers. Since that first experience I have watched a notable (at least in relation to my own cultural heritage) number of other very different kinds of Bollywood films, and I have noticed a clear change in the language use depending on the age of the films. It has appeared to me that English is used more and generally in a more positive way in more recent films, and for example the musical numbers more frequently feature English, while older films seem to avoid the use of English in songs altogether.

In this thesis I examine the use of English in three Bollywood films, namely *Sherni* (1988), *Raja Hindustani* (1996) and *Dus* (2005). The films belong to the category of Bollywood films, which is broadly defined as Hindi-language popular cinema. What I have found especially interesting in Bollywood is the use of English: in what types of different situations English language appears, and what the use of English implies in the films, in other words how and why is English used? The production times of the three films which I have chosen as material are far apart in order to get an idea of how the attitude towards English may have changed over time. Moreover, the films are quite different in their style, which for me adds to the comparison, as they represent different types of Bollywood films. So, the scope between the films to be analysed is as wide as possible with only three films.

There does not seem to be a great abundance of studies about the use of English in Bollywood films, which might be due to Bollywood not having been studied very much in general until recently (see chapter 2.2). However, it might also be that the use of English expressions and phrases is taken for granted, and it has not sparked any

discussion in India. However, there is reason to study the use of English in Bollywood films, as the English language sometimes seems to be a very explicit tool in defining characters and constructing the story, especially in the two older examples: *Sherni* (1988) and *Raja Hindustani* (1996). In the case of *Dus* (2005), on the other hand, the sheer amount of English is telling of an attitude change towards the English language.

The situation with the language use in Bollywood is not quite as simple as Hindi with borrowings from English. Laurila (2007: 139) writes that there is a notable amount of English in Bollywood films: words, phrases and even entire scenes are in English. But besides this, it is also questionable whether Hindi actually is the normative language. The language mainly used can be claimed to be Hindi or Urdu, as in practice these two languages are mutually intelligible. Bollywood DVD covers are in English because it is the lingua franca of the industry, and on a larger scale the society. At the beginning of films the title is usually presented in three ways: Arabic letters for Urdu, in Hindi Devanagari-lettering, as well as in transcribed Latin alphabet. The written forms of Urdu and Hindi are different, but since the speakers of both languages can understand the spoken language in the film, there is no reason to alienate a part of the audience, and therefore all three (or even just the Latin alphabet in some cases) are used at the beginning of each film. Since the languages are so similar, a unifying term is sometimes used: Hindi-Urdu or Hindustani. At higher levels of language there are differences: Urdu is influenced by Arabic, while Hindi is influenced by Sanskrit. Hindi-Urdu has developed from Sanskrit but it has been immensely influenced by Persian, Arabic and English. In song lyrics the scale is often tipped towards Urdu, but usually it is said that Hindi is the language of Bollywood. (Laurila 2007: 139–140.) In this thesis I refer to the language as Hindi, but it is important to remember that the situation is not that straightforward.

There are many reasons to study Bollywood. According to Desai and Dudrah (2008:1) there has not previously been much academic study on Bollywood films, partly because of the hegemony of Western and Hollywood cinemas in media/film/cultural studies, and partly because Indian scholarship has dismissed popular cinema and focused on more artistic forms of film. Desai and Dudrah (2008:10) write that “this distinction between

serious art cinema and popular films for the masses deferred much scholarly discussion of Hindi cinema within cinema and media studies". This has changed, however, and nowadays it is an acceptable academic pursuit to study Bollywood (Desai and Dudrah 2008: 1). They further write that as there has been a rise of postcolonial and transnational scholarship, there has been more global attention given to Bollywood's (and other Indian film cultures') attempt to "provincialize" Hollywood. Thus Bollywood offers a fairly fresh object of study, since it has not been under scrutiny for a relatively large portion of its history. Yet Bollywood is a cultural phenomenon influencing both India and the rest of the world.

1.1 Background of the Study

The study of a film culture has the potential to reveal cultural attitudes, and this is especially true for Bollywood, which is such a popular form of entertainment both nationally in India, and internationally as well. According to Featherstone (2005: 97), "film is the medium most integrated within and dependent upon the practices of global capital". Yet, he also writes that film is also a national medium in its descriptors, representations and consumption. According to him, film has the potential of reaching a mass audience, which is aided by the medium not demanding literacy from its audience. Thus it can communicate new national identities, and has done so in India since 1947. However, film production requires large investments, which limits its possibilities of being a means of subaltern expression. The structures for distribution and marketing are also a hindrance: the resources of political expression are necessarily constrained. There is the question of how the representations of nationhood are interpreted by audiences when films are exported into global markets. It is also to be noted that postcolonial film-makers who have built a career in America are more likely to have their films commercially available in the West than those who work within their own national film industries. (Featherstone 2005: 97–98.) This has been evident in the making of this study. While choosing films for my analysis I struggled with the lack of availability of Bollywood films in Finland, and eventually I had to settle for my old VHS recording of *Raja Hindustani*. *Sherni* and *Dus* were, on the other hand, quite easy to acquire on DVD

via the Internet, even though I had to venture out of my comfort zone by trusting an Internet store I had not used before (albeit a well-known one).

Since the films need to be understood by the mass audience, it might be that English is therefore often reduced to idiomatic phrases and expressions while the main language for communication is Hindi. Yet, there is also the aspect of a growing audience for Bollywood films outside Indian borders, which might increase the use of English in order to attract foreign audiences, as well as make the films seem more international for domestic audiences. For example, more recent films such as *Dus* (2005) and *3 Idiots* (2009) seem to entail more English items in the musical sequences, while older Bollywood films like *Sherni* (1988) and *Khilona* (1970) seem to avoid any English words or phrases in songs. The increase of English in musical sequences can be a positive thing for both local and global audiences, but in both cases it is a sign of Bollywood becoming a more global form of entertainment.

The theoretical framework of this thesis is a mixed one, as I need many tools to examine the phenomenon of English in Bollywood cinema. As a basis I use post-colonial theory, as I intend to examine the use of English from the perspective of an attitude shift from colonialism (negative) to globalization (positive) attitude towards the English language. What is clear to me is that Bollywood in general has a dual relationship to the English language. As I have stated, in older films English is presented more as an evil oppressor's language. For example in *Sherni* (1988) the villain characters keeping the village under their control use single English phrases even though they are natives themselves and are shown to have very little clear connections with Europeans. In the newer films, then, such as *Dus* (2005), English is used more. English is also used by the heroes and clearly implying a "citizen of the world" approach. There English is no longer clearly linked with India's past as a colonized area. In addition to theories of postcolonialism and globalization, I use theories of bi/multilingualism and code-switching. The combination of these two (postcolonialism and multilingualism) theoretical approaches is crucial in understanding how English is used in these films separately and in relation to each other.

According to Shohat and Stam (2003: 1), there has been a growing academic interest in issues related to identity, such as nation, race, gender and sexuality. These have been studied within subfields such as postcolonialism, multiculturalism, transnationalism and diaspora studies. However, according to them, these aspects are best combined, and studied in relation to each other. As many others, Shohat and Stam (2003: 2) also write that cinema studies have traditionally been too Hollywood centric, even though Hollywood is only a tiny portion of world's film-making. Because of the complex and versatile nature of the relationship between India, Bollywood, and the English language, it is also useful here to combine theories from different fields of study in order to understand the cultural processes at work. In chapter 3 the theoretical starting points of this thesis are further presented. Chapter 3.1 deals with the concepts of postcolonialism and globalization, as well as related phenomena such as cultural resistance and the nativization of a colonial language. Chapter 3.2, then, focuses on theories of bi-/multilingualism and code-switching, and the relation of these to cultural identity. These two approaches are starting point of this thesis, as on the one hand I wish to understand how colonialism and globalization influence the use of English in Bollywood films, and on the other hand it is worth studying how the fictional world of Bollywood relates to theories of multilingualism and code-switching that have been developed to study ”real” communication.

As a researcher I also face the problem that my own cultural background is very different from the target audience of the films, as I have lived my entire life in Finland. Armes (1987: 1) also writes about how problematic it is for a Western critic to analyse the products of the "Third World" cultures; the researcher needs to be aware of their position as a Westerner. It has been a real problem that Bollywood (and other non-Western cinemas) have only been analysed from Eurocentric viewpoints, using European cinematic aesthetics, forms and epistemologies. It is, therefore, a problem of how Bollywood should be studied, as it should be seen as a distinct phenomenon instead of only in relation to and compared to Western theories. (Desai & Dudrah 2008: 2–3.) Tenhunen (1999: 59) writes that both insiders and outsiders are needed in order to get a full picture of a researched culture. She writes that "scholars of Indian or any other origin are not unambiguous representatives of their ethnic groups". The assumption that

Indians would be able to represent India more truly is also problematic because it does not do justice to the heterogeneity of Indian society. Furthermore, it is problematic to assume that nationalities tell something about research orientations, as the academic world is increasingly globalized. (Tenhunen 1999: 59.) Thus, all in all, both insider and outsider views contain positive and negative aspects. From the insiders' point of view "it is easier to see cultural differences as contested and as entailing political possibilities and consequences" (Tenhunen 1999: 59). An outsider, on the other hand, is usually less aware of local politics of identity, but possesses the advantage of being able to "perceive what the locals tend to overlook and take for granted" (Tenhunen 1999: 59). Therefore, it can be very stimulating to have a dialogue between the insider and outsider perspectives. Thus I choose to see my distance from the Indian culture as a benefit rather than as a problem. Since I have no cultural connection to India besides my own interest, I have an emotional distance to the history and problems of the culture, and I believe that my interpretation of the language use in these films can bring something into the study of Bollywood.

I should note that it is not my intention to make a sociolinguistic study in the sense of analysing the English language of the films in linguistic detail, but rather to focus on why English is used in certain situations in the first place. For this reason I have opted not to make transcripts of the films' dialogues as would be required for a conversation analysis. It is, however, noteworthy to say that the English used in India/Bollywood is its own separate variety, distinct from other varieties of English. García and Otheguy (1989: 2) note that there are bound to be different social realities when English is used by a variety of people from different backgrounds and using other languages alongside English. This also brings about the problem that the wide spread of English in the world easily creates a false sense of mutual intelligibility (García & Otheguy 1989: 2). It is a constraint that I do not understand Hindi myself, but have to rely on English subtitles for *Sherni* and *Dus*, and Finnish for *Raja Hindustani*. An in-depth sociolinguistic analysis would only be possible if I understood Hindi as well.

The question of whether fictitious characters can be analysed on the same terms as real people is always a thing to be considered in studying representation. Cazden (1989:

108) states that many speech situations include more than the speaker and a single addressee, and she calls the others present “auditors”. Auditors are not addressed directly, but are officially present as listeners, or they can be overhearers as well (Cazden 1989: 108). This can be applied to the case of film scenes, as there can be auditors in the scene, alongside the characters actively participating in dialogue. The audience, on the other hand, is always in the role of overhearers. Viewers are receiving the information and analysing what they see and hear, without the ability to participate themselves. However, when making the film, the people involved have been aware of the audience ”overhearing”, which influences the kinds of communication situations which films present; it is not ”real” communication, but represented communication. In order to avoid the problem of analysing the film characters like real people, I take a more holistic view of the films. So, in place of analysing why a certain *character* uses code-switching, I am opting to analyse how the *film* depicts the characters and the code-switching situations. This can provide insight into how Bollywood films use language to create certain impressions, and how characterisations can also be created through language use.

From here onward the structure of this thesis is the following: In 1.2 I introduce the films in order to make the analysis more approachable to those who have not seen them. In chapter 2 I provide background information on India, with emphasis on the English language in India, and the phenomenon known as Bollywood. In chapter 3, then, I introduce the theoretical backgrounds that the analysis is based on, first in 3.1 the concepts related to postcolonialism and globalization and then in 3.2 the various ideas related to multilingualism and codeswitching. And in chapter 4, the findings of my study are presented, divided into categories that describe the situations where codeswitching is opted for: English as a Direct or Indirect Reminder of the Colonial Past, English as an Asset in the Globalized World, and Further Points. Concluding remarks are made in chapter 5.

1.2 Three Different Bollywood Films

In the following subchapters I will give short descriptions of each film, as I find it will make the understanding of my analysis easier. I will focus on explaining the characters, as I find the analysis is best done by relating the use of English to the characters: who uses English and when seems to reveal the attitude towards the language the most. I will attempt to give a genre definition for each film, even though as discussed later in 2.2 Bollywood films cannot really be categorized in the same way as for example Hollywood films. I, however, find an approximate Western genre definition useful to clarify the differences between the three films.

Before going into the descriptions of the individual films, I first need to clarify how the films were watched, and how I refer to them. *Sherni* (1988) and *Dus* (2005) were watched on DVD with English subtitles. *Raja Hindustani* (1996) was watched on a VHS recording with Finnish subtitles. Unfortunately I was unable to purchase *Raja Hindustani* on DVD, and the old VHS recording does produce some technical problems. The film was recorded from the cable television channel Canal+Kulta, and apparently it is a slightly shortened version, since comparing to clips of the film on YouTube.com I find there is material in the clips on the website that are not there in the version on my VHS tape. I have not been able to discover how widely this particular version was distibuted. Because of these problems, I opted for providing complete lists of scenes as an appendix, and all film references are made to the scene numbers in those lists. For *Sherni* and *Dus* I used the scene divisions and titles given on the DVDs, and for *Raja Hindustani* I made the scene division and titles the way I found functional.

1.2.1 *Sherni* (1988)

Sherni (1988) could be categorised as an action/adventure drama. It is directed by Harmesh Malhotra and features Sridevi as Durga, Shatrughan Sinha as Raju / Inspector Rajan and Pran as Durga's father Banjara. The film tells the story of a village girl Durga who is forced to join her father's gang of outlaws in order to get revenge for the injustices done to her family and the entire village by the rich Thakur Dharampal Singh

and his brother Vinod. The film depicts Durga's transformation from an innocent and naïve girl into a powerful vigilante fighter called "*sherni*" ("tigress") by her father Banjara.

The film begins in a situation where Banjara has been sentenced to prison under false pretences, because he was seen as a threat to Thakur and his brother Vinod, who practically rule the village. When Banjara realises the injustice done to him, he escapes and takes justice into his own hands, trying to get revenge against Thakur. At this point Durga refuses to go with her father. She still believes that there is justice for people who do not break the law. As the father is away from home, Durga is forced to dance in the streets to make money for the family, but she chooses this over breaking the law.

Among the action there is also a love story in *Sherni*, between Durga and a character called Raju (also called Rajan and Raj during the film). When Raju arrives to the village he is accidentally taken for the long-lost son of "auntie", an old lady who seems to be considered a village fool. Raju goes along with this assumption probably because he thus has a good vantage point from which to inspect the conduct of the local police. Because, as it turns out Raju is in fact a police officer, and none other than the one who originally arrested Banjara, which complicates the love story. Raju first enters the story as a heroic character when Durga is performing on the street, and some male viewers start making rude suggestions. Raju arrives on a bus, and tells the men bothering Durga off, using English, which impresses Durga.

The main villains Thakur and Vinod both serve slightly different purposes in the story. Vinod is presented as a sexual predator who tries to rape Durga with his friends. He is an unpleasant character with no respect for women or traditional values, but he is not the main villain. Thakur is the one who holds all the power; he is well connected to political power outside the village, and he has a hold on the local police. He is a ruthless character willing to do anything for personal gain. A third villainous character is the chief of police, who does not seem to feel any shame for serving Thakur instead of serving law and the people.

There are 5 musical sequences in *Sherni*, but they are not quite as important to the story as for example in *Raja Hindustani*. The musical numbers are more important in the first half of the film, as after Durga joins Banjara's gang, the darker themes of revenge and justice take the story over. The musical sequences are in scenes 4, 6, 9, 16 and 18, which shows that three of of five songs occur in the first half of the film, while the other two are towards the end, preparing the viewer for the action sequences. There is no English in the songs.

1.2.2 *Raja Hindustani* (1996)

Raja Hindustani (1996) can be considred a romantic comedy and musical. It is directed by Dharmesh Darshan. Aamir Khan plays the hero role of Raja and Karisma Kapoor plays the heroine Aarti. The plot is a simple love story, a version of the "forbidden love" prototype. The rich city girl Aarti goes on a holiday in the village of Palankhet where her parents had first met, and ends up falling in love with the handsome taxi driver Raja. Aarti's father first refuses to give his blessing to the marriage because Raja does not agree to change himself, which would be required in the father's scenario where Raja would move to Bombay and adapt to their way of life (in the film the city is still referred to as Bombay, which is why I also use Bombay when talking about the film). But a father's love soon triumphs, and he soon accepts Aarti's choice. This worries Aarti's stepmother and her brother who now fear that the poor taxi driver is now in competition with them for the father's inheritance.

The story of the film does seem to be that of a fairy tale, the poor boy marrying the rich girl and everyone living happily together after solving the problems in the way of their happiness. A couple with such different backgrounds being able to marry, and their families accepting this is very much based on Western ideologies spread by globalization, such as individualism and the belief that people should choose their own spouse. This also goes along with the Bollywood tradition of social criticism; the message seems to be that people ought to get along with each other despite their differences, and also that love matches should be a possibility. The marriage is made to seem plausible because Aarti's father is so westernised and loves Aarti enough to

overcome his pride. Raja, on the other hand, has no other family besides his aunt and uncle who are wise and loving, and do not seem to give much thought to caste/social differences; they never once mention the difference in social status between the couple.

There is a relatively wide set of characters in the film besides Aarti and Raja. In Aarti's home in Bombay the characters belonging to Aarti's family are introduced at the beginning of the film. Aarti's father plays an important role. The villain characters are also presented in this setting. They are Aarti's stepmother, the stepmother's brother and nephew, in the analysis referred to as stepmother, step-uncle and step-cousin respectively. Gulab and Kamal are presented almost as Aarti's servants, even though they are later offended when Raja calls them that. Thus they seem to be more of the status of friends. They are an odd pair of friends: Gulab a feminine man and Kamal a masculine woman. In Palankhet, Raja's world, we first meet Raja and his assistant, a small boy called Rajnikant. Raja's Aunt and Uncle are all the family Raja has, and they are extremely welcoming to Aarti. There is also Raja's best friend Balvant "Bale" Singh, who falls in love with Kamal and is thus given the task to turn the tomboy into a woman.

There are seven musical sequences in *Raja Hindustani* (eight, counting the small reprise in the final scene). Apart from one, all the sequences are at least partly set in Raja's home village Palankhet; *Tere Ishq Mein Naachenge* (scene 21) is set in Bombay and the *Pardesi Pardesi* reprise in scene 24 is a duet by Aarti in Bombay and Raja in Palankhet. This note of location is interesting because it would seem to imply that Palankhet is the place where music (and also happiness) lives. The one song performed completely in Bombay is the critical moment where the lovers are being driven apart for a while. The *Pardesi Pardesi* reprise on the other hand portrays the lovers longing for each other. Apart from a very minor usage of loanwords there is no English in the songs, and they are all carrying the love story of Raja and Aarti forward in one way or another.

1.2.3 *Dus* (2005)

Dus (2005) is an action thriller directed by Anubhav Sinha and starring Sanjay Dutt, Sunil Shetty and Abhishek Bachchan, among others. The story focuses on a group of agents of an anti-terrorist cell (ATC) on the trail of a terrorist leader, Jambwal (spelled Jambaal in the scene selection), with many political connections. Because of these political connections the protagonists are in fact working without authorization in the hunt for Jambwal, as the ATC is ordered to be shut down at the beginning. The protagonists are presented as "true heroes" that are willing to go against orders to protect civilians and see justice done. In the world of the film it appears that they have no choice but to work against orders due to all the corrupt politicians and the power Jambwal wields over people.

Visually the film takes a great deal of influences from Hollywood action films and crime television series. This shows in the colouring and general visual appearance, the fast-paced cuts and freeze-frame moments with texts providing information about places and characters, along with cookie-cutter transitions, as well as in the small number of musical sequences. This plays to the general feeling that the film attempts to seem very global, accessible to global audiences, and part of the global entertainment culture. A part of the back cover of the DVD reads:

> DUS is a nerve racking journey into the world of loes [sic], deceit, murder and mayhem. It's the story of a parallel world where heroism and treason, conmen and cops exist side by side. It's about exploding cars and gravity defying bikes. It's about dangerous aerial encounters and unrelenting ground breaking tensions. It's about intrigue and treachery as much as it's about courage and sacrifice. DUS is action, terrorism, the sting of betrayal. It is the moment of truth. (*Dus* 2005)

This is telling of how the film is marketed, as a modern Bollywood spectacle, including the ingredients of a *Masala* film (see chapter 2.2) but with a modern twist.

Introducing the characters is a more laborious task than for *Sherni* or *Raja Hindustani*, as the cast of characters is quite large. The main villain is the terrorist Jambwal, who is

for a time mistaken by the heroes to be merely Jambwal's accountant Himmat Mehendi. There is an abundance of minor villain characters, all working for Jambwal. The leader of the ATC, and the father figure for the hero characters, is Siddhant Dheer (played by Sanjay Dutt). Shashank and Aditya are the two agents that Siddhant sends to Canada looking for clues of Jambwal's plan, Shashank being the more serious of the two, and Aditya being the lighthearted younger brother type of character. Aditi is the only woman agent in the group, who also has a romantic relationship with Siddhant. Roy is a member of the original group, who turns out to be a traitor for money. In Canada Shashank and Aditya encounter a woman who they believe to be ATC Agent Neha who was supposed to meet them on their arrival. However, she later turns out to be an impostor working for Jambwal. They also encounter a Canadian police officer of Indian origin, Officer Danish "Dan", who becomes a member of their team because of his sense of justice. Furthermore, there is Dan's wife Priya, and Shashank's sister Anu who portray the more traditional female roles of damsels-in-distress. Anu and Aditya are in love, but Shashank has not approved of the match because he wants better for his sister than a policeman, and hence Anu is engaged to another man. What is interesting about character relations in this film is that even though it is set in a professional environment, and most of the characters are colleagues and not related to each other, the film still strongly portrays family values, and the ATC team functions more like a family than a group of co-workers.

There are only three musical sequences in *Dus*. One of these is the opening title song which looks very much like a modern music video presenting the protagonists, and *Deedar De* in scene 16 is a performance at a club in which none of the protagonists participate. The only traditional musical sequence takes place at the engagement party of Anu. This one scene is clearly separate from the rest of the film in colour and style; it seems to be a break from the cold and dangerous world of police work, and it also serves to explain the backgrounds and relationships of the characters.

The global ambitions of the film are seen also in the fact that alongside Hindi and English it also features a third language that is briefly used, namely German. This occurs in a flashback scene where Dan is on a vacation with his wife in a German-

speaking country. This occurrence can be seen as a further example of the global goals of the film, as Europe is included in the scope of the film, and it is acknowledged that English is not the only language used in Europe. However, since my goal is to analyse only the use of English in the selected films, I will not mention this occurrence of German further. Even so, it is worth mentioning here as it further proves, along with the frequent use of English, that the film is presenting, and is a part of, a globalized world.

2 INDIA AND BOLLYWOOD

India has been an independent country for over 60 years, yet the traces of the colonial past are still present in the culture. The status of the English language is one of the most visible signs of this. The status of English in India is that of a second language; English is an official language alongside Hindi (Crystal 2002 [1988]: 3). It is to be expected that the relationship of the nation with the English language is complicated since it is both an assett in the modern world, a gift from the former colonialists, and also a potentially painful reminder of the colonial past.

In this chapter the history of India and Bollywood are briefly explained. For the purposes of this study India's history is only relevant to a very limited extent; I give a very brief account of how the English language made its way into India via the British colonization, how India became independent, and what the language situation is like today. As for Bollywood, it is very much a world of its own, and so in order to understand the context where the material comes from, I find it necessary to explore the phenomenon that is called Bollywood as background information for this study. I will attempt to draw parallels between the generalizations about Bollywood and the specific three films I am studying.

2.1 India's Historical Relationship with the English Language

The British conquest of India began in the 18th century. In 1757, Britain conquered the first part of the peninsula, and at the beginning of the 19th century they governed the area now known as India, Pakistan, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka, either directly or indirectly via economic power. At first the power was in the hands of the British East-India company. As it functioned on the terms of commerce only, the Indian subjects rose up against the bad treatment in what is called the Sepoy rebellion of 1857. The rebellion was stopped, and Queen Victoria became the ruler of India. The time under British rule was a time of oppression, as India was used as a source of resources for the empire. (Laurila 2007: 75.)

The European colonialists brought their own languages to the areas they conquered, and imposed them on the natives. In India this meant that English replaced Persian and Sanskrit as the official language. The English language was needed to acquire recognition and respectability from the colonialists. Alongside the language came new ideas and information; through the English language the natives were taught for example mechanics, the law and agricultural sciences. The British saw themselves as saviours who were to prevent social chaos and the exploitation of the Indian people by their own kings and religions. (Nayar 2010: 52.)

India became independent in 1947 thanks to the movement run by Mahatma Gandhi (Laurila 2007:75). The decolonisation process led to the partition of India, which meant that the areas in Punjab and Bengal that had dominant Muslim populations were divided into West and East Pakistan. This led into the fragmentation of the workforces in Calcutta and Lahore: Muslims leaving Calcutta for East Pakistan, and Hindus leaving Lahore – that was now in West Pakistan – for India. Many of these workers coming to Bombay brought with them new sources of investment as well as technological and creative skills. Linguistically this helped strengthen the status of Hindi, along with the fact that Hindi was being adopted as one of the new national languages of Independent India. (Varia 2012: 15.)

It has been said that the English language was the greatest gain for India from the period of colonization. English still functions as a lingua franca in the country that has countless native languages. Nowadays the English language is also an advantage in global communication. Christian and Muslim missionaries never succeeded well among the Indian populations, as they already had their religion in a written form. Still today about 80% of Indians are Hindu. (Laurila 2007: 75.) This shows especially well how the British were successful in importing their language, but not in importing their religion. It could also be that this makes it easier to take a positive view of the language, as choosing what is useful in a foreign culture is what cultures often do, and it does not suggest forcing but free will.

The English language has played an important role in the colonial as well as the

postcolonial era of India's history. Nayar (2010: 48) writes that "the collaboration of the colonial and the native elites through English had significant social consequences", for example the construction of the Indian woman as in need of rescuing from the oppression of native men. The English language was a tool for the middle classes to create their new identities. This gave the native elite some power. Alongside the language itself the natives also received ideals of freedom and justice which did not match their material reality. It is therefore seen that the nationalist movement in India was linked to the native elite's access to the English language. (Nayar 2010: 48.)

Today English is the language of the legal system in India. It is a major language in parliament, and the preferred language in universities and fields such as civil service and engineering. There are also newspapers published in English. However, this does not mean that everyone speaks English. There is somewhat of a gap between theory and practice: only a fraction of the population has the opportunity to learn English. There is also regional variety within India, as several other languages have a special status in their own regions. (Crystal 2002 [1988]: 3–4.) This fact that the English language is not in reality available to all of India's population is something that Bollywood film-makers need to consider as their films need to be accessible to the domestic audience.

2.2 Bollywood

From very early on there was debate about what the role of film would be in the development of India. During the early years of Indian cinema, Hollywood still had a very strong hold of the film markets (Varia 2012: 7). This was not a good situation for the British Empire, as the influence of Hollywood films on the ideological atmosphere was a potential threat. Therefore the British tightened the rules of censorship between 1918 and 1920, and founded Empire Films which was to promote the production and distribution of British and colonial films. (Varia 2012: 7.) However, there were also negative opinions about the film industry, for example Mahatma Gandhi found that film was a Western import and should not be taken as a part of the Indian culture. These kinds of opinions were unwelcome to film makers who saw their work as a part of the

independence struggle. There was call to remove the colonial influence in 1928, which lead the British again to tighten their grip and censoring especially anti-colonial sentiments from films. (Varia 2012: 8–9.) Thus, strangely, the colonial master played an important role in forwarding the creation of Bollywood, which is also a part in creating the complexity of the industry. Bollywood has been created by Indians for the Indians, but with the help of the British colonial masters. Bollywood would not be the same if India had not been under colonial powers, and the English language is a part of this dilemma, as well as a constant reminder of this fact. Desai and Dudrah (2008: 6) also write about what a very important role colonialism has played in the creation of Bollywood films. They remind that things are not as straightforward as one might think, as the British censorship policies could be productive, and likewise independence did not mean a golden age of freedom (Desai & Dudrah 2008: 6).

The very term Bollywood is controversial and debated, but still useful in practice. Varia (2012: 4) writes that the actual origins of the word are not known. One view, taken by Desai and Dudrah (2008: 1), is that it was originally a "tongue-in-cheek term used by the English-language media in India" dating back to the 1930s. Another theory about the origins of the term is that it was coined by the Indian intelligentsia (Varia 2012: 4). But what is certain is that "Bollywood" has become "the dominant globally recognized term to refer to Bombay's (Mumbai's) prolific Hindi-Urdu language culture industry and cinema", and that the term "has increasingly been used to refer to the now globalized Mumbai's Hindi film culture industry" (Desai & Dudrah 2008: 1, 2). Varia (2012: 4) writes along similar lines that "the profusion of the word [Bollywood] in the worlds of business, academia and popular culture" cannot be denied. However, there are also problems related with the term. According to Varia (2012: 4), the term "is also a reason why the cinema is not taken seriously". Because the term is a play on Hollywood, it "degrades that which it aims to describe by immediately branding it as a poor imitation, therefore tarnishing its reputation and scaring away any potential for serious analysis" (Varia 2012: 4). Desai and Dudrah (2008: 2) also state that the term potentially renders the cinema as "a poor second cousin to Hollywood" and also undermines other regional cinemas in India. But, as Varia (2012: 4) notes, "the term is a double-edged sword". Even though the term can be seen to have negative connotations,

“it is also recognised as a global brand with massive commercial power at the box office” (Varia 2012: 4). It is clear that the term is somewhat problematic, but has become so recognized that the usefulness outweighs the problems.

What exactly does Bollywood entail, then? Varia (2012: 4) writes that “[e]fforts to define Bollywood have included ‘popular Indian cinema’ or ‘Hindi cinema’”. Both of these are problematic definitions because India has other cinematic traditions which should not be ignored; and there are also other types of cinema produced in Hindi, both in Mumbai and outside it (Varia 2012: 4). Because of these problems Varia (2012: 4) defines Bollywood cinema as: “Hindi-language based and populist cinema produced by major studios in Mumbai”. However, he also states that “[e]quating this cinema with a specific language risks forgetting its historical roots in Urdu”; Bollywood is not purely a Hindi cinema, even though it is often called that (Varia 2012: 4). From the start the industry has placed emphasis on the commercial, social and political value of the cinema and assuming that the wide popularity would “lead to its use as an ideological weapon in the anti-colonial struggle ensuring its important role in creating an independent India” (Varia 2012: 4). For convenience it is better to use the simple definition of Bollywood as Hindi-language popular cinema produced in Mumbai, but it is important to also be aware of the fact that the industry is not so straightforward in reality.

Bollywood is the world’s largest cinema industry. The first Bollywood film was produced in 1912, and by the 1930s over 200 films were being produced in various native languages each year (Featherstone 2005: 100). In 2009 1288 films were produced in Bollywood, while Hollywood produces an average of 500 films per year (Mahmood & Mitra 2011). In 2007 it was estimated that the profits of Bollywood films would more than double from 2003 to 2008. This is mostly due to better marketing outside India and the growing DVD sales. (Laurila 2007: 5.) Varia (2012: 1) explains the importance of Bollywood by noting that it is enjoyed by “millions around the world”. Desai and Dudrah (2008: 1) write that “Bollywood films have met with box-office success and enthusiastic audiences both nationally within India and globally”. They also note that the globalization of Bollywood is not such a recent phenomenon as one might think, and

Indian films were becoming popular through parts of the non-Western world (South Asia, the USSR, China, Africa, Fiji and Western Asia / Middle East) earlier than they came to the awareness of the Western world (Desai & Dudrah 2008: 10). Thus, Bollywood is a notable phenomenon due to the number of films being produced, the profitability of the industry, and the cultural enjoyment it provides its audiences. However, this importance of Bollywood on a world scale is not by all means self-evident to a Westerner. As Varia (2012: 1) writes, "[w]hile the west has become familiar with the idea of Bollywood, little may be known about the industry and its movies beyond a certain celebration of kitsch".

There is no denying the fact that Bollywood is a popular cinema producing entertainment for the masses. Featherstone (2005: 103) notes that popular cinema is important as it "embodies the processes of wider history, though in ways which challenge the discourses and assumptions of a dominant national or Western historiography". He writes that the Bollywood films' primary audience was to be the masses living in slums by necessity (Featherstone 2005: 104). The reasons why Bollywood was so appealing to this audience are seen to some extent in how Pinto (2011: xvi) writes about Bollywood: "[i]t had no time for your past or for your caste; it only cared about your saleability. It was secular because it paid to be secular. It was patriarchal because it paid to play to mainstream values." This cinema had to engage with the predicaments and aspirations of the Indian masses, but not via realism but rather fantasy and melodrama (Featherstone 2005: 104). Thus Bollywood has become a world of its own, which also means that, as Featherstone (2005: 112–113) puts it, the industry has been "culturally conservative and insular, shaping its narratives within its national borders and national concerns, even as it grew as a global industry through the exportation of its products".

Being popular, however, rarely means being respected or taken seriously as a form of cultural expression. Bollywood films have been receiving scholarly attention and been considered cultural texts worth academic attention only since the mid-1980s (Desai & Dudrah 2008: 1). Pinto (2011: xiv) also writes that now "a new book on Bollywood comes out every other day", but that "even twenty years ago there were almost no books

on Hindi commercial cinema". One point to note in relation to the dismissal of Bollywood as mere entertainment for naïve masses is that the industry is not stable and always financially productive, as "only a tiny number of films becom[e] hits out of the hundreds released every year" (Varia 2012: 2). The instability implies that the audience is not quite so gullible as it has been thought, since it would be easy to make hit films were it so simple to predict the preferences of the audience, and other factors that play a role in the success of a film.

What are Bollywood films like, then, if they are so recognizeable? Desai and Dudrah (2008: 1) describe Bollywood cinema as "characterized by music and dance numbers, melodrama, lavish production and an emphasis on stars and spectacle". According to Laurila (2007: 5), it is rare for Bollywood films not to feature musical numbers. This holds true for the films analyzed in this thesis, as they all feature songs: in *Sherni* there are 6, in *Raja Hindustani* 7 (8, counting the short *Pardesi Pardesi* reprise at the end), and in *Dus* there are 3. Since the musical numbers seem to be such a crucial factor in defining the Bollywood film, I am giving them some attention in the thesis. It would seem that English occurrence might carry specifically strong meanings in musical sequences, and therefore it is important to pay attention to these sequences that seem to be both the reason for the success and the low status of Bollywood films.

Varia (2012: 1) writes that "[t]here have been many academic attempts to discover a specific cultural explanation for the conventions found in Bollywood". Attempts have been made to link the aesthetics with ancient Indian dramaturgy. This includes inspecting how specific emotions (*rasas*) can be created via dramatic tools. Laurila (2007: 16) writes that there are nine *rasas* used in Bollywood: *veera* (heroism), *hasya* (laughter and happiness), *raudra* (anger, wrath, violence), *bhayanaka* (anxiety), *karuna* (sympathy, sorrow), *adbhuta* (wonderment), *vibhatsa* (disgust), *shingara* (love, adoring) and *shanta* (peacefulness). In this view Bollywood films are seen as *Masalas*, mixtures of spices (Desai & Dudrah 2008: 10). This is a way to describe the versatility of the films, as the films tend to include features that in Western cinema would belong in different genres. In the *Masala* theory genres are seen as different mixes of the same basic components. For the *Masala* films, the song and dance sequences have been

considered a key characteristic, and they do seem to be the factor that makes people either love or despise Bollywood films (Desai & Dudrah 2008: 11). However, according to Varia (2012: 2), the use of the *Masala/rasa* theory is not very well founded in reality. A more probable basis for Bollywood is in "the popular art forms that emerged in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century colonial India" (Varia 2012: 2), meaning mostly theatrical forms that came about during that time period.

What is true in the *Masala* theory, however, is that Bollywood usually strives to present "a multitude of attractions", more so than in Western cinemas where genre boundaries tend to be somewhat more clear-cut (Varia 2012: 2). Bollywood films are not easily divided into distinct genres or categories, or rather the genres are organised in a different way. Varia (2012: 2) writes that it is important to understand Bollywood as a cinema with its own unique stylistic conventions and a melodramatic framework in order to appreciate the versatility and commercial success. The first films produced in India were categorised as "mythologicals", and soon genres such as "the Stunt", "the Social" and "the Historical" started to emerge (Varia 2012: 7). Desai and Dudrah (2008: 10) also write about the problem of imposing genres upon Bollywood, noting that there are many explanations for understanding the genres, the *Masala* theory, where genres are defined by the different amounts of different *rasas*, being one. Desai and Dudrah also write that many views of genre in Bollywood are dismissive, deeming the Bollywood films as formulaic and apolitical, or lumping them as one category of All-Inclusives or All-Action Films. These different views all attempt to describe the versatility of Bollywood films. (Desai & Dudrah 2008: 10.) Desai and Dudrah (2008: 11–12) write of the *Masala* as the main genre of Bollywood, with a variety of subgenres such as the historical, the family social, the gangster/underworld and the courtesan. They write that "*Masala* films are often the ones mistaken to represent all Bollywood films as formulaic or 'the same' in uninformed commentaries on Indian and popular Hindi cinema". *Masala* films are glamorous, drawing from Indian popular culture, and appealing especially to the urban working class. (Desai & Dudrah 2008: 11–12.) Thus, according to them, there are also Bollywood films that are not *Masalas*, even though the category is often considered to entail all Bollywood films.

For most viewers outside India Bollywood is now synonymous with national Indian cinema (Desai & Dudrah 2008: 2). What is Bollywood like as a national cinema of India, then? Featherstone (2005: 99) writes that the Indian film industry comes close to a narrow definition of national cinema as a film industry funded, controlled and staffed within national boundaries, where the films produced are intended to be consumed within the national boundaries. Cinema is always seen as a process of cultural engagement, definition and resistance. What is interesting is how film-makers and audiences are able to create their own film cultures, give localized meaning to the global medium which derives from the form given to it in the USA. (Featherstone 2005: 99.) Even though Bollywood established itself as a strong autonomous production industry towards the end of the colonial period, it was controlled by censorship, which meant it was not able to support the independence movement directly. After independence the censorship remained in order to "shape a cinema supportive of dominant versions of national construction and virtually silent on the most pressing and dangerous issues of that process, such as inter-religious conflict" (Featherstone 2005: 100). This makes Bollywood an intriguing object of study, as it is such a versatile cinema, and as such demands specific sorts of tools to understand it.

The relationship between the state and the film industry has been vexed. Indian cinema has been granted official industry status by the Indian government as late as 2001 (Desai & Dudrah 2008: 7). Before independence the industry was under suspicion because of its potential to be used in the work of nationalist idealism, but it was also useful to have the industry in existence (Desai & Dudrah 2008: 7–8). Colonial and post-independence governments have wanted to maintain the film industry as producing maximum tax incomes without trying to create a stable industry (Desai & Dudrah 2008: 8). This indicates that the production of Bollywood films is highly vulnerable to changes, but on the other hand it would seem that this sort of system has the potential to provide quite a high rate of artistic freedom, as the government has been mostly interested in tax incomes and not the contents of the films. Such a system is bound to have both positive and negative effects on the films being made.

In the 1990s the All-Action *Masala* films became less popular among audiences, and

Bollywood turned more towards romantic comedy with action occurring only when it was necessary for the story (Desai & Dudrah 2008: 12). This is seen in the material of this study, as *Sherni* (1988) would fit into the category of All-Action, with a full range of rasas, while *Raja Hindustani* (1996) clearly emphasizes the romantic storyline, leaving the action a much smaller role. However, the film still includes all of the *rasas* to smaller or greater extent. Desai and Dudrah (2008: 12) further note that action is still given more space in historical and anti-Pakistani films, and there are also films with a "continued valorization of a certain brawny masculinity that is less central to the romance films". *Dus* (2005) would perhaps be best described by the last description.

Finally it is to be said that Bollywood is versatile in many other ways besides the storylines of films. Multilingualism has been a part of Bollywood from the beginning. Most studios in early Bollywood "produced multilingual films, with the northern-based companies almost always producing films in Hindi and Urdu as well as the local language" (Varia 2012: 10). Bollywood has quite often been accused of copying and plagiarism, as Bollywood versions are often made of films made in Hollywood or for example Hong Kong or Japan (Desai & Dudrah 2008: 5). Desai and Dudrah (2008: 5) write of this borrowing of stories: "this omnivorous and elastic appetite of Bollywood might be better understood as a strategy of accommodation, indigenization and hybridity as well as a strong sense of cinephilia". By cinephilia they seem to refer to a general love of cinema as a format that exists in Bollywood, which often leads to the film-makers wanting to make their own versions of films they have seen and liked. The film industry has also had a major influence in the creation of the modern Indian culture (Desai & Dudrah 2008: 5–6). Thus Bollywood is both created out of culture, and creating culture, it takes influences from the world, and creates its own, which in turn influences the world outside the industry.

3 POSTCOLONIAL CULTURE AND LANGUAGE

In this chapter I attempt to describe the various phenomena surrounding a national cinema of India, from colonialism to multilingualism and globalization to code-switching. In chapter 3.1 I present concepts related to postcolonialism, globalization and cultural identity, in short the viewpoint is cultural. In 3.2, on the other hand, I present the linguistic phenomena of bi/multilingualism and code-switching. I have divided the text into smaller subchapters for clarity. What makes it difficult to introduce this theoretical background is that the various phenomena are all linked in various ways, which is also why there may appear to be repetition of certain ideas. However, I attempt to keep in mind the connection to my subject of language use in Bollywood.

3.1 Postcolonialism, Globalization and Cultural Identity

Bollywood films bring together issues of colonialism, globalization, national identity, and India's relationship with the rest of the world. These are the cultural issues I have taken as the starting point of my theory. In this chapter I present the ideas I find noteworthy for the purposes of this study. All these phenomena are linked to each other in complex ways, and I attempt to bind them together in how they relate to Bollywood whenever possible. The issues described in this chapter are to be taken as background information to my analysis, as I do not explicitly address them in the analysis, but rather they are constantly present implicitly in how I view the films.

3.1.1 The Concept of Postcolonialism

Postcolonialism is a field of study that is interested in the phenomena that occur in areas that have been colonized, and are now decolonized. However, the definition of what the field includes is not entirely unproblematic. The term is not quite as simple as it might seem. An obvious implication is that it is a time period following a colonial rule. But there have been many colonial periods in history, and it may be seen as problematic to apply the term to only the period after the European colonial empires crumbled in the

1950s and 1960s (Childs & Williams 1997: 1). The term also implies an attitude of resistance to the ideas of colonialism: anti-colonialism (Childs & Williams 1997: 3). It should be remembered that postcolonialism is not about abstract things, but about the people and their reactions and ideologies. Some problems are bound to arise when the complexity of situations is taken into account: there are people of various backgrounds living in any taken area. Who can be said to be the original people when there have been other periods of colonization in the past? (Childs & Williams 1997: 12.) Thus, the term is indeed slippery, but still useful as long as it is used with caution.

The terminology related to the study of phenomena connected with colonialism and what has come after the colonial period is complex and controversial, as different theorists have taken slightly different positions on these phenomena. Siikala (1999: 48) writes that "we are living in a world of prefixes"; he states that "'pre-/post-' and 'de-/neo-' can be found in an amazing array of combinations with different theoretical and descriptive categories". When talking about 'pre-colonialism' people are usually depicting a "pure" original form of a culture, which was then spoiled by the Western influences brought about by colonialism. And after the colonial era, the process of decolonization could not be a return to that original, but it was the creation of something new, postcolonialism or neocolonialism. (Siikala 1999: 48.) Postcolonialism here refers to the situation that comes after the colonial era, and neocolonialism refers to the ways in which the colonial masters can still hold economic power even after they have seemingly lost the political power of the former colonized areas.

But as Siikala (1999: 48) also states, the world after colonialism has very complicated hegemonic structures, which cannot be described merely with the simple term 'neocolonialism'. Yet it seems that it is still the hobby of the West to analyse the problems of subjectivity, and this precisely is the main obsession of postcolonial discussion (Siikala 1999: 48). Prefixes do not necessarily create new worlds; there are continuities and discontinuities in the world (Siikala 1999: 48). The West thus continues to be the one analysing the former colonized areas can render the natives to be seen almost as children; and thus they do have the power to resist but even then their world is created from without, and not within (Siikala 1999: 48). Thus the aftermath of

colonialism is still very much present and part of the cultural identities in many parts of the world, even if the relationship is not quite as simple oppressor-oppressed as it was in the colonial past.

3.1.2 The Impact of Colonialism on Culture and Language

Colonialism had a notable impact on cultures, both of the colonialists' and the natives. Postcolonial scholars have demonstrated how colonialists studied every aspect of the colonized peoples' lives in order to govern them (Nayar 2010: 47). The information was gathered with ideologies of binaries that classified the natives as inferior and colonizers as superior, an "us versus them" view. The intention was also to use the gathered information to train future administrators. There was a strong will to 'civilize' the natives, and change the native culture. Marxist critics have shown that when the structures of power are unquestioningly accepted by the people, power works best. This means that it is more fruitful to teach ideologies than to use violence. (Nayar 2010: 47–48.) Postcolonialism claims that the traditions inherited by the postcolonial societies as their own were in fact created by the colonialists (Nayar 2010: 68). Nayar (2010: 68) further writes the following:

> They [the colonialists] framed Indian, African and other identities in ways that were subtle by working within the cultural rather than political domains. These identities have spilled over into the postcolonial age, and newly independent nations in Africa and Asia in the twentieth century carry their legacies of colonial structures like the railways or medical training. The cultural processes of the civilizing mission colonized the bodies and minds of the natives, and this aided the colonial project. (Nayar 2010: 68.)

It is then clear that the colonialists had an immense influence on the societies they conquered, and it is no wonder the aftermath has gained so much interest. This background on the colonial processes is good to have as basis when analysing the phenomena of current Indian culture, such as the Bollywood film industry.

The concept of resistance is a crucial part of postcolonialism, as it is necessarily needed in some form to be rid of the colonial oppression. Featherstone (2005: 202) writes that

the first priority of anti-colonial movements was to recover the political control over relevant geographical areas. Parker (1999: 24) writes of a need to broaden the popular sense of understanding what is meant by *resistance*. Resistance is usually perceived as reactive, but according to Parker, resistance should be seen more as transformative; that what actually happens is a contest that is dialectical in form, and from which eventually emerges a new synthesis. Resistance is "inserting itself within the discourses of the dominant to such an extent that it re-shapes it, trans-forms it, alters it irretrievably". (Parker 1999: 24.) So, Parker sees the post-colonial condition as a hybrid form of culture. Hybridity can be determined as a form of transculturation, a process where new cultural forms are created by the subordinate culture from materials provided by the dominant culture (Pratt in Singh 1996: 12). In hybrid cultural forms the native has become fluent enough to converse in the language of the colonial masters. This can be adapted to viewing Bollywood, as it has adopted the Western technology of film making to make their own kinds of films, to tell Indian stories. The use of English language can also be seen as an empowering thing, yet it is still a double-edged sword.

The fact that English has been used in India for such a long time means that it has been adopted as part of the society, and this means that the culture has developed a specific relationship with the English language. Crystal (2002 [1988]: 97) writes that when people adopt a previously foreign language to be a part of their culture, the language "is likely to develop features which reflect the bonds that exist between them, and distinguish them from other social groups." He also writes that a special vocabulary and grammatical constructions will emerge to depict their identities, and the group will develop their own slang. All people belong to a number of groups, and have learned a different language variety for each of them. "The more a group of people are given the status of a social institution within a community, the more distinctive their language is likely to be." (Crystal 2002 [1988]: 97.) Thus, since English has been present in India for such a long while, and has such a special status in the society, it is bound to carry identity-defining meanings. The English language is still a reminder of the colonial past, but it has also been adopted into the Indian culture. In a country of great linguistic variety, language has a role in defining identities, but the linguistic variety as such is a factor in defining national identities.

Language has a complex role in postcolonial cultures. In the case of India, the English language was brought by the colonial masters, but it did not remain only a language of the foreign oppressor. Nayar (2010: 58–59) writes about the "nativization" of the English language. As the colonialists saw it as their task to educate the natives, while doing so they gave the natives the ideological tools against the colonial masters. It has been claimed that the English education in India was a one-way imposition made possible by the structures and apparatuses of colonialism, but more accurate is to say that the natives were themselves active in receiving the language and its teachings (Nayar 2010: 50). Thus anti-colonial movements absorbed the colonialists' ideals of freedom and used them against the colonial masters. So, English was "nativized", taken by the natives as their own and used for their own purposes. In Postcolonial studies it is seen that the colonial education system created "hybrid natives whose affiliation and loyalties (not to mention their accents) remained far more complex than the British could imagine" (Nayar 2010: 58–59). It was a contradictory objective to "civilise" the colonial other. What were used as disciplining tools helped in the production of politically conscious citizenry. When the Indian people began learning English and taking it as their own, it was no longer the colonial master's language, but a useful tool for the oppressed natives to use against the colonial master. (Nayar 2010: 58–59.) I would further argue that this process of nativization is an ongoing one, and across time English has become more and more the property of the natives and less associated with the colonial masters.

3.1.3 Postcolonialism and Cinema

What, then, is the role of film in native languages in postcolonial studies? Featherstone (2005: 8–9) notes that first of all the availability of films with subtitles restricts what can be studied, and that the films made with the help of Western production companies, and thus with Western audiences in mind are most easily available. In this respect Bollywood is an easy subject of study, since the films are relatively easily available on DVD and with English subtitles, even if the availability is not quite as good in Finland as it would be in some other countries. Featherstone (2005: 97) notes that the study of film is an exceptionally suggestive and complex part of postcolonial studies because it

is a global medium with an “intense presence of national/local identity”.

Film is thus a medium where both global and local concerns are naturally present, and the relationship of the two is often worthy of studying. The availability of different film cultures globally has improved because of the Internet and online DVD stores. This furthermore increases the global aspect of the film industry. The study of postcolonial cinemas should “seek to understand the specific conditions of production and reception of their films” (Featherstone 2005: 98). But it must also seek to understand the connections to global film practices. Different socio-economic conditions of production are present in different postcolonial cinemas. About the Indian popular cinema Featherstone notes that it “challenges the subaltern connotations of the postcolonial prefix in the very size and influence of its industry” not only in India but globally as well. Bollywood is also to some extent uninterested in issues that are associated with postcolonialism, which has led some theorists to see it as neocolonial depoliticising of subaltern cultures. (Featherstone 2005: 98.) By this he seems to mean roughly that the film industry is seen as providing mere entertainment to keep people happy and thus it would help uphold unjust political systems. More recent studies see Bollywood as having “a distinctive indigenous tradition at work” and it does not need to be responding or reacting to the colonial past (Featherstone 2005: 98). These notions are noteworthy here because this study inspects how the colonial past might influence the linguistic scenery of some Bollywood films.

3.1.4 Globalization

Postcolonialism is not the only approach that is of interest here. Globalization is also a strong influence on the English use of the films. During (1993: 23) writes about the relation between postcolonialism and globalization that globalization has enabled new regions to invent themselves by transforming the old divisions of for example metropolitan/colony. This is also the development I clearly see in the Bollywood films I have watched (on a larger scale as well as in the films analysed in this thesis). For example in *Raja Hindustani* the boundary between the English-speaking city and Raja’s rural paradise, where almost no English is heard, seems to represent very strongly a

transition stage. On the other hand the film presents a longing for the happy pre-colonized past, but it also acknowledges that the new globalized way is not all bad. The marriage of Raja and Aarti can be seen as the marriage of these two viewpoints, between the old traditions and the new globalized worldview. It is not without conflict, but it is a match meant to be. Childs and Williams (1997: 14) write that

> for many groups or individuals, post-colonialism is much more to do with the painful experience of confronting the desire to recover 'lost' pre-colonial identities, the impossibility of actually doing so, and the task of constructing some new identity on the basis of that impossibility.

Thus, English can be seen as a double-edged sword: English was the tool of oppression and domination, but English as a lingua franca has brought people together in a positive way and increased intercultural understanding (García & Otheguy 1989: 3).

Globalization and postcolonialism are strongly interlinked, as they are both present today, and globalization can be seen as a sort of continuance of colonialism and post/anticolonialism. As Spivak (1999: ix) writes, globalization is now "in full swing", which brings new dimensions to the study of postcoloniality. The processes that are called globalization are new in intensity and scale, but not in their substance. Globalization is a term used for a historical phase: the capitalist present. Discourse on globalization makes it a special phenomenon in the sense that it has become self-conscious, and can be analysed from within the phenomenon. (Blommaert 2010: 1.) By this Blommaert seems to mean that as people perceive themselves as currently living the processes of globalization, and are able to criticise those processes there is a special aspect to the phenomenon. According to Blommaert (2010: 1) the often used expression "global village" is not precisely accurate, but the situation is rather that globalization has produced a "complex web of villages, towns, neighbourhoods, settlements connected by material and symbolic ties in often unpredictable ways". Postcolonialism, globalization and language are all interconnected in many ways, as globalization changes the way in which postcolonialism is perceived, and the linguistic situation of the world is very much influenced by both the postcolonial situation and the current process of globalization.

The attitude towards globalization is not always a positive one. Barker (1999: 1) ponders the situation of the world in a way that seems to hold quite true today: There is a notable amount of resistance towards globalization in different cultures. There are views that cultures should be kept pure, and not allow foreign, especially American, influences change cultures. It is the concept of cultural identity which has become most interesting to cultural theorists, and aspects of multiculturalism, postcolonialism and colonialism among others are of a great interest in inspecting the modern cultural identities (Barker 1999: 2). In the complex flows of cultures, people seem to have a need to maintain clear cultural identities while also keeping the door open to multicultural communication. But the fear seems to be that the cultural flows are too one-way, and something will be lost with the cultures that are at the receiving end of the flow.

3.1.5 English as a Global Lingua Franca

English is considered to be the lingua franca of the globalized world. Greenbaum and Quirk (2007 [1990]: 1) explain that a distinction is often made depending on how the language is learned. A *native* language is acquired as a young child (at home), a *foreign* language is acquired later in life. There is also a distinction made between a *first* language, and an *additional* language, overlapping with the previous distinction. English is used as an *intranational* language in some countries, while in others it serves mainly as an *international* language. However, English also has a special status in some countries, such as India, where it is a foreign language, yet also serves intranational purposes. English has both a national and an international purpose in such countries. This kind of domestic use of a foreign language is often called “English as a second language”. (Greenbaum & Quirk 2007 [1990]: 1.) As English is taken by people in different parts of the world as their own “we see ‘Englishes’ that are postcolonial, nativized and hybridized” (Nayar 2010: 84). Thus, the situation of English in India is more complex than just a memorial from the colonial period. It is now taken as a part of the culture, claimed as a tool in hybrid postcolonial identities. Also, even though English is increasingly used around the world due to globalization, India is one of the countries where the relationship is special because of the history of colonialism.

The relationship between the English language and globalization is a special one, as the spread of the English language is often seen as a crucial part of globalization. Facchinetti, Crystal and Seidlhofer (2010: 10) write that globalization has changed the English language in two different ways: on one hand English absorbs local features in the geographical locations where it is used, and on the other hand the language adapts to the new values and relations in global communication. Crystal (2010: 17) notes that when people use the expression 'global English' they usually refer to what is identified as standard English. However, attention has increasingly been drawn to "the regional features which differentiate one part of the English-speaking world from another", so today we talk about different 'Englishes', and there is also an increasing academic interest in these varieties (Crystal 2010: 17). According to Crystal (2010: 17), "[m]uch of the distinctiveness [of the varieties of English] resides in the area of lexicology, the linguistic domain which most closely reflects cultural identity". Naturally, when a new language is adopted by people, they begin to adapt it for their local needs (Crystal 2010: 17). What this means for English as a lingua franca of the globalized world is that it becomes to be used by more people for more private concerns, including people who have a different language as a first language (Crystal 2010: 19). In relation to this the study of English use in Bollywood is given new aspects, because this influence of globalization is brought alongside the fact that English was already present in India as an inheritance from the colonial period.

The use of English as a global lingua franca can be seen as connected to what Nayar calls "re-orientalism". It has been thought that the excessive search for authenticity in postcolonial cultures can lead to an exoticised presentation of their cultures for so called First World consumption (Nayar 2010: 90). In this phenomenon it is the native who does the exoticising of their own culture (Nayar 2010: 90). 'Anxiety of Indianness' in Indian writers who write in English and for global audiences results in the "homogenization of reality, an essentializing of India, a certain flattening out of complicated and conflicting contours, the ambiguous and shifting relations that exist between individuals and groups in a plural community" (Mukherjee in Nayar 2010: 90). However, Nayar (2010: 90) sees this accusation as an unfair one. It is true that it is easier to attract an audience in English, but it does not make the text any less 'authentic'

(Nayar 2010: 90). Even though Nayar's examples are of fiction writing, this is an interesting aspect to consider about film as well. For older Bollywood films the target audience is so clearly a domestic one that this problem does not seem probable. But in the case of *Dus*, for example, it could be a question to consider how much the film-makers have considered the picture of India they are giving to foreign audiences. This is also linked to the following points of cultural identity.

3.1.6 Cultural Identity

What precisely is a cultural identity, then, and what its relationship to language? Barker (1999: 7) writes that "the concept of cultural identity does not refer to a universal, fixed or essential identity but to a contingent, historically and culturally specific social construction to which language is central". He states that identity should not be thought of as something fixed, but rather an ongoing process of description and becoming. According to Barker (1999: 8), identity is best thought of as "the weaving of patterns of discourse into a centreless web and not as a set of attributes which a unified core self possesses". This idea takes on an anti-representationalist view of language, where language is not seen as representing a pre-existing actual thing, but rather that language brings the concept into life through the process of signification. It is clear that identity is not a set thing in any case, but that identities shift according to situation, which is radically different from how the word is used in everyday language. (Barker 1999: 8, 23–24.) Barker (1999: 26) further writes about Foucault's thought that identity and the subject are "historically specific constructions of discourse and practice". Identity can be thought of to be formed out of a common history, ancestry and a set of symbolic resources (Hall in Barker 1999: 27). Identity is, however, not only defined via similarities but also differences; meaningful defining factors can be for example class, gender, sexuality, age, ethnicity, nationality, morality and religion; and identities which are articulated through these factors are shifting, "becoming" rather than "being" (Hall in Barker 1999: 28). Bollywood films play an important, yet complex role, in the national identity formation of India. The cinema as a whole is both loved and despised, and thus can have very different functions in identity formation in different contexts. Also, within films identity formation is done in different ways, and I have found that

often language is a crucial tool in presenting different character identities in Bollywood films.

Out of the factors defining identity, nationality is perhaps the most important one for this study, especially national identity in relation to the rest of the world. As noted, Bollywood plays a versatile role in building Indian national identities, and the cinema is both influenced by post-colonialism and globalization and also a part of these phenomena. The relationship of India and the rest of the world is often present in Bollywood stories, and the films are expressions of "Indianness" both within India as well as to the outside world. ”It is at the heart of national consciousness that international consciousness lives and grows, and this two-fold emerging is ultimately the source of all culture” (Fanon, quoted in Childs & Williams 1997: 58). Nationalism has been seen as beneficial and even necessary for de-colonialization, but it is also problematic (Childs & Williams 1997: 58). What Benedict Anderson famously termed the *imagined community*, brought nations together, but some of these have turned out to be problematic later: ”the conflict between India, Pakistan and local nationalists in Kashmir since independence is just one, particularly severe example of this” (Featherstone 2005: 202). Featherstone (2005: 202) also writes that the “homogenising, essentialist tendencies implicit in ideas of national identity have also made the nation state unsteady ground for cultural and ethnic diversity”. Thus nationality is both a positive and a negative part of cultural identities, simultaneously dividing and connecting people.

Language is a key element in shaping group and individual identities, as different language varieties are tools used by people when they wish to identify with certain identities and claim difference from others (Edwards 2009: 6). People also feel the need to protect their language and even believe it to be superior to others, thus protecting their group identity (Edwards 2009: 12). Le Page and Tabouret-Keller (1985: 14) use the term *act of identity* to illustrate how people use language to express their identity and find their social place. In a post-colonial setting people have more than one option to choose from in terms of language use, and they can express different identities via the language variety they choose (code-switching). Le Page and Tabouret-Keller mention

that India is more settled in its post-colonial status than their object of study, the Caribbean. India is one of the places with long traditions to limit people's choices of language identity. (Le Page & Tabouret-Keller 1985: 14.) In this view, as time passes the identity options become more set, and the opportunity to create fresh forms of identity become less available.

The media can have a strong influence in creating national identities. Shohat and Stam (2003: 1) note that "[j]ust as the media can exoticize and otherize cultures, they can also reflect and help catalyze multicultural affiliations and transnational identifications". Thus film as a part of the mediascape of today's world can also have a strong impact on how people view themselves and others. The ideas related to identity are also strongly linked to ideas presented in the following chapter, as bi/multilingualism is a strong factor in defining cultural identities.

3.2 Bilingualism and Code-switching

The phenomena discussed in the previous chapter are closely linked to those of bi/multilingualism and code-switching. Language plays an important role in constructing the concepts of state and nation, and in regulating citizenship, and it is also of great importance in analysing phenomena such as colonialism and neo-colonialism (Heller 2007: 2–3). Language is a crucial part of identity formation, for both personal identities as well as cultural identities. Haugen (1987: 3) writes that children learn early to identify certain language varieties in relation to their status in society, and as adults then "register automatically, not just that differences exist, but that speaker is 'vulgar,' or 'stuck-up,' or 'foreign,' and behave toward him [sic] on the basis of these identifications". In this chapter I examine views on multilingualism and code-switching, as they are at the core of this thesis. I will first discuss language contact and bilingualism in general, and then code-switching more specifically as the practical result of language contact.

3.2.1 Language Contact

It is a fact that absolute monolingualism is rare in the world, and often the presence of multiple languages is seen as a problem. Heller (2007: 15) writes that multilingualism has become ever more important because of globalization, and the monolingual norm that has been the ideal situation for nation states has become more difficult to maintain. Haugen (1987: 3) notes that people have had many different attitudes and approaches to the problem of multilingualism (and different language varieties), ranging "from neighborly tolerance to rigid isolation, and from eager acceptance of a new language to brutal suppression of its speakers". *Language contact* has created a class of speakers who are able to use more than one language, the multilinguals or polyglots (Haugen 1987: 3). Haugen (1987: 3) uses the term *bilinguals* for all those who have more than one language at their disposal, and this does not mean that they have "perfect" language skills in those languages. For convenience I also tend to use the term bilingual(ism) since I am focusing on the meeting ground of only two languages.

The relationship between English and local languages is worth mentioning here, before moving on to the definition of bilingualism and the phenomenon and problems of code-switching. Blommaert (2010: 43) writes that people tend to think that strong colonial languages are a threat to local languages, but there are problems with this thinking, as this view implies that there is a place for only one language at a time. In reality there are different languages that can be used in lingua franca or vernacular varieties and thus create different sociolinguistic conditions; English sometimes poses a "threat" more to other former colonial languages (for example French, Spanish or Portuguese), rather than to the native languages (Blommaert 2010: 43). Also, sometimes the dominant local languages, instead of colonial languages, are a "threat" to minority languages (Blommaert 2010: 43). Blommaert (2010: 44) further writes that this approach has quite a rigid view on language in relation to space, as it implies that languages should be maintained in a similar manner to endangered species. This view puts an extreme emphasis on the locality of a language (Blommaert 2010: 44). Thus, even if in everyday life people easily talk of English as "spoiling" native languages, this is an over-simplification of the complex reality.

3.2.2 Bilingualism

Bilingualism is quite a complex phenomenon, even though it may sometimes appear less so in everyday thinking. Haugen (1987: 13) writes: "[i]t is no simple task to define the limits of what we call 'bilingualism'". More often than not people are required to learn more than one language at some point of their lives in order to communicate with others. In many nations, such as Belgium, Finland or India there is more than one language that are recognized as official languages of the administration of the country. In India the speakers of the other native languages have rioted against the imposition of Hindi. It is a fact that "some degree of bilingualism is now and has always been a part of the experience of most human beings who have not remained rooted to the spot of their birth". This can be both a social and political problem, as well as a personal problem. Bilingualism has been studied on many different fields and from many different perspectives. (Haugen 1987: 13–14.) But what is bilingualism? According to Haugen (1987: 14), "[t]here are two opposed schools of thought in this matter: those who adopt a *narrow* definition, and those who adopt a *wide* one." Here, a narrow definition means that a speaker has a native competence in more than one language, and a wide definition means that a speaker has some knowledge of another language. Either extreme view holds problems, as the strictest interpretation of the narrow definition practically means there are no perfect bilinguals, while the wide definition becomes useless as a term since it includes all human beings who have been in contact with other language varieties besides their own (Haugen 1987: 14). In reality a useful definition is found between the two extremes.

Language learning is a process, and it has traditionally been thought a normal situation that a child learns the language used around her/him. What happens, then, when a person learns more than one language sufficiently well to be called bi/multilingual? Heller (2006: 83) presents Landry's theory about bilingualism as two ways of becoming multilingual. The first is through substractive bilingualism, in which one language variety replaces another and the second is additive bilingualism, in which the new variety does not replace the old, but is added to it. In this view additive bilingualism is the desirable form, and thus bilingualism is ideally some kind of double

monolingualism. Substractive bilingualism would be seen as undesirable, because it would mean a one-way flow of language and culture, and this is strongly linked to people's fears of losing something valuable when languages (and cultures) change and die out. However, a view where ideal bilingualism is described as a double monolingualism seems to adopt quite a narrow definition of bilingualism, as it seems to expect a native language competence in both languages. In Bollywood films this does not seem to be the case since in them English is quite clearly a second language, and Hindi-Urdu is the main vehicle of communication.

Since monolingualism is rare in practice, it becomes ever more important to study the phenomena of language contact and bilingualism. Heller (2007: 15) claims that a sense of bilingualism as "only one perspective on a more complex set of practices" is emerging. These are practices that draw on linguistic resources thought to be from different linguistic systems, but they are best understood to be "resources called into play by social actors, under social and historical conditions which both constrain and make possible the social reproduction of existing conventions and relations, as well as the production of new ones" (Heller 2007: 15). Blommaert (2010: 43) also writes that the target of sociolinguistic studies in the globalized world should be of "mobile resources" not of "immobile languages", and even though these resources "can be conventionally tagged as 'belonging' to language X or Y, it is good to remember that the whole point is about the dislodging of such resources from their conventional origins". This is most likely a good viewpoint for related fields as well, not just sociolinguistics. Thus the complex nature of the mixing of languages (along with cultures) travelling in the global world is to be taken as a starting point for studies related to language and culture. It is possible for a person without being bilingual to use borrowings from foreign languages. Heller (2007: 15–16) further writes that the phenomena of postcolonialism, post-nationalism and the globalizing new economy are better described via shifting understandings of bilingualism. Indeed, to understand the cultural processes going on, it is important to study the shifts in language use.

3.2.3 The Study of Code-Switching

The majority of world's population has multiple languages at their disposal, and according to Franceschini (1998: 62), any linguistic theory should have variability as its basis, and take into consideration the linguistic versatility that people express in reality. Franceschini (1998: 62) sees code-switching as one of the solutions people use in language contact situations, other solutions are, for example, pidgin and creole languages. Code-switching cannot be considered a historical language, because it is not passed down from one generation to the next; it is not stable but created anew in each social context where it is used (Franceschini 1998: 62). According to Alvarez-Cáccamo (1998: 33), research on bilingual conversation has largely been based on the notion of code-switching as linguistic action, where grammar and lexicon are included. He writes that from this point of view all code-switching, even smooth switching, is potentially a source of ”interference”, and code-switching is situated on a continuum along with ”borrowing”, ”integration” and ”transfer” (Alvarez-Cáccamo 1998: 33). According to Eastman (1992: 1), the goal should be to stop categorizing any seemingly non-native material as a borrowing or a switch, because looking at language use as a whole would make it easier to truly understand how cognitive, social, and cultural processes function in urban linguistic contexts. It may be true that it would be better to investigate a language situation as it is without imposing the monolingual norm on it by differentiating between elements from different sources/languages. However, it is useful in the case of this study to identify elements originating from English in order to see the relation of Hindi and English, even if in ”real” linguistic situations the divisions between languages may be less important. Code-switching is a powerful tool in developing group norms and functions, as well as developing group identity (Franceschini 1998: 62). Code-switching, thus is communication where people use material from different linguistic codes, which easily happens when people have various different codes at their disposal.

The term *code-switching* is not without problems. Different authors often refer to different things with the term, and some wish to avoid it altogether (Heller 2007: 7). The term was originally coined as a tool to find universals of linguistic structure, and what

these sorts of bilingual expressions could tell about them (Heller 2007: 7). Often what is meant by ”code” in ”code-switching” is roughly the same as ”language”, an autonomous and bounded linguistic system. However, sometimes it is necessary to differentiate between large-scale moves (language) and close relations (code), which is why the word ”code” is used in the term, and not ”language”. Auer (1998b: 27) writes that the term has become to be used without awareness of its origins, and hence many researchers use an unhyphenated form of it. Originally, as used by Roman Jakobson, the term refers to codes that have been stored to be able to process two different types of speech forms, and not necessarily the switching of languages in speech (Auer 1998b: 27). According to Auer (1998b: 27–28), it is also problematic to equate codes with languages, because this definition would include the ”non-meaningful” type of code-switching, namely code-mixing, which in the Jakobsonian version is seen as only one code.

As to the history of code-switching studies, Heller (2007: 9) writes that in 1950s–1960s research on ”the ways in which different languages, or language varieties, might correspond to different social functions” was initiated. This new approach was called structural-functional (see also Alvarez-Cáccamo 1998: 33) and emphasised the necessity to look at the social functions of code-switching. The concept of *diglossia* “pointed to the ways in which even different varieties of one language could be assigned different functions within a hierarchy of prestige and status”, and it was seen that this could also be applied to situations where the varieties were considered to be separate languages (Heller 2007: 9). In 1972 Blom and Gumperz made a distinction between *situational* and *metaphorical code-switching* being able to capture ”the messy ways in which bilinguals imported linguistic resources across domain boundaries” in addition to using certain codes in certain situations (Heller 2007: 12). The division turned out to be inadequate in the long run, but ”it did introduce into the debate some essential ideas, notably those concerned with looking at bilingual speakers as social actors within social networks” (Heller 2007: 12). But however problematic the term may be, it is useful for a study such as this, as it does serve a purpose when looking into the language situation in Bollywood films as contact between two codes, namely Hindi-Urdu and English.

People have also presented different opinions on what should be studied about code-switching. According to Auer (1998a: 3), research on code-switching has traditionally been either sociolinguistic (in a narrow sense) or grammatical. An object of study has been ”how language choice reflects power and inequality, or is an index of the ‘rights and obligations’ attributed to incumbents of certain social categories” (Auer: 1998a: 3). The two approaches (sociolinguistic and grammatical) leave a gap. There are local processes of language negotiation and code selection at work in a conversation between bilingual speakers. Macro-sociolinguists look at the social implications of the occurrence or non-occurrence of code-switching but do not consider the local processes within the communication situation. (Auer 1998a: 3.) Franceschini (1998: 66) notes that only since linguistic theory has become oriented towards a pragmatic paradigm, interested in language use has code-switching become a recognized phenomenon. According to Franceschini (1998: 66), “[a]bove all, we need to widen our horizons: *variation*, *languages in contact*, *flexibility* and the *urge of individuals to differ from each other* could serve as cornerstones” for research. Further, Franceschini (1998: 66) states a need to study the diachronic dimension of code-switching, that is, code-switching in relation to time. Due to the limitations of this study, I am mostly focusing on the occurrence or non-occurrence of code-switching, but I do attempt to take into consideration the local processes within dialogues of the film. I attempt to find any patterns of when English is chosen in place of Hindi, and also when it is not used. The diachronic point of view is also present in this thesis on a small scale, since the three films are from different time periods, and do present different types of English use.

3.2.4 What Counts as Code-switching

As noted above, there can be different opinions of what should be considered code-switching, the kind that carries social meaning and is thus worthy of analysis. Auer takes the view that code-switching and code-mixing are different phenomena, yet he also admits the fact that languages/codes borrowing from each other is a problem for the analysis of code-switching (Auer 1998a: 13). Loanwords can seem like code-switching while in fact they are part of the surrounding code. According to Auer (1998a: 13), it is possible to know whether there are many different codes present in a situation by

showing that there is switching between codes in a meaningful way in bilingual conversation. When applied to the material of this study, a linguist would most likely say there is the Hindi-Urdu code and the English code, and that in many cases within the films English words are simply borrowed into Hindustan. But it seems to be debatable whether these instances carry social meaning or not.

It can indeed be difficult to define what sorts of instances should be studied as code-switching. Alvarez-Cáccamo (1998: 42) states that research on code-switching should focus on instances where there is social meaning in the switching of codes. He argues that in cases where two language varieties are habitually mixed into one mixed code, there is no social meaning in the switching. Then there are cases when seemingly one language entails many codes/varieties which are switched in a meaningful way. (Alvarez-Cáccamo 1998: 42.) The latter instance refers to situations where for example a certain accent or dialect of a language carries social meaning. Eastman (1992: 16) writes that "[c]odeswitching as a process may involve single lexical items, borrowing of whole phrases and the alternation of codes intrasententially to such an extent that little is gained from structurally isolating codeswitching types". According to her, what is more important than inspecting this sort of structural typology is to look at the kinds of contact situations where code-switching takes place. According to Eastman (1992: 16), thus, both the *sociohistorical* as well as the *ethnographic context* of code-switching behaviour is important. It is not only a matter of language contact, how code-switching is perceived, and how much it is used, as ethnic and race relations, political and economic realities, generational differences and factors of 'covert prestige' value within a community are also issues that have a notable influence (Eastman 1992: 16–17). It is also possible that code-switching becomes the normative way of speaking in a community, and "codeswitching itself, in particular settings or situations, may take on a normative role and become a distinct mode of speech in itself" (Eastman 1992: 17), which correlates with the idea of a mixed code. Thus, what is crucial in studying code-switching is to see the phenomenon in its context, and acknowledge that in certain situations code-switching may become a separate code of its own, even though there has been disagreement on whether such situations should be studied as part of code-switching or not as it is debatable whether they possess social meaning.

Clearly these are not straightforward matters to analyse. According to Franceschini (1998: 58), the two main problems in dealing with code-switching are the recognition of separate codes and determining the social functions. In cases where two languages are closely related, it is exceedingly difficult to attribute elements to particular codes (Franceschini 1998: 58). As to social functions, some cases are simpler to determine, but in many cases it is a matter of guesswork, as not even the people using different codes are always able to determine why they choose a certain code for a certain situation (Franceschini 1998: 59). This is true especially in cases where two closely related varieties are used alternatingly. According to Franceschini (1998: 59), it is not a satisfactory solution to call these situations code-mixing, as linguistically the speakers are using code-switching, but the conversational purposes for it still remain unclear when using a different term. Thus Franceschini seems to be of the opinion that loanword usage is also of importance.

The situation is further complicated by the fact that what seems to an outsider as a speaker using many different codes, which are then classified by linguists, the case may not appear to be like that to the speaker as his/her linguistic system is a set of personal abilities acquired through contact with others, and on the level of societies the forms of interaction are shaped by historical contexts (Franceschini 1998: 62). Thus both the defining of codes and the determining of the social context are in fact quite problematic. Auer (1998a: 2) also problematizes the determining of codes, as he writes that what linguists would self-evidently categorize as separate codes may not appear so to the participants in a conversation. What Auer does is consider the conversational dimension of code-switching, trying to understand it from the point of view of the speakers and not imposing external linguistic categories on it. He considers two important questions, namely (1) what the codes in code-switching are, and (2) how conversational code-switching relates to its social and cultural context. Out of Auer's questions the second one is important for this study. For the purposes of this thesis there is no need to question the codes, Hindi and English. Even though at some points there may be cases where the Hindustan-English is used as one mixed code rather than actual code-switching, my interest is to analyse what seem to me to be cases of code-switching from Hindi to English without differentiating between code-switching and code-mixing.

Since it does not seem useful here to differentiate between code-switching and code-mixing, the question remains what does carry meaning. Eastman (1992: 1) notes that it is practically impossible to differentiate between code-switching, code-mixing and borrowing, and further that there is no point in studying loanwords out of context. The difference that is to be made in a situation where code-switching occurs is whether it is a question of a *marked choice* or an *unmarked choice*. Code-switching is an unmarked choice in contexts where the mixing of codes is an everyday thing that carries no social meaning. But when the code-switching implies a negotiation of relative social, political or economic strength, it is a marked choice. (Eastman 1992: 1.) These can be compared to Heller's concepts of *conventional* and *anti-conventional* language use (Heller 1992: 123). According to Heller (1992: 123–126), code-switching is to be seen as a part of a range of linguistic practices used to establish social goals. In Bollywood films code-switching is, in a sense, an unmarked choice, as it is expected of the language use. However, the use of English still carries meaning in a slightly different way, and it is especially meaningful as a tool of character building.

Myers-Scotton's *Matrix Language Frame* (MLF) theory is based on the idea that "codeswitching occurs everywhere within a frame which is set by the *matrix* language" (Eastman 1992: 2). Matrix language refers to the language in which most of the morphemes occur (Eastman 1992: 2), as for example in the films studied in this thesis the matrix language is Hindi (Hindustan). The language(s) that are borrowed or switched into are in this theory called *embedded* languages (Eastman 1992: 2). Myers-Scotton's theory includes a continuum from borrowing to codeswitching, but as Eastman notes there is little reason to make this distinction (Eastman 1992: 3). Auer (1998a: 2) also presents the idea of a continuum from actual code-switching to mixed codes, and writes the following about the mixed code -end of the scale:

> Mixed codes contain numerous and frequent cases of alternation between two languages when seen from the linguists' point of view, but these singular occurrences of alternation do not carry meaning *qua* language choice for the bilingual participants (although they will usually be able to recognise them). That such a mixed code is used at all may of course be a noticeable event for the speakers, just as the absence of mixing may be noticeable; yet the individual cases of alternation receive neither discourse- nor participant-related

interpretations. (Auer 1998a: 16.)

For Meyers-Scotton the difference between the extremes of the continuum is that codeswitches are embedded into the matrix language while borrowings have become part of the matrix (Eastman 1992: 3). Thus, it seems clear that the situation does form a sort of continuum from mixed code to code-switching, but there are different opinions as to what the social meaning of code-mixing is, and whether there is any.

3.2.5 The Functions of Code-switching

There are many possible social functions for code-switching: participant constellation, turn-taking, topic change, side remarks, or contrastive devices like topicalisation and reported speech ("strong functions"), and also more subtle, stylistic ones (Franceschini 1998: 60). It is also a possibility that in some cases the code-switching has no function in the conversational context (Franceschini 1998: 60). Auer (1998a: 3) writes that code-switching is used to indicate group membership in certain bilingual communities. Both group and individual identities are defined by language, and bilingualism is indeed an important factor in defining identities, and thus it could be added to Franceschini's list that identity formation and expression is always underlying the more superficial reasons for code-switching. In fiction, including film, I would claim, code-switching always has some purpose, even if only to make the multiculturalism of the film known. However, there is variation in how much and what kind of meaning is loaded into these code-switching expressions.

Since code-switching is common in bi- and multilingual settings, it is also of importance if code-switching does not occur. According to Eastman (1992: 1), in urban multilingual contexts where there is no code-switching, it means that the negotiation is not yet possible or has become impossible. Franceschini (1998: 65) notes that when code-switching insertions occur rarely, it is an indication of either a small range of code-switching available and/or "a low degree of social acceptance of this behaviour". In order for code-switching to occur, a certain amount of political and social flexibility of norms is needed, and the coexistence of different languages/varieties needs to be

appreciated instead of being excluded (Franceschini 1998: 65). Code-switching is usually excluded from official and prestigious situations, and in written language (Franceschini 1998: 65). According to Franceschini (1998: 65), code-switching is especially favoured in languages that are not standardised and exist orally rather than in writing. Obviously code-switching is less easy in situations in which the speakers of the different languages are hostile towards each other. However, code-switching is less stigmatised in situations where the varieties hold little difference in terms of culture and identity (Franceschini 1998: 65). Code-switching is thus seen as a highly natural form of self-expression as people negotiate their identities in social situations, even though social realities can limit the how and when of the use of code-switching. In this thesis it is therefore also of importance to consider the meaning of situations where code-switching is not used as much as elsewhere in the films.

The language situation in Bollywood films is an example of a mixed code, where there actually is only one code, but that code is a combination of two originally different codes. But the use of code-switching and mixed codes also often co-occurs in the same context, so that it can be difficult to tell the difference between the two phenomena. Mainly because of this, I do not see it as important to differentiate between these two phenomena in my analysis, and I use the term code-switching for all occurrences of English language in the films. The starting point is that Hindi is the matrix language, and English is the embedded language (of interest). In what follows, I attempt to define the different functions of code-switching in the three films.

4 ENGLISH AS NEGATIVE AND POSITIVE IN THREE BOLLYWOOD FILMS

In this chapter I analyse the uses of code-switching in the three example films *Sherni* (1988, henceforth S in references), *Raja Hindustani* (1996, henceforth RH in references) and *Dus* (2005, henceforth D in references). I look at how code-switching represents the two codes and functions as a tool of representation of characters in the films. I especially focus on how the language use reflects the colonial past and the globalized present, and how the ratios seem to have shifted between these three films so that *Sherni* presents English in a more negative way than *Raja Hindustani*, and *Dus* is, in this respect, the most positive one out of the three. In chapter 4.1. I write about how English in certain situations seems to be a reminder of the colonial past, as the language was first brought into India by the colonials. The social functions for code-switching according to Franceschini listed in chapter 3 are difficult to apply to works of fiction, as in films there can only be stylistic functions. Auer's idea of identity formation is also to be considered at least insofar as Bollywood films play an important part in contributing to the national identity of India and Indians in diaspora. In chapter 4.3 I introduce further my findings of the language in the films. Finally, in chapter 4.4 I summarise and compare my findings.

Looking at the list of scenes in the Appendix, where I have included the occurrence or non-occurrence of English in each scene, it is apparent that the amount of English has increased over time. I have differentiated between occurrences where English words are clearly assimilated loanwords, and thus classified as code-mixing. This differentiation is especially important in *Sherni*, where there is a great deal of loanwords, and less of "actual" code-switching. An example of such occurrences is that the local chief of police is constantly called "Inspector-sahib" by other characters (for example S 2, 5 and 8). The ratios of the different categories are as follows: in *Sherni* 3 out of 19 scenes have no English, 10 out of 19 scenes have only loanword usage, and 6 scenes have actual code-switching; in *Raja Hindustani* 9 out of 28 scenes have no English, 5 out of 28 have only loanword usage and 14 out of 28 have actual code-switching. In *Dus* none of the 24 scenes have English, 1 out of 24 scenes have only loanword usage and 23 out of 24 have actual code-switching, even though some scenes (for example scene 14) have

a relatively small amount of English. Even though the numbers are distorted by the fact that I have divided *Raja Hindustani* into shorter sequences than the distributors of the other two films have done on the DVDs, it is clear that in *Sherni* most of the English occurrences are loanwords, while *Raja Hindustani* has more actual code-switching, yet also quite a few scenes where no English is heard. *Dus*, then, contains no scenes where English is not heard, yet there is a scene where there is only loanword usage, and there is variation in how much English is used in each scene. I should further note that since I have worked with the films alone without scripts, there is a possibility I have missed some occurrences of English, especially loanwords that are well integrated into the frame language.

4.1 English as a Direct or Indirect Reminder of the Colonial Past

English as a negative reminder of India's colonial past is shown in the speech of the villain characters in both *Sherni* (1988) and *Raja Hindustani* (1996). In *Sherni* the instances where actual code-switching into English does occur are very telling because they are so few. Code-switching is most often used by the villain characters; the other characters use mostly English loanwords only, except for a few interesting examples, which are discussed in 4.2 in more detail. The villain characters use English quite often in short expressions such as: "How are you?" (S 5); "Shut up!" (S 8). Vinod, the brother of the main villain Thakur arrives in the village from the city, and uses English (for example "How are you?" in S 5) as a sign that he has seen the world beyond the village. The English phrases that the villains use are not important because of their informational content; they do not mean much for understanding the storyline. However, in terms of the status of the English language they are quite meaningful. The villain characters using the language seem to remind us that English is traditionally the language of the oppressor. The main villains are not politicians or law officials, which would give a different explanation for them using English, even though it would also be a reminder of the colonial past in a more practical level. Thakur and Vinod are rich Indian land owners who have the local police in their pockets, which makes it even more explicit that the English used by them is a sign of power and oppression. The most

clear example of the memory of the colonial past in *Sherni* is in scene 13 where a superior police officer from the headquarters has arrived to sort out the situation: the character is relatively European-looking and uses a comparatively notable number of English expressions during his short appearance, for example ”I see” and ”public”.

In *Raja Hindustani*, then, the villains using English could be seen as part of the city–country binary, which I will discuss further in 4.3. But to be noted here is how the villain characters specifically use English, and how the language is clearly linked with a sense of ”falseness” and deception. As explained in 1.2.2 the villains in the film are the Stepmother, the Step-uncle and the Step-cousin. First of all, the Step-Cousin who has very few lines calls his father “dad”, and in scene 19 the Stepmother calls him, her nephew, ”silly boy”. These are examples of the villains’ use of English also in private situations where there is no social ”need” to appear cultivated, as is the case in the party scenes (RH 2, 20–22). The Step-Uncle can be seen as the main villain, as in many scenes it is shown that it is him who encourages his sister into scheming, and actually generates the evil plans against Raja and Aarti. This sinister character tells his sister to ”relax” when she is worrying that a poor taxi driver is about to come between her and her husband’s fortune (RH 16). The Step-uncle also uses the phrase “I see” at the party in scene 20 where Raja and Aarti are driven apart by the villainous trio. Given the fact the the Step-uncle has very few lines in total as he is more of a menacing figure in the background, even the smallest amount of English from him is noteworthy. The stepmother, then, uses phrases such as “It’s ok, darling” (RH 3). In combination with her behaviour and tone of voice she gives a very pretentious and untrustworthy impression. The stepmother tells Aarti that her father is unavailable because the “phone [is] disconnected” (RH 7). The stepmother’s use of English is very much that of a villain. She is scheming and greedy, and English is a part in conveying this. However, at the end she is not beyond redemption, and seems to genuinely regret what she has done, and when apologizing in scene 26 she uses Hindi.

In scene 20 of *Raja Hindustani* when Aarti and Raja are visiting Bombay for the birthday party of Aarti and her father, the Stepmother convinces Aarti to give Raja a Western style black suit instead of his traditional Indian wedding clothes. The suit is

actually second-hand from the Step-cousin, but the stepmother lies to Aarti that she bought it new. She also convinces Aarti to lie to Raja that Aarti herself bought it in order to get Raja to agree to wear it, which he would not do otherwise because of his pride. The stepmother uses a notable amount of English in this scene. Then, as Aarti is lying to her husband, she uses the English word ”please” in an exaggerated way, which can be seen to convey her dishonesty and going back to the city ways and using power in a negative way. Here she is learning the skills of manipulation from her stepmother because she has come to trust her, and longs for motherly advice. The stepmother's excessive use of English at the birthday party (RH 20–22) is really highlighting her role as a villainous character. She dashes around with expressions such as “right”, “got to rush” and “come soon”. When she introduces Raja to guests she insists on using English, knowing Raja does not understand. She invents Raja a business called “Hindustan Motor Company” and lies that Raja does not use English for nationalistic reasons and hates people who do use English. These lies are important in making Raja feel like an outsider, and making him believe that his wife's family are ashamed of him. It does not help the situation that when Aarti's father is trying to control Raja after Raja has had a few drinks too many, he also uses English: “Stop it now!”.

The closest *Dus* comes to a villainous character opting for English in a special way is in scene 15 where the traitor character Roy uses English in a seemingly very emotional scene. While bursting into tears he says for example: “why our families?” and “why should he die like this?”. This could be linked to the emotional distancing discussed further in 4.3, as this is the scene in which the audience is intended to realize that Roy is the traitor. English could be seen as a way to distance him, and make his sorrow seem at least partly pretended. However, this is nothing compared to the villains' use of English in *Sherni* and *Raja Hindustani*, as Roy is only slightly greedy, and has made the wrong decision in working for Jambwal. He ends up committing suicide because of his guilt and shame. Notably, the roles seem to have switched in *Dus*, as the villains use much less English than the heroes, which is most clearly exemplified by the fact that the only scene where only a few loanwords are used (D 17), is a scene where Jambwal is interrogating Asif, who used to work for him, but has betrayed him. It is important to note that Jambwal himself uses exceptionally little English.

Gulab and Kamal in *Raja Hindustani* are also important characters when analysing the language use in the films, as they are initially keeping Aarti's vain and extravagant city-girl lifestyle alive. For example in scene 8 when they spot a red Western-style mini-dress and note that it would look great on Aarti, Gulab begs Aarti to "please buy it". Before this, in scene 4 Gulab notes about Palankhet: "What a boring place!", and in scene 6 they are talking of a "five-star hotel". Thus, I would claim, the other negative strand linked to English in *Raja Hindustani,* is the more abstract power of commercialism, which is very much part of the neo-colonialist problems, if not exactly a reminder of the colonial past.

Most of the occurrences of English in *Sherni* (1988) are single loan words in a Hindi dialogue. As the story can be seen as a social commentary revealing the evils of corruption of law enforcement as well as ordinary citizens, there is a lot of vocabulary related to law and power borrowed from English. This is quite clearly a reminder of the colonial past, as that vocabulary was brought by the colonials and is still used as the expression of power. The villain and other characters in the film use English words related to law and government, for example: "inspector" (S 2, 5, 8, 9, 10, 17, 19), "warrant" (S 10), "police station" (S 10, 13), "ration card" (S 12), "police officer" (S 8, 12, 13, 17), "MP" (Member of Parliament) (S 13), "department" (S 13, 19), "hospital" (S 14), "doctor" (S 14). English as the language of law and government, as well as health care can be seen in this kind of vocabulary. It is a clear reminder of the colonial past, as it illustrates what was brought along or developed along with the arrival of the English language into India, namely many institutions and structures of regulation.

The words "loot/looting" (for example S 14) are often used in reference to the actions of the outlaws run by Durga's father Banjara. The words "jeep" (S 15) and "rifle" (S 15) are also words that are used that do not directly fall under the law and government category, but seem to hold negative associations in another way. They are words related to violence or technology. Even though Durga's father Banjara is mainly a heroic character, he is originally only framed for "looting" by Thakur, and later uses it as a revenge against Thakur. The jeep and the rifle are both foreign imports, but only the latter is used by the heroes in the film, as they move around on horses or on foot. Thus,

in general, loanwords apart from the law and government field are in some ways negative, expressing violence, foreign imported technology or morally apprehensive actions. The film as a whole seems to present the view that the Western ideal of justice is not, at least at this time, possible, it cannot exist in the context of this village, where the only way to get justice is by taking it into one's own hands. The villains are too cunning to be brought to justice through the legal system; Durga's rifle is the only form of justice that can reach them, even though the hero Raju represents a different viewpoint, which is further analysed in the next chapter.

Similarly, some loanwords in *Raja Hindustani* are reminders, although not necessarily negative ones, of the colonial past. Raja's occupation is always referred to with the English term "taxi driver" (for example RH 4 & 22). Even Raja himself, who is very explicitly stated as being ignorant of English, refers to his profession by this expression. He also uses an English loan word when he calls his friend Balvant Singh his "tandoori *chicken*" (RH 7), and again in describing Aarti's eyes, saying they shine like the "headlights" of his "taxi" (RH 10). These are cultural imports, related to technology and agriculture imported from or greatly influenced by the colonialists. Even though the village of Palankhet is almost free of English, in scene 8 when Aarti is wearing a western-style dress, one of the men commenting on Aarti's appearance uses the word "dress", which is probably in part due to the style of the garment: Western fashion calls for Western words.

Another small occurrence of English from *Raja Hindustani* is to be noted here, namely in scene 23. When the midwife examining Aarti finds that she is pregnant, she first conveys the information in Hindi and then in English, adding the timing: "You are three months pregnant". In English the time seems to go naturally with the expression, and it could be that the exact timing of things is more important in English conversation than in Hindi. It may be over-analysing such a small occurrence, but it does seem in this context that English is a language more interested in defining timing. This would thus be a sort of cultural import as well. This occurrence is, of course related to medicine like some of the loanwords in *Sherni*, but in addition the aspect of time is also present.

As for *Dus*, the English loanwords that emerge in situations where the norm is Hindi, are usually related to organizational terminology (names of crimes, departments etc.) or technology (for example “lots of coded e-mails” in D 15). It could be deduced that these are words that are generally used, borrowed into Hindi from English. There are probably two different reasons for this. In the case of organisational terminology, the reason is most likely in India’s colonial past, English still being the official language of law and government. Vocabulary related to technology, on the other hand, is much more recent imports, and related to globalization. In this area of life English words are loaned and adjusted to many other languages as well. They are used in the film naturally, seemingly without a second thought about the fact that code-switching or -mixing is applied at all. The terminology of the ATC and police work in general is, without exceptions, in English. This includes terms such as “Anti-terrorist cell” and “Intelligence department” (for example D 4). This is also seen in a scene where Anu and her fiancé are driving home from the airport after seeing Shashank and Aditya off to the airport. The discussion between the couple is fully in Hindi, as befitting the private situation, but the single English words ”right”, ”left” and ”shortcuts” are incorporated into the discussion. It seems that the terms that have to do with traffic and technology are often borrowed from English. Similarly again, when Shashank and Aditya speak between themselves, they mainly use Hindi but resort to English for work-related terminology with an ease that makes the communication seem smooth and natural. It would seem that English loanwords in *Dus*, even when deriving from colonial origins, do not hold the same negativity that could be seen in the two earlier films. However, I have mentioned them here as a transition to the next chapter.

4.2 English as an Asset in the Globalized World

All three films feature English as a lingua franca in the opening as well as ending. The info card featured at the beginning of all Bollywood films features English. The opening titles of *Sherni* are written in a Latin alphabet, and the film ends with “The End”. *Raja Hindustani* begins with a text of all characters and events being fictitious, the disclaimer often seen at the end of Hollywood titles, and ends with the Western fairy tale phrase:

”And they all lived happily ever after”, and after that ”End”. *Dus*, on the other hand, features the types of ending titles nowadays usually featured at the end of films, while they are not done in the other two films. All in all, it is clear that Bollywood is benefiting from English as a lingua franca, as it is impartial between Hindi and Urdu. The title of a film is usually given in all three forms, but in many cases where written language is needed it is enough to use English. Bollywood is also eager to take influences from foreign cinemas, most notably Hollywood.

In *Sherni*, the hero character Raju is first introduced when he arrives on a bus and saves Durga from a potential assault situation. When Raju has won the fight, he tells Vinod who has come to question him that women need to be respected, and that this is his ”last warning” to Vinod and his gang of ”stray dogs”, and further adds ”Get my point?” as his final statement (S 5). Durga appears very impressed that Raju can speak English. Here, then, English is presented as a good thing. Raju is a man-of-the-world and English the language of power in a positive sense. Thus, there are both a good character and a villainous character who come from the big world, but while Vinod is without morality and seeking only pleasure, Raju is a true hero who respects tradition and wants to improve society. Another example of Raju’s use of English is in scene 13 where Raju finds the chief of police (Inspector-sahib) in Thakur Dharampal’s house spending the evening as his guest. Raju tells the Inspector: “You should be ashamed of yourself”. Raju seems to be outraged by the situation in the village, and is trying to set things right. However noble his cause, he can also be seen as quite naïve in his trust in the legal system. In a way he seems to represent the good side of the Western ideology, but he is no match for the selfish hunger for power that can be found anywhere in the world. His use of English seems to stem mostly from his belief in the Western ideologies of justice, as he wants to be the type of “good cop” instead of the corrupted police officer who only serves the rich. In the character of Raju the nativization of English is indeed personified, as Raju is the Indian hero who has learned to use the English language for the good of India and its people. The situation could be seen as more complicated, however, as it turns out later in the film that Raju is the police officer who originally arrested Banjara, who at the time was innocent of any crime. From Durga’s point of view, Raju is thus a traitor and not to be trusted. However, I am categorizing Raju’s use

of English here on the positive side, since the negative image of Raju is seen only by Durga and her father, while the audience sees that Raju is trying his best to do what he knows to be right.

In scene 10 of *Sherni* the Inspector has come to search the house, and Durga herself uses the word ”warrant”, which signals that she is beginning to know her rights and is prepared to defend them. Mastering the language and terminology of law is a tool in claiming one’s rights, which is also closely related to the nativization of a language. This is further emphasized by the reaction of the Inspector who is angered by this single word, and mocks Durga for learning fancy words from Raju. The situation culminates in the Inspector arresting Durga, which comes to show that words are not (yet) enough to set things right. This clearly indicates that in *Sherni* English is still seen more as a negative reminder of the colonial past than as a positive tool, even though there is also positive use included in the film

In *Raja Hindustani*, the benefits of knowing English are hinted at more clearly, even though they do not seem to be fully accepted. In chapter 4.3 I will combine the two views in explaining the city-country binary, but here I am only noting that even though the villain characters use English in significant ways, the heroine Aarti, her father and the comic relief characters Gulab and Kamal also use a notable amount of English, because in their social environment of the city of Bombay, it is important to speak English well. Aarti’s use of English is most excessive at the beginning, and later in moments when her old life comes to haunt her. Initially Aarti uses many phrases such as “please” (for example RH 4) and “Are you sure?” (RH 7). Aarti also uses an innocent and even comical curse: “sorry my foot” (RH 6), which is one kind of a sign of the nativization of the language, as cursing in a language is a way to own the language, and to claim it as a part of one’s identity. When Raja describes Aarti’s eyes as shining brightly as the headlights of his taxi, Aarti responds by laughing and the English phrase “Oh my God!” (RH 10). After this point Aarti uses significantly less English until her family comes to visit her, which brings it back momentarily. The main point is that at first Aarti is a city girl who uses English because she has learned to use it in her surroundings, which indicates the awareness of the usefulness of English in a

globalizing city. What is to be noted also is that in scene 20 when the Stepmother is claiming to guests that Raja dislikes English and people who use it, Raja exclaims that this is not the case, and that he has nothing against people who use English, but he just does not speak it himself. English is, thus, acknowledged as useful in certain contexts but still carrying an undertone of something at least slightly corrupted or dishonest.

In the case of *Dus*, the sheer amount of English is a notable factor. Already in the opening credit song there is English which, perhaps in part is there to get the attention of international audiences. One cannot help but draw the conclusion that *Dus* uses so much English partly in order to be more approachable to audiences outside India, while simultaneously making the film seem international and interesting to domestic audiences through other means as well. The number of subtitles to choose from on the DVD would seem to support this observation. Moreover, this means of claiming the attention of audiences is also of importance, since a film is not only about interaction *within* the film, but also of interaction *between* the film and its audience. Bilingualism is very strong in *Dus*, and English and Hindi seem to be used almost interchangeably at times. Also, while Hindi is basically the norm language, the mother tongue, code-switching into English is presented as something valuable: English stands for internationality, education and competence.

In comparison to the other two films, *Dus* sometimes even seems to prefer English over Hindi. Both languages are needed, however. Hindi is generally needed for more serious and emotional as well as poetic uses. Orders to the agents are given in English, and even received in English, for example: “OK, boss” and “Let’s rock, sir” (D 5). Idiomatic English phrases are both accepted and probably even expected by the target audience to be used by the protagonists. The film needs to maintain an Indian identity, to create a hybrid between the Bollywood tradition and western influences, which might in a way distort the linguistic scenery of the film as it reduces English to a decorative tool, while the story has to be conveyed by the use of Hindi, and this does sometimes seem to be the case.

4.3 Further Binaries of Language Use

In the two older films, *Sherni* and *Raja Hindustani* the use of English is mentioned explicitly. In scene 5 of *Sherni*, Durga admires Raju's knowledge of English: to be able to speak English is both rare and desirable. In scene 7 of *Raja Hindustani*, Aarti finds out that Raja cannot speak nor understand English, and seems both surprised and amused by this fact, trying to teach Raja without results: in Aarti's world is it assumed that everyone knows English. In scene 20, the Stepmother again brings into light the astonishing fact that Raja is not able to communicate in this socially significant language. But in *Dus*, then, the excessive use of English is very much taken for granted. The film is bilingual to a point where it seems that the code-switching holds merely stylistic importance: it is there to make the film seem accessible to global audiences, as well as presenting the characters as citizens-of-the-world.

In *Raja Hindustani* the main function of English is to divide the two worlds of the busy (immoral and secular) westernised city and the beautiful traditional idyll of Palankhet. The film begins in the city, at Aarti's and her father's mutual birthday party. In scene 2, the father gives a speech to his daughter completely in English, and they sing the song "Happy birthday to you", and at the end of the song Aarti says: "I love you, papa". This is a very emotional occasion, and should also be an intimate moment between father and daughter. However, Aarti and papa are in front of an audience (their guests), which might imply that the situation, even if not the relationship, is slightly pretentious. When Aarti meets her father and stepmother again for the first time after her marriage to Raja, she uses the phrase "how've you been?" (RH 17). When the father and stepmother are leaving, Aarti says "Take care, ok!" and "Bye!" (RH 17). When she talks to Raja after this she uses the words "flight" and "surprise" (RH 17). It seems that meeting her father and stepmother has brought more English back into her speech. In scene 7 when Aarti thanks Raja in English, he demonstrates his nearly complete ignorance of English by replying: "Happy thank you", which causes Aarti to burst out laughing. She then attempts to teach Raja to reply "You're welcome", which is difficult for Raja to learn as he is later (in the same scene) seen practicing before a mirror saying something which sounds closer to "you come-come, memsaab".

Gulab and Kamal at the beginning of the journey seem to be the reminders of the city life, trying to keep Aarti's attachment to it intact. When Aarti, Gulab and Kamal arrive in Palankhet, the sleeping Raja is called "lazy taxi driver" by Gulab. Gulab also comments on the village: "What a boring place!" (RH 4). They behave very much like rich tourists who are used to luxury ("five-star hotel"), and the use of English conveys this message very effectively. Although this thesis is not interested in gender roles directly, it could still be mentioned that the reversal of gender roles in the characters of Gulab and Kamal is perhaps another sign of the unconventional ways of the city, Gulab being a feminine man and Kamal a masculine woman. Kamal is softened in Palankhet when she falls in love with Raja's (male) friend Balvant Singh. Gulab is allowed to remain as he is. In her masculine state Kamal is seen to wear a Nike sweatshirt with the slogan "Just Do It" written on it, but after her transformation she wears more traditional-looking clothes.

Further in *Raja Hindustani*, the whole affair of the mini-dress clearly shows the difference between Raja's world and Aarti's. To a western eye, and to the eye of Aarti, Gulab and Kamal, the dress seems quite decent as it has long sleeves and very little cleavage. However, the short skirt and fitting form are more than enough to produce whistles and disrespectful comments in Palankhet. Aarti thinks this to be quite normal, and says to Raja that in the city this is an everyday occurrence. Raja on the other hand cannot take this, and promises to keep beating people up to defend Aarti's honour if she insists on wearing clothes like that. When Aarti and Raja are arguing about the incident (RH 9), Aarti still uses quite a few English words and phrases: "Stop it, Raja!", "ignore", "How dare you?". As they are making up in scene 10, she calls Raja "too cute", "darling" and "sweetheart". It seems that such endearing terms come easily in English as chit-chat and easily mean very little. However, when Aarti has to explain the word "sweetheart" to Raja, it seems that she herself has to think about what it means, and realizes that she actually thinks so well of Raja. This is a turning point in Aarti's language use as she starts using less English; she chooses the traditional life-style of Palankhet, and starts losing the superficial ways of the city. Laurila (2007: 22) writes that it is common in Bollywood to set traditional Indian and modern Western worldviews against each other and the traditional always has to win. As an example

from *Raja Hindustani* Laurila gives the fact that Aarti gives in to Raja and changes back into the traditional clothes after wearing the provocative Western-style dress. It is true, as Laurila (2007: 22) states, that Raja represents everything good and traditional, the things to be trusted. The relationship of Raja and Aarti is unconventional on many levels. However, I would claim that *Raja Hindustani* does not argue quite that purely against the modern and for the traditional. After all, Raja and Aarti do end up together despite their differences, which as such is untraditional. Be it that it seems that Raja's job in the story is to help Aarti and her family to return to a more sincere and honest way of life, the modern city life is not presented as purely evil. It has its place, but the traditional way is more honourable and moral, not to mention happier.

In scene 2 of *Dus* Siddhant, the chief of the ATC (Anti-Terrorist Cell) team, gives a voice-over monologue about terrorism and the frustration he feels because his team can make so little difference against it. Hardly any English is used in this monologue, and the absence of English is so clear that it can easily be interpreted as intentional avoidance of English. This scene is both calm and emotional, revealing the audience the character's innermost emotions. These are the kinds of scenes where Hindi is more generally used rather than English, especially in the older films, but to some extent also in *Dus*. The use of Hindi preferred in the film also highlights the seriousness of the monologue, since English often brings a more humorous and light-hearted feel to scenes in which it is used. And finally, the monologue is an important starting point for the development of the story, and plot-development is mainly done in Hindi.

In general English is the language of work and also of a more light-hearted mood, while Hindi is the language of private life and serious emotions. The division is also one of tradition versus global/international culture. This is pretty clearly the situation in *Sherni* and *Raja Hindustani*, while in *Dus* code-switching from one language to the other is most of the time done in an unproblematized manner, and the words that happen to come more naturally at a certain moment can be either in English or in Hindi. The fact that both languages are at the film's disposal makes the communication seem smooth and natural when one knows that both languages really play an important part in the source culture. The fluent bilingualism makes it difficult to find any deeper meaning in

the code-switching of *Dus*, as it is more of a stylistic device, as well as merely an expression of a mixed-code reality that has been growing in Bollywood during its history.

Also, the orders by superiors to their workers are given mostly in English in *Dus*, which still implies an authoritative use of the language. However, at times it seems that the language is suddenly changed into Hindi because the Hindi words are simply easier to find. The fluent changing from one language to another makes communication smoother and quicker. It also ensures that the speaker gets to keep the floor without interruptions. Although in a film it is of course impossible for unscripted (even improvised lines have to be accepted by the director) interruptions to occur. There is also a difference to be seen in what types of scenes both languages are found to be more fluent and appropriate. In action sequences English items appear much more frequently than in slower paced or emotional scenes. Thus, English seems to be found useful in situations where quick and effective communication is needed, while Hindi is better suited for more poetic purposes, songs and emotional scenes. In action scenes English items seem to be found a key tool in making the communication effective and official.

Hindi is mainly used in emotional scenes for drama, while English is a more emotionally detatched language in the context of *Dus*. This sometimes leads to English being used as an intentional tool to reduce sentimentality, and keeping the action-packed film from turning too melodramatic, which would be at odds with the western action-style while in line with Bollywood traditions. An example of this is found in the scene where Dan, the Canadian police officer, becomes friends with Shashank and Aditya and decides to work with them. First he speaks in Hindi, and then adds: “and – thank you – for saving my life, guys” (D 12) in English. This can be seen as a way for the tough police officer to keep up his macho image, not becoming too sentimental. A very similar situation occurs when Dan tells his new friends about his tragic past in scene 13, and at the end of the story he says in English “I did not kill my son”. Dan’s English use could, of course, be attributed to the fact that he has been living in Canada for a long time, but as realism is not a typical consideration in Bollywood (see chapter 2.1), this does not seem likely. Furthermore, these emotional instances are highlighted in opting for

English exactly at points where things are in danger of becoming too emotional. Based on my observations of the language use throughout the film, it seems that at times English is intentionally used as a tool to avoid sentimentality. It is certainly a factor in defining Officer Danish's character in *Dus*.

Finally, for the purpose of making conversation smooth and effective by means of bilingualism, the emotional climax of *Dus* should be mentioned. In this ending scene bilingualism is very strongly present, and the two languages are used in a way that makes it difficult even to follow which language is spoken at each moment. While the distinction usually seems to be that of Hindi for serious and emotional purposes and English for light-hearted and professional purposes, this scene is the clearest exception. The avoidance of sentimentality could be part of why such an emotional scene contains so much English. However, what seems more probable is that the mixing of the two codes here actually makes the scene more emotional; all barriers are forgotten, and language differences put aside, as one of the team is forced to sacrifice himself in order to save a football stadium full of people, while the other characters are desperately trying to find a different solution that would not require such a sacrifice.

4.4 Summary of Findings

The amount of English in *Raja Hindustani* (1996) is clearly more substantial than in *Sherni* (1988) but less so than in *Dus* (2005). Thus on this small scale it seems to hold true that English use has become more common, and is also viewed as more positive than before because the hero characters also use it more often, and in fact the villains use hardly any English in *Dus*. In *Sherni* the use of English is limited to a few loan words and fewer catchphrase uses, and there are no instances where understanding of English is required to follow the story. In *Raja Hindustani* English is used in the city, between Aarti, her father, stepmother and also the comic relief servants Gulab and Kamal. In *Dus*, then, English is used by all characters, except perhaps the villains. This can be seen as an indication that English has become a strong indication for global communication skills, competence and friendliness, which would render the villains

unable to use the language as freely as the heroes. Villains not using English in this scenario would seem backwards and unable to accept the globalization of the world.

In general, it can be stated that there is a division to be found in the choices between English and Hindi. This is especially clear in *Dus*, where English is used to such great extent. Without exception the terminology of the anti-terrorist unit and police work is in English, for example ”Anti-terrorist cell”, ”Intelligence department”, ”drunk-and-driving”. So, English is clearly the normative language of the workplace. Orders are given in English, and even received in English: ”OK, boss”; or ”Let’s rock, sir”. The same can be said for *Sherni*, where most of the English used is heard at the police station, and most other use is by the villains. In *Raja Hindustani*, then, English is the language of the city, the language of social worth in the business world of Aarti’s father. In all cases, then, English is generally speaking an emotionally cold language. English is most often used in relation to the following things: villains, power, money, fashion, dishonesty, traffic, and timing.

Hindi, on the other hand, is the normative language of private life for expressing feelings. In the case of *Dus*, Anu’s engagement scene (D 6) is the most obvious example of this, as the scene is almost completely in Hindi, and it is the only scene where the protagonists are really off-duty, enjoying leisure time. Even on the level of single scenes the division between official/English – private/Hindi can be witnessed, as sometimes the chief of the anti-terrorist unit first gives an order in English, but then adds a more private note in Hindi. In *Sherni* emotions and especially musical sequences are strictly in Hindi. Also in *Raja Hindustani*, Hindi is used exclusively in songs, but the conveying of emotion is made more complicated by the fact that in Aarti’s city life English is so very common. However, when genuine deep feelings are expressed, Hindi is used. Even the stepmother uses strictly Hindi when she is apologizing to Aarti for the harm she has caused. In a situation where the other language is a learned second language, not originally a language of the home, the second language seems to be automatically more emotionally distant, and through this also emotionally liberating. This means that difficult things are sometimes most easily expressed in another language than the person’s mother-tongue.

While there is a positive view of English present already in *Sherni*, the negative memory of the colonial past is still clearly visible on a general level. In *Raja Hindustani*, there is clearly a longing for the traditional, pre-colonial, Indian way of life, and English is represented as a symptom of the secular and immoral ways of the city, though not evil as such. In *Dus*, on the other hand, the situation is almost reversed as Western influences are embraced and English is an asset and a tool for global communication and a marker of competence and a citizen-of-the-world identity.

5 CONCLUSIONS

In this thesis I have analysed the ways English language is used in three quite different kinds of Bollywood films: *Sherni* (1988), *Raja Hindustani* (1996) and *Dus* (2005). My hypothesis was that in the films I would find a twofold attitude towards the English language. On the one hand English is historically the language of the oppressor, but on the other hand the language is also empowering for the Indians themselves, and nowadays important in the globalized world. Based on previous viewings of Bollywood films, the assumption was that the attitude towards English would turn more positive in the newer films, which turned out to be the case.

The findings were versatile for each film. In *Sherni* (1988), the use of English is minimal, but already in this film the twofold attitude can be found. Even though most of the English occurrences are in relation to the villain characters, the hero also uses English, and this is seen as admirable by the heroine. Raju's use of English thus is an empowering use of English, it is seen as a useful tool to have someone "on our side" with the knowledge of the English language. In *Raja Hindustani* (1996), the twofold attitude is expressed explicitly, as English still has many negative connotations, but it is not represented as all evil, it has its uses. Eventually the message seems to be that the new global world is not needed, and Palankhet is a much more innocent and happy place than the city. The language use in the film seems to express a longing for the pre-colonial past, but at the same time the film itself is very global with its fairytale storyline. In *Dus* (2005), then, English is much more present than in the two other films, and it is presented as a more positive thing that is part of a mixed code in a way that it is not in the older films. There are situations where the other language is generally preferred above the other, and there are differences as to in what kind of situations each language is most fitting, but there are also situations in which it is difficult to determine any particular reason for code-switching.

In general, it can be said that while English often has negative connotations either

explicitly or implicitly, there is also the empowering side when English is seen as an important tool to have in the globalized world, and this view is most strongly present in the newest film of the three. Bollywood films benefit from many languages at their disposal, and the cinema is truly globalized. At the same time the cinema is also important for its domestic audience, and a part of creating the Indian national identity. The importance of Bollywood is evident, even though it has traditionally been looked down upon as “mere entertainment”.

There is a great deal of room for further study. I do not claim that merely the analysis of three films would be sufficient to make any certain deductions of development, as many factors such as genre or in general the typicality of the films for their time period could influence the results. So, merely by including more examples from different times and genres would help complete the picture of English in Bollywood. To connect the study more closely to the creation of national identity would also demand background information on how well the films did at the box-office at their initial release, and how they have done subsequently. It is possible for Bollywood films to become successes among Indians in diaspora at their DVD releases, even if they had done poorly in Indian cinemas. Different theoretical starting points could also be used to study these phenomena. All in all, this is an extremely varied and rich subject to study, with many routes to follow in future studies.

WORKS CITED

Primary Sources

Dus. Dir. Anubhav Sinha. Venky's Rock (2005). [DVD] Spark Worldwide Ltd. (2006).

Raja Hindustani. Dir. Dharmesh Darshan. (1996). [VHS television recording] Canal+Kulta (2001).

Sherni. Dir. Harmesh Malhotra. Shemaroo (1988). [DVD] Spark Worldwide Ltd (no year).

Secondary Sources

Alvarez-Cáccamo (1998). "From 'Switching Code' to 'Code-switching'. Towards a Reconceptualisation of Communicative Codes." In *Code-Switching in Conversation. Language, Interaction and Identity*. Ed. Peter Auer. London: Routledge. 29–48.

Armes, Roy (1987). *Third World Film Making and the West*. London: University of California Press.

Auer, Peter (1998a). "Introduction. Bilingual Conversation Revisited." In *Code-switching in Conversation. Language, Interaction and Identity*. Ed. Peter Auer. London: Routledge. 1–24.

Auer, Peter (1998b). "Introduction to Chapter 2." In *Code-switching in Conversation. Language, Interaction and Identity*. Ed. Peter Auer. London: Routledge. 27–28.

Barker, Chris (1999). *Television, Globalization and Cultural Identities*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Blommaert, Jan (2010). *The Sociolinguistics of Globalization.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cazden, Courtney B. (1989). "English for Academic Purposes. A Hidden Curriculum in Ways of Speaking." In *English Across, Cultures Cultures Across English. A Reader in Cross-Cultural Communication*. Eds. Ofelia García & Ricardo Otheguy. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 103–116.

Childs, Peter & Patrick Williams (1997). *An Introduction to Post-Colonial Theory.* Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Crystal, David (2002 [1988]). *The English Language: A Guided Tour of the Language*.

London: Penguin Books.

Crystal, David (2010). ”The Future of Englishes. Going Local”. In *From International to Local English – And Back Again*. Eds. Roberta Facchinetti, David Crystal & Barbara Seidlhofer. Bern: Peter Lang AG. 17–25.

Desai, Jigna & Rajinder Dudrah (2008). ”The Essential Bollywood”. In *The Bollywood Reader*. Eds. Rajinder Dudrah & Jigna Desai. Berkshire: McGraw-Hill. 1–17.

During, Simon (1993). ”Introduction.” In *The Cultural Studies Reader. Second Edition*. Ed. Simon During. Oxon: Routledge.

Eastman, Carol M. (1992). ”Codeswitching as an Urban Language-Contact Phenomenon.” In *Codeswitching*. Ed. Carol M. Eastman. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 1–17.

Edwards, John (2009). *Language and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Facchinetti, Roberta, David Crystal & Barbara Seidlhofer (2010). ”Introduction.” In *From International to Local English – And Back Again*. Eds. Roberta Facchinetti, David Crystal & Barbara Seidlhofer. Bern: Peter Lang AG. 7–13.

Featherstone, Simon (2005). *Postcolonial Cultures*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Franceschini, Rita (1998). ”Code-switching and the Notion of Code in Linguistics. Proposals for a Dual Focus Model.” In *Code-switching in Conversation. Language, Interaction and Identity*. Ed. Peter Auer. London: Routledge. 51–72.

García, Ofelia & Ricardo Otheguy (1989). ”Introduction.” In *English Across Cultures, Cultures Across English. A Reader in Cross-Cultural Communication.* Eds. Ofelia García and Ricardo Otheguy. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 1–10.

Greenbaum, Sidney & Randolph Quirk (2007 [1990]). *A Student's Grammar of the English Language*. Essex: Pearson Education.

Haugen, Einar (1987). *Blessings of Babel. Bilingualism and Language Planning*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Heller, Monica (1992). ”The Politics of Codeswitching and Language Choice.” In *Codeswitcing*. Ed. Carol M. Eastman. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 123–142.

Heller, Monica (2006). *Linguistic Minorities and Modernity*. London: Continuum.

Heller, Monica (2007). ”Bilingualism as Ideology and Practice.” In *Bilingualism: A Social Approach*. Ed. Monica Heller. New York: Palgrave McMillan. 1–22.

Laurila, Natalia (2007). *Parhaat Bollywood-elokuvat*. [The Best Bollywood Films.] Helsinki: BTJ Finland Oy.

Le Page, R.B. & Andreé Tabouret-Keller (1985). *Acts of Identity. Creole-based Approaches to Language and Ethnicity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mahmood, Shabnam & Manjushri Mitra (2011). *Bollywood Sets Sights on Wider Market*. [Online]. BBC News: Business, last updated 24th June 2011, [Cited 31st December 2014]. Available at: http://www.bbc.com/news/business-13894702

Nayar, Pramod K. (2010). *Postcolonialism. A Guide for the Perplexed.* London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Parker, Kenneth (1999). "'Black British' Writers: (Very) Cross Currents in 'British' Culture." In *Postcolonialism and Cultural Resistance*. Eds. Jopi Nyman & John A. Stotesbury. Joensuu: Faculty of Humanities, University of Joensuu. 24–38.

Pinto, Jerry (2011). "Introduction." In *The Greatest Show on Earth. Writings on Bollywood*. Ed. Jerry Pinto. New Delhi: Penguin Books. ix–xvii.

Shohat, Ella & Robert Stam (2003). "Introduction." In *Multiculturalism, Postcoloniality, and Transnational Media*. Eds. Ella Shohat & Robert Stam. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press. 1–17.

Siikala, Jukka (1999). "Writings between Cultures." In *Postcolonialism and Cultural Resistance*. Eds. Jopi Nyman & John A. Stotesbury. Joensuu: Faculty of Humanities, University of Joensuu. 48–57.

Singh, Jyotsna G. (1996). *Colonial Narratives / Cultural Dialogues. "Discoveries" of India in the Language of Colonialism*. London: Routledge.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty (1999). *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason. Toward a History of the Vanishing Present*. Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press.

Tenhunen, Sirpa (1999). "Challenges to Elitism. Subaltern Studies and Ethnographic Experiments." In *Postcolonialism and Cultural Resistance*. Eds. Jopi Nyman & John A. Stotesbury. Joensuu: Faculty of Humanities, University of Joensuu. 58–69.

Varia, Kush (2012). *Bollywood. Gods, Glamour and Gossip*. New York: Columbia University Press.

APPENDIX. Lists of Scenes

Sherni (1988). Scene titles are exactly as they appear in the scene selection menu of the DVD. Scenes 4, 6, 9, 16 and 18 feature a song.

Scene Title	**Duration**	**Occurrences of English**
1. CC/Titles	0:00:00 – 00:02:48	yes
2. Durga	0:02:49 – 0:08:18	loanwords
3. Banjara Escapes	0:08:19 – 0:11:51	loanwords
4. *Ek rupaya doge to...*	0:11:52 – 0:15:17	None in song; loanwords
5. Vinod in village	0:15:18 – 0:22:31	yes
6. *Tera sang mila...*	0:22:32 – 0:33:22	none
7. Durga & Raj	0:33:23 – 0:37:14	loanwords
8. Nandini's Engagement	00:37:15 – 0:39:00	yes
9. *Koi mard mila na aisa...*	0:39:01 – 0:42:00	None in song; loanwords
10. Durga arrested	0:42:01 – 0:47:54	loanwords
11. Attempt to kill	0:47:55 – 0:53:16	loanwords
12. Reality reveals	0:53:17 – 0:54:47	yes
13. Dharampal	0:54:48 – 0:59:57	yes
14. Durga changes	0:59:58 – 1:06:42	loanwords
15. End of Banjara	1:06:43 – 1:17:35	loanwords
16. *Ghadi ghadi chunar...*	1:17:36 – 1:26:35	none
17. The revenge	1:26:36 – 1:37:55	loanwords
18. *Mushkil hai...*	1:37:56 – 1:49:24	none
19. Climax	1:49:25 – 1:52:56	yes

Raja Hindustani (1996). Scene divisions and titles by me. Song titles (5, 10, 13, 15, 18, 21, 24 and 28) are as they usually appear on the Internet.

Scene title	**Duration approximately**	**Occurrences of English**
1. Openin titles	0:00:00 – 0:02:23	yes
2. Aarti & papa	0:02:24 – 0:04:58	yes
3. Travel plans	0:04:59 – 0:06:18	yes
4. *Raja Hindustani*	0:06:19 – 0:12:15	yes
5. *Aaye Ho Meri Zindagi Mein*	0:12:16 – 0:19:11	None in song; loanwords
6. A place to stay	0:19:12 – 0:22:43	yes
7. Palankhet	0:22:44 – 0:27:29	yes
8. The Dress	0:27:30 – 0:31:31	yes
9. Raja & Aarti argue	0:31:32 – 0:36:40	yes
10. *Kitna Pyaara Tujhe Rabne*	0:36:41 – 0:45:44	loanwords
11. The Kiss	0:45:45 – 0:48:59	none
12. Aarti is leaving	0:49:00 – 0:52:49	yes
13. *Pardesi Pardesi*	0:52:50 – 1:00:14	none
14. Aarti chooses Raja	1:00:15 – 1:03:37	loanwords
15. *Aaye Ho Meri Zindagi Mein* reprise / The Wedding	1:03:38 – 1:06:20	none
16. Stepmother schemes	1:06:21 – 1:07:28	loanwords
17. Wedding present from papa	1:07:29 – 1:13:17	yes
18. *Pucho Zara Pucho*	1:13:18 – 1:19:00	none
19. The villainous plan	1:19:01 – 1:20:48	yes
20. The birthday party	1:20:49 – 1:29:28	yes
21. *Tere Ishq Mein Naachenge*	1:29:29 – 1:34:16	none
22. Aarti stays, Raja goes	1:34:17 – 1:39:30	loanwords
23. Attempted divorce	1:39:31 – 1:45:02	yes
24. *Pardesi Pardesi* reprise	1:45:03 – 1:49:08	none
25. The baby	1:49:09 – 1:52:03	none
26. Aarti returns to Palankhet	1:52:04 – 1:54:40	none
27. Climax	1:54:41 – 1:58:30	none
28. *Pardesi Pardesi* once more	1:58:31 – 2:01:26	Yes, text at the very end

Dus (2005). Scene titles are exactly as they appear in the scene selection menu of the DVD. Scenes 1, 7 and 16 feature a song.

Scene title	**Duration approximately**	**Occurrences of English**
1. CC/Titles *Dus Bahane Karke...*	0:00:00 – 0:04:59	yes
2. Terrorist's Plan	0:05:00 – 0:07:47	yes
3. ATC Team In Action	0:07:48 – 0:13:17	yes
4. Order To Shut Down ATC	0:13:18 – 0:22:10	yes
5. DCP Siddhant's Plan	0:22:11 – 0:24:42	yes
6. Anu's Engagement	0:24:43 – 0:27:01	yes
7. *Chham Se Woh...*	0:27:02 – 0:33:19	yes
8. Anu Kidnapped	0:33:20 – 0:39:01	yes
9. The Attack	0:39:02 – 0:49:49	yes
10. Himmat Mahendi's [sic] Interrogation	0:49:50 – 0:57:43	yes
11. Information About Jambaal [sic]	0:57:44 – 1:09:20	yes
12. End of Jai	1:09:21 – 1:11:47	yes
13. Dan's Past	1:11:48 – 1:20:02	yes
14. Anu Resaved	1:20:03 – 1:22:21	Very little
15. Roy's Betrayal	1:22:22 – 1:30:54	yes
16. *Deedar De...*	1:30:55 – 1:34:25	Yes, but none in song
17. Asif's Interrogation	1:34:26 – 1:36:23	loanwords
18. Dead Body Found	1:36:24 – 1:42:50	yes
19. Mission Accomplished	1:42:51 – 1:48:46	yes
20. DSP Siddhant Reveals The Truth	1:48:47 – 1:54:01	yes
21. Aditi's Plan	1:54:02 – 1:59:16	yes
22. 10th May	1:59:17 – 2:13:43	yes
23. Jambaal [sic] Trapped	2:13:44 – 2:16:59	yes
24. Shashank's Sacrifice	2:17:00 – 2:26:05	yes