

## **INDIAN WRITING IN ENGLISH: SOME LANGUAGE ISSUES AND TRANSLATION PROBLEMS**

*Christopher Rollason, Ph.D (Metz, France) - rollason@9online.fr*

*This is the revised and updated text of a paper given by the author at Jawaharlal Nehru University (New Delhi) on 8 March 2006, as part of the event "Writers' Meet".*

The theme of this paper requires that we establish the nature of the object of study: what precisely is the thing that we are used to calling Indian Writing in English, or IWE? I shall begin my discussion with some remarks from over three decades ago, by the late David McCutcheon, one of IWE's earliest and still one of its most pertinent critics. McCutcheon's positions represent, even today and with the more detailed and sophisticated analyses that we now have at our disposal, a highly pertinent starting-point. In the introduction to his book on the subject published in 1969, McCutcheon writes: "The fascination of Indian writing in English lies ... in the phenomenon ... of literary creativity in a language other than the surrounding mother tongue"<sup>1</sup>, and goes on to pinpoint some of the characteristics, both assets and drawbacks, of that phenomenon. He highlights, for instance, the particular technical difficulties posed by the use of dialogue in IWE works: "It would require very exceptional gifts and total bilingualism to express directly in English the lives of people who do not themselves speak English"<sup>2</sup>, while noting the very specific positioning of the Indian intellectual, product of an English-medium education, writing in English, in terms which, though today they would need rephrasing for gender, remain perceptive and eloquent: "What the Indian poet or novelist may present ... is his own experience as a man educated to think and feel in Western categories confronting the radically different culture all around him"<sup>3</sup>. McCutcheon supposes a surface-and-depth model: under the English-language surface lies a "radically different" Indian *mind*. IWE, then, would on this perception be characterised by a constant if creative tension between medium (English language) and content (Indian mind) – a position which already suggests that an IWE fiction is, paradoxically, a text that, though written only once, has, in its gestation, been the object of a process of *translation*.

In the light of McCutcheon's still-valid comments, we may define Indian Writing in English as original creative writing produced in English by Indian writers or writers of Indian origin, resident or expatriate, for whom English will normally be a second language but who have in all probability been educated, even within India, in English-medium schools and universities, and are likely to write English more fluently than any native Indian language. This very particular set of conditions, inherited from the Raj but carried on beyond Independence to the present day, in no way makes these writers any less Indian: in most cases they are representing the lives, conversations and thoughts of *Indian characters* who more often than not are presumed to be speaking and thinking not in English at all, but in a plurality of Indian languages. Recent analyses have taken the view that IWE is *already* a case of translated literature, in the sense that it is already the product of a transfer between, schematically, two cultural systems or polysystems, even *before* anyone translates the text into a third language. Here we may connect McCutcheon's surface-and-depth model with the analysis of the contemporary translation scholar (and translator of IWE into Spanish)<sup>4</sup>, Dora Sales Salvador, who, writing in 2001, argues that "Indian narrative in English is a fictional echo of multilingualism and interculturality", further seeing such "literature written originally in English [as] a sort of transcreation where [other] languages and cultural forms ... survive, as a co-present substratum" at the intersection between "diverse linguistic and literary systems"<sup>5</sup>.

This model constitutes the English-language surface as the visible stratum and the native Indian thought-patterns as the substratum, thus making the IWE work a kind of "palimpsest, where one "cultural text" is superimposed upon another that it does not completely conceal"<sup>6</sup>. Thus, as Dora Sales sees it, Indians writing in English aim to make that language "contain and express what they feel, carrying the memento of other tongues' worldview, that somehow survives and beats, in that translational passage"<sup>7</sup>. This is no easy task, for, as she reminds us, "to maintain the cultural references when moving from one linguistic system to another is extremely difficult, because we cannot forget that language is the repository of inherited values, belief systems, and modes of experience and sensibility"<sup>8</sup>. It will most certainly be useful, when we examine the translation problems thrown up by IWE texts, to recall that very similar problems have more than likely already come up for the *author* in the composition of the original.

As we have seen, Dora Sales invokes the concept of "transcreation", implying a substantially transformative form of translation carried out with a high degree of cultural empathy. This notion is associated above all with the distinguished Kolkata-based scholar and founder of the Writers Workshop publishing house, P. Lal - whose long-term achievement, indeed, in a certain sense forms a bridge between the ideas of David McCutcheon, with whom he worked closely, and those of Dora Sales some three decades later. P. Lal's work is, as he has stated, based on the credo that "English is a member of the Indian family of languages" and, indeed, "an intimate part of the Indian cultural psyche",<sup>9</sup> having "proved its ability as a language to play a creative role in Indian literature"<sup>10</sup>. Close homage to Lal's work is paid by both Western critics. McCutcheon, echoing Lal's own words, declared in his book: "Whenever the ability of the Indian writer in English to 'play a creative role' is called in question, P. Lal is ready with a manifesto"<sup>11</sup>; while Dora Sales, in an essay on Lal published in 2005, similarly stresses how the great scholar "has always shown that his great passion is creativity"<sup>12</sup>, and praises his concept of transcreation as implying that "the essence is to keep and transfer the cultural ethos, through the alchemy of a global language, English in this case", adding that in her view IWE itself "is also a sort of transcreation".<sup>13</sup> For these two non-Indian scholars, then, the endogenous positions of P. Lal help point up both the Indianness and the creativity of Indian writing, even when the language medium chosen is English.

The concept of transcreation is closely related to the issue of the practical "Indianisation" of English by creative writers in their work. Raja Rao famously argued in 1938, in the preface to his novel *Kanthapura*, for using English, but an English adapted to Indian conditions:

English is not really an alien language to us. It is the language of our intellectual make-up - like Sanskrit or Persian was before - but not of our emotional make-up. We are all instinctively bilingual, many of us in our own language and in English. We cannot write like the English. We should not. We can only write as Indians (...) Our method of expression ... will some day prove to be as distinctive and colourful as the Irish or the American<sup>14</sup>.

*Kanthapura* has often been seen as being written in an English modified to South Indian conditions that reflects Kannada speech rhythms (and similar comments have been made on Malayalam and Arundhati Roy's *The God of Small Things*). Indeed, in a later essay, "In Search of – My Bride" (1978), in which he recalled the history of his writer's vocation, Rao went so far as to advocate a "Sanskritic" English:

I will have to write my English, yet English after all – and how soon we forget it – is an Indo-Aryan tongue. Thus to stretch the English idiom to suit my needs seemed heroic enough for my urgentmost demands. The Irish, remember, had done it (...) So why not Sanskritic (or if you will, Indian) English?<sup>15</sup>

English is also placed in relation to Sanskrit in a different context by A.K. Ramanujan, in an essay entitled "Is There An Indian Way of Thinking?" published in 1989. Ramanujan argues, somewhat provocatively, for a contextual or sociolinguistic analogy between English and Sanskrit:

When English is borrowed into (or imposed on) Indian contexts, it fits into the Sanskrit slot; it acquires many of the characteristics of Sanskrit, the older native father tongue, its pan-Indian elite character - as a medium of laws, science and administration, and its formulaic patterns; it becomes part of Indian multiple diglossia<sup>16</sup>.

This position highlights the relative formality of Indian English – an aspect on which other analysts concur – and thus adumbrates what we may call a *sociolinguistic* approach to the phenomenon.

Recent Indian scholars, attentive to the nuts and bolts of textual detail, have proposed a sociolinguistic approach to literary analysis in general or the study of IWE in particular. Prakash Chandra Pradhan, in an essay of 2002, proposes a general model of literary study that would prioritise as tools stylistics, sociolinguistics and the use of extra-linguistic contextual information. He writes: "A good piece of fictional text is rich in meaning and it has a range of interesting stylistic / sociolinguistic features ... The creativity of fiction is based on the author's critical consciousness of the resources of discourse and the practical skill to manipulate the resources of language to certain aesthetic effect"<sup>17</sup>, while adding: "non-linguistic knowledge about the world is highly important for comprehending the complicated processes of creation which have been produced by the interaction of language and knowledge about the world"<sup>18</sup>. With specific regard to IWE, two recent corpus-based studies, those of Jaydeep Sarangi (2005) and Sumana Bandyopadhyay (2007), draw on a range of sociolinguistic tools with a view to the close textual analysis of a given sample of IWE works – an approach that I shall endeavour to parallel, on a smaller scale, in the present essay.

Sarangi, paying particular attention to bilingualism or multilingualism as a key given in multiple language situations in India, including the creation of literary works, marshals a number of basic sociolinguistic concepts, including *code-switching* (moving from one language to another), *code-mixing* (including elements of more than one language in the same utterance), *role-relationships* (the structuring of dialogue according to the speakers' different roles in society) and *turn-taking* (the social conventions governing who speaks when). He applies these concepts to a series of IWE works<sup>19</sup>. With specific regard to Indian English and its literary manifestation in IWE, Sarangi offers a number of important observations from the inside, which we may place alongside those made, rather more from the outside, by the non-Indian scholars David McCutcheon and Dora Sales:

In the linguistically and culturally pluralistic Indian subcontinent English is used as the Second Language (L2), which is acquired after one has learnt the First Language (L1). This co-existence ... results in interference from one's First Language in the Second Language. Through a large-scale socio-cultural interaction with regional contexts

English becomes Indianised. A variety of English albeit non-native, lexically, morphologically, syntactically, stylistically and sociolinguistically different from the Standard British form has come to be known as *Indian Variety of English* ...<sup>20</sup>. English, as a link language in India, carries the weight of different experiences in different contexts / surroundings. English is essentially malleable in nature, adapting its form to suit cultural contexts ...<sup>21</sup>. In the case of literary *Indian English*, *loan translations* or *word borrowings* from the regional languages of the subcontinent are embedded in the English text, as markers pointing out a cultural distinctiveness. The writers of Indian writings in English often refuse to gloss untranslated words / expressions to be true to their respective roots. *Lexical openness* is a trademark of Indian English canon<sup>22</sup>.

Bandyopadhyay, applying her theoretical postulates to a corpus different from but comparable to Sarangi's (there is some overlapping of authors and texts between the two)<sup>23</sup>, takes an approach in many ways similar but rendered distinct by its emphasis on Indian English as a *specific variant of International Standard English*. Her analysis of specific texts stresses such features of Indian English, many of them sociolinguistic, as Indianisation of vocabulary, loan-translation, use of repetition, formality of register and linguistic creativity. She writes:

The term "Indian English" refers to the variety of English which is learnt and used by a large number of educated (in the conventional sense, someone who has undergone an intellectual and moral training) Indians as a second language ... . Indian English has the status of an Indian language, serves the international role of communication with the global community of nations and intra-regional roles of link language among people of diverse linguistic backgrounds.<sup>24</sup>

My own analysis posits a framework similar to those defined by Pradhan, Sarangi and Bandyopadhyay, albeit with a preference for the last-named's *both local and global* approach, while in practical terms privileging the concrete understanding of the words on the page. Stress will also be laid on the presence in IWE texts of potential translation difficulties for the translator of such texts into European/Western languages other than English. I shall adopt an essentially descriptive and lexical approach, taking into account the nature of Indian English as divisible into a number of lexical strands, considering both who uses a given word, expression or acronym, and when and why (the sociolinguistic perspective), and the origins and connotations of the terms used (thinking of both Pradhan's "knowledge about the world" and Sarangi's "cultural distinctiveness").

Considering standard Indian English as a variant of standard International English, we may provisionally suggest, in a non-exclusive list, nine lexical strands as being specific to Indian English, which we shall now describe in turn: a) pan-Indian terms, or words from Indian languages absorbed into Indian English as lexical items and understood throughout India - e.g. *lakh*; *crore*; *dhoti*; *dhobi*; *mali*; b) Indian "localisms", pertaining to a specific language or cultural area, e.g. to take two south Indian culinary items: *idli*; *dosa*; c) native Indian words that have been absorbed beyond India into general International English - e.g. *karma*; *dharma*; *swami*; *sari*; d) native Indian words that have been absorbed, more specifically into British English, either via the Raj or more recently, e.g. through Indian restaurants or musical styles - e.g. (first type) *wallah*; *pukka*; *dekk*; (second type) *chapati*; *biryani*; *bhangra*. e) transplanted Britishisms (words, idioms, acronyms) still used in the UK and recognisable as such to a reader from that country - e.g. *GP* (general practitioner); *snazzy*; *culture-vulture*; f) "old" Britishisms, that is, terms that now seem dated or anachronistic to a British reader but are still

current coin in India - e.g. *GPO* (General Post Office); *thrice* (for three times); *doing bird* (= being in jail); *chip off the old block* (= like father, like son); g) American or other neologisms pertaining to International English and often associated with globalisation or with the journalistic register - e.g. *MBA*; *start-up*; h) coinages or acronyms formed from within the usual rules of English but unique to India - e.g. *scheduled castes*; *shirtings*; *in-charge*; *NRI* (Non-Resident Indian); i) cases of such coinages that have passed into International English, e.g. *Bollywood*; *Goa trance*. In its very richness and creativity, Indian English emerges from this descriptive analysis as a specific form of English that may legitimately be considered as important a variant of the international language as British or American English. It will, therefore, inevitably generate a number of translation problems of a specific nature, whatever the language translated into.

\*\*

I shall now examine one extract each from four different IWE novels, with a view to identifying some of the persistent language problems associated with Indian English that are liable to produce translation difficulties. For present purposes I shall not have any particular target language in mind; I shall, however, be assuming a European/Western language, while of course being fully aware that IWE works are also, and indeed frequently, translated into Indian languages. I have chosen four novels, two by men and two by women and three of them by living authors, that are set entirely in India, and whose characters are entirely or mostly Indian. They are: *The Painter of Signs* (1967) by the late R.K. Narayan; *In Custody* (1984) by Anita Desai; *Ladies Coupé* (1999) by Anita Nair; and *The Hungry Tide* (2004) by Amitav Ghosh. Of the four authors, Narayan and Nair lived or live in India, while Ghosh and Desai are non-resident (Anita Desai is, in addition, half-German, from her mother's side). The characters in Narayan and Desai are Indians one and all; Nair's are Indian apart from foreigners in brief cameo roles; and Ghosh's are Indian other than that one is a Bengali-American. The location of Desai's narrative is in and around Delhi; of Narayan's and Nair's, in south India; of Ghosh's, in Bengal. The dominant Indian language or languages in the social environments described are, variously, Hindi and Urdu (Desai), Tamil (Narayan and Nair), and Bengali (Ghosh). In each case and with the hope of at least approximately comparing like with like, I shall, while briefly explaining the plot, confine my analysis to the opening sequence of the book. It is obviously not my purpose in the present context to offer a literary-critical analysis of the novels concerned<sup>25</sup>, and the analyses suggested will therefore be essentially linguistic in nature, stressing the lexical, sociolinguistic and sociocultural aspects, and with a specific orientation towards translation. As we journey through these texts, I shall from time to time be invoking *Hobson-Jobson*, the epic Raj-era encyclopaedic dictionary from 1885 compiled by Henry Yule and A.C. Burnell<sup>26</sup> which, as Salman Rushdie has said, bears "eloquent testimony to the unparalleled intermingling that took place between English and the languages of India"<sup>27</sup>, and remains unsurpassed for wealth of information even to this day.

\*\*

## **R.K. NARAYAN**

Our first analysis will concern R.K. Narayan's novel *The Painter of Signs*. This novel, published in 1967, locates its fictional events in 1962, in, as always with Narayan, the imaginary south Indian town of Malgudi. Raman, the painter of signs, is a bachelor of a certain age who falls in love with Daisy, a militant social reformer who works at a family

planning centre and is the embodiment of a new type of emancipated, feminist post-Independence Indian woman. The projected marriage does not happen; Daisy departs Malgudi to take her message to ever more remote parts of south India, and Raman is left with even less than he had before. Raman is a native speaker of Tamil, but is college-educated (presumably in English), and is a keen reader in both English and Tamil: "For browsing in the afternoon Raman hardly cared what book he chose; it might be Gibbon's *Decline and Fall* or [Thiruvalluvar's] *Kural* - that tenth-century Tamil classic<sup>28</sup>". The signs he paints for a living appear to be variously in either language, with occasional ventures into others such as Sanskrit. The novel's cultural codes thus shift continuously between India and the West, in what might be called a form of "cultural code-switching", so that Narayan's text can, on one and the same page, cite Shakespeare's *Hamlet*<sup>29</sup> and go on to recall Krishna's injunctions from the *Bhagavad Gita*<sup>30</sup>.

The book's opening pages (I take the first eight)<sup>31</sup>, introduce not Daisy but Raman's daily routine. This first episode centres on a not entirely successful transaction between the painter of signs and a client, a just-graduated lawyer who wants his nameboard up outside his family's house. The dialogue between Raman and the lawyer presumably takes place in Tamil; the sign, however, is in English, for when Raman arrives at the lawyer's house he has to warn the man's entourage: "still not dry. The letter "A" with all that amount of shading on its side will take time to dry. Don't touch "A" whatever you may do"<sup>32</sup>; and later, Raman warns the lawyer himself: "Careful! Four "A's are still wet. (...) Thank God you are not a barrister-at-law, otherwise there would have been three more "A's"<sup>33</sup>.

We shall now consider what words or expressions in these pages of Narayan's might throw up translation problems in this hybrid linguistic context. The opening sentence reads: "Raman's was the last house in Ellaman Street; a little door on the back wall opened, beyond a stretch of sand, to the river": the lexicon here is, the street-name apart, deadpan International English. We then learn that "Raman had been button-holed by the lawyer", who wanted his nameboard "delivered on a certain auspicious day"<sup>34</sup>, and may note an idiomatic English usage in "button-holed", but, at the same time, a use of "auspicious" that derives from very Indian notions of astrology, a theme stressed several times which serves to highlight the clash between Raman's rationalism and the traditional beliefs of his entourage.

The two go to a cheap restaurant to thrash out the deal. Here again, Narayan's English is distinctively idiomatic, using a colloquial register that will certainly be familiar to a British reader - "The lawyer beckoned to a boy who was darting about the tables, and bawled his order over the din of clattering cups and film music"<sup>35</sup> - but encompassing a specifically Indian reference to "film music", which could be either pan-Indian from Bollywood or, in a nod to regional sentiment, the Tamil film industry in Madras<sup>36</sup>, and is therefore not quite as straightforward a reference as the non-Indian reader might think.

On the second page, the book's first specifically Indian lexical item comes up, though proving to be nothing more difficult than "rupees": further down, we find an Indian use of an English word in the form of (as in American English) "kerosene" rather than the British usage "paraffin"; and, later, "oil-monger", an Indian coinage, though based on general English morphology, on the analogy of "fishmonger"<sup>37</sup>. Colloquial Britishisms, taken over into Indian English, dot the text too, as in Raman's "That sounds pretty convincing" and "If a chap wants to steal ..."<sup>38</sup>. Indeed, no real Indian localism appears until Raman has entered the kitchen of the lawyer's family house, with the precious sign in his bag. Now, "the lawyer and his two cousins became suddenly very active and effusive, and propelled Raman towards the kitchen,

saying, 'Coffee and *idli* for this man'; following which: "Out of the smoke-filled kitchen, a woman emerged blowing her nose and wiping her eyes, bearing on a little banana leaf two white *idlis*, tinted with red chilli-powder and oil"<sup>39</sup>. South Indianness, a key theme in Narayan, is here connoted not only by the obviously exotic term *idlis*<sup>40</sup>, embedded in the English-language text, plus the localism of the banana leaf, but also, and less obviously to an outsider, by the apparently neutral reference to coffee as opposed to tea.

Over what remains of this episode, if much of the subject-matter - e.g. the priest's blessing of the new lawyer - is eminently Indian, the language is for the most part idiomatically English. The lawyer's father shouts at the children: "Get out of the way, brats!"<sup>41</sup> The lawyer turns round on Raman and complains that there are sand particles on the sign, challenging him: "Do you want me to start my career with dirt on my name?", which elicits an aside from Raman: "You are bound to have it sooner or later, why not now?"<sup>42</sup> - thus activating a notable feature of Indian English, its comfortableness with such sophisticated elements as figurative language and double meanings within the adopted tongue. Raman departs in dudgeon, unpaid and concluding - ruefully but, again, in most idiomatic English: "He would be throwing good money after bad money if he tried to do another board for the lawyer".<sup>43</sup> He goes on to reflect on the general sad state of business ethics in Malgudi, while wondering if he too is not in a way a willing part of the system he disapproves: "he felt abashed when he realized that he was perhaps picking his own loot in the general scramble of a money-mad world!"<sup>44</sup>. Here, "loot" points up the historical and cultural complexities of Indian English: this word, which Anglophone readers will recognise as an informal term for plunder or ill-gotten gains, in fact came into British English through the Raj and derives, according to the *Concise Oxford Dictionary*, from the Hindi word *lut*; while *Hobson-Jobson* traces it back further to Sanskrit *lotra*, locating its first use in English in 1788 and commenting that it "has long been a familiar item in the Anglo-Indian colloquial".<sup>45</sup> Narayan's text here shows Indian English reappropriating a native term and bringing it back home - a nuance that a translator may find it hard to convey.

All in all, we may note from these pages of *The Painter of Signs* two facets of an IWE text that are likely to complicate the task of the translator: firstly, specifically Indian, and often local, cultural themes (south Indian identity; rationality versus tradition), whose proper communication calls for substantial familiarity with things Indian on the translator's part; and secondly and in a different direction, the strong textual presence of very English idioms, pertaining either to British or to general International English, whose exact register may be hard to reproduce in another language without the risk of over-naturalisation.

## ANITA DESAI

We shall now move from southern to northern India and examine the first chapter of *In Custody*, Anita Desai's Booker-shortlisted novel of 1984<sup>46</sup>. This narrative, though written in English, is about what Desai's text explicitly calls "the politics of language"<sup>47</sup>, focusing on the rivalry between a dominant Hindi and an embattled Urdu, and, poised somewhere between elegy and farce, charts the decline of the once-vibrant Urdu culture of Delhi. This is expressed through the bittersweet encounter between Deven, a Hindu and hard-up teacher of Hindi and part-time critic and poet, and a fading Muslim cultural icon, the vain, ageing but brilliant Urdu poet Nur. Deven lives in Mirpore, a small city - like Malgudi, fictional - located near Delhi, where he teaches at a low-prestige college: his subject is Hindi literature, but he was brought up bilingually in Hindi and Urdu. The book opens with Deven receiving a surprise visit at his workplace from an old college friend, Murad, who edits an Urdu-language literary

journal: Murad asks him to go to Delhi and interview Nur for the journal, and Deven's acceptance of this task sets the story in motion.

*In Custody's* opening sentence is this: "His first feeling on turning around at the tap on his shoulder while he was buying cigarettes at the college canteen and seeing his old friend Murad was one of joy so that he gasped 'Murad? You?' and the cigarettes fell from his hand in amazement, but this rapidly turned to anxiety when Murad gave a laugh, showing the betel-stained teeth beneath the small bristling moustache he still wore on his upper lip"<sup>48</sup>. This sentence raises four points, linguistic or cultural, which the non-Indian reader or translator should be aware of. First, Murad's name immediately identifies him to an Indian, but not necessarily to an outsider, as a Muslim. Second, the apparently unproblematic word "college" could raise translation problems into some languages, given the slipperiness of an educational term found in British, American and Indian English with varying significations in each, that does not necessarily mean the same thing in all contexts. In India, an institution called "college" can be, variously, a secondary school, a subdivision of a university, or, as here, a non-university higher education establishment, the imaginary, privately-endowed Lala Ram Lal College. Third, the book's first embedded Indianism appears in the shape of *betel*, defined by *Hobson-Jobson* as "the leaf of the *Piper betel* [plant], chewed with the dried *areca*-nut ... by the natives of India" and derived by that dictionary, not, interestingly, from a north Indian or Sanskritic source, but - highlighting India's hybrid and heterogeneous cultural makeup - from the Malayalam *vettila*, meaning 'simple leaf'<sup>49</sup>. Finally and perhaps most important, the one word "You?" raises the question as to what language - Hindi, Urdu or English - Deven and Murad would be speaking in - a question which Desai's text does not explicitly answer, but which I shall attempt to resolve at the end of this discussion.

Further down the first page, Deven is named and thus identified, for the Indian if not the non-Indian reader, as a Hindu. Deven keeps Murad waiting for lunch as he has to give a class: if the attitude of the students seems, alas, universal enough and hardly requires cultural glossing - "boredom, amusement, insolence, and defiance" - a specific cultural note is sounded when Deven exhorts the class: "Last time I asked you to read as much as you could find of Sumitra Nandan Pant's poetry"<sup>50</sup>, thus identifying himself to the Indian reader as a teacher of Hindi<sup>51</sup> but leaving a cultural trail which the translator may prefer to explicate. The two friends then go to lunch, at the cheapest restaurant the impecunious Deven can think of, and Murad's gibes at the food - "Raw radish - the food of cows, and pigs" - form a cultural marker, pointing up, via the implied critique of vegetarianism, the Hindu-Muslim antagonism that is one of the book's themes. Deven reflects sadly that "he could not possibly afford a meal in Kwality or Gaylord, the two best restaurants, both air-conditioned and exorbitant", Kwality - a case of a standard English word (*quality*) respelt and appropriated to create an Indian brand-name - being a national chain of restaurants which any Indian would recognise, while Gaylord too is an established home-grown chain whose (English) name harks back to its two Indian founders<sup>52</sup>. We are dealing here with very mixed cultural codes which the translator needs to be aware of.

As lunch progresses the two discuss Murad's proposed deal, namely that Deven, who though a Hindu learnt Urdu before he knew Hindi and is a lover, indeed a practitioner, of Urdu poetry, should go to Delhi and interview Nur for Murad's journal. Murad sharply denigrates the Hindi language as "that vegetarian monster", while praising Urdu as the "language of the court in the days of royalty": not all foreign readers will be aware of the parallel between Hindu/Muslim (religious) and Hindi/Urdu (linguistic) identities, and here the translator will have done well to explain these issues and their historical context in an introduction. An

embedded Indianism, "nawabs" - one likely to be familiar to outsiders - now occurs, but is balanced by an idiomatic Britishism when Deven explains that he could never have made a living by writing at a time when he had to support his young wife Sarla: "'I was married, Sarla was expecting, you know'". Here, an unwary translator might fall into the trap of mistranslating "expecting" as referring to the treatment Sarla might want from her husband, but in fact this very British euphemism means "pregnant"<sup>53</sup>. The conversation moves on to Nur, and, in the last Indianism to be found in the chapter, Murad issues Deven the fateful command: "I want you to track him down in his house in Chandni Chowk"<sup>54</sup>. The Hindi term "chowk" is defined by *Hobson-Jobson* as "an open place or market street in the middle of a city where the market is held, (as for example, the *Chandni Chauk* of Delhi)"<sup>55</sup>; and this word, appearing as it does in so many Indian addresses, already plunges the reader into the Delhi back-street atmosphere that will dominate Deven's strange encounter with the poet.

The language in which the two converse in this extract is not specifically indicated, but it is likely to be the conveniently neutral English rather than either Hindi or Urdu: Murad speaks so pejoratively of Hindi that he can hardly be using it, while Urdu seems to be the respectfully-treated object of the discourse rather than its medium (though it is also possible, given the objective closeness of the two rival tongues, that Deven is speaking Hindi and Murad Urdu). At all events, both Murad and Deven are Hindi-Urdu bilingual (indeed trilingual if one adds on English), and the apparently monolingual text thus self-reflexively inscribes itself as a instance of Indian multilingualism. It is the translator's task to be attentive to the complex interweaving of cultural codes from three cultures - British/international English, north Indian Hindu and north Indian Muslim - that creates the dense texture of Anita Desai's unsettling novel.

\*\*

## ANITA NAIR

With *Ladies Coupé*, Anita Nair's novel of 1999, we return to south India, and to an environment where, as in Narayan, the two main languages are Tamil and English. Nair tells the tale of a train journey through Karnataka, Kerala and Tamil Nadu and the intertwining life-histories of six women who meet in the ladies' section of a second-class compartment and tell each other their stories. They are represented as telling these tales in English, except for one who uses Tamil. The successive stories are framed by the larger narrative of the main character, Akhila, whose departure from Bangalore and arrival at Kanyakumari on the Tamil Nadu coast mark the book's beginning and end. Akhila, aged 45, a tax-office employee and still single, is getting away alone, for the first time in her life, from her constrictive, traditional brahmin family. Her late father was a bookish clerk whose favourite newspaper was an English-language publication, *The Hindu*<sup>56</sup>; Akhila, educated in English and Tamil, is at ease in both languages and is an avid reader of women's magazines in Tamil<sup>57</sup>, though her teacher of that language had scolded her for knowing the poetry of Wordsworth better than the works of Thiruvalluvar<sup>58</sup>, the classical Tamil writer whom we have already encountered through Narayan.

In the opening sequence of the novel<sup>59</sup>, we are with Akhila at the Bangalore Cantonment station, waiting for her train. The terminology that sets the scene, with the topographical and transport registers dominant, is already distinctively Indian, despite the English words employed. The title phrase ("coupé" is actually of French origin, thus incidentally pointing up the hybrid nature of English as such) refers to a gender-segregated convention, apparently now disappearing, of Indian rail travel; the Raj-inherited term "cantonment", scarcely found

outside India<sup>60</sup>, denotes an Indian city's onetime military quarter, today generally a residential district for the elite. Both terms call out to the translator to be glossed. The first sentence itself, however, is in a round, unvarnished International English, with Akhila's name as the sole Indian indicator: "This is the way it has always been: the smell of a railway platform at night fills Akhila with a sense of escape". As it unfolds, the description of the station identifies it as quintessentially Indian, and the second paragraph throws up the book's first lexical Indianism with an evocation of "moist gunny bags", next to "the raw green-tinged reek of bamboo baskets"<sup>61</sup> (*Hobson-Jobson* derives "gunny", i.e. coarse jute sacking, from the Sanskrit *goni* [sack], through Hindi and Marathi *gon* or *goni*<sup>62</sup>, thus pointing to commerce as a source of the Anglo-Indian lexicon).

Next, Anita Nair's impressionistic prose focuses on Akhila's inner life, deploying resources of language and imagery that deftly fuse International with Indian English: 'so this then is Akhila. Forty-five years old. Sans rose-coloured spectacles. Sans husband, children, home and family. Dreaming of escape and space. Hungry for life and experience. Aching to connect"<sup>63</sup>. Here, despite the apparently simple incomplete sentences, Nair is in fact using highly idiomatic International English. The "rose-coloured spectacles" image is an interrogatory recasting of the cliché "seeing through rose-coloured glasses"; "sans", a French-derived alternative to "without", is archaic and, in a nod to the canon of the former colonial power such as we found earlier in Narayan, harks back to Shakespeare and his *As You Like It*<sup>64</sup>; while in "aching to connect", the idiomatically intransitive "connect" raises another literary echo - "Only connect", the famous aphorism coined by a British writer to whom India was not unknown, E.M. Forster<sup>65</sup>. In the next paragraph, attention shifts to Akhila's clothes, with an obvious Indianism appearing in: "she took time over every decision ... Even the saris she wore revealed this"<sup>66</sup>. The translator can easily gloss "saris", or may even not think it necessary to do so: the more difficult challenge is the task of communicating the flavour of Anita Nair's eloquent use of International English, its clichés, cultural codes and idioms.

Attention now shifts to Akhila's family life, and we learn of her conversations (presumably in Tamil) with Padma, her straitlaced younger sister: "Akhila felt her mouth draw into a line. Padma called it the spinster mouth"<sup>67</sup>. Here, while "spinster" is an International English term, if today decidedly old-fashioned in Britain, its *connotations* are clearly much harsher in the south Indian Brahmin context. Anna and Padma are described having breakfast: "three idlies, a small bowl of sambar, and a piping hot cup of coffee"<sup>68</sup>: here as in Narayan, both *idlis* (spelt by Nair as *idlies*) and coffee appear as south Indian markers, alongside the also very southern *sambar*<sup>69</sup>. Once again, the regional dimension appears as a challenge for the translator.

Nair's narrative now returns to the railway station, and we read of Akhila's efforts the day before to get her ticket to Kanyakumari: "Akhila read the board above the line. 'Ladies, Senior Citizens and Handicapped Persons'". The notice is certainly in English, but reflects an Indian way of doing things: "there was a certain old-fashioned charm, a rare chivalry in this gesture by the Railway Board"<sup>70</sup>. Her ticket had in fact been arranged by a colleague, taking advantage of contacts to secure her a place on a crowded holiday train at short notice: "The train is full. There are no second AC sleeper or first-class tickets. What she has got you is a berth in a second-class compartment, but in the ladies coupé"<sup>71</sup>. The translator should here note, not only the culturally specific notion of (those who can) arranging tickets through privileged contacts rather than queuing first-come first-served, but also, lexically, the Indian term "AC [air-conditioned] sleeper", a category of carriage unknown to British train travellers. Her sister had asked Akhila how she would get to the station; her reply, "There are plenty of autorickshaws"<sup>72</sup>, would no doubt require glossing and specification of what kind of

rickshaw an auto is, especially for non-Indian readers who may have seen the film *City of Joy* and might, most erroneously, extrapolate the Kolkata hand-pulled rickshaw to all of India. The station reached, we learn how the eager traveller 'searched the noticeboard for the list of passengers', this noticeboard being an Indian railway custom with which, again, outsiders may not be familiar and which the translator will need to get across accurately. Akhila studies the names of her fellow passengers in the coupé, the women whose stories will make up most of the rest of the narrative: "The sight of her name reassured her. Beneath her name were five others. Sheela Vasudevan, Prabha Devi, Janaki Prabhakar, Margaret Paulraj and Marikolanthu"<sup>73</sup>. This list holds some cultural traps for the unwary: the name "Marikolanthu" identifies its bearer as Tamil, while "Margaret" might, to a non-Indian, suggest a foreign origin but is in fact legitimately Indian, since Margaret and her husband will prove to be Tamil Christians living in Coimbatore.

We cannot follow Akhila further on her journey, but the pages we have examined are indicative of the hybridity and complexity of Anita Nair's apparently simple and direct language. Highly specific regionalisms and "general Indian" cultural markers such as the railway terms appear in her writing cheek-by-jowl with a skilful and idiomatic deployment of the resources of International English. Nair's novel as a whole introduces only a very few non-Indian characters, preferring to tease out the multiple strands of Indian women's lives through the medium of English. With the next and last novel we shall examine, however, we shall be dealing, via the English language, with issues of contemporary India's interaction with the wider world.

## AMITAV GHOSH

*The Hungry Tide*, Amitav Ghosh's novel of 2004, homes in on the human and natural ecosystems of a small, isolated and highly particular area of India, but at the same time imports the wider world through cosmopolitan outsiders - albeit of Bengali origin - hailing from Delhi and the American West Coast. Ghosh focuses a magnifying lens on what might be called a micro-culture within Bengali culture - namely, the "tide country" made up by the Sundarbans, the islets of the Ganges delta that lie south of Kolkata and just east of the West Bengal/Bangladesh border.

The story centres on two visitors to the Sundarban community, Kanai Dutt and Piyali (or Piya) Roy, and their interaction with that community and with each other. Kanai, a Bengal-born Delhi resident in his forties, is paying a visit to an aunt, an NGO activist who runs a hospital on one of the islands. Piya, a Bengali-American scientist from Seattle in her twenties, irrupts into the Sundarban world as less a diasporic Indian than an outsider pure and simple, "the American": she was born in Kolkata, but her parents relocated to the US when she was aged one. Kanai is there to pick up and read a journal left him by his late uncle, an intellectual in the Bengal rationalist tradition, whose contents will oblige him to delve deep into his family history; Piya's journey to the tide country is part of her ongoing research on dolphins. Piya knows no Bengali, and her ignorance of her own language heritage induces her to take Kanai on board as interpreter between her and the people she encounters in the Sundarbans.

Ghosh's novel takes as its task the exploration of a whole field of human communication, testing possibilities and limits as the characters seek to cross the barriers of language, religion, class and culture - as well as those between the "old" and "new" India, and between India and the outside world. As it happens, a central metaphor for communication in a hybrid world is provided in this text by no less a theme than *translation*. Kanai is a translator/interpreter by

profession: he knows six languages (his native Bengali plus Hindi, Urdu, Arabic, English and French<sup>74</sup>), runs a translation/interpretation agency, and offers to act as interpreter for Piya with the local Bengali speakers whose knowledge and lore are vital for her research. Further, Ghosh's text announces its linguistically hybrid nature to the reader, incorporating a large number of Bengali terms, mostly italicised on first occurrence and in many, if not all, cases glossed within the text. It is clearly a challenge to any translator of this novel to bring across the particularities of a novel, thus inscribed in an interlingual context, which takes translation/interpretation as one of its main themes!

We shall now examine the opening sequence of Ghosh's narrative<sup>75</sup>. Like *Ladies Coupe*, *The Hungry Tide* begins at a railway terminus, in this case a "south Kolkata commuter station". Kanai, awaiting the train that will take him to Canning, the railhead for the Sundarbans, is intrigued by the unusual figure of Piya, standing out among the crowd waiting for the same train. The very first sentence reads: "Kanai spotted her the moment he stepped onto the crowded platform: he was deceived neither by her close-cropped black hair, nor by her clothes, which were those of a teenage boy - loose cotton pants and an oversized white shirt". Apart from Kanai's Bengali name, this opening sentence is in neutral International English, other than "pants" for "trousers", a term not found in this sense in British English but which American and Indian English have in common - an appropriate enough lexical touch, given Piya's Bengali-American provenance. The second sentence offers details that - much as in Nair - unmistakably identify the station as Indian, even if here without any Indianisms: "Winding unerringly through the snack-vendors and tea-sellers who were hawking their wares on the station's platform, his eyes settled on her slim, shapely figure". Before the first paragraph is out we have the book's first lexical Indianism: "There was no *bindi* on her forehead"<sup>76</sup> - Piya's lack of a *bindi* (the vermilion "holy dot" traditionally indicating a Hindu woman's married status) pointing to her in-between status as a "foreigner", both Indian and not Indian.

Intrigued, Kanai wonders why this woman, if she is heading for the Sundarbans, is taking the train, rather than the ferry as tourists do: "The train was mainly used by people who did *daily-passengeri*, coming in from outlying villages to work in the city". Here, in *daily-passengeri* (commute), we have a striking example of code-mixing, with English lexical elements modified by a non-English morphology to create a new Indian compound noun - which the translator, rather than trying to formulate something similar in the target language, would surely do best to retain and gloss. Kanai watches as Piya unsuccessfully tries to find out from a bystander which is the train to Canning, and overhears her confess her ignorance of Bengali: "she stopped the man with a raised hand and said, in apology, that she knew no Bengali: *ami Bangla jana nai*. He could tell from the awkwardness of her pronunciation that this was literally true"<sup>77</sup> Despite Piya's lack of language resources, Ghosh's text here mutates from code-shifting into fully-fledged code-mixing, thus pointing, even through its matricial English, to the complexities of Indian multilingualism.

Code-switching returns as Kanai boards the train and - having lost sight of Piya - button-holes a man reading a Bengali newspaper with a request to change places: "*Aré moshai*, can I just say a word?" (the Bengali phrase means "Hey, sir").<sup>78</sup> Kanai is equally at ease in Bengali and English, but given the man's Bengali newspaper he would no doubt have addressed him in that language, and the code-switching can be seen as a gesture within the English text towards the goal of creating an authentic Bengali atmosphere. The move succeeds - Kanai has done it because he wants to read himself - and for most of the train ride he is absorbed in a description of the Sundarbans, "a few sheets of paper covered in closely written Bengali

script". Ghosh's text then "quotes", as it were, a long section of this imaginary article, but, necessarily, in what it offers to the reader *as a translation* - thus, incidentally, comforting the position that a postcolonial text *has already been translated*<sup>79</sup>. The extract includes a number of Bengali terms, all glossed within the text, among them being *mohona* (confluence) and *bhatir desh* (the tide country)<sup>80</sup>. Here, the translator would be well advised to retain both the Bengali and the glosses, in order to communicate the special hybrid quality of Ghosh's writing.

English has thus far appeared in this narrative as above all a stand-in for a Bengali perceived as the dominant language in the social and geographical context narrated. However, English comes into its own when Piya unexpectedly changes seat and Kanai suddenly finds her sitting opposite him. She has just bought herself a cup of "milky, overboiled tea", a beverage for which she has "developed an unexpected affinity" since her arrival in India ten days before.<sup>81</sup> This conversion to tea Indian style might look like a sign of an acculturation or hybridation on the way: but if that is going to happen, English is the only language she can live it in. As the train jerks and jolts, Piya accidentally spill a trickle of tea on to the Bengali document Kanai is reading. In the wake of the accident, they strike up a conversation: Kanai identifies Piya as American, and introduces himself as a translator-interpreter who knows six languages - in response to which discovery she has bashfully to admit her monolingualism in a multilingual country: "I'm afraid English is my only language". Kanai reacts in perplexity: "If you don't know any Bengali or Hindi, how are you going to find your way around over there?"<sup>82</sup>. They separate at Canning, but their paths will cross and re-cross for the rest of the novel, and indeed one of the major themes as Ghosh's narrative unfolds will be, precisely, the communication difficulties and cultural misunderstandings experienced in the Sundarbans by the monoglot outsider Piya. After multiple vicissitudes - floods, storms, tigers and more - the novel ends with Piya's decision to return and learn Bengali, and at least the hint that she and Kanai may have found a surprising future in their relationship. A makeover, Bengali-speaking Piya would, indeed, enjoy far greater possibilities of communication and cross-cultural understanding than the "American" whom the reader met at the beginning; and should Ghosh ever write a sequel to this novel, the challenges raised to the translator would be as potent as with this one, but not exactly the same.

\*\*

We have now examined, through the openings of these four novels, a cross-section of the linguistic and sociolinguistic characteristics of Indian Writing in English and the translation problems that may arise. Our corpus has of course been small, certainly too small to allow us to extrapolate any generalisations about, say, the diachronic evolution of Indian English in recent times or any inherent differences between men's and women's writing (important though such perspectives of course are). What we have come some way towards establishing through this work is the essential, indeed the defining *hybridity* of Indian English. If there are two challenges that permanently face the translator of IWE works into any non-Indian language, they are, on the one hand, the presence of lexical Indianisms, embedded in the text, and the need to find appropriate translation strategies to communicate their sense and flavour; and, on the other, the strong tendency of IWE texts to deploy to the full the idiomatic resources of International English, with a marked continuing influence of British English, a characteristic which forces the translator to decide how far each such idiom should or should not go into a similar register in the target language. Today, translation of Indian Writing in English, for all its challenges and difficulties, has a major role to play in communicating, to as wide an audience as possible, the richness and complexity of Indian culture, in an ever-more

globalised world to which that culture will have a remarkable contribution to make as the twenty-first century unfolds.

---

<sup>1</sup> McCutcheon, *Indian Writing in English*, 10.

<sup>2</sup> McCutcheon, *Indian Writing in English*, 15.

<sup>3</sup> McCutcheon, *Indian Writing in English*, 16.

<sup>4</sup> Sales Salvador has translated IWE texts by Vikram Chandra, Manju Kapur and Vandana Singh into Spanish.

<sup>5</sup> Sales Salvador, "Translational Passages", 1, 2.

<sup>6</sup> Sales Salvador, "Translational Passages", 6.

<sup>7</sup> Sales Salvador, "Translational Passages", 3.

<sup>8</sup> Sales Salvador, "Translational Passages", 7.

<sup>9</sup> Lal, *Writers Workshop*, 1.

<sup>10</sup> Lal, *Writers Workshop*, 101.

<sup>11</sup> McCutcheon, *Indian Writing in English*, 27.

<sup>12</sup> Sales Salvador, "Beyond the Western Paradigm", 12.

<sup>13</sup> Sales Salvador, "Beyond the Western Paradigm", 17, 16.

<sup>14</sup> Rao, *Kanthapura*, Preface, 5.

<sup>15</sup> Rao, "In Search of – My Bride", 147.

<sup>16</sup> Ramanujan, "Is There An Indian Way of Thinking?", 437.

<sup>17</sup> Pradhan, "Stylistics of Fiction", 93, 97.

<sup>18</sup> Pradhan, "Stylistics of Fiction", 97.

<sup>19</sup> Sarangi's corpus is made up of works by Mulk Raj Anand, Raja Rao, R.K. Narayan, Bhabani Bhattacharya, Khushwant Singh, Rama Mehta, Anita Desai, Amitav Ghosh and Arundhati Roy. The works which Sarangi discusses by Narayan (*The Guide*), Desai (*Clear Light of Day* and *Fasting, Feasting*) and Ghosh (*The Shadow Lines* and *The Calcutta Chromosome*) are different from those analysed in the present paper.

<sup>20</sup> Sarangi, *Indian Novels in English*, 17.

<sup>21</sup> Sarangi, *Indian Novels in English*, 18.

<sup>22</sup> Sarangi, *Indian Novels in English*, 19.

<sup>23</sup> Bandyopadhyay's corpus consists of works by Salman Rushdie, Vikram Seth, Vikram Chandra, Rohinton Mistry, Amitav Ghosh (inter alia, *The Shadow Lines* and *The Hungry Tide*), Upamanyu Chatterjee, Manju Kapur and Arundhati Roy. It thus overlaps with Sarangi's by including Ghosh and Roy's *The God of Small Things*;

<sup>24</sup> Bandyopadhyay, *Indianisation of English*, 3.

<sup>25</sup> I have written on Ghosh's *The Hungry Tide* from a literary-critical viewpoint elsewhere: see Rollason, "'In Our Translated World'".

<sup>26</sup> *Hobson-Jobson* is, for instance, also invoked as a reference by Bandyopadhyay in her study.

<sup>27</sup> Rushdie, "Hobson-Jobson", 81.

<sup>28</sup> Narayan, *The Painter of Signs*, 18. The classic work by Valluvar (or Thiruvalluvar), *Kural* or *Tirukkural* ('sacred Couplets'), has, however, been translated into English: the *Penguin Companion to Literature* (which, incidentally, dates it not in the tenth century but in the third or fourth century CE) mentions (4: 324) three such translations as being in existence in 1962, the year in which Narayan set his novel. It is therefore at least possible that Raman might be accessing his own cultural heritage through English.

<sup>29</sup> "What's he to Hecuba or Hecuba to him?" (Narayan, *The Painter of Signs*, 105). This is actually a slight misquotation of *Hamlet* II.2, 561: "What's Hecuba to him, or he to Hecuba?"

<sup>30</sup> Narayan, *The Painter of Signs*, 105.

<sup>31</sup> Narayan, *The Painter of Signs*, 7-15.

<sup>32</sup> Narayan, *The Painter of Signs*, 10.

<sup>33</sup> Narayan, *The Painter of Signs*, 12.

<sup>34</sup> Narayan, *The Painter of Signs*, 7.

<sup>35</sup> Narayan, *The Painter of Signs*, 7.

<sup>36</sup> As Chennai was then called.

<sup>37</sup> Narayan, *The Painter of Signs*, 8, 9.

<sup>38</sup> Narayan, *The Painter of Signs*, 8, 9.

<sup>39</sup> Narayan, *The Painter of Signs*, 10.

<sup>40</sup> For the non-Indian reader, *idlis* are typically south Indian rice cakes.

<sup>41</sup> Narayan, *The Painter of Signs*, 11.

<sup>42</sup> Narayan, *The Painter of Signs*, 12.

<sup>43</sup> Narayan, *The Painter of Signs*, 13.

- <sup>44</sup> Narayan, *The Painter of Signs*, 14-15.
- <sup>45</sup> Yule and Burrell, *Hobson-Jobson*, 519-520.
- <sup>46</sup> Desai, *In Custody*, 1-11.
- <sup>47</sup> Desai, *In Custody*, 53.
- <sup>48</sup> Desai, *In Custody*, 1.
- <sup>49</sup> Yule and Burrell, *Hobson-Jobson*, 89.
- <sup>50</sup> Desai, *In Custody*, 5. Later in the novel Pant, the (real) award-winning contemporary Hindi poet, is denigrated by Nur (53).
- <sup>51</sup> This is made explicit on page 8: "Hindi was what he taught at the college".
- <sup>52</sup> See [www.paloaltoonline.com/restaurants/cgi/food\\_long\\_fab.cgi?id=167](http://www.paloaltoonline.com/restaurants/cgi/food_long_fab.cgi?id=167): the name "comes from the names of the New Delhi founders, Ghai and Lamba. The two started the Gaylord family of Northern Indian restaurants under British rule in the '40s".
- <sup>53</sup> Desai, *In Custody*, 8.
- <sup>54</sup> Desai, *In Custody*, 11.
- <sup>55</sup> Yule and Burrell, *Hobson-Jobson*, 214.
- <sup>56</sup> Nair, *Ladies Coupé*, 47.
- <sup>57</sup> Nair, *Ladies Coupé*, 53.
- <sup>58</sup> Nair, *Ladies Coupé*, 52.
- <sup>59</sup> Nair, *Ladies Coupé*, 1-10.
- <sup>60</sup> *Hobson-Jobson*: "This English word has become almost appropriated as Anglo-Indian, being so constantly used in India, and as little used elsewhere. It is applied to military stations in India, built usually on a plan which is originally that of a standing camp or 'cantonment'" (158).
- <sup>61</sup> Nair, *Ladies Coupé*, 1.
- <sup>62</sup> *Hobson-Jobson*, 403.
- <sup>63</sup> Nair, *Ladies Coupé*, 2.
- <sup>64</sup> The reference is to the line "sans teeth, sans eyes, sans taste, sans everything", from Jaques' famous speech on the seven ages of man in *As You Like It* (II.7, 166).
- <sup>65</sup> "Only connect ..." is the motto to *Howards End*, Forster's novel of 1910.
- <sup>66</sup> Nair, *Ladies Coupé*, 2.
- <sup>67</sup> Nair, *Ladies Coupé*, 4.
- <sup>68</sup> Nair, *Ladies Coupé*, 5.
- <sup>69</sup> For the non-Indian reader: *sambar* is a spicy vegetarian preparation typical of south India.
- <sup>70</sup> Nair, *Ladies Coupé*, 6.
- <sup>71</sup> Nair, *Ladies Coupé*, 7.
- <sup>72</sup> Nair, *Ladies Coupé*, 8.
- <sup>73</sup> Nair, *Ladies Coupé*, 8.
- <sup>74</sup> Ghosh, *The Hungry Tide*, 199.
- <sup>75</sup> Ghosh, *The Hungry Tide*, 3-15.
- <sup>76</sup> Ghosh, *The Hungry Tide*, 3.
- <sup>77</sup> Ghosh, *The Hungry Tide*, 4.
- <sup>78</sup> Ghosh, *The Hungry Tide*, 5.
- <sup>79</sup> Cf. Sales Salvador, above.
- <sup>80</sup> Ghosh, *The Hungry Tide*, 7, 8.
- <sup>81</sup> Ghosh, *The Hungry Tide*, 9.
- <sup>82</sup> Ghosh, *The Hungry Tide*, 11.
- \*\*

## WORKS CITED

- Bandyopadhyay, Sumana. *Indianisation of English: Analysis of Linguistic Features in Selected Post-1980 Indian English Fiction*. Ph.D. thesis. Kanpur: Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur. 2007.
- Desai, Anita. *In Custody*. 1984. London: Vintage. 1999.
- Dudley, D.R. and Lang, D.M., eds. *The Penguin Companion to Literature 4: Classical and Byzantine, Oriental and African Literature*. Harmondsworth: Penguin. 1969.
- Forster, E.M. *Howards End*. 1910. Harmondsworth: Penguin. 1989.
- Ghosh, Amitav. *The Hungry Tide*. London: Harper Collins. 2004.

- 
- Lal, P. *Writers Workshop: Indian Creative Writing in English*. Kolkata: Writers Workshop. 2004.
- McCutchion, David. *Indian Writing in English: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Calcutta [Kolkata]: Writers Workshop. 1969. Repr. 1997.
- Nair, Anita. *Ladies Coupé*. 2001. Rev. edn. London: Vintage. 2003.
- Narayan, R.K. *The Painter of Signs*. 1976. Harmondsworth: Penguin. 1982.
- Pradhan, Prakash Chandra. "Towards an Inclusive, Multi-functional, Sociolinguistic Theory of Stylistics of Fiction". In Christopher Rollason and Rajeshwar Mittapalli (eds.). *Modern Criticism*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers and Distributors. 2002. 93-103.
- Ramanujan, A.K. "Is There An Indian Way of Thinking?: An Informal Essay" [1989]. In Chaudhuri, Amit (ed.). *The Picador Book of Modern Indian Literature*. London: Picador, 2001. 420-437.
- Rao, Raja. *Kanthapura* [1938]. New Delhi: Orient Paperbacks, 2001.
- Rao, Raja. "In Search of – My Bride" [1978]. In *The Meaning of India*. New Delhi: Vision Books, 1996. 142-148.
- Rollason, Christopher. "'In Our Translated World': Transcultural Communication in Amitav Ghosh's *The Hungry Tide*". *The Atlantic Literary Review*, Vol. 6, No. 1-2, Jan-Mar and Apr-Jun 2005. 86-107. On-line at: <[www.seikilos.com.ar/ghosh.pdf](http://www.seikilos.com.ar/ghosh.pdf)>.
- Rushdie, Salman. "*Hobson-Jobson*". 1985. In *Imaginary Homelands: Essays and Criticism 1981-1991*. London: Granta. 1992. 81-83.
- Sales Salvador, Dora. "Translational Passages: Indian Fiction in English as Transcreation?". Conference paper. V Congreso Internacional de Traducción. Barcelona: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. 2001.
- Sales Salvador, Dora. "Beyond the Western Paradigm: P. Lal's Contribution to Literary and Translation Studies". *Titus: An Annual Journal of Creative & Critical Writing in English* (Midnapore, India). Vol. 1, February 2005. 11-19.
- Sarangi, Jaydeep. *Indian Novels in English: A Sociolinguistic Study*. Bareilly: Prakash Book Depot, 2005.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Complete Works*. Eds. Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor. Oxford: The Clarendon Press. 1998.
- Yule, Henry and Burrell, A.C. *Hobson-Jobson: The Anglo-Indian Dictionary*. 1886. Ware, England: Wordsworth Editions. 1996.