3.0. INTRODUCTION

The term ‘South Asian English’ constitutes a formal assumption of English language in use in the South Asian region that geographically includes Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, the Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka. The English language enjoys a substantial space in this region primarily because of its widespread functions in significant domains of social life, education and cross-cultural communication (Braj Kachru, 1997). In the entire region, English is perceived as a language of ‘power’ and as a means of ‘economic uplift’ and ‘upward social mobility’ (Baumgardner, 1996). Since English serves as a ‘link language’ among the people of different regions within South Asia with different L1, and in some cases even L2, more than a colonial liability, English is viewed as an asset in the form of international language representing cross-cultural communication and collective development.

The South Asian region, historically, has a long tradition of acculturation of nonnative languages and the acculturation/appropriation/nativization/domesticization of English has produced new forms and varieties, such as Indian English, Pakistani English, Sri Lankan English, Bhutanese English, Nepalese English, South Asian English etc. Moreover, each region constituting South Asia shares certain collective privileges: they are multilingual, multiethnic and multicultural; they share a collective experience of colonization by the same colonizer, who imposed, along with many other forms, the colonization through its language; they share and belong to the same historical tradition that has shaped a unified collective psychology and perspectives.

In such a scenario, as it has raised at the global front in regard to English language being a lingua franca of the world, can there be any legitimate formation or standardization of South Asian English? Since there are multiple varieties of Englishes within the South Asian societies, is there any standard form of the language that could be identified as the South Asian English? At present, however, there is no prescribed or defined standard of English in South Asia. Since the majority of the users of language in the region use localized varieties, the question of standardization remains unanswered. Moreover, the terms, such as Indian English, Pakistani English, Bhutanese English, Nepali English etc., presuppose and assume the use of English as a second or third language in a bilingual or trilingual context. Along with that, the social, cultural, historical and political contexts need to be understood as secondary
forces in nativization of English. How do such factors influence South Asian English in creative writing is what the central objective of the present chapter.

In primarily bilingual South Asia, there are many authors whose literary representations are constructed only in English, although it is their second or third language. A survey of South Asian writing in English gives substantial evidence of the use of English language to fulfill the creative function.

It seems that the very reason for the use of localized forms of English in contemporary South Asian literature is to transcend the colonial past and to postcolonialize the attitudes and uses of English. The contextualization of English language in art makes the language more exotic to its context-based usages. The ‘appropriations’ can be seen at times in changing the rhythmic pattern, which may eventually affect the conventional spellings, fusing words, using more localized lexicons, coinages and neologisms, syntax and symbolic representations.

The present Chapter attempts to identify the features of South Asian English through the study of South Asian literary creations. Moreover, it aims to provide a detailed analysis of how the features of South Asian English differ from the other varieties of Englishes as they are represented in their respective nativized forms. The Chapter also analyzes the influence of socio-cultural, historical and political contexts that shape the nativized form of the language.

Section 3.1. discusses the South Asian English from a general perspective. Section 3.2. examines South Asian English from a literary perspective and tries to see the use of the language in the narrative representations of the authors belonging to South Asia. Subsections 3.2.1. and 3.2.2. are the continuation of the discussion carried out in Section 3.2. Subsection 3.2.1. looks at the literary language from the postcolonial perspective and the following subsection discusses the major postcolonial concepts of ‘abrogation’ and ‘appropriation’ with reference to the language use in a postcolonial text. The entire Section 3.3. is an exercise in defining and explaining the linguistic features of South Asian English as they are represented in the literary texts. From subsection 3.3.1. to 3.3.7., each of the seven linguistic features are discussed in detail: (1) Code Switching, (2) Code Mixing, (3) Coinage and Neologism, (4) Linguistic Borrowings, (5) Syntactic Innovations, (6) Semantic Extensions and (7) the Use of Native Similes, Metaphors and Symbols. Section 3.4. is devoted to understanding the stylistic features as they are represented in the South Asian literature in English. The subsection 3.4.1. discusses the notion of language that shapes the literary style; subsection 3.4.2. outlines the basic concept of ‘literary interpretation’ with reference to the stylistic analysis; and subsections 3.4.3.
and 3.4.5. attempt to define and describe the concept of ‘style’ and ‘stylistics’ respectively. Section 3.5. discusses the representative stylistic features that have been applied to the representative texts for the analysis. Subsection 3.5.1. discusses the feature of Foregrounding and Repetitions; subsection 3.5.2. critically examines the feature of Foregrounding and Response in the light of Postcolonial studies; subsection 3.5.3. explains the feature of Foregrounding and Conflict; whereas subsection 3.5.4. sheds light on the feature of Foregrounding and Translation. The final Section 3.6. of the chapter summarizes the entire discussion.

3.1. SOUTH ASIAN ENGLISH: A GENERAL PERSPECTIVE

The label ‘South Asian English’ is a cover term for English language in use in India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nepal, Bhutan, Sri Lanka and the Maldives. Though English language has various varieties and sub-varieties within this subcontinent, a singular reference, South Asian English, could be used for a number of reasons. The region of South Asia consists of geographically contiguous countries or nearby islands. Each region constituting South Asia shares certain collective privileges: they are primarily multilingual, multiethnic and multicultural; they share, except Nepal and Bhutan, a collective experience of colonization by the same colonizer, who imposed, along with many other forms, the colonization through its language; they share and belong to the same historical tradition that has shaped a unified collective psychology and perspectives. Furthermore, in the opinion of many scholars, South Asia can be treated as a linguistic area in which phonological, syntactic, lexical and stylistic features are shared to a large extent. The English language enjoys a substantial space in this region primarily because of its widespread functions in significant domains of social life, education and cross-cultural communication (Braj Kachru, 1997). In the entire region, English is perceived as a language of ‘power’ and as a means of ‘economic uplift’ and ‘upward social mobility’ (Baumgardner, 1996). Baumgardner further states,

The presence of English language for over 200 years in the region has led to the nativization of the language, which is evident in several local varieties of English, collectively referred to as South Asian English.
B. Kachru adds to this argument and considers the nativization of English as an enriching process, not only for the English language but also for the indigenous languages, in the form of borrowing and coinaging neologisms as well as developing semantic shifts.

To understand South Asian English in its entire definitional term, it would be a productive exercise to look at it statistically. However, this statistics are based more on approximations than on authentic number. According to McArthur’s research of 2002, the seven countries just mentioned already encompassed nearly 1.5 billion people which, at that time, represented slightly less than one quarter of the population of the world (McArthur, 2002 : 309). However, the latest census gives altogether different dimension to this count: the population of India, according to March 01, 2011 count, was 1,210,569,573 with a projection of 1,257,476,000 by July 01, 2013; the population of Pakistan, according to the Official Population Clock, is 183,621,000 on July 08, 2013; the population of Sri Lanka, according to Preliminary 2012 Census Result of March 12, 2012, was 20,277,597 with a projection of 20,462,000 by July 01, 2013; the population of Bangladesh, according to the Bangladesh Official Estimate on July 16, 2012, was 152,518,015 with a projection of 154,514,000 by July 01, 2013; the population of Nepal was 26,494,504 with a projection of 27,224,000 by July 01, 2013; the population of Bhutan, according to the Official Population Clock of Bhutan Government, is 736,130 on July 08, 2013; and according to the Official Estimate of 2010, the population of Maldives was 317,280 with a projection of 331,000 by July 01, 2013. If these results and projection are considered, it would together make a total of 1,644.36 millions of population in South Asia.

Further, it would also be significant and important to consider the use of English language within these regions. According to the survey carried out in 2001, 10.35% of the total population of India was using English, either as its first language or as an additional language; according to an estimation by Euromonitor International in 2009, 49% of the total eligible population of Pakistan and 18% of the total eligible population of Bangladesh was using English, either as a first language or as an additional language; according to David Crystal’s research of 2003, 9.9% of the total eligible population of Sri Lanka and 11.4% of the total eligible population of Bhutan was using English, either as a first language or as an additional language. However, there is no statistical data available of the use of English language in Nepal and Maldives. Further, the data indicating the present count of the total number of users of
English is not available for any of the South Asian country. But the phenomenal spread of English language can be observed in all spheres of life in South Asia in the present time.

Considering the case of India alone, the facts are revealing. In the *Times of India* article, “Indiaspeak : English is Our 2nd Language” (March 14, 2010), it was revealed that there are more Indians who speak English than any other language, with the sole exception of Hindi. English speakers in India outnumber those in all of Western Europe, not counting the United Kingdom. And Indian English-speakers are more than twice the UK's population. The article was based on then recently released census 2001 data on bilingualism and trilingualism in India. English was used as the first language for barely 2.3 lacs Indians at the time of the census, more than 86 million listed it as their second language and another 39 million as their third language. This puts the number of English speakers in India at the time to more than 125 million. However, the number has reached new pinnacles in the last 5 years.

Most of these statistical outcomes fall short, if one neutrally examines the growth and development of South Asian countries, especially India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka, during the last decade. The rapid growth in all the sectors, be it economic, socio-cultural sector, education and research, media and entertainment, fashion, trade and commerce etc. could be observed.

The dominance of English in the public lives of five of these seven nations (Nepal and Bhutan were not part of the empire) is a legacy of British colonialism with its administration and the establishment of English in their educational systems. The indigenous languages of these nations belong to two large families, Indo-European and Dravidian. The former covers most of the north of South Asia, up as far as the border with China and the Turk-speaking central Asian republics. The latter is a family which is chiefly represented in southern India, though the presence of the language Brahui in present-day Pakistan has led linguists to conclude that Dravidian languages were spread across the entire subcontinent more widely before being confined to the south by encroaching Indo-Europeans from the north-west (Andronov 1970).

In the following, the development and present-day forms of English in three of the seven countries forming South Asia will be considered: India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. It should be borne in mind that these countries were, until the middle of the twentieth century, part of one large area - known previously as the Indian subcontinent - which was under the influence of Britain as the major colonial power. The compartmentalization of the subject matter which is
evident in the structure of the present chapter reflects the national divisions in present day South Asia and is in keeping with the manner in which English is treated in academic research into language in this area. A similar situation obtains for South-East Asia, where the political division of Singapore and Malaysia, with the independence of the former in 1965, has meant that increasingly researchers treat these countries as having separate forms of English.

Kachru (1986: 33, 1994: 508) uses the term *South Asian English* to refer to the varieties of English spoken in the Indian subcontinent, which includes India, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Nepal, Sri Lanka and Bhutan, and emphasizes that it is a cover term used for the standard variety of English. Altogether the population of these countries is nearing two billions which means that there are plenty of potential English speakers in the area.

South Asia is defined as a “linguistic area”, in terms of English, because it has shared linguistic features. According to Hock (1986 : 494-512, as quoted in Kachru 1994 : 498), there is considerable linguistic convergence in the Indian subcontinent which is the result of shared cultural and political history, shared literary and folk traditions and also the “all-pervasive substrata of Sanskrit, Persian and English, in that chronological order”. Moreover, all the major countries are multilingual and there are even diaglossic situations, as in Sri Lanka, which means that the learned variety of language is used in formal situations and its colloquial variety in non-formal situations. These are the reasons South Asia is considered a linguistic area. In addition, many of these shared linguistic characteristics are transferred to South Asian English, which makes the variety distinct from other New English varieties. (Kachru 1994 : 498, 500.)

Kachru, however, (1986 : 36, 83) reminds that he does not use the term ‘linguistic area’ to indicate linguistic homogeneity or a uniform linguistic competence. The term refers to the regional varieties spoken in the countries, for instance, Sri Lankan English, Pakistani English and Indian English. Furthermore, each regional variety of English is spoken in a different environment in terms of history, acquisition and culture. Therefore, it must be kept in mind that the way one particular variety has developed needs to be considered from this perspective. In other words, as Kachru (1986 : 135,139) points out, the distinct characteristics each regional variety has are due to ‘linguistic’, ‘cultural’ and ‘ethnic’ contexts of the region.

Moreover, each variety of English goes through acculturation in the surroundings it has been transplanted in, in other words, in its new socio-
cultural context. In this new environment the variety then becomes culture-bound. According to Kachru (1986: 37-38), South Asian English is distinct because of three factors that are shared by the users of the New Englishes spoken in the area. The first factor is that English is mainly an additional language in South Asia. There are people who speak English as a first language is not very large but growing rapidly because of the acceptance of English as a medium of instruction is most of the educational institutions. According to Melchers’ and Shaw’ (2003: 138) research, only a small minority of South Asians, about 100 000, had English as their first language and ethnic identity. These people are descendants of mixed marriages many generations ago. However, this number has grown to a large extent in the present time. Kachru (1986: 38, 1994: 513) points out, for instance, that the Anglo-Indian community in India and the Burgher English users in Sri Lanka claim to be native speakers of English. However, most of the people who use English are at least bilinguals and in some cases it is difficult to determine what their dominant language actually is. The second factor is that English is an acquired language in South Asia. Thus, English is acquired in sociolinguistic, educational and pragmatic contexts. For example, McArthur (2003: 20) states that English has spread through education in many Asian countries. Therefore, as pointed out by Melchers and Shaw (2003: 138), the language proficiency of South Asians varies greatly. The third factor is that English is taught through the written medium and not through spoken language. Therefore, many features of pronunciation are based on spelling (Kachru 1986: 38). Thus, Kachru (1994: 513) states that spelling or orthographic pronunciation plays a crucial role in the acquisition process. Moreover, South Asian English is generally spelt in the British style, however, word stress is not that significant and it can vary greatly among individuals (Melchers and Shaw 2003: 138-139).

Kachru (1994: 513-514) states that the South Asian-ness of English is to be defined according to its linguistic characteristics and its contextual and pragmatic functions. Linguistic characteristics refer to, for instance, phonological, lexical and grammatical features of the language. Contextual functions mainly determine the functional domains in which the language is used in South Asia and pragmatic functions refer to how the language is used. However, in terms of pragmatics, South Asian English, namely the standard variety, has not deviated much from British English. Moreover, it should be borne in mind that even though there are similar lexical features among different Englishes spoken in the Indian subcontinent, there are still characteristic features in each individual variety. These lexical items derive
from the different cultural backgrounds of these countries; each country, for instance, has its distinct history, types of dishes, festivals and religions.

An example of the cultural differences between the countries is, for instance, the fact that the main religion in India is Hinduism, in Pakistan it is Islam and in Sri Lanka it is Buddhism, which is bound to have an impact on the words used in the variety of English spoken and written in the three countries. Moreover, the native languages are different in these three countries; in Sri Lanka they are Sinhala and Tamil whereas in India they are, among several others, Hindi and Urdu and in Pakistan it is Urdu. Tamil is also spoken in South India so there is a common language between India and Sri Lanka and likewise Urdu and Panjabi is used in India as well as Pakistan. Moreover, these varieties have also borrowed a lot of words from other South Asian languages. All in all, the native languages have a significant impact on the ‘lexis’ of a particular New English because, as stated by Melchers and Shaw (2003 : 142), many of the characteristic lexical features of South Asian English have been borrowed from foreign languages and refer to local cultural features. However, New Englishes spoken in the Indian subcontinent do share some lexical items with one another as well because the flora, fauna, food and clothes, for instance, of these countries have similarities. All these features have an impact on the vocabulary of each New English and the characteristic words that derive from the socio-cultural context of each country are therefore needed in order for the people to be able to fully express themselves.

3.2. SOUTH ASIAN ENGLISH : A LITERARY PERSPECTIVE

If one surveys post-colonial studies, post-structuralist studies or postmodern studies as a subject, one fact would be apparently observable that the subject stands at the intersection of debates about ideological discourse, (de)centrality, gender, politics and most pressingly the as the investigative inquiry onto the sovereignty of language. Post-colonial studies, in particular, are intensely perceptive to language, since language has itself performed such a pivotal role in colonization. In this reference Bill Ashcroft (1995) makes a subtle observation,
‘Ordinary’ words take on new meanings, and specialist language and concepts from a number of disciplines (e.g. anthropology, literature, history, government, psychoanalysis) are redeployed with different emphases and contexts.

Since the entire channel of human understanding is finally governed and controlled by the means of language – reception, comprehension, representation – the study in the process of functionality and comprehensibility of language has become central to major post-1960s intellectual discourses.

The point of departure for the field of World English(es) was early 1980s, when the prolific investigation of Braj Kachru questioned the English language being the global language in its entirety. However, at that point, the ideological discourse of globalization was believed to have constituted the scholarly consensus of English language being a global means of communication, representation, reception and comprehension. It was, and is still today by many scholars, referred to and accepted as ‘world language’ – ‘*lingua franca* of the modern era’ (David Graddol, 1997). However, it was required to study that globalization of English has fundamentally raised the questions of ‘legitimacy’ and ‘standardization’ of the language. It has been researched and debated over the last three decades whether English can be circumscribed within a British or an American form since there are multiple varieties of English languages observable in various different cultural contexts. These are often caused by the constant and continuous language shifts through domesticization/nativization and hybridization as these multiple cultural contexts feed back into the language.

In the present section, the researcher aims to investigate into the linguistic features of English language within the framework of the South Asian literary constructions. Moreover, the section would also examine the linguistic features of South Asian literature in English not merely as a localized creative constructs but as a representation of *South-Asian-ness* in its textual, contextual as well as conceptual histrionics. The contemporary literary constructs in South Asian region seem to cease, partially though, the depiction of postcolonial thematics; however, they adequately represent their own ‘self’ into the language that it has subtly and necessarily nativized to fulfill its creative impulse. The process of nativization and hybridization of the colonizer’s language - from the English to Englishes - is no longer a foreign means of expression; rather, it has become a subjective means through its localized and indigenous appropriation within the socio-cultural forms.
3.2.1. POSTCOLONIALISM AND THE NOTION OF LANGUAGE

Although many colonized countries are home to multiple indigenous languages - in India, for example, more than 22 languages exist alongside English - many postcolonial writers choose to write in the ex-colonizer’s ‘tongue’. However, authors such as Arundhati Roy, Kiran Desai and Salman Rushdie deliberately play with English, remolding it to reflect the rhythms and syntax of indigenous languages, and inventing new words and styles to demonstrate mastery of a language that was, in a sense, forced upon them. This fact would be transparent if one surveys the literatures in English produced from all the postcolonial societies, whether it is Asian, African or Latin American ones. There is plethora of research studies that answer how and why such decolonization of English language happens from different perspective – sociolinguistic, dialectology, historical and contact linguistics etc. It would be an insightful exercise to overview one of such perceptive investigations: *The Empire writes Back : Theory and Practice in post-colonial Literatures* (1989) by Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. However, the present subsection would focus, keeping in mind the objectives of the present study, only on Chapter 2 of the book, *RE-PLACING LANGUAGE – Textual Strategies in post-colonial Writing*. The Chapter opens with an insightful statement:

The crucial function of language as a medium of power demands that post-colonial writing defines itself by seizing the language of the centre and re-placing it in a discourse fully adapted to the colonized place. There are two distinct processes by which it does this. The first, the abrogation or denial of the privilege of ‘English’ involves a rejection of the metropolitan power over the means of communication. The second, the appropriation and reconstitution of the language of the centre, the process of capturing and remoulding the language to new usages, marks a separation from the site of colonial privilege. (P. 37)

This statement is constituted of two major concepts of language use in post-colonial literary constructs in particular and a collective use of ‘english’ in the colonized societies in general: the concept of ‘abrogation’ (or retraction) and the concept of ‘appropriation’ (or indigenization). The authors further define abrogation as “…a refusal of the categories of the imperial culture, its aesthetic,
its illusory standard of normative or ‘correct’ usage, and its assumption of a
traditional and fixed meaning ‘inscribed’ in the words” (P. 37). In other words,
abrogation could be understood as a concept referring to the rejection by post-
colonial writers of a normative concept of ‘correct’ or ‘standard’ English used
by certain classes or groups, and of the corresponding concepts of inferior
‘dialects’ or ‘marginal variants’. In this sense, ‘abrogation’ definitely refers to
an important political stance, whether articulated or not, and even whether
conscious or not, from which the actual appropriation of language can take
place. It could be observed that the concept of abrogation is perceived here as a
process of de-colonization by refuting the imperial inscriptions and further
appropriating them into localized, culture-rooted meaning. Appropriation is
seen here as the process by which the language is taken and made to ‘bear the
burden’ of one’s own cultural experience. So language is channelized as an
apparatus to express widely differing cultural experiences. It could be observed
that the concept of ‘appropriation’ is described as acts of usurpation in various
cultural domains, but the most potent are the domains of language and
textuality. In these areas, the dominant language and its discursive forms are
‘appropriated’ to express widely differing cultural experiences, and to interpose
these experiences into the dominant modes of representation to reach the
widest possible audience. However, these differences may exist in cultures
which appear to be quite similar, for instance South Asia. For instance, a close
study to the various literatures produced from the third-world countries respond
almost similarly to the questions of language use in the creation of a text. And
that is perhaps the reason for postcolonial literatures in English to be
instinctively ‘cross-cultural’ because they confer a ‘gap’ between ‘worlds’, a
creative tension in which the continuous and simultaneous process of
‘abrogation’ and ‘appropriation’ seeks its existence - the abrogation of the
‘received’ language from the ‘centre’ and the act of ‘appropriation’ that seeks
to decentralize, hence vernacularize, the narratorial space.

However, the perception and its expression vary in response to certain extent in
writers. In a general statement, Ngũgĩ points out that language and culture are
inseparable, and that therefore the loss of the former results in the loss of the
latter, which presupposes the continuation of the colonial language to be a
threat to the vernacular language and its respective culture from where it is
generated:
A specific culture is not transmitted through language in its universality, but in its particularity as the language of a specific community with a specific history. Written literature and orature are the main means by which a particular language transmits the images of the world contained in the culture it carries.

Language as communication and as culture are then products of each other … Language carries culture, and culture carries, particularly through orature and literature, the entire body of values by which we perceive ourselves and our place in the world … Language is thus inseparable from ourselves as a community of human beings with a specific form and character, a specific history, a specific relationship to the world. (P. 15-16).

On the other side of such language debate is Salman Rushdie, who accepts and embraces English to be a vehicle to reach out the world without surrendering to utter ‘Englishness’. Although Rushdie’s novels often tackle the history of India, Pakistan, Bangladesh and Great Britain, his comments have wider relevance, particularly considering his status in world literature. He comments on how working in new Englishes can be a therapeutic act of resistance, remaking a colonial language to reflect the postcolonial experience. In the essay “Imaginary Homelands” (from the eponymous collection published by Granta in 1992), he explains that, far from being something that can simply be ignored or disposed of, the English language is the place where writers can and must work out the problems that confront emerging/recently independent colonies:

One of the changes [in the location of anglophone writers of Indian descent] has to do with attitudes towards the use of English. Many have referred to the argument about the appropriateness of this language to Indian themes. And I hope all of us share the opinion that we can’t simply use the language the way the British did; that it needs remaking for our own purposes. Those of us who do use English do so in spite of our ambiguity towards it, or perhaps because of that, perhaps because we can find in that linguistic struggle a reflection of other struggles taking place in the real world, struggles between the cultures within ourselves and the influences at work upon our societies. To conquer English may be to complete the process of making ourselves free. (17)
The theoretical and scholarly debate about language is addressed in detail in *The Empire Writes Back* (1989). In the line of what Salman Rushdie has said, Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin (P. 40) express this fact more theoretically:

The process of decolonization, which sometimes becomes a search for an essential cultural purity, does not necessarily harness the theoretical subversiveness offered by post-colonial literatures. Nevertheless, writers as diverse as Janet Frame (1962), Dennis Lee (1974), Robert Kroetsch (1974), and Wole Soyinka (1976) have argued that not only is the notion of authentic experience as false as its validating concept of the ‘centre’, but that the inauthentic and marginal is in fact the ‘real’.

They explore the ways in which writers encounter a dominant, colonial language. They describe a two-part process through which writers in the post-colonial world displace a standard language (denoted with the capital ‘e’ in ‘English’) and replace it with a local variant that does not have the perceived stain of being somehow sub-standard, but rather reflects a distinct cultural outlook through local usage. The terms they give these two processes are ‘abrogation’ and ‘appropriation’ as we have already discussed above.

The authors are careful to point out, however, that abrogation alone, though a vital step in ‘decolonizing’ a dominant language is not sufficient, in that it offers the danger that roles will be reversed and a new set of normative practices will move into place.

Another important aspect Ashcroft et al. point out is the three types of linguistic communities: the monoglossic, the diglossic, and the polyglossic. Monoglossic communities, corresponding roughly to old settler colonies, are places where ‘english’ (the lower-case ‘e’ in ‘english’ denotes local, non-standard/British usage) is the native tongue. Diglossic communities, by far the most common of the three, occur where “… biculturalism has become an enduring societal arrangement, for example in India, Africa, the South Pacific, for the indigenous populations of settled colonies, and in Canada, where Québécois culture has created an artificially bilingual society” (39). Finally, polyglossic societies “… [o]ccur principally in the Caribbean, where a multitude of dialects interweave to form a generally comprehensible continuum” (39).
Many of the language issues that the Native Americans face are parallel to the postcolonial debates, although the status of Native American studies remains unclear in postcolonial scholarship. Gerald Vizenor, a writer and critic, has celebrated ‘english’ as a vehicle for resistance in his *Manifest Manners* (1994: 105-6):

The English language has been the linear tongue of the colonial discoveries, racial cruelties, invented names, the simulation of tribal cultures, manifest manners, and the unheard literature of dominance in tribal communities; at the same time, this mother tongue of para-colonialism has been a language of invincible imagination and liberation for many people of the post-indian worlds. English … has carried some of the best stories of endurance, the shadows of tribal creative literature, and now that same language of dominance bears the creative literature of distinguished post-indian authors in cities … The shadows and language of tribal poets and novelists could be the new ghost dance literature, the shadow literature of liberation that enlivens tribal survivance.

The issue of multiplicity of language raises several polemical questions for consideration in the study of literary texts: does the author choose to work in a local language or a major global one? If the latter, what kind of semantic processes of abrogation/deformation and appropriation/reformation occur in the work? When a local language lends terms, in what context do they occur? What does the use of language imply about an implicit theory of resistance? How does such ‘creative’ language create its own subjective space in the global culture?

There are several such questions that need to be undertaken while analyzing a literary text from linguistic and stylistic perspectives. However, before analyzing the features of the mentioned perspectives, it would be important to probe into the processes of ‘abrogation’ and ‘appropriation’ into a more detailed form, as such clarity would grant a more objective analysis to the selected texts for the present study.
3.2.2. THE PROCESS OF ABROGATION AND APPROPRIATION: DEFINING LANGUAGE AND TEXTUALITY

If one imagines the English language as representing western culture, postcolonial literature, especially the African and South Asian literatures in English, is an evident example of a successful cultural transplant. Postcolonial literature, for instance the South Asian literature written in English, it is observed, should only serve to strengthen a sense of identity by proving that South Asian values and ideas can survive the translation and transplantation. The key is to make the language one's own, as Raja Rao rightly says, to incorporate rather than being incorporated. The present sub-section focuses, thus, on the processes of ‘abrogation’ and ‘appropriation’ of language evident in the South Asian literature produced in English that would further help understand, hence identify and examine the features of South Asian English.

There are several linguistic features that signify the comprehension of the textual representation only within the context of the author's native socio-cultural values and environment. If the contextual theory of meaning is studied closely, for instance, it is primarily associated with systemic linguists and it suggests that literary constructs can only be ‘decoded’ against the background of the pattern of signification in the ‘source language’. In this regard, Brumfit rightly states (1977), “…the more culture-bound the style becomes, the more distance is created between the native varieties of English and the non-native varieties.”

Further, in the same direction, Ashcroft et al (1989) argue that in postcolonial literature, the concept of ‘cultural purity’, the indispensable and dependable expression of the cultural occurrence, no longer binds the theoretical insubordination. Hence, such dispensation of ‘margins’ in postcolonial writing principally rejects the very notion of art existing for its own sake or, in a deeper tone, literature becoming a supra-conscious human experience. They further asserts,

…the syncretic and hybridized nature of post-colonial experience refutes the privileged position of a standard code in the language and any monocentric view of human experience. At the same time, however, it also refutes the notions that often attract post-colonial critics: that cultural practices can return to some ‘pure’ and unsullied cultural condition, and that such practices
themselves, such as the use of vernacular terms or grammatical forms in English literature, can embody such an authenticity. Therefore, syncretic views of the post-colonial distance themselves from the universalist view of the function of language as representation, and from a culturally essentialist stance which might reject the use of English because of its assumed inauthenticity in the ‘non-English’ place.

To substantiate its own cultural occurrence, the postcolonial literature acculturates and nativizes its own ‘standards’ of linguistic expressions; it generates its own culture-specific subtexts and explores a wide range of linguistic experiments. What are those devices that abrogate and appropriate the South Asian English in its creative use? What are the processes in which these devices form acculturation? It would be a productive exercise to understand the definitional implications of these features in linguistic analysis of literary texts. Following are some elaborations of the selected features of South Asian English that are undertaken for the linguistic analysis of the selected literary texts for the present study.

3.3. SOUTH ASIAN ENGLISH : LINGUISTIC FEATURES IN LITERARY CONSTRUCTION

As we have discussed in the previous sections, the rejection of English language being perceived as a ‘lingua franca’ of the world transparently implies the acceptance of ‘world Englishes’. As the present study aims to investigate into the features of socio-cultural, historical, linguistic and stylistic resonances of English language within the framework of the South Asian literary constructions, the present section would undertake the efforts to define the linguistic devices that form a collective standard of South Asian English. Moreover, as the study aims to examine the contemporary South Asian literature in English not merely as a localized creative constructs but as a representation of South Asian-ness in its conceptual as well as contextual histrionics, it would be a productive exercise to define the linguistic devices as a structural basis for the analysis of the selected texts.
The contemporary literary constructs in South Asian region seem to cease, partially though, the depiction of postcolonial thematics; however, they adequately represent their own ‘self’ into the language that it has subtly and necessarily nativized to fulfill its creative impulse. The process of nativization and hybridization of the colonizer’s language – from the English to englishes – is no longer a foreign means of expression; rather, it has become a subjective means through its localized and indigenous appropriation within the socio-cultural forms.

Strategies of appropriation are numerous and diverge widely in postcolonial literatures, but they are the most dominant and omnipresent way in which English is altered by formerly colonized writers. Such strategies, in its practical terms, facilitate the writer to gain a world readership and yet produce a culturally subjective, and hence, culturally appropriate expression that publicizes itself as ‘altered’ even though it is ‘English’. In this way postcolonial writers have contributed to the transformation of English literature and to the fragmentations of those ideological assumptions that have supported the principle of that literature as an influential Western discourse.

What are those literary devices that abrogate and appropriate the language to create a culture-specific texts and subtexts? How do they transplant the cultural occurrences and cultural experiences to the creative enterprise of the literary constructs? Why do authors of South Asian region use such devises? Is constructing literary narratives in nativized English ‘to resist’, ‘to write back’, ‘to decolonize’ or it is ‘to create’, ‘to represent’, ‘to attain’ a subjective space? The following sub-sections would endeavour to answer these questions.

3.3.1. CODE SWITCHING: INSCRIBING ALTERITY

Since 1970s, a large number of research studies in the field of bilingualism and multilingualism have focused on the mixing of languages in discourse, in particular ‘Code Switching’ and related phenomena, variously called ‘Code Mixing’, ‘Code Shifting, ‘Language Alteration’ or ‘Language Interaction’. However, each mentioned term has different connotation and they vary in various theories advocated by the scholars.

Moreover, the research studies in the concerned area evidently suggest that the element of code-change has undergone various periods that have shown how
complex the phenomenon of code-switching is. In the course of research of code-change it has become apparent that code-switching can be scrutinized from diverse and multiple perspectives.

In its general definition, code-switching is primarily understood as a phenomenon that occurs both consciously and unconsciously in the speech/dialogue of bilinguals or multilinguals (Auer, 1995, 1998; Myers-Scotton, 2002). The majority of the research studies on code switching, hence, seem to focus on naturally occurring code-switched occurrences/utterances in interpersonal interaction or spoken media (Paugh, 2005; Shinhee, 2006). A few studies have analyzed the deliberate use of code-switching technique as an aspect of literary or bilingual creativity in world English literatures (for example Bamiro, 1997; and Zabus, 1991 on West African writers in English; Dissanayake and Nichter, 1987 on Sri Lankan English fiction; D’Souza, 1991 on Indian English; Lee, 2004 on Chinese pidgin English in Maxine Hong Kingston’s novels; Tan, 1999 on Singaporean English; Watkhaolarm, 2005 on Thai novelists in English).

Research scholars, who have engaged their academic investigations on code-switching, have proposed that linguistic forms and practices are either conscious or unconscious unification in its totality. And code-switching, in its turn, exemplifies not only variation, but the relationship between linguistic form and language use as social practice. If one surveys the plethora of research studies in the disciplines of linguistics and psycholinguistics, it would be observable that they fundamentally focus on understanding the nature of the systematic of code-switching, as a way of edifying linguistic and potentially cognitive processes. Research studies on psychological as well as social dimensions of code-switching have principally been engaged with answering the questions of why writers shift between and among ‘codes’ and what the social meaning of code-switching is to the narratorial framework. The sociological perspective later goes on to attempt to use the answer to those questions to illuminate how language operates as a social process. In its entire history of research, code-switching has been perceived as a necessary link to all these forms of analysis and that, indeed, it is that prospect that is one of the most subtle rationale for studying code-switching, since such a link would grant the growth and substantiation of hypotheses regarding the relationship among linguistic, cognitive and social processes in a literary construct.

In its general definition in the wider discipline of linguistics, code-switching primarily refers to a switching over between two or more languages, or language varieties, in the context of a single conversation or a dialogic event.
within a literary text. It is frequently observed that in multilingual societies, where people usually articulate more than one language are observed to use elements of multiple languages in conversation. Thus, code-switching is the use of more than one linguistic variety in a manner consistent with the syntax and phonology of each variety.

From the literary perspective, the concept of ‘Code-Switching’ refers to as a channel to appropriate the creative language to construct a culture-specific text. It is consensually agreed that the principal method of ‘inscribing alterity’ by the process of appropriation is the technique of switching between two or more codes, particularly in the literatures of the Caribbean continuum and South Asia. The techniques employed by the polyglossic and diglossic writers include variable systems to make a dialect or a regional variety of language more reachable, double glossing and code-switching to act as an interweaving interpretative mode, and the selection of certain words which remain untranslated in the text. All these are common ways of installing cultural distinctiveness in the writing. But probably the most distinctive feature of the South Asian fiction is the narrator who ‘reports’ in standard English, but moves along the continuum in the dialogue of the characters.

Further, Scholars of literature use the term Code-Switching to describe literary styles which include elements from more than one language, as in novels by Chinese-American, Anglo-Indian, South Asian diasporic authors. In popular usage code-switching is sometimes used to refer to relatively stable informal mixtures of two languages, such as English, Hindi, Urdu, Tamil etc. Both in popular usage and in sociolinguistic scholarship, the name code-switching is sometimes used to refer to switching among dialects, styles or registers, such as that practiced by speakers and writers of South Asian vernacular English as they move from less formal to more formal settings. In this regard, code-switching in literature can be understood as a conscious effort to use two or more languages, for example Urdu and English, or English and Hindustani, with the objective of creating specific literary effects. These effects relate to conveying social and cultural elements to the reader as well as setting the mood of the narrative.
3.3.2. CODE MIXING: INSERTING ALTERITY

Code mixing can be simply defined as the use of one language or linguistic code into another language, the mixing of two or more languages or linguistic varieties in oral or dialogic interactions. Hamers and Blanc (1989 : 35) consider code mixing as the use of elements of one language into another. It is the conversion from using linguistic units (words, phrases, clauses, etc) of one language to using those of another within a single sentential structure. Code mixing, thus, refers to the interweaving of various linguistic units (morphemes, words, modifiers, phrases and clauses) primarily from two participating syntactic systems within a sentence.

Oloruntoba-oju (1999) believes that code mixing happens when elements of two or more linguistic systems are ‘randomly’ used. It may occur as an effect of repercussion (diminishing competence in a language or as a result of the influence of L2 or reduced context of L1). It often occurs because the speaker can either not find a suitable word in his/her mother tongue or because s/he finds the terms in the target language more convenient to use. Alabi (2007) emphasizes that code mixing is often an unconscious illocutionary action in naturally occurring conversation.

Though there are no specific norms that guide the level of code mixing, different communities and groups maintain, either consciously or unconsciously, their levels of code mixing which is controlled by proficiency. Code mixing was first observed in West Africa and brought to attention by Ansre (1971) in relation to English and West African languages. He described it informally as:

…inserting various chunks of English into the performance of West African languages in trying to show the influence of English on West African languages.

Some linguists use the terms code mixing and code switching more or less interchangeably, particularly in terms of informal studies of syntax, morphology, etc, both of the terms are used to refer to dialogic performances that illustrate the elements of two or more grammatical systems. While code switching accentuates a multilingual’s shifts from one grammatical system to
another, the term code mixing implies a hybrid form, drawing from the distinctive grammatical systems. In other words, code mixing emphasizes the formal aspects of ‘language structures’ or ‘linguistic proficiency’, while code switching emphasizes ‘linguistic performance’. The practice of code mixing, which is drawn from competence in two different languages or language systems at the same time, suggests that these competences are not kept or processed individually.

Wardhaugh (1986 : 86) opines that in the present time this phenomenon is referred to as code mixing, a position which people occasionally prefer to use a code formed from two other codes by interweaving the two. In the case of Nigeria, the contact English made with the polylectal society has led to the mixture of English language with the indigenous languages. This is caused by the socio-cultural background in which the English language is used in Nigeria. Bamgbose (1985 : 99) states,

…in a language contact situation particular a close one where an exoglossic language becomes official role in a country, the language is bound to be influenced by its linguistic and cultural role.

Bhatia and Ritchie (2004) further the argument and state that there are some factors which “generate code mixing such as quotations, reiteration, topic comment or relative clauses, hedging, interjections and idioms and deep rooted cultural wisdom.” Direct quotation or repeated speech generates language mixing among bilinguals linguistically.

Bhatia and Ritchie (2004) further state that some languages are perceived as more appropriate to specific participatory/social groups, settings or discourse than others. They also postulate that social variables such as class-structure, ethnicity, gender and age can influence the pattern of language mixing both qualitatively and quantitatively.

It could be concluded that the term code-mixing, in its simplest meaning, refers to the mixing of two or more languages or language varieties in speech. Code-mixing is comparable to the use or creation of artificial languages; but while an artificial language is created across groups that do not share a common language, code-mixing may transpire within a multilingual setting where the participatory group shares more than one language. It is important to note here
that code switching is associated with particular pragmatic effects, discourse-oriented effects, discourse functions, or associations with group identity. In this tradition, the terms code-mixing or ‘language alternation’ is used to describe more unwavering situations in which multiple languages are used without such pragmatic effects.

Sridhar and Sridhar (1980) define code-mixing as "the transition from using linguistic units (words, phrases, clauses, etc.) of one language to using those of another within a single sentence." They point out that this is distinctive from code-switching in that it occurs in a single sentence, which is sometimes referred as ‘intrasentential switching’ and in that it does not execute the pragmatic or discourse-oriented functions described by sociolinguists.

From a postcolonial perspective, code mixing can be viewed as a significant aspect of cultural transplantation that brings in the linguistic hybridity to the narrative framework. It further brings in the narratorial objective of the author to represent his/her perception of reality within the context of his/her socio-cultural identity.

3.3.3. COINAGE AND NEOLOGISM: ENGRAVING CULTURE

According to Daisy Rockwell (2012), each text carries its own ‘cultural markings’ which makes a text culture-specific. Cultural markings often emerge out in forms of specific cultural terms, ideas or ideological concepts in a text. These particular elements in a text create a ‘translational style by introducing a sense of foreignness or otherness of English in its encounter with South Asian themes and subjects” (Rockwell, 2012: 597). Over a long period of time, “English is like a ‘framing device’ used to value and represent non-English cultures” (Rockwell, 2012: 598). One of the ways to disintegrate or unveil the limits of English cultural representations is through the use of cultural markings, inclusive of non-traditional sentence structure or invented compound words, in English texts (Rockwell, 2012 : 598-99).

Neologism in its simplest definition means ‘new’, or in other words, speech or utterance is a newly coined term, word, or phrase that may be into the procedure of entering common literary use, but has not yet been recognized into conventional language. Neologisms are often associated with a specific character, textual framework, historicity of the text, or narrative event that
constitutes the text. Some scholars believe that a neologism can also be a new usage or reintroduction of an existing word, sometimes called a semantic extension.

In the present study, in all the representative texts, a preponderance of lexical coinages is observed that reflect the linguistic milieu of the source/native language of the authors. Apparently, this is a product of the author's strategy of transliteration. This strategy precipitates a phenomenon of multi-word units or compound neologisms, which abound in the text. The meaning is traceable to the source language, though the constituent lexical choices are English.

Literary neologisms differ distinctly from those of conventional language, since the affectivity which is permeated into literary texts is absent in other types of writing. However, literature is another discipline where neology can be evaluated; linguistics has long neglected literary neologisms, simply on the ground of their classification as anomalies. Since literary neologisms engage in recreating a sociological and affective viewpoint, they cannot be studied without going beyond the bounds of linguistics. It is argued that literary neologisms need to be studied in conjunction with other disciplines, such as sociology, literary criticism, pragmatics, psychology and cultural studies. In accordance with this interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary approach, the researcher has drawn on theories developed in psychoanalysis and cultural formations. On the one hand, linguistics is associated strongly with psychoanalysis to explore authors’ subconscious, and psychoanalysis needs linguistics, as it reveals and constitutes itself in language. On the other hand, literary analysis studies linguistics to understand associated anomalies of language, whereas linguistics and psychoanalysis need literature to shed light on certain aspects of the human being in its culture-specific existence, which are only accessible through literature. On the basis of this undertaking, the aim of the researcher is to undertake the study of literary neologisms into the selected texts and how they can provide insight into the subconscious and conscious use of language. The language used by the writers like Salman Rushdie and Kiran Desai, with its extremely rich vocabulary, in particular in its linguistic creativity, provides an ideal example of how the affectivity projected into the neologisms is a reflection of the extreme language and the driving forces experienced by the writer.

There are scholars who believe that neologism is the most concise genre of literature. They further argue that even aphorism seems obese and verbose as compared with neologism. If aphorism as a literary genre corresponds to the
sentence as a linguistic unit, then a neologism corresponds to the word as a minimal element of speech having meaning as such.

The material for neologism is provided by formative units of words: roots, prefixes, suffixes and other morphemes. Not any arbitrary combination of morphemes can be regarded as a new word, just as not any arbitrary combination of words can claim to be a poem or a story. A neologism is a minimal literary text that has its own idea, image, composition, plot, authorial intention and intertextual connections with other words. This distinguishes neologism as a genre of logical and dialogical art from random combinations of morphemes. The meaning of a neologism cannot be mechanically derived from the separate meanings of its morphological components.

3.3.4. LINGUISTIC BORROWING: LOANING LEXIS

To define the term ‘borrowing’ is problematic because scholars and researchers in the specified field use several different terminologies to refer to numerous language contact phenomena and it is complicated to settle the consensually agreed definitional framework. However, the definition given by Thomason and Kaufman (1988) in their pivotal work on contact-induced change has been very significant and insightful and it is therefore probably a rational point of departure for the theoretical analysis of the term. Thomason and Kaufman (1988 : 37) define ‘linguistic borrowing’ as follows:

Borrowing is the incorporation of foreign features into a group's native language by speakers of that language: the native language is maintained but is changed by the addition of the incorporated features.

In most cases, in a situation of language contact between bilinguals, words are the first elements to enter a borrowing language. In the view of Thomason and Kaufman (1988 : 37), if bilingualism is extensive and if there is strong continuing cultural pressure from source-language speakers on borrowing language speakers, “structural features may be borrowed as well -
phonological, phonetic and syntactic elements and even features of the inflectional morphology.”

Thomason and Kaufman (1988 : 14) constitute the argument that “as far as the strictly linguistic possibilities go, any linguistic feature can be transferred from any language to any other language”. It is apparent, however, that not all features are likely to be borrowed with equal intensity. Thomason and Kaufman therefore suggest a very detailed borrowing hierarchy, which has subsequently been used widely by other scholars and researchers as a benchmark against which the depth of the borrowing process in contact situation can be measured. The hierarchy is an illustrated explanation of the hierarchies of what is termed ‘borrowability’ that have been proposed earlier in the literature and literary studies.

However, there are other scholars who have adopted different terminology. Haugen (1950 : 212), for instance, defines ‘borrowing’ as “the attempted reproduction in one language of patterns previously found in another”. The definition finds its problematic in the notion ‘patterns’ that remains implicitly vague, and it is ambiguous to the question that to what extent the elements beyond the word level are included. Weinreich (1953 : 01), on the other hand, uses the term ‘interference’ as a cover term for ‘interlingua influence’ at different levels - phonological, syntactic, semantic and lexical. He defines interference as,

...those instances of deviation from the norms of either language which occur in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language.

Van Coetsem's definition of borrowing as ‘recipient language agentivity’ equals to Thomason and Kaufman's definition of borrowing, and Van Coetsem's (1988) concept of ‘imposition’ (source language agentivity) is comparatively close to Thomason and Kaufman's concept of ‘interference through shift’. However, since there is disagreement among the existing terminology, some scholars and researchers have advocated new terms. Clyne (1967, 2003) prefers the term ‘transference’ over ‘interference’, mainly and convincingly because of the negative connotations associated with the notion ‘interference’. Johanson (1993) introduces the term ‘code copying’. Milroy (1997 : 311) points out that “as for language contact, it is not actually languages that are in contact, but the speakers of the languages.” This
definition opens up new dimension stating that there is a danger in perceiving languages as ‘discrete entities’ independent of speakers, because under this view the role of speakers in actuating and diffusing language change (or borrowing) is being neglected. Most researchers have however continued to use the terms borrowing, albeit in slightly differing definitions.

One of the most easily observable results of intercultural contact and communication is the set of loanwords that is imported into the vocabulary of each language involved. The field of cultures and languages in contact (Weinreich 1953) has grown a great deal over the past fifty years.

Language borrowing has been an interest to various fields of linguistics for some time. In the study of linguistic borrowing, loanwords are only one of the types of borrowings that occur across language boundaries. The speakers and writers of a language have various options when confronted with new items, concepts and ideas in another language. There are mainly four processes in which the linguistic borrowing could be observed, namely Loan-words, Loan-shift, Loan-translation and loan-blend.

The term ‘loan-word’ suggests that the users may adopt the item or idea and the source language word for each. The ‘borrowed form’ is a Loanword. These forms now function in the usual grammatical processes, with nouns taking plural and/or possessive forms of the new language and with verbs and adjectives receiving native morphemes as well.

The term ‘loan shift’ is another process that occurs in adapting native words to the new meanings. A Loan-translation occurs when the native language uses an item-for-item native version of the original. A Loan-blend is a form in which one element is a loanword and the other is a native element.

In Sociolinguistics, 'borrowing' refers to 'copying'. It has three important characteristics:

1. Borrowing of Easily Detachable Elements: Such elements can easily be picked out of their parent language without carrying over any additional properties along with them. For example, the names of the food items like pizza, pudding, burger etc are much used in Urdu language also.

2. Borrowing after Modification: A few items are borrowed after a little modification in them in order to make them adjustable in the new language.
3. Minimal Adjustment: Two neighbouring languages usually influence each other. But this influence is not established quickly. The mutual borrowing takes place. For instance, in South Asia, English, Hindi, Tamil and Urdu have influenced one another to a great extent.

### 3.3.5. SYNTACTIC INNOVATION: LOCALIZING LANGUAGE

New literatures in English, or particularly the postcolonial South Asian literature, reflect the identity of non-native writers who are conscious to intertwine linguistic and thematic elements in English in disagreement to the British or American literature so that their nationality and cultural identity appearing in the characterization and other various literary devices would add to the uniqueness of new varieties of English. The present section of the study would endeavour to study the innovative facet of such linguistic components, particularly regarding syntax, which are central to the debate in the discipline of World Englishes. It aims to present particular types of syntactic innovations used in literary texts in English produced by South Asian authors whose mother tongue is not English. It could be observed that these authors primarily identify five types of syntactic creativity - literal translation, overgeneralization, omission, reduction, restructuring and progressive verb forms - to stress their writings which replicate the localization and nativization of the English language.

Any verbal and written expressions in English by non-native users which violate Standard English norms, namely native-English norm, are often regarded as ‘altered’ or ‘non-standard’ notions - mistakes, errors and deviations. However, if the World Englishes approach is applied to this argument, such a statement would require a great deal of revision. That is to say, non-native speakers and writers intend to express particular forms of deviations influenced by their vernacular features in order to express their cultural identity in English and to articulate their ability in creative nativization and linguistic innovation. In this regard, certain linguistic forms in English - pronunciation, words, sentences, spellings and discourse styles - in spoken as well as written texts produced by non-native users which represent a variety of variation from Standard English need to be examined by the concept of innovation.
Linguistic innovation is an important conception for constructing unique features of the English language in a non-native context. It is defined by a number of prominent scholars of World Englishes. First of all, Braj Kachru (1983: 45-46, 325) provides a distinction between the terms ‘mistake’ and ‘deviation’ to conceptualize the term ‘innovation’. He opines that a mistake seems not to be accepted by a native speaker because it violates the linguistic norm of the English language, it cannot be determined in relation to the socio-cultural context of a non-native variety, and it is not an outcome of the productive processes used in nativization of English. On the one hand, a deviation encompasses the following three characteristics:

1. the result of the new ‘un-English’ linguistic and cultural scenario where the English language is used,

2. an effect of the productive processes that emphasize the typical variety-specific features, and

3. a systematic element emerging within a variety, not an error.

Hence, an innovation is an acceptable deviation from the native English norms. In this respect, innovations are manifest in the use of English in different channels - personal interactions, media, register ranges, and non-native English literature, etc. Kachru (1983: 46-47) provides four levels of examples of innovations in South Asian English.

1. Phonologically, there are substitution of the retroflex consonant series for the English alveolar series and the use of syllable-timed rhythm in place of the stress-timed rhythm of English.

2. Grammatically, there appears to be using progressive verbs for static verbs and forming interrogatives without changing the position of subject and auxiliary items.

3. Morphologically, there are caste mark, policewala, sodabatiwiwa and bodom head, etc.

4. Textually, different texts mark the distinctive stylistic feature of *Nigerianness* and *Indianness*. 
Similarly, Pandharipande (1987: 155-156) seems to accept Kachru’s (1983) concept of innovations. She divides deviation into two kinds - intentional and unintentional. The former is referred to the way non-native users consciously use deviation to serve as certain functions in nativized varieties of English. For instance, creative writers and journalists intend to use lexical, grammatical and stylistic deviant patterns as a linguistic tool to create an appropriate extralinguistic effect on readers. This kind is called meaningful deviation or creativity or innovations. Meanwhile, the latter deviation emerges when non-native English users have neither control nor consciousness of linguistic structure in their ordinary speech. This kind is considered a mistake. Different from Kachru (1983), she exemplifies innovations at only the syntactic and lexical levels. For instance, an Indian English writer namely Nassim Ezekiel makes static verbs ‘progressive verbs’ for promoting Indian English in his writing - “You are all knowing, friends”. Meanwhile, Raja Rao uses the long embedded clauses and loan translation (e.g., temple courtyard and holy jug) in his novels.

Likewise, Bamgbose (1998: 2-4) states that “an innovation is seen as an acceptable variant while an error is simply a mistake or uneducated usage. If innovations are seen as errors, a non-native variety can never receive any recognition.” This definition of innovation is parallel to those given by Kachru (1983) and Pandharipande (1987). In other words, Bamgbose (1998) argues for an existence of an innovation as an emerging linguistic feature of new Englishes. He presents five internal measures of innovations to support the notion of linguistic innovations in World Englishes; these measures represent as factors for differentiating innovations from errors. Firstly, the ‘demographic factor’ refers to numbers of users of new Englishes with regard to three levels of competence – basilectal (users of uneducated forms), mesolectal (users who mix non-standard and standard forms), and acrolectal (standard users) varieties. Secondly, the ‘geographical factor’ involves the spread of an innovation. For example, Indian English consists of Hindi English, Marathi English, Kashmiri English and Tamil English, etc. If an innovation from each regional variety has greater spread, it will have a higher acceptance as a standard form. Thirdly, the ‘codification factor’ is related to the way an innovation enters a standardized written form - grammar books, lexis and pronunciation dictionaries or any type of reference manual. Fourthly, the ‘authoritative factor’ concerns an acceptance of the use of an innovation by writers, teachers, media practitioners, examination bodies, publishing houses, and influential opinion leaders. Lastly, the ‘acceptability factor’ is the final test of an approval of an innovation in relation to the normal processes of language change in a society. If an
innovation is accepted by reputable authorities for use, it will be codified and become a part of a non-native variety of English.

Kachru (1983) and Pandharipande (1987) are similar in that they point out linguistic characteristics of an innovation with reference to a non-native variety of English whereas Bamgbose (1998) goes beyond such features by imposing criteria for justifying the actual recognition of an innovation. However, the three scholars’ concepts meet at a description of lexical and grammatical features of an innovation as well as an acceptance of creative writing as a key source of an innovation. The two levels of linguistic innovations in literary texts produced by non-native authors, especially those who use English as a first or second language, lead to a concentration of the present study. Creative writers are likely to possess the creative license to use lexical and syntactic (or phonological and stylistic) innovations as a linguistic device to develop characters, themes, settings, as well as figurative language in order to interest the readers. Such a device is based on both natural speech in accordance with ordinary speakers’ everyday English use and fictional speech which increase the literary color and flavor.

Nevertheless, the present section concentrates on a syntactic innovation, not a lexical one, because it emphasizes an interface between ‘informal or colloquial expressions’ and ‘standard English grammar’ embedded in dialogues and narratives in South Asian literature in English. That is, an appearance of those expressions in such literature results in more obvious form of language used for communication among the characters.

There are certain types of syntactic innovations appear in different new varieties of English according to morphological and syntactic interfaces. Indeed, it was found from early studies that non-native writers of English principally utilize five types of grammatical innovations to increase the remarkableness of their literary works and to enrich their linguistic identity of new Englishes - literal translation, overgeneralization, omission, reduction and restructuring. These types are to be enumerated below.

‘Literal translation’ is an effect of the writer’s L1 influence as found in phases, clauses and sentences directly translated into English. In this aspect, the writer’s translation of local idioms and proverbs in English is not included as these expressions contain underlying meaning and socio-cultural connotation. Therefore, this type focuses on only denotative sense of expressions used in the writer’s L1 conversation and everyday speech translated in English.
The issue ‘overgeneralization’ emerges when ESL/EFL users are more concerned with achieving communication than grammatical accuracy. This first strategy of simplified grammar features refers to an overuse of rules and exceptions of Standard English language forms such as countable and uncountable nouns, prepositions, word order, and subject-verb agreements. Another aspect of overgeneralization is the misuse of words in sentences.

‘Omission’ is another simplified grammar feature in which main components in sentences are absent such as the copula be, subject and object pronouns, prepositions, auxiliary verbs, determiners, infinitives, as well as marking of plural nouns and present-past tense verbs.

For instance, this strategy appears in an Indian English poem The Patriot (1989) by Ezekiel (Gargesh, 2006: 366): “You want one glass lassi?” In fact, this question lacks the auxiliary ‘do’. This feature also partially emerges in a comic novel by Naipaul, The Mystic Masseur (1957), in which West Indian English dialect is syntactically and lexically used. For instance, the sentence ‘Why you want it for?’ shows that the writer omits the auxiliary ‘do’ but adds the preposition ‘for’ at the end of the question (Ramchand, 1969:1 as cited in Killam, 1976: 212-213). Likewise, Rushdie’s novel The Satanic Verses (1988) conveys the structure of Babu English, a basilectal variety of Indian English through the expression “What you waiting? Some Goddess from heaven? Greta Garbo, Gracekali, who?” (p.25). The author deletes the auxiliary ‘are’ and the preposition ‘for’ here. Hence, the Standard English expression ‘What are you waiting for?’ is replaced by the Indian English syntax ‘What you waiting?’ (Langland, 1996: 20). These two examples imply that the auxiliary ‘are’ is deleted by both Naipaul and Rushdie. However, the preposition ‘for’ is inserted by the former but it is omitted by the latter. At this point, the absence of only a preposition is obvious in particular new literature in English.

‘Reduction’ resembles omission as certain grammatical elements are missing for simplified expressions. Reduction requires more radical processes of simplification than omission. While omission is confined to a drop of main grammatical segments regarding ‘sentence types’, reduction involves the creation of a newer and much shorter sentence form in relation to ‘tense system’ with the existing meaning.

‘Restructuring’, the final simplifying strategy, is used to change more complicated structures into easier ones. This alteration requires the substitution process; a new grammatical form with its remaining semantic element is created to replace a complex expression.
As Ashcroft et al. point out, the fusion of differing systems of belief that further leads to hybridization in post-colonial literature denies the privileged position of a standard linguistic code and any monocentric view of human experience. At the same time, however, as we have discussed earlier, it also refutes the phenomena that largely attract post-colonial critics: cultural practices can return to some ‘chaste’ and unsullied cultural condition, and that such practices themselves, such as the use of vernacular terms or grammatical forms in English literature, can exemplify such a legitimacy. Therefore, syncretic views of the post-colonial literature detach themselves from the objectivist view of the functionality of language as representation, and from a culturally essentialist stance which might refuse the use of English because of its assumed inauthenticity in the ‘non-English’ place.

Ashcroft et al. discuss this aspect in their pioneering work on postcolonialism, *The Empire Writes Back*, where they take an example of the African novel *The Voice* (1964) written by Gabriel Okara. The discussion in *The Empire Writes Back* on this aspect could be taken as an example to understand how a linguistic unit could expand its semantic boundaries within a cultural context. Okara, in the novel, attempts to develop a ‘culturally relevant’ use of English by adapting Ijaw syntax and lexical parameters. This exercise clearly displays the significance of the ‘situation’ of the word in the narratorial discourse by giving rise to lexical items which have various meanings depending on how they are employed in the text. A significant example of this is the use of the terms ‘inside’ and ‘insides’, which are employed in a variety of ways in the novel:

‘Listen. Asking the bottom of things in this town will take you no place. Hook this up with your little finger. Put it in your inside’s box and lock it up.’

‘Your teaching words do not enter my inside.’ (36)

‘You must leave this town. It will pain our insides too much to see you suffer.’ (48)
But Okolo looking at them said in his *inside* that his spoken words would only break against them as an egg would against a stone. (48)

‘These happening things make my *inside* bitter, perhaps more bitter than yours.’ (48)

‘How can I change my *inside*?’ he said.’ (49)

‘I see in my *insides* that your spoken words are true and straight. But you see it in your *inside* that we have no power to do anything. The spirit is powerful. So it is they who get the spirit that are powerful and the people believe with their *insides* whatever they are told. The world is no longer straight . . . So turn this over in your *inside* and do as we do so that you will have a sweet *inside* like us.’ (49)

In these quoted passages, it would be possible to interpret these uses of ‘*inside(s)*’ as ‘emotions, sentiments or feelings’, ‘self-referentiality’, ‘outlook on life’, ‘personality’, ‘intellectual perception’, ‘understanding’, ‘intellectuality’, ‘heart’ and ‘mind’. But to do so would be to interpret Okara’s words and contain them rather than allow their meaning to be determined by their place in the discourse. The term ‘sweet inside’ is dense with metaphoric possibility, connoting all the characteristics of a harmonious and amiable spirit. One may make some very clear deductions from these passages about the holistic nature of self in Ijaw culture, of the notion of the ‘*inside*’ as that which responds to everything which is ‘other’ or ‘outside’ (and, on further reading, of the notion of the ‘*inside*’ and ‘outside’ as coextensive). But it would be erroneous to believe that this sense of self is a contingent component in the communication of the meaning of the term ‘*insides*’ when used in the novel. This is because the word does not have some ‘essential’ meaning which is unique to Ijaw and experientially inaccessible to members of another culture; the meaning of the word is that composite of uses which emerges in any reading. ‘*Inside*’ is not a metaphor for ‘the Ijaw sense of self’, when used in these ways in the novel. It is a metaphor for ‘self’, and may give rise to the possibility of many meanings: ‘*mind*’, ‘*will*’, ‘*spirit*’, or ‘*emotion*’, according to the ways in which it functions in the text.

Given this use of the word in its situation, the ‘meaning’ of the term ‘*inside(s)*’ becomes virtually limitless, and many more senses of the term could be compiled from this one novel: ‘Our father’s *insides* always contained things
straight’ (50); ‘everybody’s inside is now filled with cars and money’ (50); ‘he remained talking with his inside until sundown’ (51); ‘My inside has become hard’ (53); ‘You are indeed a child in your inside’ (55). Clearly, the notion of a referent for the term ‘insides’ apart from its application in the context of discourse ceases to have any meaning. The ‘objective’ and ‘universal’ state represented by the word does not exist. Such a metaphoric use of language may or may not be indicative of language use in Okara’s native Ijaw, but this is immaterial to the function of the word in the English text and to its ability to mean in the same way as it does in Ijaw.

This shows the creative potential of intersecting languages when the syntactic and grammatical rules of one language are overlaid on another, and of the way in which cross-cultural literature reveals how meanings work. In a consumption of the text which is divorced from any knowledge of what is being represented, the field of intersection, the literary work, is the field within which the word announces its purpose. Similarly, in whatever way the prolixity of the word ‘insides’ is linked to the Ijaw perception of the world, this function cannot be limited to the understanding of the Ijaw consciousness. The ‘world’ as it exists ‘in’ language is an unfolding reality which owes its relationship to language to the fact that language interprets the world in practice, not to some imputed referentiality.

Ashcroft et al concludes the argument with this statement:

Language exists, therefore, neither before the fact nor after the fact but in the fact. Language constitutes reality in an obvious way: it provides some terms and not others with which to talk about the world. Because particular languages provide a limited lexicon they may also be said (metaphorically) to ‘use’ the speaker, rather than vice versa. But the worlds constituted in this way do not become fixed composites in the speaker’s mind, a set of images which differs, by definition, from the set in the mind of the speaker of a different language. Worlds exist by means of languages, their horizons extending as far as the processes of neologism, innovation, tropes, and imaginative usage generally will allow the horizons of the language itself to be extended.
3.3.7. THE USE OF NATIVE SIMILES, METAPHORS AND SYMBOLS

The authenticity to the kind of literary imbedding practiced by renowned South Asian writers writing in English is, however, provided by the post-colonial discourse and theories, which primarily deal with the ‘hybridization’ (Bhabha, 1994: 158) of English. According to Barker (2000: 277), “English has a variety of global forms leading postcolonial literatures to be concerned with a range of Englishes”.

This ‘syncretic practice’ (Ashcroft, Griffíths, and Tiffín, 2004: 397) between languages and even genres is owing to the fact that “(T)he borderline work of culture demands an encounter with ‘newness’ (Bhabha 1994: 10). Bilingualism and multilingualism are the chief factors that encourage such novel practices. Han Suyin (1991: 18) explains the generation of this novelty as writers from “cultures and backgrounds different from the one in which the language we use was born, are contributing to the enlargement and extension, the enrichment of the English language.” She explains how, through the usage of English, an understanding of the native cultures and geographies can be expanded. As Braj Kachru (1986) points out, in many former colonies, it was not only the indigenous languages that were modified; rather the English spoken and written there also underwent some form of genetic modulation.

Braj Kachru (1986: 159) highlights this point in his work *The Alchemy of English* that the ‘pluricentricity of English’:

... extends the cultural load of English lexis from conventional Greek and Roman allusions to Asian and African myths, folklore, and traditions. It universalises English, and one might say ‘de-Englishizes’ it in terms of the accepted literary and cultural norms of the language.

This, as Ashcroft et al (2004: 396) note, leads to ‘a view of language grounded in an assertion of the importance of practice over the code, the importance of the ‘variant’ over the ‘standard’. English was no more the singular property of the English people; it was appropriated, assimilated and domesticated by the locals of those colonies within their own socio-cultural paradigms. This usage of the English language by the ‘Natives’ of the former colonies ensured what
Suyin calls in his Plenary Lecture ‘inventiveness’ (as quoted in Harris, 1991: 18).

It is the flexibility and ductility of the English language that has permitted a redefinition of English Literature. Literatures in English produced by non-Native English writers mark a departure from the standardized usage of English and in doing so enable these writers to highlight multitudinous themes that range from the personal to the socio-cultural and the political in a creative, and even in some cases an avant garde, manner. Heidi Gardner (1997: 102-103) writes in her essay ‘The Role of Literature from the English Speaking World in the EFL Classroom: Short Prose Fiction from the New English Literatures’:

> English Literature has indeed been redefined on the basis of the common denominator of all these writers’ language, of which Anita Desai says that it is ‘the most flexible, the most rich in nuances and subtleties’, making it the natural vehicle of communication and artistic expression, even for writers for whom English is not the mother tongue, or whose rejection of colonialism may make them very hostile towards European culture.

While English is invariably a unifying medium of expression, Post-colonial literatures in English display a balance between ‘assimilation and resistance to colonial culture’ (Patke, 2006: 4), which has led to the ‘hybridization of the English Muse’ (Ramazani, 2001: vi) since Post Colonial writers have infused the target language with ‘indigenous metaphors and rhythms, creoles and genres’ (Ramazani, 2001: vi). Therefore, both ‘appropriation’ (Bhabha, 1994: 172) and the ‘intersection of vocabularies’ (Ramazani, 2001: 72) permits a two way traffic, both cultural and spatial, between the indigenous and the foreign realms. This linguistic commerce across culture and language influences the stylistic patterns of the literature generated in English. According to Ashcroft (2001: 75):

> The intersection of language which occurs when texture, sound, rhythm and words are carried over from the mother tongue to the adopted literary form is one which many writers propose as the distinguishing form of postcolonial literature. This use of
language is often regarded as the sign of an individual author’s creative capability, or the sign of an ethnographic function by which the ‘truth’ of culture is inserted into the text by a process of metaphoric embodiment.

3.4. SOUTH ASIAN ENGLISH: STYLISTIC FEATURES AND POSTCOLONIAL AESTHETICS

Stylistics is a method of textual interpretation in which primacy of place is assigned to ‘language’ and its ‘functions’ in the narratorial context. The reason why language is so important to stylisticians is because the various forms, patterns and levels that constitute linguistic structures are an important index of the function of the text. The text’s functional significance as discourse acts in turn as an access to its ‘interpretation’. While linguistic features do not of themselves constitute a text’s ‘meaning’, an account of linguistic features nonetheless serves to ground a stylistic interpretation and to help explain why, for the interpreter, specific types of meanings are possible. The traditional connection between stylistics and literature brings with it two important admonitions, though. The first is that creativity and innovations in language use should not be seen as the exclusive preserve of literary writing. Many forms of discourse often exhibit a high degree of stylistic dexterity, such that it would be wrong to view dexterity in language use as exclusive to canonical literature. The second admonition is that the techniques of stylistic analysis are as much about deriving insights about linguistic structure and function as they are about understanding literary texts. Thus, the question ‘What can stylistics tell us about literature?’ is always paralleled by an equally important question ‘What can stylistics tell us about language?’ In the context of the present study, stylistics would be considered and applied to the analysis of the selected text in the light of these two questions.

In spite of its clearly defined remit, methods and object of study, there remain a number of myths about contemporary stylistics. Most of the time, confusion about the compass of stylistics is a result of confusion about the compass of language. For instance, there appears to be a belief in many literary critical circles that a stylistician is simply a trained old grammarian who spends rather a great amount of time on such trivial pursuits as counting the nouns and verbs in literary texts. Once counted, those nouns and verbs form the basis of the stylistician’s ‘insight’, although this stylistic insight ultimately proves no more
far-reaching than an insight reached by simply intuiting from the text. This is an erroneous perception of the stylistic method and it is one which stems from a limited understanding of how language analysis works. However, nouns and verbs should not be overlooked, nor indeed should ‘counting’ when it takes the form of directed and focussed quantification. But the purview of modern language and linguistics is much broader than that and, in response, the methods of stylistics follow suit. It is the full gamut of the system of language that makes all aspects of a writer’s craft relevant in stylistic analysis. Moreover, stylistics is interested in language as a function of texts in ‘context’, and it acknowledges that literary utterances are produced in a time, a place, and in a ‘cultural’ and ‘cognitive’ context. These ‘extra-linguistic’ parameters are inextricably tied up with the way a text means. The more complete and context-sensitive the description of language, the fuller the stylistic analysis that accrues.

To do stylistics is to explore language, and, more specifically, to explore creativity in language use. Doing stylistics thereby enriches our ways of thinking about language and, as observed, exploring language offers a substantial purchase on our understanding of literary texts. With the full array of language models at our disposal, an inherently illuminating method of analytic inquiry presents itself. This method of inquiry has an important reflexive capacity insofar as it can shed light on the very language system it derives from; it tells us about the ‘rules’ of language because it often explores texts where those rules are bent, distended or stretched to breaking point.

Stylistics is traditionally regarded as a field of study where the methods of selecting and implementing linguistic, extra-linguistic or aesthetic means and devices in the process of communication are studied. In general, scholars in the field distinguish ‘linguistic stylistics’ and ‘literary stylistics’. The division between the two is by no means easy or clear. In his book *Exploring the Language of Poems, Plays and Prose*, Mick Short (1996 : 01) comments on this problem in these words:

... stylistics can sometimes look like either linguistics or literary criticism, depending upon where you are standing when looking at it. So, some of my literary critical colleagues sometimes accuse me of being an unfeeling linguist, saying that my analyses of poems, say, are too analytical, being too full of linguistic jargon and leaving unsufficient room for personal preference on the part of the reader. My linguist colleagues, on the other hand,
sometimes say that I’m no linguist at all, but a critic in disguise, who cannot make his descriptions of language precise enough to count as real linguistics. They think that I leave too much to intuition and that I am not analytical enough. I think I’ve got the mix just right, of course!

The above-mentioned book provides a clear and broad ranging introduction to stylistic analysis including a comprehensive discussion of the links between linguistics and literary criticism. Short’s standpoint is a linguistic one. He works exclusively with literary texts; texts of poetry, fiction and drama and consequently his analyses include a considerable amount of literary interpretation and discussion of literary issues.

For the purpose of the present study, it is crucial to understand that there are different traditions of stylistic research which influence the limits and ambitions of stylistic study as well as the methods used in stylistic analysis. However, modern developments and tendencies towards an interdisciplinary research have to be taken into account.

There are many problems that have fascinated scholars working at the interface between language and literature: What is literature? How does literary discourse differ from other discourse types? What is style? What is the relationship between language, literature and society? Within the last 40 years, scholars have introduced various approaches, summarised and discussed in detail in the book edited by Jean Jacques Weber *The Stylistics Reader. From Roman Jakobson to the Present* (1996). These are mainly:

- ‘formalist stylistics’ represented by Roman Jakobson,
- ‘functionalist stylistics’ represented by Michael Halliday,
- ‘affective stylistics’ introduced by Stanley E. Fish and Michael Toolan,

Other currents in contemporary stylistics are different types of ‘contextualized stylistics’, for instance: ‘pragmatic stylistics’ represented by recent works of Mick Short, Mary Louise Pratt and Peter Verdonk; ‘critical stylistics’ represented mainly by Roger Fowler and David Birch; ‘feminist stylistics’
introduced by Deirdre Burton and Sara Mills; and ‘cognitive stylistics’ represented by Donald C. Freeman, Dan Sperber, Deirdre Burton and others.

3.4.1. THE NOTION OF LANGUAGE AND LITERARY STYLE

Traditionally, stylistics is considered as the study and interpretation of literary texts from a linguistic perspective. It also attempts to establish principles capable of explaining the particular choices made by individual authors and social groups in their use of language. Hence, it could also be viewed as the detrimental forces of representation, the production and reception of meaning and critical discourse analysis. Other features of stylistics include the use of dialogue, including regional accents and native dialects, descriptive language, along with the cultural rootedness, belief system, socio-cultural and historical realisms, distant and recent historiographical depictions, behavioral patterns, etc. In addition, stylistics is a distinctive term that may be used to determine the connections between the form and effects in a particular variety of language within a structural framework of a literary text.

As J. Mistrík (1985 : 30) notes, stylistics can be defined as the study of choice and the types of use of ‘linguistic’, ‘extra-linguistic’ and ‘aesthetic’ mean, as well as particular techniques used in communication. The goal of most stylistic studies is not simply to describe the formal features of texts for their own sake, but to show their functional as well as aesthetic significance for the interpretation of the text. Moreover, considering the generally accepted differentiation between linguistic and literary stylistics, J. Mistrík suggests that the language style, belles-lettres and literary style should be carefully distinguished.

The ‘language style’ is a way of speech or a kind of utterance which is formed by means of conscious and intentional selection, systematic patterning and implementation of linguistic and extra-linguistic means with respect to the topic, situation, function, author's intention and content of an utterance. The ‘Belles-Letters style’ is one of the language styles which fulfills, in addition to its general informative function, a specific aesthetic function. The ‘Literary Style’ is the style of literary works implemented in all components of a literary work, that is, on the level of language, ideas, narrative structure etc. All these components are subordinated to aesthetic norms. Thus ‘Literary style’ is an extra-linguistic category while the language and belles-letters styles are
language categories. It could be recognized that there are several categories of
the style, for instance the style of a literary school, group or generation and also
an individual style of an author. This further leads to understand that, on the
one hand, one can name the so called ‘individual styles’ and on the other the
‘inter-individual’, or what could be termed ‘functional’ styles.

3.4.2. STYLISTIC ANALYSIS AND LITERARY
INTERPRETATION

In his work on stylistics J. Mistrík (1985 : 31) draws clear boundaries between
stylistic analysis and literary interpretation; he defines stylistic or text analysis
as a procedure which aims at the linguistic means and devices of a given text,
the message, topic and content of analysed texts are not the focus. The method
of stylistic analysis can be equally applied to the study of language use in
literary as well as non-literary texts.

From this point of view, literary interpretation is a process which applies
exclusively to literary text; it aims at understanding and interpreting the topic,
content and the message of a literary work, its literary qualities and the so
called decoding of the author's signals by the recipient.

3.4.3. DEFINITIONS OF STYLE

The understanding of the term ‘style’ influences the characteristics given to
Stylistics as one of several linguistic disciplines. The following are the most
common characteristics of ‘style’ as listed by K. Wales (1990) in her respected
work A Dictionary of Stylistics.

Although the term ‘style’ is used very frequently in Literary Criticism and
especially Stylistics, it is very difficult to define in any singular form. There are
several broad areas in which it is used.
1. In its simplest definition, style refers to the ‘manner of expression’ in writing and speaking. One might talk of someone writing in an ornate style, or speaking in a comic style. For some people style has evaluative connotations and judgmental.

2. One obvious implication of the first point is that there are different styles in different situations; also that the same activity can produce stylistic variation. So it further leads to understand style as ‘variation in language use’, whether literary or non-literary. Style may vary not only from situation to situation but according to ‘medium’ and ‘degree of formality’, what is sometimes termed ‘style-shifting’. On a larger scale it may vary, in literary language, from one genre to another, or from one period to another, or from one region to another. Style is thus seen against a background of larger or smaller domains or contexts.

3. In each case, style is seen as distinctive: in essence, the ‘set of linguistic features’ that seem to be characteristic: whether of register, genre or period, etc. Style is very commonly defined in this way, especially at the level of text, for example, the style of Tagore’s *Gitanjali*, or Rushdie’s *Midnight’s Children*.

4. Stylistic features are basically features of language, so style is in one sense synonymous with language. What is implied, however, is that the language is in some way distinctive, significant for the design of narratorial objective. When applied to the domain of an author, style is the set of features peculiar to, or characteristic of, an author, his or her language habits or idiolect.

5. Clearly each author draws upon the general stock of the language in any given period; what makes style distinctive is the ‘choice of codes’, and their distribution and patterning. A definition of style in terms of choice is very popular, the selection of features partly determined by the demands of genre, form, theme, etc. All utterances have a style, even when they might seem relatively plain or unmarked.

6. Another differential approach to style is to compare one set of features with another in terms of a ‘deviation from a norm’, a common approach in the 1960s. It would be wrong to imply that style itself is deviant in the sense of abnormal, even though there are marked poetic idiolects. Rather, we match any text or piece of language against the linguistic
norms of its genre, or its period, and the common core of the language as a whole. Different texts do reveal different patterns of dominant or foregrounded features.

3.4.4. DEFINITIONS OF STYLISTICS

Stylistics is the study of style. Just as style can be viewed in several ways, so there are several different stylistic approaches. This variety in stylistics is due to the main influences of Linguistics and Literary Criticism. Stylistics in the twentieth century replaces and expands on the earlier discipline known as ‘rhetoric’. Following the publication of a two-volume treatise on French stylistics by Ch. Bally, a pupil of the structuralist, Ferdinand de Saussure, interest in stylistics gradually spread across Europe via the work of L. Spitzer and others. It was in the 1960s that it really began to flourish in Britain and the United States.

Traditional literary critics were suspicious of an objective approach to literary texts. In many respects, stylistics is close to literary criticism and practical criticism. By far the most common kind of material studied is literary, and attention is ‘text-centred’. The goal of most stylistic studies is not simply to describe ‘the formal features of texts’ for their own sake, but to show their ‘functional significance’ for the interpretation of the text; or to relate literary effects to linguistic causes where these are felt to be relevant. Intuitions and interpretative skills are just as important in stylistics and literary criticism; however, stylisticians want to avoid vague and impressionistic judgements about the way formal features are manipulated. As a result, stylistics draws on the models and terminology provided by whichever aspects of linguistics are felt to be relevant. In the late 1960s generative grammar was influential; in the 1970s and 1980s discourse analysis and pragmatics. Stylistics also draws eclectically on trends in literary theory, or parallel developments in this field.

So the 1970s saw a shift away from the reader and his or her responses to the text, for example affective stylistics, reception theory etc. Stylistics or general stylistics can be used as a cover term for the analysis of non-literary varieties of language, or registers (D. Crystal & D. Davy in Investigating English Style, 1969; M. M. Bakhtin in The Dialogic Imagination, 1981 and The Problem of the Text, 1986). Because of this broad scope stylistics comes close to work done in sociolinguistics. Indeed, there is now a subject ‘socio-stylistics’ which
studies, for instance, the language of writers considered as social groups or fashions in language.

### 3.5. THE REPRESENTATIVE STYLISTIC FEATURES FOR THE PRESENT STUDY

At this point, the researcher would like to engage the discussion on the representative features of stylistics, which are to be investigated into the selected texts for the analysis. For the purpose mentioned herewith, there are four stylistic features, which have been taken up for the analysis of the representative texts. They are as following.

1. Foregrounding and Repetitions
2. Foregrounding and Response
3. Foregrounding and Conflict
4. Foregrounding and Translation

In each of the following subsections, the researcher would discuss these stylistic features, their definitions and descriptions.

### 3.5.1. FOREGROUNDING AND REPETITIONS

As we have seen earlier, *stylistics* is the description and analysis of the variability of linguistic forms in actual language use, either in the written discourse or in the spoken interaction. Further, it needs to be stressed that the concepts of ‘style’ and ‘stylistic variation’ in language rest on the general assumption that within the language system, the same content can be encoded in more than one linguistic form. Operating at all linguistic levels - lexicology, syntax, text linguistics, and intonation - the scholars in the discipline analyze both the ‘style’ of specific texts and the ‘stylistic variation’ across texts. These texts can be literary or nonliterary in nature. From a generalist perspective, style may be regarded as a choice of linguistic means, as deviation from a norm, as recurrence of linguistic forms and as comparison, whereas stylistics could be understood as a systematic study of the mentioned factors.
Considering style as choice, there are a multitude of stylistic factors that lead the language user to prefer certain linguistic forms to others. For the convenience, these factors can be classified into two categories: (1) user-bound factors and (2) factors referring to the situation where the language is being used. User-bound factors include, among various others, the writer’s age, gender, idiosyncratic preferences, and regional and social background. Situation-bound stylistic factors depend on the given communication situation, such as medium (writing), participation in discourse (monologue as well as dialogue), attitude (descriptions, explanations, statements etc.) and field of discourse (literary, sub-literary, non-literary).

The feature of Foregrounding and Repetitions, on the one hand, falls under the linguistic level of lexicography, where the lexical codes - singular, phrasal or sentential - are repeated, either consciously or habitually, to create effects with regard to either culture-specificity, locale-oriented peculiarity, aesthetic-intentionality or linguistic creativity. On the other hand, the repetition could be observed in the insertion of lexical codes having similar sound pattern used in the intrasentential words and the use of singular lexical code with different grammatical nomenclature in a singular sentence. The element of repetitions signifies an iterative process in which the linguistic unit(s) are either presented ‘afresh’ or just placed ‘again’. The fundamental objective of foregrounding the feature of repetition is to balance the ‘response’.

3.5.2. FOREGROUNDING AND RESPONSE

The term ‘response’ in postcolonial studies invokes various theoretical aspects; one of such aspects is the tendency to ‘resist’. How could a tendency of ‘resistance’ find its space in postcolonial literature in English is what at the centre of discussion among the scholars of postcolonial linguistic studies. In its formal sense, the term ‘response’, in postcolonial literary sense, simply reveals the tendency to ‘answer back’ and to ‘write back’. It is, in a sense, a conscious effort to hypothesize that the language, which is historically nativized, culturally acculturized and regionally indigenized, has been an inseparable entity to the people who were the subjects of this colonial imposition of the language. However, the colonizer’s language has been greatly acculturated, annotating the regional cultural influences on the language use – in terms of lexical, syntactical and semantic functions – which have not merely ‘transferred’ the language but also greatly ‘altered’ it. So when a creative writer
structures his/her narrative, what s/he inserts into the narrative as a mode of representation is this acculturated forms of the language, not the language they were ‘compelled’ to use. This element in postcolonial writing could be considered as ‘response’ to the ‘western’ or ‘centre-oriented’ modes of writing, and broadly it could be illustrated as an exercise of ‘answering back’ rather than merely ‘writing in line’.

With this element of ‘response’ naturally falls the tendency of ‘resistance’ as a part of creative substance, as it is the ‘resistance’ that generates the localized forms of language use and hence incorporates the nativized and acculturated language into the narratives. From a generalist perspective, the tendency of ‘resistance’ in contemporary South Asian literature in English in particular, and postcolonial literature in general, refutes the very notion that idea of representation also connotes further subjugation. The tendency of resistance uses the language of empire to rebut its dominant ideologies. In other words, the colonized nation is ‘writing back’, speaking either of the oppression and racism of the colonizers or the inherent cultural “better-ness” of the indigenous people.

The primary objective of the South Asian authors creating their literary oeuvres in the colonizer’s language, thus, is to examine and to scrutinize the native history of the precolonial, colonial and postcolonial times, its spatio-temporal coordinates, its cultural shifts, its repressions and oppressions, its struggle for the subjective space and most pressingly its own unique existence. The postcolonial literature resonates not merely ‘questioning’ but rather ‘answering back’ to the colonizers, who imposed every form of colonization during their course of power, including the imposition of language. The use of nativized English in the constructions of nations and narrations has thus become a primary channel and one of the most subtle, hence conscious, attempt to decolonization.

To incorporated the acculturated language, to insert the regional syntactic formations and locale-specific lexical terms are merely the one possible ways in which the element of ‘response’ is generated through the language use; the more substantial and sharpened technique is to insert the localized ideological concepts through the assertion of a nativized language. These concepts may superstitious), cultural belief system, social norms (acceptability and unacceptability), political view (created or corrected), life-style (rural and urban) etc.
3.5.3. FOREGROUNDING AND CONFLICT

‘Conflict’, in a strict literary definition, means a device used for expressing ‘resistance’ in the protagonist of the story who finds himself/herself at odd in achieving his/her desired goals. The conflict is a discord that can have external aggressors or can even arise from within the self. It occurs when the subject is battling his/her inner discord, may be at odds with his/her surroundings and lastly, may be pitted against others in the narrative.

However, in postcolonial literature, the very concept of ‘conflict’ has been deconstructed and further advocated to include several other phenomena that the postcolonial writing installs. The concept of ‘conflict’ has been, in postcolonial writing, enlarged to such an extent that include, not merely the protagonist’s journey, but the entire narrative itself. It includes culture, language, social norms, religious beliefs, geographies, moral stands as well as ethicality to integrate the element of ‘conflict’. In this broader sense, the element of ‘conflict’ does not remain character-oriented, but rather is explored to an extent where even the conflict among the cultures is included.

In the line of this discussion, the stylistic device ‘Foregrounding and Conflict’ could be merged together to mean that the element of conflict in the narrative which are consciously highlighted through a specific use of language signify the author’s intentions to engrave the larger issues that the narrative intends to specifically point out. Their use could be at various levels in the narrative space – lexical, structural, socio-cultural, ideological and most pressingly linguistic – and hence their foregrounding creates the literary environ to gain interpretative attention.

3.5.4. FOREGROUNDING AND TRANSLATION

The primary raison d’être behind the evolution of postcolonial writing is to create a cultural-space, a space where-on the ‘culture’ positions and celebrates its existence with all its uniqueness. To fulfill this objective, if one surveys the postcolonial literatures from Africa, Asia, South America and even the parts of Europe, the representative authors have always consciously inserted what Daisy Rockwell terms the ‘cultural markings’. These cultural markings are not...
merely a set of localized linguistic units, but, on a larger scale, are the concepts that the representative culture has so rigorously evolved. Further, these cultural concepts are the very root of a ‘cognitive self’, an individual as well as social identity that shapes the ‘being’ – social, cultural, political, ethical, moral, and so on. In other words, these cultural concepts are the ‘marks’ that shape the ‘self’. Hence, the representation of a character in a postcolonial writing is theoretically a representation of a ‘cultural-self’, which is collective and can never be interpreted in fragments.

Thus, in the postcolonial writing, what the author presents in the narrative space is the representation of ‘culture’ that receives its insertions through various culture-specific linguistic codes. Further, the author who is an inseparable part of the collective ‘cultural-self’ can never separate himself/herself from it and hence inevitably becomes the apparatus of such cultural markings in the narrative. So, in this regard, it is not the medium of representation that determines the insertions of ‘cultural markings’, but rather it is the ‘cultural self’ that ascertains the appropriation of language to receive its own insertion. In other words, it is the culture that determines the specific language use and not vice versa.

So when one reads a postcolonial text, one would encounter several ‘cultural markings’ that are present within the narrative space at various levels – lexical, structural, semantic as well as conceptual. At various instances, it is observed that when a culture-specific linguistic unit, or a phrase, or a structure, or a concept does not have any correspondent code(s) in the language of representation, the authors place in the ‘cultural code(s)’ either with ‘glossing’ or without it. Sometimes, in the case of ‘glossing’, the author requires to provide either description or explanation of the cultural code(s) if it doesn’t have any equivalent code at all in the language of representation. In the discipline of linguistics, these practices are known as ‘Code Switching’ and ‘Code Mixing’, whereas in stylistics, they are termed as ‘Foregrounding and Translation’.

### 3.6. CONCLUSION

As we have discussed so far, the present Chapter has been an effort to identify the linguistic as well as stylistic features of South Asian English through the study of South Asian literary creations. Further, the chapter has discussed
seven linguistic and four stylistic features that will be applied to the representative texts during the process of analysis. Moreover, the present chapter has provided a detailed analysis of how the features of South Asian English differ from the other varieties of Engishes as they are represented in their respective nativized forms. The Chapter has also analyzed the influence of socio-cultural, historical and political contexts that shape the nativized form of the language, which, in turn, is reflected and represented in the narrative constructs of the South Asian authors.