Chapter III

Linguistic Third Space

The word “translation” comes, etymologically, from the Latin for “bearing across.” Having been borne across the world, we are translated men. It is normally supposed that something always gets lost in translation; I cling, obstinately, to the notion that something can also be gained. (Rushdie, IM 17).

Different from other Indian writing in English, Rushdie’s extraordinary writing style successfully marks cultural distinctiveness between cultures. His writing style is known as “Rushdie-era writing” or “the new phenomenon of Indian writing in English” (Rockwell 597). According to Daisy Rockwell, each text has its own “cultural marking,” which makes a text reside in a specific culture. Cultural markings often appear in forms of specific cultural terms, ideas or concepts in a text. These particular elements in a text create a “translational style by introducing a sense of the foreignness or otherness of English in its encounter with South Asian themes and subjects” (Rockwell 597). Over a long period of time, English is like a “framing device” used to value and represent non-English cultures (Rockwell 598). One of the ways to shatter or unveil the limit of English cultural representation is through using cultural markings, inclusive of nontraditional sentence structures or invented compound words, in English texts (Rockwell 598-99). Rushdie inserts quite a lot of
Indian lexicons and expressions into his writing (Rushdie-isms), which manifests the
limit of English representation and invents an Indian milieu in his texts (Rockwell
600,602-03). Through decoding the specific Indian cultural marking, readers are
able to acknowledge the limit of English representation and ineffaceable cultural
differences (Rockwell 617).

Rushdie’s using of specific Indian cultural terms is to challenge the monolithic
cultural translation in English. In order to see how Rushdie takes advantage of
cultural marking to debunk the myth of cultural translation, we have to question the
nature of language, cultural translation, and the Standard English first. Because of
Ferdinand de Saussure’s assertion of the “arbitrary” signifier- and -signified relation,
representation of words is questioned. The arbitrariness results in the rupture of
author-text relationship and deconstructs the master-slave hierarchy between words
and meanings. Word/language loses its representational function. Under such an
ambivalent circumstance, a third space emerges. The space provides writers/readers
more possibilities for interpretation and re-creation of texts. Some post-structuralists,
such as Derrida, Walter Benjamin and so forth, inspire readers to reconsider the
connectedness of words and meanings. In terms of “dialogicality” of words, Bakhtin
unfolds the interrelation between words, texts, and social context. Full meanings
will not be transmitted or decoded completely through literary words, which are not
transparent representational media any more. In other words, a word/language is a
contesting arena, a medium in which subversive processes keep going. Based on
ambivalence and arbitrariness between language and meaning, the linguistic third
space gives a new life to translation and interpretation, which are released from the
bindle of original texts. The master-slave hierarchy is reversed, which has a great impact on the colonial representation of the world. Through diverse interpretations and new writing techniques to question cultural representation, the western cultural (linguistic) hegemony is shattered. The colonized are able to speak out for themselves. Their silenced and effaced histories will be re-inscribed into human history.

Postcolonial writers, such as Rushdie, take advantage of their ambivalent cultural positions to create their unique writing styles, challenging the western representation of the East. In this chapter, I will discuss how Rushdie uses the linguistic third space as his writing strategy in the novel to hybridize and contaminate the “pureness” of the Standard English and to resist the canonical English discursive representation of the East. This chapter is going to be divided into three parts. The first part is a short theoretical survey on interpretation of language; the second part is about how the emergent third space transforms and challenges traditional cultural translation and the Standard English; in the final part, I will discuss how Rushdie fights against the western representation of the East by appropriation of English in his texts.

**Brief Review of Bakhtinian Thought in Language**

From Saussure, the arbitrary relation between signified and signifier has deeply influenced the later literary interpretation and translation. The identification of arbitrariness raises “indeterminacy” and “instability” of meaning (Sim 356).
Saussure’s linguistic insight starts a new linguistic epoch. His pioneering insight has caused sonorous responses among a lot of linguistic and literary scholars. M. M. Bakhtin (or V. N. Voloshinov) inherits part of his ideas and extends the indispensable relation between language and social context. He claims that if people intend to interpret or understand the meaning of the text, they should take language and social context into consideration simultaneously. Language is an incessantly changing, developing, and producing process rather than an “achieved” thing (Dentith 24). Language becomes meaningful as it is set on a certain “occasion.” It adapts itself to diverse occasions, including speakers, cultural or social environments. Speakers, creative and productive agents, “use and transform the ideological meanings and values” when they need. They are not passive language users, just abiding by the underlying and restricted linguistic rules (Dentith 28). What is more, meanings of language always generate in particular “situations;” the meaning is not determined by the literal one only (Dentith 29). The idea echoes Voloshinov’s notion, “Each word [. . .] is a little arena for the clash and crisscrossing of differently oriented social accents” (qtd. in Harland 162). On different occasions, language connotes bountiful meanings. The argument displays agency and multiple meanings of language and

1 M.M. Bakhtin, Pavel Medvedev, and V. N. Voloshinov are representatives of Bakhtinian circle. But most of the critics believe that both Medvedev and Voloshinov are Bakhtin himself, who borrows his friends’ names to publish books (Harland 157-8). Although the disputation is unsettled, in this thesis I deem the three as one person—Bakhtin himself. However, in order to distinguish the origin of the works, I still quote their name in the text individually.

2 Bakhtinian circle opposes Saussure’s monolithic view on langue and parole—utterances are restricted or controlled by langue, which is socially-constituted universal rule. The notion limits human agency and social effect. Bakhtinain circle believes that particular circumstances will influence and decide the meanings of an utterance. It highlights the influence of particular situation and utters’ intention (Harland 158).
echoes “heteroglossia” or “dialogicality” of language, which pose a question to monolithic discourse.

Voloshinov proposes that “the verbal interaction is the reality of language” (Hawthorn 76). There is not only one voice or meaning in language. Accordingly, in Bakhtin’s opinion, words are all “second-hand” and not neutral. They contain plural voices which are naturalized and effaced by temporal present users. Words are “contaminated,” “impregnated,” and “saturated” (Hawthorn 76). There are constantly collaboration, negotiation, and contestation within words. The present language users cannot cast off the influence of the previous ones. As a result, Bakhtin compares spoken and written utterances to “palimpsests,” which contain multi-layered meaning of words. Only by scraping them off a little will the hidden words and meanings come into sight on the surface (Hawthorn 76). On the basis of the metaphor of palimpsests, we know that meanings of words do not just show in literal forms but complex tucked ones as well. It indicates that there are centrifugal forces from history, culture, and geography, which control the meaning and interpretation of words. It makes “pureness” of language and monologic interpretation unattainable (Denith 36). Rushdie’s story of “Yorick” in East West parodies William Shakespeare’s Hamlet to ferret out the palimpsest of writing (words) itself. At the beginning of the story, the narrator addresses the audience,

Truly, a Velluminous history!—which it’s my present intent not merely to abbreviate, but, in addition, to explicate, annotate, hyphenate, palatinate & permanganate—for it’s a narrative that richly rewards the scholar who is competent to apply such sensitive technologies” (64).
The announcement sets out agency of writers and breaks justification of monolithic interpretation and the authenticity of history. The ultimate truth or reality will not be transmitted only in words. It is wrapped up by the author’s intention, readers’ interpretations, and socio-historical situations. The three factors intersect with one another, which produces dialogues in the text. The mutual-interacting relation usually appears in “authorial speech,” “narrator speech,” “character speech,” and “inserted genres” (Hawthorn 152), by which a dialogue is originated between authors, readers, and cultural or social context. The trial interaction forms a third space in which fixed normative discourse is challenged and far more interpretative possibilities coexist. Literary interpretation fails to reflect reality; representation of words is in question.

**Interrogation of Cultural Translation and the Standard English**

**Interrogation of Cultural Translation**

Since language fails to represent reality, the nature of cultural translation should be reconsidered. If we trace back the history of cultural representation, we will find that those who possess the authority of writing are possessive of the controlling power. Writing is endowed with the power of representation by which all things can genuinely be transmitted. Cultural translation is an act of “denoting the process of transformation in a given culture.” Ethnography is an example, which documents the transformation of the third-world tribal cultures and histories. The cultural
translational process occurs when ethnographers attempt to engage with a specific mode of life. In order to familiarize themselves with a new culture, they have to learn and accommodate the new environment and language. Since every culture has its own rigid language and customs, ethnographers must “translate” the observed culture into their own cultural form to serve their readers to know the culture more (Asad 159). As Talal Asad remarks,

The translation is addressed to a very specific audience, which is waiting to read about another mode of life and to manipulate the text it reads according to established rules, not to learn to live a new mode of life. (159)

Westerners refuse to accommodate their mode of life and language with other cultures so that they violently impose their interpretation on the observed culture. Such a fact makes the observed culture likely to be silenced and wrongly transformed. What the observers depict or understand is formed and imagined from their distorted cognition. This is why Edward Said and Tejaswini Nirajana attest that the Orient is formed by the misrepresentation of the West via its ethnographical and historical documents. Although the western ethnographers present non-western cultures by misrepresentation in writing, in Bhabha’s opinion, writing is still an access to “acquisition of agency.” Writing takes in a new linkage among “already pregiven subjects, pregiven objects, and a preconstituted mise en scène.” It is a “continually revisionary” and “revolutionary” activity (qtd. in Olson and Worsham 3). The ambivalent (porous) characteristics of writing offer the colonized and the indigenous to resist dominant discourse and to re-inscribe their histories.
In *Orientalism*, Said points out that the Orient to the West is an imaginative, repressive, and men-made image. The Orient is not ontological and epistemological presence (2-4). The Orient plays a counter role to the West by which the West defines itself. In order to concretize and bolster its own racial and political prestige, the West in their writings degrades the East as an uncivilized, feminized, and indolent object. The negative image of the Orient is not just a “fantasy” of the West but it is an actual being created by grand sweeping theories with substantial “material investments” as well (Said 6). The western academic and historical discourses occupy a great proportion of the material investments. Through depicting and recording the contour of the Orient under the westerner’s pen, the Orient is formed. Consequently, both the “Orient” and the “Occident” are interdependent and man-made:

Therefore as much as the West itself, the Orient is an idea that has a history and a tradition of thought, imagery, and vocabulary that have given it reality and presence in and for the West. The two geographical entities thus support and to an extent reflect each other. (Said 5, emphasis added)

Literal representation of the East is the main factor forming the Orient. In addition to the representation from the West, consensus from the Orient itself is another significant reason. In *Siting Translation*, Niranjara gives a full view of

---

3 The successful colonization of the indigenous is to teach them the colonizer’s language and values. Internalized by the colonizer’s cultural values and language, the indigenous will accept their imposed images. They may deem the colonizer’s culture as the best one. In the colonial period, Indians rushing to read and to buy English novels are an example.
misrepresenting and mistranslating the Oriental cultures in the western historical and literary documents.\footnote{In \textit{Siting Translation}, Niranjara displays the complete historical British colonial documents of which writers recorded what they had seen and thought of the non-western world. In these documents, readers will know how the West constructs their culture through degrading the non-western civilization.}

Besides, the intimate relation between translation and (de)colonization is pointed out, too. He asserts that translation is a site of “asymmetrical relation of power operating under colonialism” (Niranjara 2). By inventing its transparent and continuous history, subject, and text, the West imposes on the colonized its overarching conceptions and seemingly static higher positions. Translation conspires to confine certain kinds of representation of the other and establishes the colonizer’s hegemonic power, “strategies of containment.” Although translation gives prestige to the colonizer, it also puts forward a renewal and interrogating space for the colonized (Niranjara 3).

The third space in cultural translation is a “hybrid site of meanings” and a “supplementary space.” Within the space, diverse cultural signs collide and negotiate with one another. And repetition of cultural signs in disparate cultures is “differential” and “different.” No cultural sign is obscured and anterior (Bhabha, \textit{LC} 163). Bhabha names the cultural phenomenon as “cultural difference,” in which every culture is “incomplete” and “open to cultural translation” (\textit{LC} 162-3); he claims, “the‘difference’ of cultural knowledge that ‘adds to’ but does not ‘add up’ is the enemy of the \textit{implicit} generalization of knowledge or the implicit homogenization of experience” (\textit{LC} 163). The proposition shatters the western statements of cultural pureness, pre-givenness. Cultural diversities are highly esteemed. To some extent,
cultural difference poses questions to conventional cultural translation (the western representation of the East), which exerts to reach a pure and essential culture. It urges people to acknowledge cultural distinctiveness.

Additionally, Bhabha extends the cultural meaning of Benjamin’s well-known article, “The Task of the Translator,” to elaborate upon “cultural difference.” He argues that the “foreignness of languages” displays “interdisciplinarity” and “untranslatability” between original and translation. It constructs an ambivalent space in which the transfer of meaning will never be exhausted (Bhabha, LC 163):

While content and language form a certain unity in the original, like a fruit and its skin, the language of the translation envelops its content like a royal robe with ample folds. For it signifies a more exalted language than its own and thus remains unsuited to its content, overpowering and alien. This disjunction prevents translation and at the same time makes it superfluous. (Benjamin 75)

The foreignness of languages impedes foreclosure of meaning and text. It “overpowers” and “alienates” translation from the original. Translation enriches the original and gives afterlife to it. As Benjamin explicates,

Translation is so far removed from being the sterile equation of two dead languages that of all literary forms it is the one charged with the special

5 “Foreignness of languages” in translation is the untranslatable part of languages. It is the counter part of “pure language.” Benjamin defines, “all suprahistorical kinship of languages rests in the intention underlying each language as a whole—and intention, however, which no single language can attain by itself but which is realized only by the totality of their intentions supplementing each other” (74).
6 In Bhabha’s words “interdisciplinarity” is “the acknowledgement of the emergent sign of cultural difference produced in the ambivalent movement between the pedagogical and performative address (LC 163).
mission of watching over the maturing process of the original language
and the birth pangs of its own. (73).

Moreover, every translation does not follow its previous one but translation itself is
another new life. The differences between original and translation or translations
themselves are not erased but shone forth in the process of translating. If literal
meanings fail to transmit the authentic reality, the western representation of the East
in words is untenable. By using the linguistic third space, untranslatability of
foreignness of languages, postcolonial writers discover a way to re-interpret and
re-define themselves. Furthermore, by creolization and appropriation of English in
English-based works, the writers bring forth the unbridgeable cultural gap more
visibly.

*Interrogation of the Standard English*

Cultural mélange or cultural hybridity is not a new term in the contemporary
society-- all cultures are interrelated and interdependent. Under colonialism, the
colonizer erases the history and voice of the colonized. Official languages and
colonizer-imposed histories are the only standard to represent the world. However,
the Prospero-Conrad myth\(^7\) is gradually debunked after decolonization. Migrants and
formerly colonized people are marks of “shifting boundary,” which “alienate the
frontiers of the modern nation” (Bhabha, *LC* 164). A colonized/migrant silenced

\(^7\) Prospero-Conrad myth is a metaphor referring to “the colonizer’s tongue was ‘language’
while the victim’s was no more than a ’brutish gabble’” (Okonkwo 70). The mission of
decolonization is to debunk this myth and re-establish the oppressed status of the colonized.
culture, “the silent Other of gesture” and “failed speech,” becomes the “haphazard member of the herd,” “the Stranger,” whose silence and language absence provoke an “anxiety” in the colonial discourse. The fantasy of pure, fixed, and permeable culture is broken. By imitating, appropriating, and creolizing the master code (official language), migrants destabilize and decenter dominant discourse (Lavie and Swedenburg 9). This counter reaction unfolds a new linguistic dimension that helps the marginal and colonized articulate and re-inscribe their erased cultures into history. Appropriation of English is an obvious model.

English as a prevalent global language is one of the most pertinent communicative media in the contemporary world. Its prevalence is attributed to the prime of British colonial history. At that time British Empire introduced English to its colonies. In order to establish the colonial authority, British colonists forced the colonized people to master the Standard English. Merely by learning the Standard English well would they get a higher rank in the colonial society. English was a symbol of civilization and erudition. Nevertheless, with the rise of postcolonial discourse, we begin to inquire: Is the Standard English a pure being and the only way to represent the world? Or is it another ideologically constructed product? The answer is evidently clear. According to the historical survey, the Standard English is not a pure and an original language in Britain. It was introduced to Britain by the invasion in 1066 (Talib 1). It itself underwent a “post-colonial phase” when Latin

---

8 According to Said, the western colonizers justify their rule in the colonies by embellishing their intrusion as an act of “civilizing mission,” which means the colonizers have to educate those “barbarian” people/nations. One of the way to “civilize” the colonized is to overlap the indigenous culture with the colonizer’s such as language (Ashcroft and Ahluwalia 86-8).
It was not until the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries that the English language became the dominant language (Talib 2). Moreover, the so-called Standard English is derived from one of the dialects of English in south-eastern England, a wealthier part of England (Talib 14). Its formation is based on its peculiar social and economic situation. From the evidences, we acknowledge that English is continuously growing and changing, for it “realizes potentials which are then accorded to it as properties.” It is subject to versatile uses and it is an efficient tool of conveying cultural complexity as well (Ashcroft, The Empire Writes Back9 40). It is open to encompass multiple foreign elements and transformation. Especially in India, English has become the significant official language. Indians internalize and transform English into Indian English, which tallies with the usage of local folks. As C. D. Narasimhaiah says, “English is not a pure language but a fascinating combination of tongues welded into a fresh unity” (qtd. in Ashcroft, EWB 40). By the “growing” and “becoming” process of English, the standard linguistic code does not stand in dominancy anymore. A marginal code replaces a standard one. It reverses the opposition of “periphery” and “center” (Ashcroft, EWB 56). For example, the emergence of englishes in post-colonized locations is an obvious proof. The colonized people appropriate, transform, and domesticate the Standard English with their native dialects such as creole englishes or lingua Franca. Because of the specific mélange of foreign elements, new languages are formed and bear the responsibility of cultural transmission. Besides,

---

9 The Empire Writes Back, written by Bill Ashcroft, will be abbreviated as EWB in the following pages.
confrontations of the two cultures occur within this new ambivalent linguistic space. A multiplicity of englishes enables marginal people to re-write their silenced history into the western world and earn much more audience to know their cultures. There are several writing techniques which fuse the two diverse cultural enterprises together. These techniques are mostly shown in the crisscrossing use of languages. For instance, by appropriation, two cultural contexts meet, conflict, and negotiate with each other. Rushdie is the writer who performs the techniques of appropriation of English most successfully.

**Rushdie’s Transformation of the Standard English**

With the rise of national consciousness, postcolonial writers have begun to notice how to represent their own cultures in the English context authentically. Some writers propose to use a pure, native language, which is fiercely interrogated. And there are still other two viewpoints held by writers. One point of view is advocated by Harold Braithwaite, who believes novels with creoles will show the plurality of cultures and reject the absolute position (Fenwick 180). The other viewpoint is put forward by Ngugi wa Thiong’o, who encourages writers to use not only creoles but also take advantage of “hybridization of genres”\(^{10}\) to present the blending cultural elements (Fenwick 183). Both writers reject cultural purity; instead, they envision an authentic local cultural form as inherently “partial,”

---

\(^{10}\) Novels with hybridization of genres refer to the “ever-shifting, ever-adapting framework of infinite possibilities. The cross-cultural processes of transmission and reformation of genre” (Fenwick 184).
“relational” and “processional” (Fenwick 184). Their perceptions are close to Rushdie’s idea of “hybridity.” To articulate and represent the authentic cultural form is to raise “consciousness of the cross-cultural processes of hybridization” (Fenwick 186). Rushdie maintains in his essay, “Commonwealth Literature Does Not Exist,” that the commonwealth literature is not simply a branch of English literature but has its own unique literary status and historical-cultural background. In the post-independent countries, though English is common used, it is re-appropriated and transformed. English is not a pure language anymore but mixes with other foreign linguistic elements. Its linguistic center has been crushed (Rushdie, IM 70). People there “remake,” “domesticate,” and become more “relaxed” to use it. They internalize English as part of their own cultural rudiments, subverting the “linguistic neo-colonialism.” Based on its flexible and hybrid nature, appropriation of English has become one way of shaking the foundation of normative English, especially when English has become a universal communicative medium under globalization (Rushdie, IM 64). By using and transforming the normative English into englishes, the colonized people array their cultures in front of the audience around the world. Therefore, literature written in English connotes idiosyncratic local cultural contexts and is not purely the extension of English literature. It lays out a new space for the colonized to articulate for themselves. How is the Standard English appropriated by non-English speaking users? How does the transformation of English become an “agonistic tongue” against English cultural imperialism? And in what way do “englishes” perform as a third space to transmit various cultures? By incorporating the categories of linguistic appropriation, Bill Ashcroft, Jaina C. Sanga, Bishnupriya
Ghosh have penetrating analyses. Their insights can be discussed from three aspects: glossing and untranslated words, Indian English grammars and usages, and code-switching and pronunciation. In this chapter, I am going to discuss how Rushdie employs these tactics in *East, West* to replace tacitly the master-slave relation between the Standard and Indian English.

**Rushdie’s Post-colonial Writing Techniques in *East, West***

India, once colonized by Britain, has taken English as its most pertinent commercial and official language. India is a diaglossic society in which bilingualism has become societal agreement (Ashcroft, *EWB* 39). As a result of the common use of English in India, Indians internalize English with their customs and daily-used vernaculars, peppering it with an Indian flavor. Transformation of English indicates abrogation and appropriation of language in the colonies. For appropriation, by internalization and transformation of English, the language shoulders a responsibility to transmit non-English cultures and to negotiate with diverse ones. As for abrogation, English prestigious status and its transmitted cultural values are seriously interrogated. The two striving forces (appropriation and abrogation) disclose cultural differences, which form an unfilled cultural-linguistic gap, in the colonial contact zone (Ashcroft, *EWB* 38-39). Rushdie, celebrating hybridization of culture, twists and plays with language by drawing on the “situated hybridity.” By means of the “situated hybridity,” the writer is able to put a transformed language in a specific cultural or local context. If readers attempt to
de-code its meaning, they should know its cultural context first. Generally speaking, English of the “situated hybridity” smashes the modernist dichotomous value, opening up a third space (Ghosh 132-33). In *East, West*, Rushdie, by his “relexication” and “palimpsestic” English, inserts a great number of Indian linguistic elements in the stories, challenging the authority of normative English, on the one hand; on the other hand, by plunging Indian elements into these stories, he denaturalizes the pre-established English discourse, which maps over the Indian culture (Ghosh 136). His “reshaping” and “stretching” English manifests in the following ways: glossing and untranslated words, Indian-English grammar and special usages, and code-switching and pronunciation.

*Glossing & untranslated words*

Glossing and untranslated words are two obvious authorial vehicles of showing cultural distinctiveness in cross-cultural texts. They both insert foreign individual words in the text but there are still nuances of differences in both techniques. Glossing foregrounds the meaning of foreign words in parentheses, footnotes, glossary, and explanatory preface. It indicates floating nature of signifier and signified and the continuity of cultural distance (Ashcroft, *EWB* 61). By glossing, readers have an opportunity to go into the writer’s culture while the technique of untranslated words directly set foreign individual words in a text without any explanations. It lays out not only cultural distinctiveness but also “the importance of discourse in interpreting cultural concepts” (Ashcroft, *EWB* 64). Although “the
absence of translation” sometimes makes readers unlikely to appreciate the text, it unfolds cultural difference, which does not intuitively exist in a text but is man-made (In post-colonial literature, the Other’s language plays a crucial role in both bridging and showing the “gap” in different cultures, which manifests that language cannot represent ultimate and authentic cultural experiences.) If readers attempt to understand the text with untranslated words, they should involve themselves into the foreign linguistic system (Ashcroft, *EBW* 64-66). All language systems are social and cultural products, so monolithic representation is not tenable. In order to resist English dominancy, Rushdie works on glossing and untranslated words to hybridize the East-West cultures.

In *East, West*, there are large numbers of inserted Hindi and Indian English in each story, especially, in the “East” and the “East, West” sections. The terms in the stories such as “sahib,” “wallah,” “ayah,” and “swastika” and so on are Indian expressions seldom appearing in English texts. By appropriating English, Indians form these words into English forms and the words become part of Indian cultural heritages, now recognized by western readers. As I have mentioned earlier, English is the language *in the process*, keeping transforming and embracing Other elements. Thanks to its ambivalent nature, Indian English breaks, fractures the normative English and fashions new forms to transmit its cultural value in the linguistic third space (Prasad 271). Some of the words in Indian English are specific titles standing for one’s status quo and identity in the society. It is due to Indian unique social system, *Caste*, which causes a clear class bureaucracy. With reference to Wikipedia
on-line Dictionary\textsuperscript{11}, we can explain the terms in three aspects. First, Indians often show formal respect for elders, strangers or someone else in the term of “ji/jee.” The evidences are throughout the whole stories: “babuji” (12), “Daddyji” (14), “diptyji” (150), and “Indiraji” (152). Second, the word, “wallah,” denotes one’s own occupation or the thing he/she is involved in. In “The Free Radio,” the narrator calls Ramani, the “rickshaw-wallah” (19); Rehana in “Good Advice is Rarer than Rubies” calls Muhammad Ali “Advice wallah” (13), Zulu in “Chekov and Zulu” as a “security wallah” (169) and so on. Third, Mr. and Mrs. are called “sa(a)hib” and “begum.” Examples are “Dipty sahib” (149), “begum sahib” (151,152) etc. These specific terms reflect the clear social hierarchy in India.

Apart from the titles, exclamation words in Indian language also constantly appear in the stories. The interjection and casual references, “hai” (it means OK, alright, great, fine and sure), ”wa(a)h-wa(a)h” (it shows admiration) “yaar” (it refers to a friend or man) and bhaiyya (it is the formal term of brother) are ubiquitous. When Zulu’s wife mourns for Indira’s death, she says, “Hard to believe it. Indiraji! [ . . . ]. She was our mother. \textit{Hai hai! Cut down in her prime}” (152, emphasis added).

And when Chekov praises the refined decoration of Zulu’s house, he wonders, “Fixed the place up damn fine, Mrs. Zulu, wah-wah” (149). Furthermore, “yaar” appears in Chekov and Zulu’s conversation. Chekov greets Zulu, “What-ho, Zools! Years, yaar, years,” which means “Brother! We haven’t seen each other for years!” (154). These

\textsuperscript{11} “Wikipedia: the Free Encyclopedia” is a complete on-line database which assembles great numbers of articles in different languages. The research on variants of English is one of their crucial projects. The sources of Indian-English in this website are mostly derived and arranged from an authoritative book--\textit{Hobson-Jobson}, a glossary of colloquial \textit{Anglo-Indian} words. The book is written by Henry Yule and A.C. Burnell in 1886.
words retain the spirit of Indian language and milieu. In addition to the words of titles and exclamations, some of the words are remains of the colonial past. They reveal the interwoven cultural relationship between the colonizer and the colonized. For instance, the specific term, Raj (the British India Empire, the kingdom), is inherited from the colonial history. The examples above are a tip of an iceberg but from them we are aware of that Indian languages sufficiently appropriate English to match their culture. Indian English is now even accepted as a variant of English. Variants of English manifest the hybrid nature of English, which is open to embrace foreign elements. Invented in the cultural contact zone, the ambivalent linguistic third space, Indian English challenges the normative English discourse. By means of the linguistic third space, Rushdie successfully merges the inside (India) and outside (English) of two cultures together.

Different from the already recognized Indian English, the words such as “nasbandi,” “funtoosh,” “Ye Akashvani,” “khichri,” “djinni,” “bakvaas,” “abba,” “chandni,” etc. are untranslated words. They are not edited into English dictionaries. In case someone tries to dig out meanings of untranslated words, he or she must be acquainted with the Indian cultural background first. The untranslated words hinder reading complacency of western readers. They show an unbridgeable cultural distance and limitation of language representation. Although the author sometimes can find a similar meaning in English, he does not use it. Direct translation of the word may lose the Indian spirit of the word. “Abba,” for example, connotes unspeakable intimate feelings toward one’s father in Indian language. English fails to totally convey it. Untranslated words represent an incompatible cultural gap,
which cannot be bridged merely by language transmission. However, this postcolonial writing strategy encourages and enforces western readers to know more about the subcontinent culture. The writers do not totally translate their culture into English. They deliberately leave incompatible cultural differences and hybridity in writings to persuade western audience to contact with unfamiliar non-western cultures. The techniques help these writers gain recognition in the world; besides, non-English cultures are re-introduced to the English-speaking world.

Indian-English Grammar and special usages

Since the Standard English is assimilated into Indian context, Indian-English grammar and usages are not as normative as the Standard one. Compared with the Standard English, Indian English is more ornate and embellished. The syntax of Indian English is complex, which is in contrary to the Standard English-- simplicity and succinctness are highly praised. The particular characteristic of Indian English reveals in its specific grammar and idioms. In accordance with Suchismita Sen and Wikipedia On-Line Indian- English Encyclopedia, Indian-English has the following three attributes shown in *East, West*: the use of progressive-tense in stative verbs, the use of word repetition to show intensity, and the old- fashioned English expressions.

Using a verb in the progressive tense is one of the common Indian-English traits. Indians often say, “I am hungering” instead of “I am hungry” in American or British English. Linguists observe the speech pattern as an intention to “impart objectivity to a personal experience” (qtd. in Sen). The evidence in the novel is in “Chekov and
Zulu” while Chekov is telling Mrs. Zulu about Zulu’s absence. He says, “But his absence is *damning*, you must see” (153, emphasis added). The progressive tense of “damning” reinforces a serious impact which Zulu is going to bring forth.

Sometimes the progressive tense often goes with repetition of words to intensify its meaning. In “The Prophet’s Hair,” Hashim tells his wife about how to teach the unfortunate to stop borrowing: “to teach these people the value of money; let them learn that, and they will be cured of this fever of *borrowing-borrowing* all the time” (41, emphasis added). The repetition of “borrowing” strengthens the speaker’s intonation and intention. And repetition of words also occurs in “Chekov and Zulu” when Zulu’s wife talks about the tragedy of Indiraji. She says, “And on radio-TV, *such-such* stories are coming about Delhi goings-on” (152, emphasis added). The repetition of “such” intensifies the same violent events constantly happening in Delhi.

And as Chekov recalls his memory of seeing *Star Track* with Zulu, he tells Mrs. Zulu, “*So-so* many episodes I have been made to see [. . .]” (153, emphasis added). The function of the repetition of “so” is intensification, too. Rushdie often uses the progressive tense with repetition to invent the Indian milieu in his writing.

The other unique usage coming into sight in Indian-English context is old-fashioned English idioms. Due to the experience of British colonization, the Standard English gradually becomes a significant communication tool in India. After decolonization, the usage of English has not developed and kept up with the current British/American usages. It results in language fossilization. Indian English, nowadays, still retains its Victorian flavor, which focuses on politeness and refined phrases (Sen). These old-fashioned idioms are seldom used in Britain or the
For instance, when the two first meet, they may ask, “What is your good name, sir?” The phrase is the same as “What is your name?” in the Standard English. “Good” refers to the other’s health and general well-being. The similar out-of-trend usages show authentic Indian milieu in *East, West*. Rushdie attaches short explanations after the usages. In “Good Advice is Rarer than Rubies,” Muhammad Ali blames Rehana for not taking his advice, and he shouts to her, “What goes of my father’s if you are?’ (Meaning, what was it to him)” (12). The illustration in the parenthesis helps readers understand the text better.

The special Indian English grammar and idioms are ineffable traces of its colonial past. Indian people internalize and take advantage of the Standard English as their valuable communicative medium. Trolling between the ambivalent language space (Indian languages and the Standard English), Indians are endowed with a power to articulate for themselves and challenge normative English discourse.

*Code-switching and pronunciation*

Glossing, untranslated words, unique Indian-English grammar and idioms are ways to expose cultural distinctiveness. However, the transcription of two or more codes presents more apparently the otherness between languages. Code-switching, “the use of an entire language side by side with English (not use of scattering words in a different language or dialect but a whole clause or a sizeable phrase from the other language or dialect is imported),” is the most common technique applied by postcolonial writers (Talib 142-3). It is often used in literature in the form of
-language interchanging between narrators and characters. In *East, West*, most of the stories are narrated in the third person point of view. The narrators describe the development of stories in the Standard English tongue while the characters speak in spectacular Indian English. Readers shuttle between the two different cultural milieus with code-switching. It brings cultural distinctiveness into light. “The Courter” is one of the examples. The narrator recalls his childhood memory with his family in Britain. The story is narrated by the narrator in fluent and elegant English. Nevertheless, when other characters speak, their accents and tones change. For instance, when Certainly-Mary, the porter, and the narrator’s family speak, the tongue shifts into variants of English. In the process of code switching, the transcultural reaction occurs. The reaction brings both positive and negative results. The positive result happens between the porter and Certainly-Mary. Thanks to Certainly-Mary’s difficulties in pronouncing an English letter “p” and the porter’s East European accent, their conversations turn out to be a “multi-ingredient creole dish akin to the mélange and hotchpotches Rushdie values so highly” (Gane 52). Mary’s mispronunciation of “p” intriguingly transforms porter into “courter.” It gives the porter another identity and ignites their romance. As Gillian Gane states, “the jumbling and mixing-up of language, rearrangements of the elements of names and the metamorphoses these entail [. . .] are what this story is about” (52). However, the negative event is cultural misunderstanding. The representative instance is the misuse of the word “teats” for “nipples” by the narrator’s father (184-5). In Indian English, “teats” is a word of taboo while in England it refers to rubber substitutes on baby bottles (Gane 53). The narrator’s father uses the word
“nipples” instead of “teats,” harassing the lady in the pharmacy. From these two cases, though mispronunciation and misuse of languages may bring cultural misunderstanding and racial discrimination, they are sometimes dynamic to hybridize the fixed and unchangeable normative language. English with a foreign tongue can not only fracture and dissipate meanings but generate a new reality as well (Gane 55). In comparison with the narrator’s Standard English, the variant tongues of other characters witness the transcultural activities. However positive or negative they are, they challenge the normative one.

Authors often draw on code-switching to “reflect the accuracy of language use by the characters” and to be “in response to the nature of the situation, participants […] that is relevant to the context” (Talib 145-6). Although the strategy of code-switching is often criticized, it still foregrounds cultural distinctiveness and the interwoven relation between languages. As Ashcroft argues,

Since the notion of a historical moment of language change is only ever a heuristic device the “standard” code and the appropriated usage continue to exist side by side within the permanently bifurcated situation of a settler culture. [. . .]. Code-switching is thus only one strategy of that widespread, though often undetected, linguistic variance in monologic literatures, which belies the apparent uniformity of the language (EWB 75).

In this chapter, we enter into another dimension, the third space between languages. Deconstructing the established false images of the non-western world, postcolonial writers take advantage of the ambivalent language space to represent their already effaced cultural contexts. The first step to debunk the Prospero-Conrad myth is to interrogate the legitimate English representational power. In a long period of time, English plays a dominant role whether in political, economic, or pedagogical phases. By its written form, it obtains the hegemony of defining and representing other cultures. In this way, someone or someplace in the margin is destined to be silenced. In order to rediscover their silenced cultures, postcolonial writers have to “appropriate” English, which helps them re-inscribe and re-locate their voiceless cultures into human history. The ways of appropriation of English include insertion of glossing and untranslated words into the English text, Indian-English grammar and special usages among the lines, and code-switching between narrators and characters. These methods hinder complacent reading of the English text, but they foreground peculiarities and cultural distinctiveness to readers. The cultural gap will not be filled purely by a mononist language. At the same time, purity of English is questioned. Rushdie as one of the most outstanding postcolonial writers plays with words in his novels. His utilizing of glossing and untranslated words, Indian-English grammar and special usages, and code-switching and pronunciation in *East, West* facilitates his readers to differentiate the East and the West cultures—they are not totally opposite; instead they are intermingled, hybrid—and adds dynamic consciousness to their mesmerized minds.