

Tribhuvan University
Post-Colonial Resistance in the form of Decolonized English Language in
Arundhati Roy's *The God of Small Things*

A Thesis Submitted to the Central Department of English in Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in English.

By
Dipak Prasad Paneru

Central Department of English

Kirtipur, Katmandu

March, 2009

Tribhuvan University
Central Department of English
Letter of Recommendation

This Thesis entitled “Post-Colonial Resistance in the form of Decolonized English Language in Arundhati Roy’s *The God of Small Things*” has been prepared by Mr. Dipak Prasad Paneru under my supervision from June 30, 2008 to February 30, 2008, I recommend this Thesis to be submitted for the viva-voce.

Mr. Shuvaraj Ranabhat

Lecturer

Central Department of English

T.U. Kirtipur

Date:-.....

Tribhuvan University
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
Central Department of English
Letter of Approval

This Thesis entitled, “Post-Colonial Resistance in the Form of Decolonized English Language” in Arundhati Roy’s *The God of Small Things*,” Submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University by Dipak Prasad Paneru has been approved by the undersigned members of the Research Committee.

Members of the Research Committee

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

.....

Internal Supervisor

.....

External Examiner

.....

Head

Central Department of English

Date:-.....

Acknowledgement

I would like to extend my sincere thanks to Mr. Shuvaraj Ranabhat for all his efforts in bringing this project to fruition. His approval of this paper is without a doubt the crowning achievement of my academic career, for he is not just the supervisor of my thesis, but is my mentor as well. I would like to extend my sincere thanks to Dr. Krishna Chandra Sharma, the Head of the Central Department of English. I would like to express my special thanks to Mr. Chitra Karki for the valuable guidance in writing this thesis who also helped me in taking up this type of research.

I would like to thank Kedar Katuwal and Raj Chandhari for their valuable time in the typing and the printing of my thesis. I would also like to thank my dear friends Shriram Dhakal and Shiba Hari Gyawali for co-operating me with their valuable time while I worked for this thesis.

As a personal achievement, I dedicate this paper to my respected parents whose blessings always give meaning to everything I do. Their love and blessing always lead me towards the successful achievements in my life and all I have ever accomplished, and all I will ever be, I owe to my dear mother and father.

March, 2009

Abstract

This paper explores the linguistic situation of the once-colonized country. In the post-colonial and post-independent condition, the language of colonizer, the English language, has been seized and the centrality occupied by the English language has been subverted. It is no more than a dialect as that of the periphery. The linguistic position of the English language is associated with native context where the interlinguistic situation is created in the post-colonial condition. In such act, the rules and the norms of the 'Standard English' are rather subverted as an act of decolonization, adapting the very language so as to strike the colonizer back. This is what this paper seeks to observe in *The God of Small Things*.

This paper examines the linguistic situation of the once colonized country, India, how Arundhati Roy breaks the 'Standard' notion of the English language in the post-colonial condition as the form of resistance, along with the emphasis on nativism for the provocation of native cultural and linguistic practices in their own context. This becomes a strategy to subvert the colonial centrality in the post-colonial condition. Along with this, it also seeks how Roy breaks the rules and norms of the English language asserting her own way of the linguistic usage that is what becomes her linguistic inventiveness.

Contents

I. Review of <i>The God of Small Things</i> in Indian Milieu	1-6
II. Linguistic Strategies for Appropriation in the Post-colonial Discourse	7-25
III. Decolonization of English Language in <i>The God of Small Things</i>	26-49
IV. Post-colonial Linguistic Demonstration in <i>The God of Small Things</i>	50-51

Work Cited

Review of *The God of Small Things* in Indian Milieu

The God of Small Things published in 1997 won the prestigious Booker Prize in 1997. It has become very popular among the lovers of fiction. Arundhati Roy, the author, became the first non-expatriate Indian author and the first woman writer to win the prestigious Booker Prize. The novel raises different issues that have been observed by different scholars and critics. They have observed the text from various perspectives in association with the Indian society. Some of the scholars have seen it how Roy presents the socio-cultural condition of Kerala. We can see that some of the scholars and the critics have observed it as an autobiographical novel of Arundhati Roy. Similarly, it has been observed from the perspectives of Marxism, Post-colonial feminism etc.

The God of Small Things presents the socio-cultural condition of Kerala. The practice of caste-system is portrayed in the text. The evil act of caste-system makes the characters victimize. The characters protest against the very practice and become the victim. M. Dasan in *Arundhati Hits the Socio-Political Ball* writes, "Ammu in *The God of Small Things* protests against the society that forces her into the role of scapegoat and victim" (23). Amitabh Roy in the introduction of *The God of Small Things- A Novel of Social Commitment* says it a serious novel. He says, "Arundhati Roy couldn't be discussed lightly. She had a social commitment, a social vision and anyone who failed to see that, couldn't appreciate the novel correctly" (vi). He evaluates the novel sociologically. for him, 'small things' means "the victims of the state, society and the sheer will of the unthinking power" (46). K. V. Surendran in *The God of Small Things- A Saga of Lost Dreams* writes, "Arundhati Roy draws a large canvas [. . .], and unfolds the story of five generations beginning from Rev. E. John Ipe's father. Rev. Ipe is the great grandfather of Sophie Mol whose arrival from England to Ayemenem becomes a turning point in the novel" (50). M. Dasan talks about the locatedness of characters in the social and cultural milieu. "The development of characters

are not done in isolation but in relation to socio-political and cultural milieu that prevailed in Kerala during a specific time: the 60^s and the 70^s of this century" (24). Amar Nath Prasad in *Arundhati Roy's The God of Small Things: A Critical Appraisal* demarcates a line among the characters "on the basis of two powerful symbols, *Laltin* and *Mombatti*, employed by the author" (148). He observes the novel through the realistic perspective with the use of symbols. He writes, "Both of them symbolize two forces: the ruler and the ruled" (148). 'Laltin' refers to characters like Mammachi, Pappachi, Baby Kochamma, Chacko Inspector Thomas Mathew etc. who seem to be the dominating over the mombatties or the downtrodden. Mombatti refers to Velutha, Ammu, Rahel, Esttha, Vellya Pappen etc. who are tortured by the laltin. Roy portrays the realistic picture of the contemporary Kerala society. He further says, "*The God of Small Things* presents the realistic picture of dresses, customs, rituals and men and manners of the contemporary Keralite society" (Amar Nath 225).

We can see that some of the scholars have analyzed *The God of Small Things* as an autobiographical novel. They have observed the novel in association with the novelist's life. Jaydipsinh Dodiya in *Arundhati Roy - The Woman and the Writer* writes:

The character of Ammu in the novel represents Mrs. Mary Roy, Arundhati Roy's mother. She has married a Bengali man with Roy surname. Since Ammu and her husband belong to two different states, there is very much cultural difference between husband and wife. It results in several problems. Their married life is full of conflicts. Ammu is not happy at all. Her husband gives her divorce. Then she is overburdened with the responsibility of bringing up two children. (3)

The story resembles Arundhati Roy's personal life in many ways. Her mother was very poor. But she studied in Delhi. She got scholarship and went to Italy. Dodiya writes, "She got education after facing hardships" (3). Arundhati Roy grew up in Kerala, born to a

Syrian Christian mother and a Bengali father and lived at her uncle's pickle factory. Roy makes the resemblance of pickle factory in the text. Dodiya writes, "The texture is autobiographical" (4). The text accounts the personal story of Ammu as well as the saga of Ayemenem family. M. Dasan writes, "The novelist herself says, it is the experience of 37 years of her life, her own fears with which anyone could agree or disagree" (24).

We can see that *The God of Small Things* has been analyzed with the perspective of Post-colonial Feminism. The critics and the scholars have observed how female is dominated by the patriarchy. Women become the victims in the patriarchal society. C. Gopinath Pillai in *Aesthetics of Post-colonial Feminism: A Reading of The God of Small Things* writes, "Roy attempts to fashion her strategy with the help of intense awareness of her role as a feminist operating in a post-colonial situation" (88). Roy provokes the situation of subaltern women and their painful condition. He further writes, "The problems of patriarchal domination and female subalternity and the clash between the two are related in the specific geocultural reality of Ayemenem. Of the male characters, Pappachi and Chacko represent phallographic hegemony" (88). Roy makes the characters defy the social norms as the form of protest. Amar Nath writes, "It is the place where the characters like Ammu defies the long established codes of history" (134).

M. Dasan observes the text in term of communism. He finds communism as a reformist movement in Kerala. He writes:

The authorial voice argues that communism as a reformist movement in Kerala never overtly questioned the traditional values of a caste-ridden, extremely traditional community. But almost all the questions that she raises in the novel are still relevant to Kerala though the official communists would find it damaging. (27)

Roy shows the success of Communist Party of Kerala through the portrayal of characters like K.N.M. Pillai. He further writes, "Arundhati Roy discusses at length the major reasons for the success of the party in Kerala" (27). The real secret of the success of the Communist Party is a challenge to the official version and is contradictory to the reason / explanation given by the Communist Party. Dasan writes, "Arundhati Roy exposes the ideological and political programmes [. . .]" (29).

The God of Small Things bears many issues. The critics and the scholars have analyzed it from different perspectives. We can see that some of the scholars have observed it as a depiction of the social and cultural reality. They have focused that the novel depicts the cultural practices of Kerala society. Some of the scholars and the critics have analyzed it as an autobiographical novel. They have focused on the novelist's autobiographical aspects in the novel. They observe Roy's life through the portrayal of the character. Not only that, it has also been observed from the perspective of Post-colonial Feminism. The novel has been observed how Roy tries to show the domination and the suppression of female in the patriarchal society of Kerala. The characters like Ammu, Mammachi etc. get victimized. Some of the scholars have seen it from the Marxism that communism as a reformist movement in Kerala never overtly questioned the traditional community. But the novel has not been observed from the decolonial perspective of language. It still deserves the worth to be explored. It can be seen from the perspective of decolonization of the English language. In the post-colonial and the post-independent condition, the language of the colonizer, the English language, has been seized by the writers of the once-colonized country since they get the linguistic freedom. Roy also adapts the very language to subvert the colonial centrality since she gets the linguistic freedom in the post-colonial and the post-independent condition. She has rather subverted it as an act of decolonization. Linguistically, she tries to provoke the nativity on the one hand, asserts her own linguistic inventiveness breaking the norms of the

English language on the other. This is what this research tries to seek how Roy tries to handle the English language merging with the native features for the assertion of the post-colonial linguistic appropriation as an act of decolonization of the English language.

Arundhati Roy's *The God of Small Things* demonstrates the linguistic features of the post-colonial condition. Roy uses the English language in such a way that it ultimately deviates from the 'Standard English'. Since the 'Standard English' is supposed to possess the colonial centrality, Roy uses it differently so that the marginalized language gets the position in the post-colonial condition. In a strategical way, the post-colonial writers of the once colonized country use the very 'Standard English' associating with the native features to carry the message differently. This is what is an act of decolonizing the English language and giving the significance to the native linguistic and cultural features of the once colonized countries.

Roy's *The God of Small Things* can be analyzed as a text of the post-colonial resistance in the form of the decolonized English language. Roy uses the Malayalam linguistic and cultural features as the text produced in the post-colonial condition. The use of the English language merging with the native features makes the non-natives feel difficult in the proper understanding of the text.

Roy uses the English language differently. She entails different strategical ways to deviate from its norms and rules. She uses untranslatable words making the characters switch the codes of their own language. The use of mythical reference and allusion asserts the cultural significance to associate the characters' relationship. She further makes the characters mistakenly spell the linguistic codes of the English language to represent the eye dialect. 'Quasi-Phonetics' and 'Run-Together Phrases' have been used to deviate from the English linguistic code in the form of the variable representation. She further uses the anti-clockwise writing of the English linguistic codes. The use of distinct as well as hybridized

words in the text shows the linguistic admixture due to the interlinguistic situation of in the post-colonial condition. She further breaks the words to the extreme. She unusually capitalizes the words. She unusually joins the words so as to break the rules of the English linguistic codes.

Through the adaptation of the native linguistic features along with the deviation of the English language, Roy tries to strike the colonial centrality through the perspectives of the colonized in the post-colonial condition. She tries to strike the colonial centrality as occupied by the English language in the form of the colonial tongue. Such deviation of the English language used by the writers of the colonized country evokes the sense of linguistic freedom of the writers of the once colonized country in the post-colonial condition.

Linguistic Strategies for Appropriation in the Post-colonial Discourse

Post-colonialism is a type of discourse which resists the imperial power and studies the history of once colonized country and impacts of colonizers on the native culture language and other native domains. The term has been subsequently widely used to signify the political, linguistic and other cultural experiences of societies that were once the former European colonies. Colonized people feel culturally displaced and identityless. In such situation, their culture and language become hybrid and hybridity, mimicry, fragmentation and displacement become the thematic aspects of post- colonial writings. However, the literary activities in the colonized countries have attempted to subvert the colonial centrality and to spread the national subjects of language, culture, history and other aspects which were marginalized by the imperial centre. Hans Bertens in *Literary Theory: The Basics* writes:

Post-Colonial Theory emphasizes the tension between the metropolis and the (former) colonies [. . .]. It focuses on the cultural displacement and its consequences for personal and communal identities that inevitably followed colonial conquest and rule and it does so from a non-Eurocentric perspectives. (200)

We use the term 'post-colonial' to cover all the culture affected by the imperial process from the moment of colonization to the present day. The term 'post-colonial' has been used to describe writing and reading practices grounded in some form of colonial experience occurring outside Europe which was a consequence of European expansion and the exploitation of the other parts of the world. This is because there is a continuity of pre-occupations throughout the historical process initiated by European imperial aggression. But the post- colonial writings foreground the imperial power and emphasize 8 the 'differences' from the assumptions of imperial centre. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin in *The Empire Writes Back* write, "Post-colonial literatures have emerged out of

colonization and asserted [. . .] the tension with the imperial power and by emphasizing their differences from the assumptions of imperial centre which makes them post-colonial" (2).

One of the main features of imperial oppression is to control over language. The imperial education system installs a 'Standard' version of the metropolitan language as the norm and marginalizes all the variants as impurities. "It's what becomes medium through which a hierarchical structure of power is perpetuated and conceptions of 'truth', 'order' and 'reality' become established" (*Empire* 7). It is to say that such power created through the means of 'Imperial Education System' as 'Standard' version suppresses the other variants of language of colonized society. "So such linguistic power is rejected as an effective post-colonial voice" (*Empire* 47).

The complex way in which the 'English' language has been used in the colonized society is to indicate the 'difference' from the way the colonizers had previously used. In this account, we need to distinguish between the 'Standard British English' inherited from the empire and the 'english' which the language has become in post-colonial countries. In the post-colonial situation, the imperialism has resulted the spread of a language 'English' across the globe and the varieties have been emerged in the form of 'englishes' in the once colonized countries. In such a case, we need to differentiate between what is proposed as a standard code 'English' (the language of imperial centre) and the linguistic code 'english' which has been transformed and subverted into distinctive varieties throughout the world. The distinction is to indicate the various ways in which the language has been employed by different communities in the post-colonial world. Post-colonialism in term of language refers to the discourse that asserts the identity of the colonized with the use of the deviated colonial tongue associating with the regional usages which becomes no longer 'English' rather 'english'. Simon During in *Postmodernism or Post-colonialism Today* writes:

The post-colonial desire is the desire of decolonized communities for an identity [. . .]. In both literature and political the post- colonial drive towards identity centres around language [. . .] partly because identity is barely available elsewhere. For the post-colonial to speak or write in the imperial tongue is to call forth a problem of identity [. . .]. (125)

The history of distinction between 'English' and 'english' has been between the claims of a powerful centre and the intersecting usages designed as peripheries. In such case, "the languages of periphery shaped by an oppressive discourse of power have been the site of most exciting and innovative literature" (*Empire* 8). It has been the result of the energies uncovered by the political tension between the idea of a normative code and a variety of regional usages. It further focuses on the regional, cultural and linguistic features of the colonized society.

Post-colonial writers in the discourse of post-colonialism try to emphasize the distinctive features of the particular national, regional, cultural and linguistic features of the colonized society which depict the inheritance in literature of complexity to account the particularity. In such situation, not only the regional feature but also the colonial tongue gets hybridized or syncretized. It is a way to "decolonize the normative value of Standard English" (*Empire* 53). In this regard, Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin write, "Privileging of the 'margin' in the post- colonial writing asserts [. . .] the syncretic and hybridized nature of post-colonial experience, [. . .] refutes the privileged position of a standard code in the language and monocentric view of human experience" (*Empire* 40). The post-colonial condition becomes the situation where the colonized language, culture and history are re-made and reconstituted through the formation of 'english'. John Docker in *The Neocolonial Assumption in University Teaching of English* also focuses that the colonized countries should create literature placing their own culture and language at the centre and

English becomes suitable means to express their voices which is improved to fit their cultural experiences in the discourse of post-colonialism. He says, "The challenge of the post-colonial literature is that by exposing and attacking anglocentric assumptions directly and it can replace English literature with the world literature in English" (445).

The English language is politically decolonized so as to assert the native cultural and linguistic significance. It becomes difficult for the colonizers to understand the text produced by the colonized perspective because the very message gets abrogated due to the inclusion of native devices. Braj B. Kachru in *The Alchemy of English* writes:

The English language is not perceived as necessarily imparting only western traditions. The medium is non-native but the message is not. English now has functions both distinct and complementary. English has thus acquired a new power base [. . .]. The domains of English have been restructured [. . .]. The new varieties have their own linguistic and cultural ecologies or sociological context. The adaptation to these new ecologies has given non-native Englishes new identities [. . .]. (294)

The post-colonial writers justify their choice of language by emphasizing how the colonial embodiment is dominant over the native and the hybridized medium itself "displays the various conflicts of the postcolonial condition vibrantly" (Boehmer, *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature: Migrant Metaphors* 211). Their acceptance of using the colonial tongue is "the need to dismantle the authority once commanded by the English. If colonial tongue embodies a colonial vision, then the aim must be to dislodge that vision" (Boehmer, 210). Such use is important "to encourage a situation in which multiplicity of 'englishes' are able to coexist as opposed to a world in which one metropolitan English is dominant over other forms" (Boehmer, 208).

Thus, post-colonialism refers to the discourse which tries to resist the imperial power circulating through the means of language and strategically supports the culture, language, history, myth and other aspects of colonized locations. Such strategies make the writers of the colonized countries gain the audience of their own that become distinct, on the one hand, and strike the colonizers' sense of superiority through the use of syncretic and hybridized methods on the other. In this matter, they have contributed to the transformation of English and in "the dismantling the ideological assumptions that have buttressed the canon of that discourse as an elite western discourse" (*Empire* 76). This is the way of decentering the English as canon and it is reduced within a new paradigm of the international 'english' studies. Thus linguistic multiplicity outlines the complexity of culture, society and language that foregrounds as the 'variance', 'difference' and 'marginality' as the norm in the discourse of post-colonialism.

Decolonization is the process that refers to the dismantling the earlier assumptions of colonization over the colonized countries in terms of culture, language, history and other aspects of colonial impacts. It is the process that tries to dismantle the colonial relation as circulated through the discourse created by the colonizers. It is not only the process of dismantling the colonial power but also of reconstituting the colonized culture through the process of appropriation. The post-colonial writers adapt the colonial tongue as a strategy to decolonize the colonial centrality. But in the process of decolonization, they don't use it as the colonizers previously did, rather they seize and

12

deviate it. They associate it with native features for the reconstitution of the suppressed and dominated culture, language, history and the other aspects of the colonized society.

Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin say that decolonization in term of language has to do with the processes of textually constructed world where the writers of the

post-colonial country abrogate the 'Standard English' and "reconstitute it by which the language is made and taken to bear the burden of one's own cultural experiences" (*Empire* 38). They further write:

[. . .] neologisms, innovations, tropes and imaginative usages generally allow the horizon of language itself to be extended. But 'english' language [. . .] in post-colonial literature may be the way in which it constructs difference, separation and absence from the metropolitan norm. But the ground on which such construction is based is an abrogation [. . .] and a dismantling of its imperialist centralism. (*Empire* 43)

The relationship between the colonizer and the colonized posits the important questions that of possibility of decolonizing the culture and language of the colonizers. Post-colonial societies have centered on what decolonization implies and how it should be achieved. This asserts the need of recapturing the pre-colonial languages and cultures. The hierarchical feature of colonization is subverted through the process of decolonization. This asserts the peculiar strength of the post-colonial societies.

The process of decolonization has importance of carrying the cultural and linguistic values of the post-colonial societies. It is a project which has significant roles in the re-creation of the post-colonial discourse. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin write:

Decolonizing projects [. . .] recognize the literature written in indigenous Indian languages, the relationship between those languages and the much less extensive writing in 'english' in post-colonial self-assertion. In settler colonies, decolonizing projects underlay the drive to establish national cultures [. . .]. (*Empire* 29)

The re-creation of the 'english' language is a strategy to decolonize the 'Standard English'. The re-created 'english' language has unfamiliar message through the process of '

relexification. The post-colonial writers from the colonized country adapt the process of 'relexification' in term of the linguistic usage. In this process, they do not give the exact translation of the native linguistic features in the text so as to make the understanding difficult for the non-native speakers. It has to be understood along with "the general background of 'Third World' de-linkage with western supremacy" (Zabus, *Relexification* 315). P. Mallikarjuna Rao, Rajeshwar Mittapalli and K. Damodar Rao in *Post-colonial Theory and Literature* also write, "Translations of literatures fill the enervating void creative writing in English and act as the liberation. These translations represent the forces and the concepts of the once colonized countries to challenge the canonical and the hegemonic" (*Introduction*, ix). The authority of the colonizer's language is subverted and the originality of the earlier erased and suppressed language is further reconstituted where the act of interlanguage simultaneously takes place. Chantal Zabus in *Relexification* writes:

On the strategical level, relexification seeks to subvert the linguistically codified, to decolonize the early colonial literature and to affirm a revised non-atavistic orality via of imposed medium [. . .]. Relexification grounds the character in a specific ethnicity. Relexification is therefore more recurrent in the novels with a local, or rural setting hereafter called native culture-based novels. (318)

14

Elleke Boehmer in *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature: Migrant Metaphors* again talks how English language is adapted by the post-colonial writers as a form of resistance. The adaptation of the English language becomes antithesis that has the effect of shifting the accepted meanings into an expanded context. Thus adapting and adopting the colonial tongue, the post colonial writers become able to move into a strategy of resistance for the colonized self assertion. Elleke further writes:

However, at least in the medium of language and literary form, assimilation has remained for the nationalist writers and other anti-colonial writers an important mode of resistance. It is a mode constantly enacted into the bending and 'misshaping' of the English language by the postcolonial writers around the world today. Transposing the English conventions into an Indian, African or Caribbean context extended what it was possible to say within the framework. [. . .] assimilation was at this time perhaps more subversive and effective. (173-174)

Decolonization of English language and culture questions the supremacy of the colonial discourse and the imperial power exercised over the once-colonized countries. The act of abrogation and reconstitution simultaneously takes place in the text produced by the writers of the colonized countries. They create a space of 'difference' in the text. The space of 'difference' gives the significance to the linguistic, cultural and social characteristics of the colonized countries through the act of the re-creation of post-colonial discourse. The imperial centrality is subverted in term of English systematic codes, and the varieties of 'englishes' have exploded the 'Standard' notion of the English language. Thus the traditional canon of English is reduced within a new paradigm of 'english'. Hence, the process of decolonization of the English language in the post-colonial discourse has brought the strategies that acknowledge readings and formations of language for the reconstitution of native in association with the colonized experiences. It makes the process of decolonization a complexity rather than something achieved in the moment of independence in the colonized countries. The process of decolonization in term of the English language becomes an important act to strike the colonial centrality. Such adaptation of the very colonial tongue makes the writers of the colonized countries

linguistically empower so as to deny the colonial supremacy. They re-study and re-create the native features in the discourse of post-colonialism.

South Asian English bears the characteristics of admixture of regional and linguistic features and the expansion of English through the process of colonization has expanded the horizon of South Asian English. When the British colonized the South Asian country, the British domination increased. The British colonizers took administrative power by circulating English language as a form of standard. But the contact with the varieties made the English hybridized. Different levels of linguistic hybridity appeared and the native began to use the English language hybridizing with their own linguistic features in the post-colonial condition. In such situation, the post-colonial writers of the colonized country try to give emphasis on the native linguistic features though they use English language. They posit the situation of the bilingualism through the re-creation of 'english' in the post-colonial discourse.

The diffusion of English language with the native of South Asia has not been able to change the religious, cultural and linguistic diversities. The diffusion of English is marked by the political domination by the British. In this regard, Braj B. Kachru in *Asian Englishes: Beyond the Canon* writes:

The recorded attempts at contact around the sixteenth century and by the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the political domination by the British 16 was almost complete. As the British political power increased, so did the currency of the English language in various important functional domains [. . .]. However, for understandable reasons the earlier uses of English were restricted to a small group [. . .] to deal with the British East company and later those of the Raj. (33)

The original role of English in South Asia was essentially that of a foreign language. With the diffusion of bilingualism in English and its institutionalization, the English

language affected the various South Asian varieties. “The term 'SAE' (South Asian English) is used as a cover for [. . .] the varieties of South Asian English. There are different parameters to determine the variation” (Kachru, *Asian Englishes: Beyond the Canon* 39). The variation is caused by different socio-cultural factors. Such variation depicts the native linguistic features as the contact takes place. Kachru writes:

The user’s proficiency in term of language acquisition and years of instructions [. . .], the region of South Asia to which the user belongs and the impact of dominant language of that region [. . .] reflect [s] the characteristics of single language [. . .], the ethnic background of the user. (*Asian Englishes: Beyond the Canon* 39)

However, there are distinct varieties which are functionally determined and they have acquired various levels indicative of their functions and the interlocutors involved in an interactional context. The major features which contribute to the distinctiveness of the South Asian English are varied and complex. The linguistic features are different according to the context of the South Asian location. The English language is said to be the additional and the foreign language which is acquired in the socio-educational context of South Asia and the difference in context is due to the regional difference. But the South Asian English has to be characterized both in terms of the linguistic feature and contextual and pragmatic functions. Thus the variety has deviated significantly from the mother tongue varieties and the South Asian users of English have marginal interactions with native speakers of the language.

The study of grammar of South Asian English does not have to be specific rather it is impressionistic analysis of the text. During the post-1960s several register-specific empirical studies and contrastive studies were undertaken. This study focused comparison between English and the particular South Asian language. Kachru writes, “There is a tendency to use complex over-embedded as opposed to simple sentence [. . .]. One reason may be to the

diglossic nature of several South Asian languages. In these languages, the elaborate lexical ornamentation is displayed [. . .]” (*Asian Englishes: Beyond the Canon* 48). In term of lexical resources, there is different tendency that is different from that of the British usage. Due to colonization, English has been hybridized with the regional usage and such lexicons have their meanings according to regional context. “There are sources for the entry to South Asian lexical stock into English and small number of lexical items through [. . .] local customs, festivals, rituals [. . .], words related to the legal system and administration [. . .]” (Kachru, *Asian Englishes: Beyond the Canon* 51). The intrusion into English language can be seen in terms of two classes. “The first class consists of those lexical items which have been assimilated across the varieties of language, especially in British English and American English eg. *pandit, mantra*” (Kachru , *Asian Englishes: Beyond the Canon* 51). These lexicons have regional features in their uses. Such lexicons are distinct because they have specific meanings in the particular context and they evoke the cultural significance. “The second types comprise those items which occur frequently in various South Asian varieties [. . .] which are not included into the dictionary of English” (Kachru, *Asian Englishes: Beyond the Canon* 51). These lexicons show the distinctiveness of the South Asian language varieties. They become the integral part of the glossaries or dictionaries focusing on South Asian features. Such as '*naxalite*' violent agrarian revolutionary, '*Janta*' people the masses, '*zamindar*' landlord, '*gherao*' surrounding and detaining a person to extract a concession. They become hybrid items once associated with the non-native linguistic features. They have semantic value according to the socio-cultural context of South Asia and they are categorically observed keeping in different classes. "The first class of words single lexical items are to be separated from the hybridized items or neologisms [. . .], have not been assimilated into native variety of English [. . .]" (Kachru, *Asian Englishes: Beyond the Canon* 53). Only few words are assimilated. The illustratives of such items are '*bindi*' dot marked on

the forehead by Hindu women, '*bungalow*' one-storied -house, '*coolie*' native hired labour, '*verandah*' open pillared gallery around a house, '*bangle*' ring bracelet or anklet, '*pariah*' social outcast, '*guru*' Hindu spiritual or religious teacher, '*jungle*' land overgrown with vegetation.

“The second class involves hybridized lexical items which consist of two or more elements at least two distinct languages. A distinction is made between a hybridized form which has no grammatical constraint on the selection of items and an item which has such a constraint” (Kachru, *Asian Englishes: Beyond the Canon* 53). like '*lathicharge*' baton charge, '*bindi mark*' a dot like mark put on the forehead by Hindu women.

"The third class includes lexical items used with extended or restricted semantic connotations and involved several productive processes" (Kachru, *Asian Englishes: Beyond the Canon* 54). Neologisms, innovations and imaginative uses are the result of the institutionalization of English language in South socio-cultural context such as '*eating leaves*' leaves on which food is eaten, '*military hotel*' a non vegetarian restaurant. Such process evokes the creative potentiality of the writers. Kachru further writes about hybrid collocations which are generally registered in the South Asian English although the 19 register restriction does not apply to their South Asian elements in a South Asian language. Such collocations are capitalized. Politically registered collocations occur in the Indian English like '*Janta Party*' Janta (Masses) Party.

The nationalistic writers have used the English language as a tool to achieve freedom against the domination of the foreign rule. However the use of the English language is quite different in its purpose. Along with the nativization of a text, the rhetorical devices like similes, symbols, metaphors, images etc. are not only consistent with those used in the English language but also have the association with the socio-cultural context which are familiar to the native speakers. Such usages make the non-native speakers feel difficult to

understand the text. "The bilingual writer chooses styles not only appropriate to the high culture [. . .] but also appropriate to the specific cultural and linguistic group of South Asia" (Kachru, *Asian Englishes: Beyond the Canon* 61). The post-colonial writers try to re-create the 'english' out of the appropriation in the English language associating with the native linguistic features. Such inclusion of the native linguistic features make the non-native speakers feel difficult in the proper understanding of the text. This act is one of the strategical ways of docolonizing the English language in the discourse of post-colonialism.

Post-colonial writings have strategical roles to abrogate the imperial power exercised through the means of language. Post-colonial writers use the English language to strike the colonizers back. They use the English language not as it is supposed to be the 'Standard English' rather they make it evoke the native features. They assert different native devices like myths, allusions, untranslated words, code-switching etc. to create the fusion in the English language so as to decolonize it. This is the way to re-create and re-make the 'english' out of the appropriation in the 'Standard English'. This process becomes 20 the strength to decode the English language in the post-colonial re-creation. The fusion of languages creates the space of interlanguage in the post-colonial text. The post-colonial writers try to create the space of the interlanguage to abrogate the colonial tongue and to reconstitute the native cultural and linguistic features. Politically the post-colonial writers try to abrogate the colonial centre writing from the 'periphery ' or 'margin'.

The use of untranslated words gives a space for the native cultural and linguistic distinctiveness and makes the non-native speakers feel difficult to understand the native cultural and linguistic features. "The technique of untranslated words [. . .] is more widely used device for conveying the cultural distinctiveness" (*Empire* 63). It creates the 'gap' between the colonial power practised through the English language and the suppressed colonized native languages. The use of the untranslated words gives the information about

the linguistic features of the regional variety and code-switching of the native linguistic usage in the regional context. Such use creates the situation in the post-colonial text. "Such an interlanguage may become the focus of an evocative and culturally significant idiom" (*Empire* 66).

Code-switching takes place in bilingual situation. It is determined by situations, status, relationship, topics and attitudes of speakers. The use of code-switching evokes one of the features of the variety. As the regional practice, code-switching has social and attitudinal reasons. "A variety of language signals pride in social identity" (Sharma and Chhetri, *Linguistics and Stylistics* 256). The post-colonial writers try to make the characters switch their own dialect so as to distinguish from the 'Standard English' and create the 'difference' and 'gap'. This process makes the text complex due to the linguistic complexity. "Linguistic complexity outlines the multiplicity of language and foregrounds the 'variance' and 'marginality' as the norm" (*Empire* 74). Such process makes the marginalized occupy a position in the discourse of the post-colonialism. The fusion of different linguistic features²¹ creates the space of interlanguage to foreground the marginal culture. It plays also an important role to create the opposition to the centre as occupied by the 'Standard English'. The politics behind the fusion is to create the gap where the silenced culture of periphery is re-evoked in the discourse of post-colonialism.

Allusions and mythical references are also the sources of post-colonial writings which were suppressed by the colonizers. Allusions and myths have association with the native cultural context. They have power to create the linguistic and cultural distance from the colonizers. The process of allusions and myths "[. . .] installs linguistic distance as a subject of the text. The maintenance of this 'gap' in the cross-cultural text has the profound importance to its ethnographic function" (*Empire* 57). The assertion of such references maintains 'gap' and 'distance' from the colonizers' culture and provides the dynamic

possibility of writing within the tension of centre and margin. They have social and cultural function in native location to emphasize the particular meanings. "Tale, dance, song, myth etc. can be performed. They have social purposes" (Ngugi, *On the Abolition of the English Department* 44). The post-colonial writers adapt such native features to evoke the suppressed culture in the process of decolonization. The assertion of allusions and mythical references make the non-native speakers feel difficult in the proper understanding of the text. In this regard, Sisir Kumar Das in *A History of Indian Struggle for freedom: Triumph and Tragedy* writes, "The feature of patriotic writing is the assertion of Indian identity in terms of religion, language, myth and history. The patriotic writings grew almost spontaneously in different languages as the resistance of a community against the foreign rules" (61).

Post-colonial writings assert various types of representations of verbal speeches which are other of the native speakers. In this situation, the writers try to break conventions and use variant spellings and other devices if they are to convey a variety other than the 22 intended standard variety. In this regard, Sharma and Chhetri in *Linguistics and Stylistics* write:

While representing the speech, authors use eye-dialect which consists of nothing but the use of "deliberate spelling errors" that, in fact, reflects no distinctive phonological, lexical or syntactic structure whatsoever [. . .]. In such representation, authors don't pay full attention to details of linguistic features. They rather pick up [. . .] a few expressions like 'comin', 'exkusable' [. . .]. (247)

The writers of once-colonized country participate in the indigenization of the English by manipulating it to suit their creative potentiality because the notion of the 'Standard English' envisions the colonial embodiment and plays the role in inferiorizing the natives. Strategically, the post-colonial writers use the 'english' language as a form of resistance and

produce the text using their own creative potentiality. In this regard Bell Hooks in *this is oppressor's language / yet I need it to talk to you: Language, a place of Struggle* writes:

[. . .] Spoken English “the oppressor's language” [. . .] would need to be possessed, taken and claimed as a space of resistance. [. . .] the moment that they realized “the oppressor's language” seized and spoken by the tongue of the colonized, could be a space of bonding was joyous. For in that intimacy could be restored that a culture of resistance would be formed [. . .]. (73)

Some writers try to capture the way of uttering which is not consistent to the 'Standard English'. They make the characters utter differently so as deviate the standard use of English language. "Quasi-phonetic, exaggerated phonetic spellings: e.g. baad" and "Run together phrases e.g. ontheaccountof" (Sharma and Chhetri, *Linguistics and Stylistics* 247)²³ are the examples of variable representations. The deviation of the English codes gives the linguistic empowerment to the non-native of the English language. Through such representation, the writers try to strike the imperial centrality of the colonizers and resist against the colonial domination.

Post-colonial writings give emphasis on the native cultural values though the writers take 'alien' language. The contact literatures in English have several characteristics associated with the native in both content and style. "South Asian literatures have maintained stylistic devices, metaphors, imagery, symbolism [. . .] as the language of national revival. It has provided new perspectives in India through an 'alien' language". (Kachru, *The Alchemy of English* 293)

In the post-colonial appropriating strategy, the process of nativization emphasizes the vernacular linguistic features. It has an ideology to decolonize the Euro-centric value, culture as well as language. But nativism has its value, only when it is perceived in opposition to the non- native. In this regard, non-native language plays to role to give the identity of 'self' of

the native. In this matter, Kirtee Agrawal in *The Language of Nativism: The Inherent Hazards of Narrating the Nation* writes:

Nativism has only relevance and validity when perceived as a differential category from the West. The native has significance only in opposition to the non-native. Nativism is a return to the roots, an attempt to retrieve a lost originality and has a goal of maintaining a degree of separation from the West [. . .], results the essentialization of an Indian identity [. . .]. (34)

The post-colonial writers use irony, allusion and the controlled abandon of the English language to disregard the very notion of the 'Standard English' which was the imposed tool of colonial subjection. The English language is distorted and deviated in such a way that it becomes associative with native features through the act of fusion. In this regard, Meenakshi Sharma in *Narrating Indian History in Fiction from an Indigeneous Perspective* writes:

[. . .] a commentary on modern India seen in the macrocosm sense does a delightful disregard for the 'purity' of the English language. The irony, allusion and the controlled abandon of the language assert the novelist's claim to the English language as an imposed tool of the colonial subjection [. . .]. The representations of English not only challenge English self-representations but also provide [. . .] the inversions and the questioning of the record of the Western discourse. (153)

Thus, post-colonial writings attempt to reconstitute the culture, history, myth, language and other aspects of the countries which were once dominated by the colonizers. In the post-colonial situation, the writers from the once colonized countries use the English language so as to refute the imperial centre and emphasize the margin or periphery which was suppressed and dominated by the colonizers. "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" (*Empire* 36). The post-colonial writers can't write only in the English language because it can't represent their distinctiveness of culture, language, myth, costumes and other aspects of their society. So they try to deviate from the English language and merge it with native features. Raja Rao in *Language and Spirit* also says, "We can't write like the English. We should not. Our method of expression has to be a dialect which will prove to be as distinctive and colourful as the Irish and the American" (296). It is through the use of language that provides a way to restore the native features and to strike the imperial centrality. The post-colonial writers adapt the colonial tongue associating with native varieties in the post-colonial and the post-²⁵ independent era. They get linguistic power to subvert the colonial tongue. For this, they include native features to re-create and re-make the 'english'. "Such reconstruction occurs in regional 'english' varieties [. . .]. Such varieties themselves produce national and regional peculiarities [. . .]" (*Empire* 39). In this sense, the post -colonial writers don't write in the way the colonizers wrote rather they try to deviate the English language to strike the colonizer back and re-create their suppressed cultural and linguistic features in the form of 'english'. Their writings assert the identity in term of language, religion, myth and history in the post-colonial situation. Such writings grew as the resistance against the foreign domination.

The post-colonial writers adapt the English language associating with their cultural, linguistic and social context which shows the usage of the English language in the transcultural situation. "The English language itself, shared amongst a varied group of the post-colonial nations is showing signs of its transcultural situation. English coexists and intermingles with regional languages" (Boehmer, 210). In this sense the non-natives of the

English language are using it to show an indication of indigenization of the English language. After the process of decolonization, the rapidity of evolution of literatures grew “in colonized countries and the 'Third World' as an expression of new local realities” (Bijay Kumar Das, *Critical Essays on Post-Colonial Literature*, 149). Such growth of literature in English has displaced the position of the English language. It has rather become an alternative. Bijay Kumar Das further writes, “The situation is that at present, English is now an important alternative language. In the second half of the present century, the language of the educated people has lost its prestige. It is no more than a ‘dialect’ as accepted [. . .] in the region” (149). In such situation, the centrality occupied by the English language has been displaced.

Decolonization of English Language in *The God of Small Things*

The text *The God of Small Things* presents the linguistic features of the post-colonialism. Roy’s handling of the English language evokes the process of decolonization on the one hand, and the presence of nativism in opposition to the centre on the other. She tries to depict the Indian culture, language and history in the post-colonial condition. She uses the English language in such a way that it becomes the medium to resist against the colonial oppression. She politically adapts the English language to assert the native ways of the linguistic usage so to nativise it in the post-colonial condition. For this, she deviates from the English language adapting the different strategies. She uses it intermingling with the native features, in particular Kerala region of India, which shows how the English language has been deviated from its originality and has become hybridized in the process of the post-colonial linguistic re-creation. In such situation, the nativization of the English language becomes one of the ways of decolonizing the ‘Standard’ notion of the English language to resist against the colonial centrality. That is what Roy has done in the text *The God of Small*

Things. She intermingles the Malayalam linguistic features with the English language to make the understanding of the text difficult to the non-native users of the regional dialect. Along with the interlinguistic situation, she adapts the different ways to decolonize the English language. Code-switching, mythical reference, anti-clockwise writing of the English linguistic codes, variable representations, quasi-phonetics, use of the distinct as well as hybridized lexicons, untranslatable words, excessive fragmentation of the words, run together phrases, capitalizing the words, the process of relexification etc. become the ways to deviate the 'Standard' notion of the English language in the discourse of post-colonialism. This is what Roy adapts the different ways to decolonize the English language in the post-colonial linguistic re-creation.

27

Roy strikingly breaks the linguistic code of the 'Standard English'. She employs the different strategies in the text, *The God of Small Things*. She adapts the strategy of the 'Variable Representation' where she makes characters spell mistakenly to assert the eye-dialect. Some of 'Variable Representations' that Roy uses in *The God of Small Things* are: 'eggzackly', (for 'exactly') (324), 'Thang god', (for 'Thank god') (320), 'yooseless goose', (for 'useless goose') (312), 'porketmunny', (for 'pocket money') (102), 'mani plants', (for 'money plants') (305), 'Sssss' for the Sound of Soo-soo, (here, 'Soo-soo' is the expression of child-euphemism.), 'Mmmmm' for the Sound of 'Myooozick', (for 'music') (95), 'Amayrica' (for 'America') (129), 'One mint', (for 'one minute') (134) etc. Such types of 'Variable Representations' evoke the sense of native ways of pronouncing the English language. It is an act of nativizing the English language that Roy nativizes in the context of Indian society. Usha Mahedevan also writes, "There are linguistic features of pronunciation of English the Malayalam way" (*A Native Response* 91).

Roy has further adapted the 'Quasi-Phonetics' i.e. exaggerated phonetic spellings as the other form of 'Variable Representation'. In such linguistic usage, Roy has added the

phonetic spellings. There are many situations where Roy has adapted the 'Quasi-phonetics'. Some of them are: 'Verrrry', (for 'very') (323), (This is an expression that the lady expresses her sense of sweetness of the 'yellow laddoos' offering Estha to eat.), ("She made kissing sounds with her mouth" (323), due to the sweetness of the laddoos.), 'Saar', (for 'sir') (271), "Mrs. Pillai asked Latha, 'D' you know who this is?' Latha shook her head. Chacko saar. Our factory Modalali" (271). Latha speaks in the native way of pronouncing asserting the native untranslatable word i.e. Modalali (meaning is 'landlord'). Latha gives respect to the factory owner who comes to meet Mr. Pillai. Here, it is needed to understand the native linguistic usage. The other words in the form of Quasi-phonetics are: "Oho", (for 'Oh!' as an exclamation) (273), 'Hah', (for 'Ha') (273), 'Hell-oh', (for 'hello') (143), 'Hello wall', (for 'Hello all') (143), (It is the expression where Sophie Mol tries to greet the members of her 'biological father's' mother, sister and other, copying the sound of the mother, Margaret Kochamma. Here, Roy linguistically tries to depict the childish way of uttering since Sophie Mol is a child.), 'dangrouse', (for 'dangerous') (157), 'whanted' (for 'wanted') (158), 'feest', (for 'feast') (158), 'Lay Ter', (for 'later') (334), (Roy uses the very form of 'later' repeatedly breaking the phonological rule of the English code.), 'Gnap', (for 'nap') (183), 'bea', (for 'be') etc.

Roy's *The God of Small Things* deviates from the English code in different ways. She uses the different 'Run-Together Phrases' to depict the quick ways of uttering the different words together. Such usage becomes the way of negating the English linguistic rules and norms. Some of the 'Run-Together Phrases' that Roy uses in the text are: 'longago', (for 'long ago') (97), 'mydearjudges', (for 'my dear judges') (271), 'Sosoon', (for 'So soon') (108), 'ofcourseofcourse', (for 'of course, of course') (109), 'Thankyou', (for 'Thank you') (116), 'Pleasetomeetyou', (for 'Please to meet you') (212), 'finethankyou', (for 'fine, thank you') (145), 'Shutup', (for 'Shut up') (100), 'Getout', (for 'Get out') (100), 'whateveritis', (for

'whatever it is') (279), 'thiswayandthat', (for 'this way and that') (107), 'Whatisyourname', (for 'What is your name?') (127), 'luckup', (for 'luck-up') (328), 'deadlypurposed', (for 'deadly purposed') (304), 'stoppit', (for 'Stop it') (142), Here, Roy, using both 'Quasi-phonetics' and 'Run-Together Phrase', depicts the Sophie Mol's childish way of copying the linguistic utterances uttered by her mother.

Roy's sensitive style is seen in the brilliant way. She combines the realistic details of the surroundings through the linguistic presentation, "Scurrying hurrying buying selling luggage trundling porter paying children shitting people coming going begging bargaining reservation-checking Eechoing stationsounds" (300). 29

Through such linguistic presentation, Roy tries to give brisk transaction of life that is taking place on the railway platform. One should have travelled by the Indian railway to see the authenticity of such realistic picture of Indian life around the railway platform. She applies alliteration, assonance and lexicon sets to evoke and echo station sounds. The absence of the punctuation mark is to evoke the continuous flow of different actions of the people on the platform.

Roy presents the Indian tendency of misusing the English articles. It can be seen in the language used by K.N.M. Pillai: 'He is good worker.' (277), 'He is genius.' (274), 'One is must.' (130), 'Design is same. Only difference is in the text, I suppose' (276).etc. Roy depicts the Indian ways of speaking the English language in the native context. Some of such sentences are: Comrade Pillai says about his son, " 'He is genius. In front of visitors only he is quiet. He is standing first in the class.'" (274), "What is the news?" "How is your daughter adjusting?" (273). In these sentences, Roy uses 'be + verb + ing' constructions. With these verbs, in 'Standard English' such constructions don't occur in the progressive aspect. Comrade Pillai says, "His daughter's daughter is this." (129), the English formation of a sentence i.e. 'S + V + O' pattern is reversed into 'O + V + S'. This pattern illustrates the

native way of speaking the English linguistic code for the convenience of the native speaker. This is what abrogates the 'Standard English' and its rules and norms.

Roy, being a writer of the once colonized country, India, uses the distinct lexicons which evoke the linguistic features of native usage in the context. They give the meanings in their own context. Roy uses many distinct lexicons in *The God of Small Things*. Some of the distinct lexicons used in the text are: 'ghat', (pyre) (219), 'Coolie', (a native hired worker) (257), 'verandah', (open pillared gallery around a house) (307), 'Bangle', (ring, bracelet or anklet) (92), 'guru', (Hindu spiritual and religious teacher) (16), 'Zamindar', (landlord), (65), 'veshya', (prostitute) (8), 'Baba', (father) (31), 'bhajan', (a devotional song) (31), 'Parvan' (one of the untouchable caste's name) (70), 'Paratha', (fried flabread often stuffed with spices vegetables) (125), 'mundu', (a single piece of white cloth worn around the waist with a separate cloth covering the upper part of the body, specially in Southern India) (98), 'ashram', (Hindu spiritual center) (295), 'mittam', (yard) (310), 'oondas' (egg) (273), 'Pariah', (untouchable) (69), 'bungalow', one-storeyed house whose rooms are all at ground level, of the type originally used as an official's residence) (41), 'Naxaliate', (violent agrarian revolutionary) (89), 'cheroot', (cigar with both ends open) (70), 'bandh', (general strike used as a political protest) (128), 'Ayurvedic', (traditional Indian medicine) (132), 'Maharaja', (the title of certain Indian prince, a ruler) (7), 'bindis', (red dots worn on the foreheads of women) (189), 'Namaste', (a way of greeting somebody in which the hands are placed together as in prayer and the head is bowed) (279), 'Maharani', (Queen) (158), 'Santa', (a saint) (298), 'Sahib', (a title added to a name of the position, a male European) (53), 'Rakshasa', (Demon) (59), 'bazaar', (a group of shops or stalls) (199), Diwali', (an autumn festival in honour of the Goddess) (297), 'Sadus', (Hindu ascetics) (298), 'Swamis', (Senior members of a Hindu religious order) (298), 'dhobi', (a person who washes clothes for living) (251), 'avatar', (incarnation) (65), 'chauridar', (traditional narrow tight-fitting trousers with folds near the

anklet: worn by both men and women in North India) (240), 'Laltin', (a device for giving light by burning gas or oil) (88), 'laddoo', (a common sort of cookie made from lentil flour, ghee raisins nuts and spices) (323), 'chatta', (blouse) (170), 'Mombatti', (candle) (88) etc.

In the same way, Roy has also used many hybridized lexicon sets in which there are lexicons from two different languages. This is an act of creating interlinguistic and bilingual situation in the form of the post-colonial text. Roy also seizes the colonial language and gets it merged with the native linguistic features of India so that the text creates difficulties for the non-native speakers. Some of the hybridized lexicon sets that she uses in the text are: 'bindi-mark', (a dot like mark put on the foreheads by the Hindu women) (189), 'Black-Sahib', (a title given to a position) (52), 'burning-ghat', (funeral pyre) (219), 'tiffin-carrier', (lunchbox, a set of shallow metal foot containers with fit onto one another) (32), 'Kathakali-dance', (the classical folk dance of Kerala performed exclusively by men playing both male and female parts) (229), 'Co-sadhus', (assistant Hindu ascetics) (298), 'Co-swamis', assistant senior members of a Hindu religious order) (298), 'British-coolie', (a native hired worker who works for the British) (257), 'colonial-bunglalow', (the one- storeyed house used as an colonial official's residence) (127), 'Pariah-kite', (Roy, in this hybridized lexicon set, symbolically refers Velutha as a kite who is 'Pariah', has been supposed to dart Ammu, the touchable class) (220), 'Ayurvedic-oil', (oil prepared as medicine by the traditional Hindu science of medicine) (132), 'Secret-Mantra', (a sacred prayer or incantation for religious purpose) (230) etc.

Roy uses many untranslatable words. Such untranslatable words are used in the native context and they have contextual meanings. Roy, using untranslatable words in many situations, makes the characters switch the codes while communicating in English too, they knowingly or unknowingly happen to switch their own dialect. It creates the bilingual and the interlinguistic situations in the form of the post-colonial text. Due to such usage, the non-

native speakers don't get access to the text unless they get the meanings of these untranslatable words in the native context. Such words are used to show characters' relation and cultural significance in the native context. Some of the instances of these words that Roy uses in *The God of Small Things* are: '*chhi-chhi poach*' (51), Ammu switches the blasphemous language to show an indication that Eurocentric pretensions of an authoritarian of an authoritarian father whose extremely desensitized ways and interventions had tormented her childhood. She calls him, 'an incurable CCP which was the short for *chhi-chhi poach* which means shit-wiper' (51). Ammu's conflict assumes with the patriarchy. It is to show the prevalent male domination in the Kerala society. Similarly, there is the sense of male domination in the relationship of K.N.M. Pillai and his wife Kalyani. Kalyani respects her husband but Pillai speaks to her with the language of male authority. "He has gone to Olassa. He will be back any time now", she said. She referred to her husband '*addham*' which was the respectful form of 'he', whereas 'he' called her '*edi*' which was approximately, 'Hey, you!' (270). Likewise, there are other situations where Roy uses the untranslatable words in the native context. Baby Kochamma frightens the innocent children giving the vivid pictures of police as well as jail so that they will speak the false statement against Velutha and Ammu's relation. "Baby Kochamma built up her case. She drew (from imagination) vivid pictures of prison life. The cockroach-crisp food. The *chhi-chhi* piled in the toilets like soft brown mountains" (317). It is an act of creating the expression of disgust used as an euphemism for excrement that they will get frightened with the frightening pictures of prison life and make false statement. She further gives the picture of the police with big moustaches, 'the Uncle with the big *meeshas*' (318). *Meeshas* means moustaches. Roy further uses such words to show the characters' way of respecting each other in their relationship through the use of Malayalam dialect:

Chacko was driving. He was four years older than Ammu. Rahel and Estha couldn't call him chachen because when they did, he called them chetan and cheduthi. If they called him Ammaven, he called them Appoi and Ammai. If they called him Uncle, he called them Aunty, which was embarrassing in the public. So they called him Chacko. (37)

We see the male position is dominant in Kerala society. The children couldn't call Chacko, 'chachen' (meaning is 'father' in Malayalam) because he was not their father. If they called so, he would call them, 'chetan' and 'cheduthi'. The meanings of the words are 'older brother' and 'older brother's wife' respectively in Malayalam. If they called him, 'Ammaven' (meaning is 'Uncle', 'mother's brother' in Malayalam), he called them 'Appoi' and 'Ammai' (meanings are 'mother's brother' and 'mother's brother's wife' respectively in Malayalam). If they called him 'Uncle', he would call them 'Auntly'. But it was not suitable in the relationship. The relationship is seen prevailing from the male to that of the female in Malayalam. The utterance of 'Uncle' would take different 'connotation' with 'Auntly' in Malayalam that becomes embarrassing in the public. This is why they call him by his name, Chacko. Chacko gets male supremacy in the society but Ammu doesn't get such position due to the patriarchal social structure. Some other untranslatable words have been used to denote the protesting situations in the native context, "The marchers that they were party workers, students and labourers themselves. On the shoulders, they carried a keg of ancient anger lit with recent fuse. Through the Plymouth window, Rahel could not see that the loudest word they said was '*Inquilab Zindabad*'" (70).

The meaning of *Inawilab Zindabad* is roughly 'Long Live the Revolution'. The workers make the protest against the factory owner. In the meantime, Chacko, the factory owner, 'factory Modalali' (271), Ammu and Rahel were inside the Plymouth. Someone slammed down on it. "Chacko rolled down his window and called out to the man who had

done it. 'Thanks *Keto!* he said. *Valarey* thank!', 'Don't be so ingratiating Comrade', Ammu said" (70). The rough meaning of 'Thanks *Keto!*', '*Valarey* thank' is "Thanks a lot O.K?" in the annoyed mood of Chacko. "Rahel rolled down her window in a flash. She saw Velutha. Velutha! *Ividay!* Velutha!' she called to him" (71). Rahel switches the Malayalam in the sudden appearance of Velutha nearby place since the meaning of '*Ividay!*' is 'Over here!' Kochu Maria tries to chase the puppy when it comes into the room. "Kochu Maria hit the floor fiercely with her palms and said, 'Hup! Hup! *Poda Patti!*', it appeared to be familiar with the routine" (90). *Poda Patti* roughly means, 'Get lost, you dog!' in the form of exclamatory expression. In the chapter, 'Abhilash Talkies', the Orangedrink Lemondrink Man speaks in Malayalam with Estha when Estha sings. "*Ay, Eda Cherukka!*" the Orangedrink Lemondrink Man said in a gravelly voice thick with sleep" (101). He exclaims in Malayalam to mean 'Hey, you boy!' to stop singing since this is his 'Resting Time' (102). 'Soo-soo' (95) is also commonly used untranslatable word in the native context to evoke the childish euphemism for penises.

While meeting with Rahel, Comrade Pillai tries to make her remember him switching the Malayalam code of expression. He further asks about Estha with her:

Rahel tried to walk past unnoticed. It was absurd of her to have imagined that she could.

'*Aiyyo, Rahel Mol!*' Comrade k.N.M. Pillai said recognizing her instantly. '*Orkunnilley?*' Comrade Uncle?

'*Oower!*', Rahel said.

Did she remember him? She did indeed.

Neither question nor answer was meant as anything more than a polite preamble to conversation. Both she and he knew that there are things that can be forgotten [. . .].

Comrade Pillai lowered his voice as though there were people fastening, though there was no one about [. . .].

'And Mon?' he whispered confidently. 'How is he?'

'Fine', Rahel said. 'He's fine.'

Fine-flat and honey-coloured. He washes his clothes with crumbling soap.

35

'*Aiyyo Paavam*', Comrade Pillai whispered and his nipples drooped in mock dismay. 'Poor Fellow.' (128–131)

We can see that Comrade Pillai expresses his expression of dismay for his meeting with Rahel switching the Malayalam, *Aiyyo*. *Aiyyo* means the sudden expression of dismay. He switches 'Mol' and 'Mon' to refer 'girl' and 'boy' respectively. 'Mol' and 'Mon' also literally mean 'daughter' and 'son' respectively. Recognizing Rahel, he switches *Orkunnille* to mean 'Don't you remember?' Rahel speaks *Oower* to mean 'Yes'. This act of the switching shows 'a polite preamble to conversation' (128). When Pillai knows that Estha washes his clothes with crumbling soap, he speaks, *Aiyyo Paavam* to mean 'What a pity!' in the form of mock dismay in Estha's act of washing clothes. Velutha exclaims, '*Aiyyo kashtam*' (177) to mean 'How could you say that?' Literally, it also means 'Oh, what a pity!' He switches it when Rahel tells him, 'Liar and pretender' (177). There are other situations where Roy makes the characters switch the Malayalam dialect. We can see such switching in the dialogues between Mammachi and Kochu Maria:

Kochu Maria always spoke a little loudly to Mammachi because she assumed that poor eyesight automatically affected the other senses.

'*Kando*, Kochu Mariye?' Mammachi said. 'Can you see our Sophie Mol?'

'*Kandoo*', Kochamma? Kochu Maria said extra loud. 'I can see her.'

She smiled at Sophie, extra wide.

'She has her mother's colour', Kochu Maria said.

'Pappachi's nose', Mammachi insisted.

'I don't know about that, she's very beautiful', Kochu Maria shouted.

'*Sundarikutty*. She's a little angel.' (178)

36

We can see the 'Quasi-Phonetics' in the speeches of Mammachi and Kochu Maria.

Mammachi distorts the name of 'Kochu Maria' into 'Kochu Mariye'. Roy does it to evoke the distant loud utterance in the general way of speaking. Mammachi asks Kochu Maria whether she could see Sophie Mol. Kochu Maria, in return, using phonetic-exaggeration in *kando* utters in extra loud voice, *kandoo* to mean that she can see her. Here, we see that the word *kando* is used by both the speaker and the listener to give two different meanings. It has the meaning, 'Can you see her?' to the speaker and the meaning, 'I can see her.' to the listener as a reply. Roy depicts the realistic usage of the regional dialect in the located context. Kochu Maria shouts *sundarikutty* to refer 'Sophie Mol' as a lovely little girl, a little angel.

Roy uses the untranslatable word to evoke the native usage of different food items in the Indian context. Some of such untranslatable words are: 'Chakka valaicha-thu', (Jack fruit, jam) (161), 'idi appam', (steamed rice noodle cakes) (210), 'kanji', (rice soup) (210), 'avial', (a spicy vegetable stew cooked in coconut milk, a typical Malayali dish) (210), 'toddy', (the sweet fermented sap of various palm trees) (73), 'Paratha', (fried flabread often stuffed with spiced vegetable) (125), 'tandoori pomfret', (fish baked in a clay oven) (125), 'kebas', (spiced marinated meat, ground or in cubes, usually on a skewer) (125) 'kappa', (cassava root, cooked in various ways) (124), 'laddoo', (a common sort of cookie made of lentil flour, ghee, raisins, nuts and spices) (323) etc.

Roy also uses such untranslatable words to denote different costumes used in the Indian context. Some of the instances of such words are: 'Kavani', (top part of a two-piece

sari, draped diagonally across the upper body) (269), ‘kunukku earrings’, (a type of ancient Christian Keralite jewelry, using gold earrings consisting of a short, thin chain with a small ball hanging from it) (30), ‘Chatta’, (Blouse) (170), ‘pallu’, (the loose end of a sari which is draped over the shoulder) (189), ‘mundu’, (a single piece of cloth arranged as a sort of loose pair of trousers, tied at the waist, worn by both men and women, longer than the dhoti) (98) etc.

The other untranslatable words that Roy uses in the text are: ‘Mammachi’, (Grandmother) (178), ‘Pappachi’, (Grandfather) (35), ‘khusumbi’, (jealous woman) (185), ‘Onner, Runder, Moonner’, (One, Two, Three) (64), ‘Amhoo’, (moo) (Amhoo is the onomatopoeic form of ‘moo’ used in the native context) (201), ‘Punnyan Kunju’, (Little Blessed One) (23), ‘patcha’, (green) (27), Comrade Pillai makes the labels of the *Paradise Pickle Preserves* which becomes unwantedly *Emperors of the Realm of Taste*:

Along with the bottom of the S-shaped swirl of [. . .] billowing skirt, it said, in S-shaped swirl, *Emperors of the Realm of Taste* - which was a literal translation of *Ruchi lokathinde Rajavu*, which sounded a little less ludicrous than *Emperors of the Realm of Taste*. But since Comrade Pillai had already printed them, no one had the heart to ask him to redo the whole print order. So unhappily, *Emperors of the Realm of Taste* became a permanent feature on the Paradise Pickle labels. (47)

We can see the natives valorizing the native linguistic features. But the English phrase ‘already printed’ becomes symbolically dominating factor that becomes ‘permanent feature’. It is to show the English being nativized in the native context. This is how Roy strategically plays with the English asserting native usage of language. Similarly, Comrade Pillai as a political leader, speaks in very strategic way when Ckacko, ‘An Oxford avatar of the old zamindar mentality’ (An English-influenced reincarnation of the traditional landlord)

(65), comes to meet him to talk about Velutha. Chacko wants Velutha be overthrown from the factory. Comrade Pillai gives suggestion. “Moving his whole scalp up and down, ‘*Oru kaayam parayathey?*’ Comrade Pillai switched to Malayalam and a confiding conspiratorial voice. I’m speaking as a friend *Keto*. Off the record” (277). The meaning of *oru Kaayam Parayathey* is ‘Shall I tell you something?’ and *Keto* is ‘Have you heard?’ Comrade Pillai doesn’t have any objections to throw him away since he is a card-holder of workers union. He suggests Chacko not to open the record that would be the well-being for all.

The torture incurred on Velutha by the police is further shown as “History in live performance” (309). The word ‘History’ becomes symbolic to denote the police brutality. How they hurt him, we can see through the switching of the agents of the ‘History’. “‘*Madiyo?*’ one of the History’s agents asked. ‘*Madi aayirikkum*’, another replied” (310). The meanings of *Madiyo* and *Madi aayirikkum* are “Is it enough?” and “It may be enough.” respectively. Ammu departs from Velutha from the Meenachal River bank. When she walks away, she speaks ‘*Naaley*’ to mean tomorrow. The meaning, ‘tomorrow’ indicates the uncertainty of their meeting again and the uncertainty of their relationship.

Roy strikingly uses the mythical reference of *Mahabharat* which she associates with the characters. The non-native speakers feel difficulty in getting the access of the very use of mythical reference unless they get the idea of *Mahabharat*. Usha Mahadevan in *Arundhati Roy’s The God of Small Things: A Native Response* writes, “It is important to note how the description of the classical art would appeal to a native conversant with the dance form. Roy’s description of the dancer’s movement reveals her love for this art” (86). The instance of *Mahabharat* performed by the ‘Kathakali Man’ becomes associative to the Malayali context. “He becomes a Regional Flavour” (231). “Such Stories become Great Stories” (229). They become the parts of their life. Estha and Rahel also watch the performance of the Kathakali Man along with K.N.M. Pillai. He also evokes the value of

'Native Culture'. This is what becomes the act of the valorization of nativity in the post-colonial situation. "He had sandalwood paste on his forehead" (237). He speaks to the twins, "Oho!, he said in his piping voice you are here! So still you are interested in your Indian culture? Goodgood. Very good. The twins not rude, not polite said nothing. They walked home together. He and She. We and Us" (237). 39

With her affection for the country, coupled with a brilliant stance, she perceives the Indian tradition. Usha Mahadevan also writes, "There are some features in the Indian tradition which have to be preserved and some others which have to be discarded" (*A Native Response* 85). The subject of Kathakali is important to note how the native description of this classical art would appeal to a native conversant with this dance form. Roy gives the very effect of cultural practice through the performance. She shows the patriarchal domination prevailed in the native context. We can see such situation when she writes, "The Kathakali Men took off their make-up and went home beat their wives. Even Kunti, the soft one with breast" (336). The male domination can be seen in the text that Roy presents through the performance of Kathakali tradition. Pappachi, the imperial entomologist is a regular wife beater. Ammu suffers in the same manner in her husband's house. Her husband pesters her to humour his lecherous English boss Hollick for the family's survival. She tolerates his drunken violence and finally leaves him when the violence gets directed against the children. Through the sense of 'Love Law', Roy evokes the cultural and social practice prevailed in the Indian society. Through the performance of Kunti and Karna in the Kathakali, she evokes the sense of cultural norm of the society. We can see it through the revelation, "It is them that Kunti sought to protect by announcing to Karna that she was his mother. She had a promise to extract. She invoked the Love Laws" (233). The very form of 'Love Law' is associative in the text in the form of cultural practice of Kerala. She writes, "That it really began in the days when the 'Love Laws' were made. The laws that lay down who should be loved, and how.

And how much" (33). This instance becomes associative in the relationship between Ammu and Velutha. Ammu, being the member of the higher caste, makes relationship with Velutha, a Paravan, an untouchable caste in the society. Their relationship comes to a disastrous end that Velutha, despite being innocent, gets mercilessly tortured by the police by the conspiracy made by Baby Kochamma. The society doesn't allow the lower caste to keep the relationship with the higher caste. When Vellya Paapen tells his son's relation to Mammachi, she gets extremely angry:

Suddenly the blind old woman in her rickrack dressing gown and her thin grey hair plaited into a rat's tail stepped forward and pushed Vellya Paapen with all her strength. He stumbled backwards down. He was taken completely by surprise part of the taboo of being an Untouchable was expecting not to be touched. At least not in these circumstances. Of being locked in to physically impregnable cocoon.

Baby Kochamma walking past the kitchen, heard the commotion. She found Mammachi spitting in to the rain "THOO! THOO! THOO!" and Vellya Paapen lying in slush, wet, weeping, grovelling. Offering to kill his son. To tear him limb from limb. (256)

Roy, using mythical reference, evokes the sense of cultural practice prevailed in the Kerala society. The caste system and the patriarchy are portrayed through the use of mythical reference of *Mahabharat* on the one hand, and evokes the cultural practice of the Kathakali dance and its preservation required in the post-colonial condition on the other. Roy has given emphasis on the nativity since she is homegrown Indian. Usha Mahadevan in *Arundhati Roy's The God of Small Things: A Native Response* writes, "The novel set in India in the village Ayemenem of Kerala ought to have features that are distinctly native" (83).

Roy breaks the English linguistic rules of the code to the extreme as she gets linguistic freedom in the post-colonial condition. T. Vinoda writes, “[. . .] the novel offers interesting insights into the many ways in which the standard / authentic notion of language has been subverted. Such writing is a potent weapon in the hands of anti-hegemonic and decolonizing forces as the form of resistance” (*Introduction ix*). She breaks the rules of forming words. She disjoins the letters of the words in her own wish. Some of the instances of disjoined words used in the text are: ‘Bar Nowl’, (Barn owl) (328), ‘Pre NUN sea ashun’, (Pronunciation) (154), ‘Mo-stunfortunate’, (Most unfortunate) (130), ‘A Wake’, (Awake) (238), ‘A Live’, (Alive) (238), ‘A Lert’, (Alert) (238), ‘Lay Ter’, (Later) (146), ‘Die-vorced’, (Divorce) (130), Roy makes Comrade Pillai break the word ‘Divorced’ into ‘Die-vorced’ which has the symbolic meaning in the text. The idea of ‘divorce’ is not native. It has the foreign cultural association. The Indian society unites the members of the family in a co-operative way along with the acceptance of respect in the relationship. Rahel gets married with Larry Lawrance. But their relationship ends in separation as they divorce. Comrade Pillai, while talking with Rahel breaks the word as if it is a form of death. “‘Die-vorced?’ His voice rose to such a high register that it cracked on the question mark. He even pronounced the word as though it were a form of death” (130). Similarly, Roy uses other words with symbolic meanings. ‘Locusts Stand I’ has symbolic meaning in the text. It is the breaking of the Latin Phrase *Locus Standi*. The meaning of the phrase, *Locus Standi* is ‘having no legal standing’ (231). Roy uses it in the text to denote the symbolic meaning in association with the Indian social and cultural context. The dominance of the patriarchy has been evoked through the use of the very phrase in the text. In the patriarchal society, the male gets the higher position and the legal standing than the female. As we see in the text, Roy has made such situation to show the Indian social structure:

Though Ammu did as much as work in the factory as Chacko, whenever he was dealing with food inspectors or sanitary engineers, he 42 always referred to it as *my* factory, *my* pineapples, *my* pickles. Legally, this was the case because Ammu, as a daughter, had no claim to the property.

Chacko told Rahel and Estha that Ammu had no Locusts Stand I.

'Thanks to our male chauvinist society,' Ammu said.

Chacko said, 'What is yours is mine and what's mine is also mine.' (57)

The above depicted lines from the text show that Ammu has no legal position in the house and over the property because she is a female. But Chacko, as a male, has legal position in the house as well as over the property. It is because of the dominance of the patriarchy functioning in the social structure. Roy depicts the social structure of Indian society using the symbolical breaking of the linguistic code in *The God of Small Things*. She adapts the mythical reference to show the characters' relation. She uses the deviated form of language to describe the situations and incidents differently. That is what negates the earlier ways of writing. T. Vinoda in *Moving the 'Small' to the Centre: The God of Small Things: A Study in Style* also writes:

The new code of the writing negates the old which was earlier value-centered. [. . .] Roy's way of succeeding could be seen in the extra-ordinary linguistic inventiveness. Indeed, the novel uses the language in a way that largely makes for riveting equality. She uses the English as a plaything. She can spit at correct English. (131)

Roy uses the anti-clockwise pattern of the linguistic code of the English language in different conditions. It represents the act of breaking the English linguistic rules and norms. Some of the instances of such anti-clockwise patterns of the English linguistic codes used in

The God of Small Things can be illustrated as: Roy depicts the mental status of Estha while departing from Ammu at the Cochin Harbour: 43

It was about the night time. Every First Class train was green. The seats green. The berths green. The floor green. The Chains green. Darkgreen. Lightgreen.

TO STOP TRAIN PULL CHAIN, it said in green.

OT POTS NIART LLUP NIACH, Estha thought in green. (325)

Roy depicts the activity of the police administration in “comical manner later when Estha and Rahel read the board backwards” (Batra, *The God of Small Things: A Critical Study* 121). The police don’t act systematically following laws rather take the side of the higher caste. Who has position in society “After Sophie Mol’s funeral Ammu went with her children to make her statement to the police Inspector Thomas Mathew told her brusquely, ‘He spoke the coarse Kottayam dialect of Malayalam. He stared at Ammu’s breast as he spoke. “He said the police knew all they wanted to know and that the Kottayam police did not take statements from *veshyas* or their illegitimate children. We can see the further illustration of the behaviour of the police which Roy depicts linguistically when Inspector Thomas Mathew speaks to Ammu:

‘If I were you?,’ he said, I’d go home quietly, Then he tapped her breasts with his batton. Gently *Tap Tap*. As though he was choosing mangoes from a basket. Pointing out the ones that he wanted, packed and delivered. Inspector Thomas Mathew seemed to know whom he would pick on and whom he wouldn’t.

Police men have that instinct.

Behind him a red and blue board said:

Politeness

Obedience

Loyalty

44

Intelligence

Courtesy

Efficiency. (8)

Police represents the servants of the state to protect the life of the general people. “They are six servants of the State” (304). We can see the great irony in the action of the police that Roy metaphorically evokes. They are the servants but violate their service as the servants of the state. In this sense, we can see the ironical depiction of the conduct of the police. Roy linguistically shows the manner of the police that she generalizes through the statement, ‘Policemen have that instinct.’ The very meaning of ‘**POLICE**’ is read by Estha and Rahel to indicate the opposite conduct of the police and their oppressive and deceptive brutality over the innocent people like Velutha. It also represents “the growing incoherence in children” (313) due to the death of Sophie Mol:

Estha read aloud from the board on the wall.

‘ssenetilo**P**,’ he said. ssenetilo**P**, ecneideb**O**,’

‘ytlayo**L**, ecnegilletn**I**,’ Rahel said.

‘ysetruo**C**.’

‘ycneiciff**E**.’

[. . .] Inspector Matthew remained calm. He sensed the growing incoherence in the children. He noted the dilated pupils. He had seen it all before . . . the human mind’s escape valve. (313)

The other instance of the anti-clockwise pattern of the English linguistic code has been very logically illustrated. The imposing act of reading the clockwise pattern ordered by an Australian missionary friend of Baby Kochamma, Miss Mitten, on the children has been

reversed through their act of reading the English code backwards. The children dislike her⁴⁵ and logically show her how it is possible to read backwards as well as forwards. They deny Miss Mitten's imposing act of reading the clockwise pattern of the English linguistic code:

When Baby Kochamma's Australian friend, Miss Mitten gave Estha and Rahel a baby book - *The Adventures of Susie Squirrel* – as a present when she visited Ayemenem, they were deeply offended. First, they read it forwards. Miss Mitten [. . .] said that she was Little Disappointed in them when they read it aloud her backwards.

'ehT serutnevda fo eisuS lerriuuqS. enO gnirpS gninroM eisuS lerriuuqS ekow pu,'

They showed Miss Mitten how it was possible to read both *Malayalam* and *Madam I'm Adam* backwards as well as forwards. She wasn't amused and it turned out that she didn't even know what Malayalam was. They told it was language every one spoke in Kerala. She said she had been under the impression it was called Keralese. Estha, who had by then taken an active dislike to miss Mitten, told her that as far as he was concerned it was a 'Highly Stupid Impression'.

Miss Mitten Complained to Baby Kochamma about Estha's rudeness, and about their reading backwards. She told Baby Kochamma that she had seen Satan in their eyes. *nataS in their seye.*

They were made to write. *In future we will not read backwards.* A hundred times. Forwards.

A Few months later, Miss Mitten was killed by a milk van in Hobart, across the road from a cricket oval. To the twins there was hidden justice in fact the milk van had been *reverting*. (59-60)

We can see the children logically disapprove the way of reading. They insist on the way they wish. They read backward and prove it possible to read forwards and backwards. They illustrate with *Malayalam and Madam*. The complaint made by Miss Mitten to Baby Kachamma about the rude behaviour brings the punishment to them that they have to write, '*In future we will not read backwards*' hundred times. But the killing of Miss Mitten by a milk van becomes the 'hidden justice'. It becomes ironic in the sense that the punishment gets failure since the milk van has been *reversing* that is to say backwards. The children's backward way of reading the English codes gets logically accepted. This is what becomes the act of disapproving the centrality of the English language since the children prove both *Malayalam* and *Madam* can be read backwards as well as forwards. It shows the equal position of different linguistic uses. *Madam I'm Adam* can also be spoken forwards as well as backwards in the same manner if we read in a fractured way. This is how Roy makes the children logically assert their ways of reading the linguistic code.

Roy uses different collocational clashes and paradoxes. In such clashes, she violates the selection-restriction rules of the English linguistic codes. Some of the instances of such clashes and paradoxes used in *The God of Small Things* are:- 'an unmixable mix' (44), 'Noisy Television Silence' (28), 'mirthless smile' (239), 'Beautiful Ugly Toads' (187), 'Green heat' (202), 'listening with his eyes' (19), 'A lucky leaf that wasn't lucky enough.' (73), 'strange insects appeared like ideas in the evenings.' (9), 'Automobile island in a river of people' (65), 'cold-knowledge' (38), 'bottomless-bottomful feeling' (107) etc.

We can see that Roy uses the English codes in her own way. Such linguistic usage is supposed to the inventiveness of the writer which is named as neologism. Roy also founds such different neologisms in *The God of Small Things*. Since Roy uses the colonial tongue, she invents different neologisms using it according to her own wish. Some of such

neologisms that we see in the text are:- 'Rice-Christians' (74), 'Half-Hindu-Hybrids' (45), 'bottomless-bottomful feeling' (107), 'Airport-Frock' (37), 'Free-funeral' (4), 'a viable die-able age' (3), 're-Returned' (9) (The word has been used with symbolic meaning that Estha gets physically returned to Ayemenem on the one hand, he gets the whole memory mesmerized back.), 'a pair of two-egg twins' (262), 'Man-less-woman' (45), 'The History House' (53), 'Reading Aloud Voice' (55), 'well-fed-tie' (173), 'Orangedrink Lemondrink Man' (270), (Roy uses this compound as a name of a character), 'Noisy-Umbrella' (79), 'A cloudy-kiss' (335), 'a Church-feeling' (54), 'An Oxford avatar of the old zamindar mentality' (65), (This compound refers to the character, Chacko who has studied at Oxford, still has the prestigious position in the society, a landlord.), 'The Torch-Man' (98), 'biological father' (135), 'public-pots' (94), 'Big Man the Laltin Sahib' (89), 'Small Man the the Mombatti' (89), 'trying-not-to cry mouth' (324) etc.

Roy makes the characters play with the linguistic code along with the situation. We can see the Orangedrink Lemondrink Man speaking the English phrase in a laughing manner since the meaning is different:

'I asked you where lived,' he said, spinning his nasty web.

'Ayemenem,' Estha said. I live in Ayemenem. My grandmother owns Paradise Pickles & Preserves. She is my Sleeping Partner.'

'Is she, now?' the Orangedrink Lemondrink Man said. 'And who does she sleep with?' He laughed a nasty laugh that he couldn't understand. (102-103)

The Orangedrink Lemondrink Man makes fun of the phrase, 'sleeping partner'. He takes it surfacely to associate with Estha and asks, 'And who does she sleep with?' 48 when Estha says that she is his sleeping partner. But the connotative meaning of the 'sleeping partner' is 'a partner who has invested money in a business company but who does not

actually work in it. In the chapter, 'The Madras Mail', Estha is to depart from Ammu. Ammu wants to soothe him telling that she will join the school and take him back. But actually, it never happens. This situation is shown with the play of words. Estha says it would be too far away which Roy shows linguistically in the text:

'As soon as I get a job. As soon as I can go away from here and get a job.' Ammu said.

'But that will be never,' A wave of panic. A bottomless-bottomful feeling.

By 'never' Estha had meant that it would too far away. That it wouldn't be *now*, wouldn't be *soon*.

By 'Never' Estha hadn't meant Not Ever.

But that's how the words came out.

But that will be never!

For Never they just took the 'O' and 'T' out of Not Ever.

And that's how it had all turned out.

Never. Not Ever.

It was *his* fault that the far away man in Ammu's chest stopped shouting. *His* fault that she died alone in the lodge with no one to lie at the back of her and talk to her.

Because he was the one that had *said* it. *But Ammu that will be never!*

(324-325)

We can see the turn and the twist in Ammu's life that she couldn't meet Estha again. The turning of 'Not Ever' into 'Never' gets associated, as Ammu's life also gets turned. 'And that's how it had all turned out' shows the real turning of Ammu's life. And we can see what Estha means 'never' i.e. 'too far away' really gets sensed in the text that they will never be

meeting again. This is how Roy linguistically shows the turn and the twist of life of the characters. She asserts her linguistic inventiveness with the significance in the text.

Post-colonial Linguistic Demonstration in *The God of Small Things*

Post-colonial critics and writers demonstrate the social, cultural and linguistic situations of the once-colonized countries. They have got linguistic freedom in the post-

colonial condition which becomes a major act to strike the colonial centrality back on the one hand, have given position to nativism in opposition to the center on the other. The linguistic freedom has led the writers of once-colonized country to seize the colonial tongue, distort it and merge it with the native context to provoke the native cultural and linguistic practices. Along with this, they use the English language with their own wish so as to evoke their linguistic inventiveness. This is what Roy has done in *The God of Small Things*. This process has become one of the acts of decolonization of the colonial tongue i.e. 'Standard English'.

We can see that Roy has used the English language in the native context. Along with the nativization of the English language, she distorts it in different ways. She has adapted the code-switching to evoke the general way of the native usage of the language in the native context. She has used different distinct as well as hybrid lexicon sets. Through the use of distinct as well as hybrid lexicon sets, Roy depicts linguistic usage of the Indian people and how the native usage of the language has been hybridized with the English linguistic code due to its contact with the native. This is what gives the equal position to the different languages and subverts the centrality occupied by the English language. This is what creates the interlinguistic situation in the text in the post-colonial condition. Run together phrases, variable representation, quasi-phonetics, anti-clockwise writing of the English linguistic codes in the different situations become important to deviate the English linguistic codes which Roy has adapted in *The God of Small Things*. She invents different neologisms in which she has used the English Language differently so as to evoke her own linguistic inventiveness.

51

The use of mythical reference of the *Mahabharat* evokes the sense of 'Love Laws' which Roy associates with the relationship between Velutha and Ammu in the social context. She also depicts the religious dominance in term of the caste system in the Kerala society through the adaptation of the mythical reference that the untouchable caste should not have

relationship with the higher caste since Velutha is a Paravan, an untouchable on the one hand, Ammu is from higher caste on the other.

She shows the police conduct differently that they show opposite conduct with the general people and suppress and punish them, since they are the servants of the state. Roy depicts this with the anti-clockwise pattern of the English linguistic code to ironize their conduct. She further depicts the hovering mind of the children and their strong opposition to the clockwise reading of the English linguistic code through the anti-clockwise pattern.

She depicts the social and cultural practice of patriarchy linguistically. The breaking of the phrase, *Locus Standi* into *Locusts Stand I* has symbolic meaning that Ammu doesn't get the position in the house and over the property because she is female. The patriarchy gives the male the dominant role in the family as we see Chacko gets higher position in the family as well as in the society.

Adapting such strategies, Roy has used the English language differently which becomes the act of striking the colonial centrality seizing the very colonial tongue as she gets the linguistic freedom in the post-colonial condition. This is what we call the act of the decolonization of the English language and giving it a position no more than that of a dialect. *The God of Small Things* projects the decolonizations of the English language in the post-colonial condition on the one hand, also projects the nativization of the English language along with the linguistic inventiveness of Arundhati Roy on the other.

Work cited

Adam, Hazards. Ed. *Critical Theories since Plato*. New York: Harcourt Brace

Jovanovich, 1992.

Ashcroft, Bill Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin, eds. *The Empire Writes Back*. London:

Routledge, 2002.

Agrawal, Kirtee. "The Language of Nativism: The Inherent Hazards of Narrating the Nation." *The Inside View: Native Responses to Contemporary Indian English Novel*.

Ed. Rangrao Bhongle. New Delhi: Atlantic, 2003. 30-40.

Batra, Shakti. *The God of Small Things: A Critical Study*. New Delhi: Surjeet 2006.

Bertans, Hans. *Literary Theory: The Basics*. London: Routledge, 2003.

Boehmer, Elleke. *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature: Migrant Metaphors*. New York: OUP, 1995.

Brians, Paul. "Arundhati Roy: *The God of Small Things* - Study Guide." 17th Dec. 1998

<<http://www.wsu.edu/~brians/anglophone/roy.html>>

Brians, Paul. *Modern South Asian Literature in English*. Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2003.

Das, Bijay Kumar. *Critical Essays on Post-Colonial Literature*. 2nd ed. New Delhi: Atlantic, 2007.

Das, Sisir Kumar. *A History of Indian Literature Struggle for Freedom: Triumph and Tragedy*. New Delhi: Shitya Academy, 1995.

Dasan, M. "Arundhati Hits the Socio-Political Ball." *The Critical Studies of Arundhati Roy's The God of Small Things*. Eds. Jaydipsinh Dodiya and Joya Chakravarty. New Delhi: Atlantic, 2001. 22-36.

Docker, John. "The Neocolonial Assumption in University Teaching of English." *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. Eds. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. London: Routledge, 1995. 440-448.

Dodiya, Jaydipsinh. "Arundhati Roy - The Woman and the Writer." *The Critical Studies of Arundhati Roy's The God of Small Things*. Eds. Jaydipsinh Dodiya and Joya Chakravarty. New Delhi: Atlantic, 2001. 1-7.

- Dodiya, Jaydipsinh and Joya Chakravarty. Eds. *The Critical Studies of Arundhati Roy's The God of Small Things*. New Delhi: Atlantic, 2001.
- During, Simon. "Postmodernism or Postcolonialism Today." *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. Eds. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. London: Routledge, 1995. 125-129.
- Hooks, Bell. "'this is oppressor's language/ yet I need it talk to you': Language, a Place of Struggle." *Between Languages and Cultures: Translation and Cross-Cultural Texts*. Eds. Anuradha Dingwaney and Carole Maier. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1995. 70-77.
- Kachru, Braj B. "The Alchemy of English." *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. Eds. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. London: Routledge, 1995. 291-295.
- . *Asian Englishes: Beyond the Canon*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Kinger, Anil. "Feast from the East: Arundhati Roy's *The God of Small Things*." *The Critical Studies of Arundhati Roy's The God of Small Things*. Eds. Jaydipsinh Dodiya and Joya Chakravarty. New Delhi: Atlantic, 2001. 131-134.
- Kumar, P. Shiv. "Towards a Translation Protocol in the Postcolonial India." *Postcolonial Theory and Literature*. Eds. P. Mallikarajuna Rao, Rajeshwor Mittapalli and K. Damodar Rao. New Delhi: Atlantic, 2003. 37-43.
- Mahadevan, Usha. "Arundhati Roy's *The God of Small Things*: A Native Response." *The Inside View: Native Responses to Contemporary Indian English Novel*. Ed. Rangrao Bhongle. New Delhi: Atlantic, 2003. 83-94.
- Pillai, C. Gopinath. "Aesthetics of Post-Colonial Feminism: A Reading of *The God of Small Things*." *The Critical Studies of Arundhati Roy's The God of Small Things*. Eds. Jaydipsinh Dodiya and Joya Chakravarty. New Delhi: Atlantic, 2001. 87-92.
- Prasad, Amar Nath. *Arundhati Roy's The God of Small Things: A Critical Appraisal*. New

- Delhi: Sarup and Sons, 2004.
- Rao, P. Mallikarajuna, Rajeshwor Mittapalli and K. Damodar Rao, eds. Introduction. *Postcolonial Theory and Literature*. New Delhi: Atlantic, 2003. vi-xiii.
- Rao, Raja. "Language and Spirit." *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. Eds. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. London: Routledge, 1995. 296-298.
- Roy, Amitabh. *The God of Small Things: A Novel of Social Commitment*. New Delhi: Atlantic, 2005.
- Roy, Arundhati. *The God of Small Things*. New Delhi: Penguin Books, 2002.
- Sharma, Ghanshyam and Hari Chetri. *Linguistics and Stylistics*. 3rd ed. Kathmandu: Students Books, 2005.
- Sharma, Meenakshi. "Narrating Indian History in Fiction from an Indigenous Perspective." A Native Response." *The Inside View: Native Responses to Contemporary Indian English Novel*. Ed. Rangrao Bhongle. New Delhi: Atlantic, 2003. 147-156.
- Surendran, K.V. "The God of Small Things - A Saga of Lost Dreams." *The Critical Studies of Arundhati Roy's The God of Small Things*. Eds. Jaydipsinh Dodiya and Joya Chakravarty. New Delhi: Atlantic, 2001. 49-72.
- Tiffin, Helen. et. el. *Key Concepts in Postcolonial Studies*. Chennai: EOU, 2004.
- Thing'o, Ngugi Wa. "On The Abolition of the English Department." *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. Eds. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. London: Routledge, 1995. 438-442.
- Vinoda, T. "Moving the Small to the Centre: *The God of Small Things*: A Study in Style." *Postcolonial Theory and Literature*. Eds. P. Mallikarajuna Rao, Rajeshwor Mittapalli and K. Damodar Rao. New Delhi: Atlantic, 2003. 129-146.
- Zabus, Chantal. "Relexification." *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. Eds. Bill Ashcroft,

Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. London: Routledge, 1995. 314-318.