# Exploring Literary Multilingualism in Indian Diasporic Writing

**Urjani Chakravarty**
Faculty, Department of Communication, Indian Institute of Management Indore, Prabandh Shikhar, Rau-Pithampur Road, Madhya Pradesh, India
Email: urjanic@iimidr.ac.in

**Abstract** The present paper explicates some main characteristics of the function related to literary multilingualism in Indian Diasporic literary discourse. Literary multilingualism can be defined as a phenomenon where word groups whose structures and meanings cannot be derived from a single language directly as they occur in two or more languages. In particular, it focuses on selective multilingualism especially features of spoken discourse that authors like Amitav Ghosh, Chitra B. Divakaruni, Kiran Desai and Rohinton Mistry recurrently use in their novels, and generally which has not been accounted for within linguistic research. By collating Relevance Theory with the use of literary multilingualism, it is proposed that writers who adopt such an approach are dissolving the boundaries between spoken and literary discourse for multiple reasons. This claim will be elucidated through the analysis of the novels within the framework of the concept of a 'cognitive environment' as explicated by Sperber and Wilson in their discussion of Relevance Theory (2002 249). The paper explores functions of literary multilingualism in Indian Diasporic literary discourse thus adding a new perspective to the typologies which often have been set up mainly to account for multilingualism in spoken discourse.

**Key words** literary multilingualism; spoken discourse features; literary discourse; Relevance Theory; popularity.

**Author** **Urjani Chakravarty,** Dr. Philo., is currently working as Faculty of Communication at Indian Institute of Management, Indore, Madhya Pradesh, India. Her areas of interest are culture, communication, linguistic approaches to literature, applied linguistics (discourse analysis and psycholinguistics) and pragmatics. She has published extensively in the area of different branches of linguistics as well as literature.

**Introduction**

> what happens when a multilingual culture gets constructed or studied in one language, i.e., English? What are the advantages and the limitations of such linguistic compression or collapse ? (Makarand R. Paranjape 101)

The above epigraph juxtaposes the issue of multilingualism with literary discourse. This work endeavours to understand the point through the use of 'literary multilingualism' in four Indian Diasporic novelists namely Amitav Ghosh, Chitra Banerjee Divakaruni, Kiran Desai, and Rohinton Mistry by illustrating how these writers use various structural characteristics of spoken discourse in their literary texts. The usage will be explicated within the Relevance Theoretic framework in conjunction with insights from fields like Sociolinguistics and Cross-Cultural Pragmatics. Knauth (2007.Web) first used the term 'literary multilingualism' to denote the mixing of two or more languages for the cross-cultural or experimental purpose. Literary multilingualism refers to the interspersing of words and phrases from different languages in any multilingual situation in the form of code switching and code mixing. The study focuses on literary multilingualism present in literary discourse, as well as suggests that the Relevance-Theoretic concepts of Ostensive Inferential Communication, Ostensive Stimulus and Mutual Cognitive Environment provide an analytical tool to understand literature written by Indian Diasporic Novelists.

In the context of nonfiction, this feature has been observed by Suzuki (2009) who comments that the adoption of such an approach can be considered as deliberately redefining the boundary between spoken and written discourse. However, Suzuki limits her discussion to nonfiction whereas the present analysis investigates this phenomenon in literary discourse. The study contends that the "mutual cognitive environment" which authors like Amitav Ghosh, Chitra Banerjee Divakaruni, Kiran Desai and Rohinton Mistry so recurrently construct in their novels is largely dependent on their use of features of spoken discourse, and which account for their present day popularity and appeal (See. Khushu-Lahiri and Chakravarty, 2011 112). The contention is established with the help of analysis of the novels within the framework of "mutual cognitive environment" developed by Sperber and Wilson's Relevance Theory (2002 249). This is incited by the assumption that a comprehensive account of how this "mutual cognitive environment" is created by these writers and the process of their interpretation by readers should generate accounts of how these texts give rise to particular effects.

The effects, it is maintained is created due to the interaction of contextual assumptions. The environment includes markers of spoken discourse reformulation, insertion of spoken features of Hindi and other Indian languages (fillers, particles, formulaic expressions) herein referred to as Pragma-Markers (See. Pragma-Cultural Markers in Khushu-Lahiri and Chakravarty, 2014) and spoken Indian English (plural rules) called S-Markers within the English text. Accordingly, by applying Relevance Theory and rules of spoken language, it is proposed that the phenomenon discussed here may be viewed as a reflection of the language usage prevalent in today's society is the cause of change in the language of the literary texts.

**Background of the Study**

The paper brings into the ambit of discussion the use of 'literary multilingualism' in literary discourse as exhibiting as well as reflecting the multilingual language situation in Indian society. Akshya Saxena's view about how the present day popular media is using the language in the Indian society substantiates the above contention:

> It is this English –injected Hindi which is the culturally confident desi cool donned by MTV Generation who are as comfortable with the multi-lingual title track of Johnny Gaddar (2007) and Pappu can't dance, Saala as with film titles like Jab We Met (2007), Kismet Konnection (2008) as with desi poke application on Facebook with option to darao your friends with a nakli chipkali or pilao them Roohafza. Increasingly, the interface between Hindi and English in India is blurring, giving way to a curious concoction of 'Hinglish' that comes with its own shades of grey across social, religious and cultural stratification (55-56).

The above discussion on the interspersing of Hindi with English further stressed the point that this is not a singular phenomenon in the country as all the state languages like Bengali, Tamil and other major languages in the VIII Schedule are regularly intermixed with English. As a result, the distinct evolution of regional variants of English in contemporary usage has led to terms such as Hinglish, Banglish, Tenglish (See. Dutta and Rajeswari, 2015) respectively. The cause of this can be assumed to be the multilingual competence of the country's population. The existence of an inter-language relationship between English language and over 1500 hundred indigenous languages in India (Census India 2010-2011) have led to literary multilingualism in conversation and discourse.

Most studies conducted by sociolinguists' state that Indians in a multi-lingual

setting often switch from one language to another (e.g., Bhat, 2010). The switch generally occurs not only at a passage/sentence level (code-switching) but also at a phrase/word level (code mixing). Various hypotheses (e.g., Bhatia and Ritchie, 2006; Sridhar, 1980) discuss the phenomenon, as the cause of switch and a mix of the codes either to make communication smoother between the speakers or to make a conversation more effective. Indians seem to do the switching and mixing consciously as well as unconsciously.

Turning to the representation of spoken discourse in the novels taken up for study it seems to occur on several different levels, e.g. at the level of orthography, literary multilingualism, i.e. code-switching/code-mixing and grammar. Notably, this work focuses on the functions of literary multilingualism to create the mutual cognitive environment. The analysis will show how the functions generally correspond to the specific usages in fixed places. Furthermore, the functions of literary multilingualism can be seen as operating at two main levels: a local and a global level. This view derives from Auer's (1999) discussion of local and global meaning, where he differentiates between code-switching as "locally meaningful" (310) and code mixing as "meaningful … in a more global sense" (310). Local functions of code-switching are thus functions that can be seen in the text and consequently can be considered as meaningful for the readers of the novels, e.g. instances where code-switching is used in reiterations in order to give emphasis. Global functions, on the other hand, operate on a higher level such as identity etc. Since these categories are flexible in nature the study proposes that literary multilingualism can be regarded as having both local and global functions for creating mutual cognitive environment. As an overarching frame, the investigation takes the broader social context (e.g. social, political, historical and economic factors) into account. This is in line with the central assumption in this work that language cannot be understood separately from its socio-cultural context.

This discussion of local functions of code-switching builds on a list in which there are places which have clear local functions and in which switching is frequent. Before discussing this list in more detail and before launching into the analysis of the novels, it is useful to look at other suggested typologies.

Perhaps the most well-known of these is Gumperz (1982) typology of functions of code-switching. He suggests this preliminary typology on the basis of his studies of code-switching in three different language situations. The typology consists of, "quotations, addressee specification, interjections, reiteration, message qualification, personalization versus objectivization" (Gumperz: 75-80).

In addition to the typology suggested by Gumperz, Grosjean (1989) provides

a summary of some of the reasons why speakers code-switch. Code-switching is used to, "fill a linguistic need for lexical item, set phrase, discourse marker, or sentence filler, continue the last language used (triggering), quote someone, specify addressee, qualify message: amplify or emphasize ("topper" in argument), specify speaker involvement (personalize message), mark and emphasize group identity (solidarity), convey confidentiality, anger, annoyance, exclude someone from conversation, change role of speaker: raise status, add authority, show expertise" (Grosjean 152). Auer (1995) offers a list of "conversational loci in which switching is particularly frequent" (120). Auer's list is illustrated as follows, "reported speech, change of participant constellation, parentheses or side-comments, reiterations, change of activity type, topic shift, puns, language play, shift of key, topicalisation, topic/comment structure" (Auer 1995 120).

Taking into account the fact that not much attention has been paid to the functions of written code-switching the study discusses here some important typologies of spoken code-switching that have been applied to written discourse by scholars working in the area. Typologies such as those described above have been called into question in case of written code-switching. For example, Auer (1984, 1995) has strongly criticized such lists, claiming that they are inappropriate for several reasons. Two points in Auer's criticism are especially relevant. First, there is the limitation that it will never be possible to write an exhaustive list of the functions of code-switching. Auer, therefore, claims that "it is a futile endeavour to give a closed classificational scheme for code-switching, for an indeterminate number of interpretations can be arrived at" (1984 3). He argues that "participants don't just choose one type from some fixed set of alternatives" (3) and that, instead, the switching is "closely tied to the specific, never-identical circumstances in which alternation occurs" (3). The intent of this study is not to propose a view of literary multilingualism as fixed, stable, or static. On the contrary, code-switching is regarded as a fluid, dynamic and creative process. However, bearing in mind that it will never be possible to write an exhaustive, all-inclusive list of the functions of code-switching, we found it useful to build on such a list to describe some of the functions of literary multilingualism to create a mutual cognitive environment for the analysis of the novels.

It is also worth emphasizing that despite the criticism of typologies, the Auer's Conversation Model (1984, 1995, 1998) and Myer-Scotton's Markedness Models (1993) that have been included therein are none the less valid. In fact, Sebba admits that Auer's global and local functions are not exactly clear in case of literary discourse. He further states that as the interaction is between a writer and

a distant reader, "its scope of the term code-switching to such text types could be extended for the change of language must be locally meaningful functioning as a contextualization cue for the reader" (2012 4). Consequently, the work explores functions of literary multilingualism in Indian Diasporic novels thereby adding a new perspective to the typologies/lists which often have been set up mainly to account for oral code-switching.

**Theoretical Framework**

The fact that the novels under discussion are popular and have appealed to readers from all walks of life poses a challenge to any theory which aims to analyse the literary texts and the reason for their sustained popularity. Relevance Theory by Dan Sperber and Deidre Wilson will be used to explain the popularity of the novels under discussion. The paper underscores the fact that insofar as the purpose of literary criticism is to develop interpretations or readings of texts and readings are generated by evidence from literary texts and contextual assumptions, Relevance Theory can enhance literary criticism by exploring how readings are arrived at and considering what given evidence there is to support a particular texts' popularity. Further, Sperber and Wilson consider communication as an asymmetrical process wherein the discourse initiator has the complete responsibility of handling the communication in such a way that there is no misunderstanding between him/her and the discourse recipient. The discourse initiator within a mutual cognitive environment has insight into the discourse recipient's possible interpretive processes and uses this knowledge to create the input in such a way that the discourse recipient obtains contextual information in order to interpret it. In defining the term "cognitive environment" Sperber and Wilson make the following proposition:

> A fact [or, more generally, assumption] is manifest to an individual at a given time if and only if he is capable at that time of representing it mentally and accepting its representation as true or probably true. [Hence] an individual's total cognitive environment is a function of his physical environment and his cognitive abilities. It consists of not only all the facts [or assumptions] that he is aware of, but also, all the facts [or assumptions] that he is capable of becoming aware of; in his physical environment...Memorized information is a component of cognitive abilities. (Sperber and Wilson 1995 39)

Thus, one can state that a cognitive environment for any individual is a group of assumptions that are valid to him/her because they are understandable and

distinguishable.

On this basis, a mutual cognitive environment is further defined as, "any shared cognitive environment in which it is manifest which people share it. In a mutual cognitive environment… every manifest assumption is mutually manifest" (Sperber and Wilson 1995 41- 42).

The model developed with the help of these assumptions is:

Ostensive Inferential Communication => [Discourse Initiator] E & [A, B, C…] & Ostensive Stimulus (reformulation, insertion of Indian language words and phrases) = [Discourse Recipient] E
Where E= Shared Cognitive Environment
A, B, C…= Contextual Information

Now with the above model, it can be inferred the writers under discussion with their knowledge of the country and its multilingual setting, which forms an integral part of their cognition, during the process of writing give clues about their meaning by creating a shared cognitive environment (See. Chakravarty and Gaur, 2011). Thus, Relevance Theory can offer to literary studies an understanding of the use of literary multilingualism, and the ways by which a text is used to communicate the meaning of the author to the reader.

**Analysis**

In the following section, Relevance theoretic analysis is used based upon the theory of Sperber and Wilson to illustrate how the Diasporic authors use language and the recurrent images in their novels to construct and vividly portray the characters and their lives. However, this analysis does not illustrate the complex relations and constant interaction existing between our cognition and its manifestation. Rather, it attempts to give a somewhat schematic idea of the potential sources from which information can be supplied during the process of communication, which takes place between the author and readers, and map the location of discourse internal information and its meaning within the broader picture of the plot of a literary text. By analysing the mutual cognitive environment created by Ghosh, Divakaruni, Desai and Mistry within the framework of the two categories (viz., Pragma-Markers and S Markers) identified earlier in this study the novels' appeal to the readers is underscored:

1. Pragma-Markers: This category is created to classify the usage of literary multilingualism in the eight novels undertaken for study. These are being named

as pragma-markers as their functions are more pragmatic than syntactic. As research on word order of English states that English is a SVO language and Indian languages are SOV. The word order rule is followed more strictly in writing that in speech. However it is seen that in case of literary multilingualism the word order is not consistently maintained in the sense that the interspersing of other language elements include: fillers, exclamatory particles and reformulations. The examples used in this chapter appear in these texts as conversational discourse and general narrative discourse. Specifically, the mechanisms include the following two categories:

1.1) Exclamatory Particles and Fillers as Pragma-Markers: The non-canonical word order in speech or to reproduce a style of speech, creation of sarcastic, satirical or ironic tone and creation of an authentic tone. Researchers describe the canonical word order, SOV, is not necessarily maintained in conversational Hindi or Bengali. It is observed that in the literary texts taken up for study there is the occurrence of subjects, objects, and other constituents before the subject and after the predicate in a sentence. The study divides sentences constituents that are present before a subject or after predicate into two types. In the first type, it is considered to be motivated by factors such as thinking time; there is a prosodic break between the subject and the pre-subject element. Some examples from the texts are given below. For example, the use of fillers occur regulary to depict dialogue forms like in the examples below 'Um', 'Uh-huh'. There is also a set of vocabulary that is associated mostly with speech (i.e. colloquial expressions) like 'Hai' and 'Arey'. The differences between spoken and written in Hindi or Bengali language are not limited to these structural differences. However, this chapter is concerned with the structural differences and similarities and makes only brief references to these other types of differences. The literature that studies word order of Hindi or Bengali definitively states: sentence-final expressions such as final particles and tag-like expressions are considered to be part of the predicate. One way of ensuring that this flow of information is preserved is through the use non-canonical constructions, i.e. syntactic structure in which the canonical order of element (in English, Subject-Verb-Object) is rearranged. Chafe (1976) uses the term packaging to refer to this use of syntactic structuring to serve pragmatic functions. He further notes that by choosing to package information using one structure rather than another, a writer accommodates his or her writing to various "states of addressee's mind", which is nowhere more evident than diasporic writing (Stouck 7). Like in the writer's use of interjections, fillers and sentential constructions of another language as in *Queen of Dreams* and *The Mistress of Spices* Divakaruni uses the category of Pragma-marker

with the help of fillers and exclamatory particles.

> Um-what do you mean, special? Is that like an imaginary friend (QOD 74)?

In the first example from *Queen of Dreams* Divakaruni uses the filler Um as a pragma-marker to show how Rakhi takes time to think while discussing about her daughter Jonaki's obsession with her imaginary friend and it is portrayed in such a manner that it is like a real conversation. It also shows to the reader how she is worried that her daughter might get upset with her questioning and the hesitancy in her mind is made clear by the author with the filler *Um*.

The other two examples from *The Mistress of Spices* illustrate the use of exclamatory particles *Hai* and *Arre* as a pragma-marker.

> Hai, you are talking like Ramu now, and his wife, that Sheela who brought up her girl too lax, never a slap even, and see what has happened (TMOS 85).

> Arre baap, so what if this is America, we are still Bengalis, no (TMOS 85)?

In both the examples, the author with the help of these two pragma-markers expresses the contextual information about how Leela's grandfather is unhappy with the socio-cultural situation of America. He disapproves of the unbidden freedom that a young woman gets in the country. In the first example, he shows his disapproval with the help of the exclamatory particle *Hai*. In the second example, the use of *Arre* shows to the reader that his earlier depression about his son's behaviour has turned into irritation as it is now added with another exclamatory word *baap*. *Baap* as a word means father but when added to a particle like *Arre* it becomes an emphatic marker. The author with help of this particle provides the reader with ostensive stimulus as well as the background knowledge to convey the meaning.

Similarly Mistry too uses exclamatory particles as pragma-markers for building the "mutual cognitive environment". The instances of pragma-markers in both his novels are the particles *Arey*. The spelling of this particle in both novels changes with the change in the language background of the character.

Here in the first example from *Such a Long Journey* the exclamatory particle *Arre* is spelled in such a way as to represent the pronunciation of places like Mumbai in western India.

> "Arre, no seth. Not like that, never" (SALJ 135).

The Gurkha in this example is disagreeing with Gustad's opinion that "he is sleeping all night without doing his duty." The guard tones down the negative quality of speech and adds the exclamatory particle. The particle *Arre* is making it possible to make the conversation run smoothly even in an uncomfortable moment. It provides the reader with the contextual assumption needed for the reader to create the author's intention.

In the two examples from *A Fine Balance* the particle *Arey* is spelt with a sound making the pronunciation nearer to Eastern India.

> "Aray Chotu, not so loud," said Dukhi. (AFB 102) / "Aray father-of-ishvar, what did you do to my child" (AFB 103)!

In the first usage of the particle, the mother is light-heartedly asking the child to stop crying, and the particle provides the intention of the author that Dukhi is not upset with the sound. The next usage is where the particle becomes a part of a phrase which is an example of transliteration from Hindi. Both usages provide the reader with the information about the backgrounds of the speakers and this helps in building the "cognitive environment".

There is another set of particle that Mistry uses in his novels which validate the view that these writers are reflecting the spoken variety of Indian languages. The particle *bas* is used as a pragma-marker in two different positions, initial and final for different contextual reasons. In his novel *Such a Long Journey*, Mistry uses *bas* in both the situations.

> Bas, it is too much for…. (SALJ 236)!

> A glass of cold water for me, bas (SALJ 38).

In the first sentence bas occurs in the initial position as an exclamatory particle, it functions in a way that it gives the sense of "enough" in the sentence. The particular usage brings to life a scene in the novel wherein a person is giving a speech and how the rest of the colony is unappreciative of his opinion.

In the second example from the same novel, the position of bas is at the end of the sentence. In this occurrence, it functions as a confirming particle instead of an exclamatory particle and gives the sense of "that's all" in the sentence. Dinshawji declines Gustads offer for a drink and ask for just water.

The second usage is from *A Fine Balance* in which the particle occurs at the

beginning of the sentence.

Bas I'll keep my mouth shut from now on and think quietly (AFB 471).

The pragma-marker in this sentence helps the reader to understand the disappointment and failure Ishvar feels when he could not convince Dina to get Om married and then stay at her place with his wife.

This particle has a finality attached to it and the author unlike his use of *Arey* uses this very rarely. Bas is not used by the other novelists in their texts. The reason behind this maybe that unlike Mistry who believes in keeping his novels' language as close to Indian language as possible the other authors experiment with other methods like translations etc. The use of particles like *Arey* is more natural because of its limited functions thereby making it more acceptable in the globalized society. In contrast, particle *bas* in Hindi or Bengali is multifunctional and thus has ambiguous meanings, which is not as easily incorporated in English as *Arey* can be.

The two examples that are studied here are from Ghosh's *The Hungry Tide* and *Sea of Poppies*. In this with the usage of *Aray* the writer represents similar conversation situation when we meet someone and show our surprise at the sudden meeting.

The first example is from *The Hungry Tide*

"Are tumi" (THT 19)!

Through the use of an expression like above *Are tumi* the author tries to interweave the diverse elements of age etc. that are eminently present in every human life and construct the social picture for the reader in the text.

Ghosh with the incorporation of *Aray* particle in the extract from *Sea of Poppies*, attempts to portray another aspect of that time when major socio-cultural changes were taking place in places like Bengal. In this kind of sentence, *na* is questioning particle coming finally.

It functions in such a way as to affirm the answer to be true of the sentence it is questioning "Arre Jodu na? Isn't that you – Jodu Naskar" (SOP 63)?

In the foregoing example, the inclusion of exclamatory particle intermixed with the negative particle enables the author to create the natural conversation like atmosphere vividly.

The last examples in this category are of Kiran Desai's *Hullabaloo in the Guava Orchard* and *The Inheritance of Loss*.

The first example is the exclamatory particle Aray with its spelling representing the pronunciation of Northern Indian language. "Arre, Sampathji, how could you

do that" (HGO 43)? The usage of *Arre* is generally for positive emotion, but in this case, the particle portrays incredulity and disbelief. The author builds the "cognitive environment" for the reader where he can get the author's meaning with the help of the contextual information.

The example below is from *The Inheritance of Loss* portraying familiar formulaic expressions used in most spoken language.

"Owwaa", she shouted… "Oooph" she said" (TIL 116).
"Hm. What long fingers. Little nails. But look, you bite them" (TIL 115).

The onomatopoeic exclamatory particle is used to represent surprise or pain, and the other interjection is used for disgust. Though the above sentence has no other, information except for these two particles, still it provides the cue to build the possible conversation situation and helps in the understanding of the author's meaning.

The other example from the novel is an interjection used for agreement. It also shows a noncommittal approval in a situation where one is not ready to give direct opinions like in this interaction where Sai and her tutor are exploring about each other and yet not prepared to show their impressions clearly.

1.2) Reformulation as Pragma-Marker: Production of an element to redo any linguistic expression just produced. The practice of reformulation written in texts can be easily considered as features that represent the essence of spoken language reflecting the dynamic, interactive nature of speech. Thus, one would expect that writers cannot adopt these features because they are not engaged in ongoing, emerging interactions as speakers are. However, the Diasporic writers do attempt to utilize some of these crucial features of spoken discourse as shown below. In the first instance, this feature can be seen in Amitav Ghosh's novels *The Hungry Tide* and *Sea of Poppies*.

To accurately portray Kusum's character in the novel, Ghosh furnishes the clue for her role by using a simile like a storm, a jhor and emphasize with the reformulation. Moyna nodded. I've heard people say she was like a storm, a jhor (THT 137).

In this example, the reformulation of the simile has two functions first it helps in building a good rapport between Moyna and Kanai. The second function is to help the reader understand about the admiration that existed between a village girl like Kusum and a suave character like Kanai.

Further, from this reformulation, the reader becomes aware of all characters'

background as well as their view of each other. The example is from *Sea of Poppies*, "ka bhaile? What's happening? He said at last in his hoarse unmindful way, and she felt sure now that if he'd ever had any memory of that night, his slow, simple mind had long since lost track of it. Ey-re kalua, she said, that man of mine is unwell at the factory; he has to be brought home" (SOP 60).

The preceding example from Ghosh's *Sea of Poppies* facilitates explanation as it illustrates "emphasis through repetition". The first question in Bhojpuri "ka bhail?" is just followed by the English translation. The pattern is of two or more sentences coexist in the construction as in speech we say something twice to provide the question of some importance. The character of Kalua is from the backward classes of the society, and as a person, he is timid so while talking to a woman and that too of a higher level this reformulation helps the reader to see the hesitancy in his behaviour.

The next examples of reformulation are found in Divakaruni's novels *The Mistress of Spices* and *Queen of Dreams*. Unlike Ghosh who whose both novels are replete with these markers, Divakaruni uses reformulation as pragma-marker in particular instances. In *The Mistress of Spices* the reformulation is present only when Tilo the co-protagonist of the novel calls to her spices for help the names of spices are given in two languages side by side.

> Adrak ginger, and so I called on ginger. Be with me…Root of gnarled wisdom, ada in your hide of banded brown, help me in this my seeking… (TMOS 123).

> "The dry chilli, lanka, is the most potent of spices (TMOS 37).

Speak to me, fennel, mouri, coloured like the freckled house sparrow that brings amity where it nests, spice to digest sorrows and in their digestion make us strong (TMOS 106).

The above examples are all instances where Tilo is acting as the Spice mistress and calling onto her spices for some or other purpose. The reformulation in this novel alludes to real conversation situation. The repeated word helps to build the impression that this is a real calling ceremony hence adding to the mystic element of the plot.

The reformulation of "Chai House" is a very apt example to build the "cognitive environment" of cultural amalgamation insofar as the word chai connoting an Indian tea shop is conjoined with the English word house which is generally used in conjunction with the word coffee evoking images of Coffee Houses of yesteryears.

> They have decided to transform the Chai House into an Indian snack shop, a chaer dokan, as it would be called in Calcutta (QOD 185).

The term *chaer dokan* repeated much later in the sentence could be seen as an ostensive stimulus from the author to the reader stressing the point that once you accept the "word for foreign food" of another cultural group you have broken the first barrier and are on your way to acceptance of a different culture.

The last example of reformulation as pragma-marker in the novels is from Desai's *The Inheritance of Loss* wherein she writes about an Indian myth in a casual way.

> … Thereby angering two snakes, mia-bibi, husband and wife, who lived in a hole nearby (TIL13).

The extract is taken from the part of the novel where the Judge's Cook is thinking about how he had broken into a snakes pit to use as a lavatory and the snakes were disturbed by this activity thus became angry. The author shares a very profound aspect of Indian culture, i.e. their various deities. The reference of the snakes as personified husband and wife and its reformulation in Hindi helps to create the 'cognitive environment' about cultural beliefs in a relaxed manner.

Rohinton Mistry in both his texts does not use reformulation of any kind. His instances of literary multilingualism are the usage of Hindi or Gujarati words and phrases without any translation such as, "Paan we don't chew only," said Ishvar." But sometimes we like to smoke a beedi" (AFB 9). but as can be noticed the sentence structure in the first part of the sentence is spoken Indian English and the reason maybe his plots are generally constructed in India thus he subconsciously places the reader of his tale in India and does not translate his literary multilingualism.

2. S-Marker: This marker is developed to classify a unique set of examples in literary multilingualism, which can be said to be grammatical. Following of plurality rules in any language generally decides whether construction is grammatically correct or not. However, sociolinguistic analysis of natural language, take an entirely different view. They opine that many words and structures are characteristic of, especially informal; speech need not follow strict rules of grammar or nonstandard spellings. Of this category, this study has found the plural rules of English being over-generalized in Hindi words.

The first instance of usage of S-marker is from Divakaruni's *Queen of Dreams* and *The Mistress of Spices,*

> …Oh mom, not alu parathas again (QOD 31)!

They want fresh coriander seed, organic of course, or pure ghee for as karma free diet, or yesterday's burfis at half price (TMOS 67).

The S-marker at the end of *alu-paratha* in Queen of Dreams refers to the innumerable times that Rakhi has to eat it because her mother made her. In the other example too *burfis* provides the reader that it is an instance of continuous thought and that it is an informal situation. The grammatical mistakes also help in the illusion of a spoken situation wherein the informal quality of speech has been captured by the usage.

Ghosh in his two novels also uses the S-marker. His usage in *The Hungry Tide* reads as if it is an instance of spontaneous speech.

> He spoke to the demons and ghostly ganas, the dainis, the pisachas and all the rakshasas (THT 381).

In the above example, Ghosh describes a situation where a jungle ritual is being performed by Fokir to invite all mythical creatures for protection. The S-marker helps in the creation of the illusion as to the huge numbers of these creatures.

In the example from *Sea of Poppies* among the group boarding Ibis she is the new *girmitiya* who has this constant companion, a small bundle under her arm.

> …Sarju, the midwife, had buried her face in her precious bundles and bojhas…. (SOP 354).

The word *bojhas* though alluding to a single bundle creates the picture of the huge uncertainty of the lonely woman who uses the bundle as protection from the outside world. Mistry in A Fine Balance and Kiran Desai in The Inheritance of Loss uses the S marker in the word *chapati*. This word with the plural marker –s is present in most of these writers. Also, Desai like Divakaruni adds this marker to other bread forms like *puri* and *paratha*.

> Om granted his affirmation, adding, chapatis are a little dry, not as nice as

yesterday. You didn't follow my method or what (AFB 613)?
"The judge ate even his chapatis, his puris and parathas, with knife and fork." (TIL 176).

The usage in both the authors is for slightly different reasons. In Mistry, the *chapatis* are used for the construction today's *chapati* as in yesterday's *chapati* was better than today's *chapati*. But in Desai's *chapatis*, *puris*, *parathas* it shows that nothing ever is eaten with hands.

Thus, all these authors use the S-marker as interlocutors and portray spoken language. These markers make greater use of shared knowledge like spoken discourse. Further, the S markers are also used to perform phatic functions, such as "creating a real experience" for the reader where unplanned and casual discourse helps in the overall appeal of the novels.

After analysing the examples from the novels following conclusions were drawn. These above examples give the real world knowledge as well as create a mutual cognitive environment for the reader. Of the structural differences between speech and writing, the features that are sometimes present in these four contemporary fiction writers' novels include Pragma-markers and S-markers. It is not be decided that the distinctions are not being used naturally. The pattern that is seen is that these writers strategically adopt specific features through these two markers and create "cognitive environment" for the reader. In other words, their writing includes fillers, exclamatory particles, reformulations etc. Their sentences may be repetitive with new spelling rules from English language used in Indian language constructions. This makes their literary discourses look like it may have gone through a dynamic process because it includes reformulation and fillers. Particularly when encountering the above structures, which have been 'created' by the author in the text, our imagination is aroused as to the place and time, we feel we are faced with a typical scene that we all know so well. On the other hand, the foreign reader can envisage the social reality in India and can visualize what occurs there thus giving them an idea of real-world knowledge. Therefore the novels, according to the principle of Relevance Theory, hint at the authors' intention and the readers decide on the interpretation of the fictional work which satisfies all questions resulting in the completion of the communication cycle.

**Discussion**

This analysis has investigated the functions of literary multilingualism in selected novels of four India Diasporic novelists. By what was found in the novels with the

help of two categories referred to as Pragma-markers and S-markers, it is suggested that the following are the functions that literary multilingualism perform. The use of pragma markers like *Arey*, *Hai* etc. are generally due to lack of proper translation of such expressions in English. In case of fillers as pragma-markers, there are no English specific markers present.

The use of such expressions, reformulation, and plural elements provide a better understanding of the text by the reader. It also allows authenticity to the characters and makes the plot more believable for the reader. Following the examples from the texts, one saw that some contemporary writers are adopting various characteristics of spoken discourse in their writing. The study contends that these writers are taking spoken language features for forming a distinctive style. Scholars like Suzuki argue that these writers are influenced by the style of communication situation around the world. To summarize the argument of the paper, I would like to draw upon views from literary critics and linguists.

> Amitav Ghosh's work introduces a number of "languages", including those of the Indian folktale, the Mahabharata, journalism, and the memory pattern of the extended family, radically deconstructing traditional novel forms (52).

Here Louis James highlights the view that scholars have noted the variety of languages present in these authors' novels. Further critics like Tapan Ghosh discuss other linguistic features such as exclamation marks, use of capital letters, unpunctuated words that often reads like a breathlessly long sentence in Desai (76), thus showing that the critics are conscious of the choice of a different style of writing in these authors. He also cites another example from Desai:

> Bananafritterpineapplefritterapplefritterapplesurpriseapplecharlotteapplebettyb readandbutterjamtartcaramelcustardtipsypuddingrumtumpuddingjamarolypoly-gingersteamdatepuddinglemonpancakeeggcustardorangecustardcoffeecustarstr awberrycustardtrifle…." (64), employment of slang and swear words(181,190), Hinglish jingles like Shopping keliyejayenge,bhelpurikhayenge…dollars me kamaenge, pumpumpum (298), lines from Islamic prayer (136),Bollywood film songs (51,53) and advertising doggerel (194)

The above quote further shows that critics are aware of the writer's choices of features of spoken discourse. Considering this, it is interesting to read Aijaz Ahmad's commentary. As Aijaz Ahmad has noted, English is the language most

removed in its cultural ambience (or discursive affinities, regarding this book) from other Indian languages. While Aijaz Ahmad notes this "difficulty" in the context of using English as the language in which the knowledge of "Indian" literature is produced", this gap between the "ambience and structure" of English and other Indian languages creates at least two major problems for the Indian English writer- the problem of dialogue and the problem of mapping (99). By acknowledging the problem of the conventional style of writing, Aijaz signals to the reader about the reason for the adoption of a non-conventional stance. He further states that the problem of dialogue can be seen to be solved by,

> "…at least two major writers (Desani and Rushdie) solve by trying to evolve a seemingly pidgin Indian English that develops the tradition of literal translation into a type of artistic eco-language, a language sounding un-English and Indian while remaining English and not being literally Indian. This last effort is, of course, not unique – in the sense that many other attempts at a careful replication of real dialogue (or dialect) (Mark Twain, Thomas Hardy, Emile Bronte, George Eliot in Adam Bede) can be shown to be a selective and stylized version of the dialect being copied" (100).

Similarly, the writers who incorporate features of spoken discourse into their literary writing may be doing so for creative as well as linguistic purposes. Additionally, to being creative, the writers of this style of writing have motivations related explicitly to features of spoken discourse. To discuss the fundamental differences between speech and writing in general, Chafe (1982) says the following:

> […] the speaker is aware of an obligation to communicate what he or she has in mind in a way that reflects the richness of his or her thoughts – not to present a logically coherent but experientially stark skeleton, but to enrich it with the complex details of real experiences – to have less concern for consistency than for experiential involvement. The situation for the writer is fundamentally different. […] the writer is less concerned with experiential richness, and more concerned with producing something that will be consistent and defensible when read by different people at different times in different places, something that will stand the test of time (45).

This may mean that those Diasporic writers who adopt features of spoken language are looking for experiencing the pluralism present in India. Griffiths, Ashcroft and

Tiffin argue that language and characterisation go a long way in emphasizing the "ethnic pluralism" of Indian life and are reflexive of the multicultarality of the nation in the text (215). When the reformulation and filler examples were discussed, it was mentioned that such reformulation in speech can be attributed to the notions of afterthought and repair. Though writers have time to plan their writing, the conventional sense of repair and afterthought does not apply when such examples occur in writing. On the use of reformulation and fillers as Pragma markers in the novels one can refer to the quote by Chafe above. In addition, as this study has denoted these features as Pragma-markers this can be corroborated by Clancy (1982) who writes that one aspect of the "involvement" characteristic of spoken discourse is that writers feel they should try to convey some of the rich, experiential detail, which is more lifelike in their context building, rather than simply narrating events in the novels. It is seen that these are present in the authors' works like: Ghosh with reformulated phrases like "ka bhaile? What's happening?" (SOP 60). It is because different reformulated and filler constructions impose constraints on the familiarity level, which in turn can assist the reader in constructing a coherent discourse representation thus helping in its interpretation. The S-markers i.e. the plural -s markers like *parathas* from Divakaruni's *Queen of Dreams* and the other authors provide rich, experiential aspect to the sentences too. However, the spoken style features are strategically placed in the novels.

Further, finding out these specific places where they use the speech like features might reveal their purpose. The purpose as apparent from the writers' texts device ways to add flavor to their writing through the use of Pragma-markers and S-markers.

Evidently, these writers use these features of spoken discourse because they want to involve their readers and make them feel more connected to their texts. Thereby, appealing to their sensibilities.

As mentioned earlier, Tabish Khair writes about the problem of mapping providing justification that the Indian English writer confronted,

> …the problem of writing in English about a country whose physical and cultural geographies are yet to be comprehensively mapped by and in (Indian) English. Moreover, given a country where English is not widely spoken, the first problem leads, whether we like it or not, to dilemma of translating speech from spoken Indian languages to a remote (predominantly textual) language such as English (101).

In other words, writers use spoken discourse features in their writing when they want to involve and engage readers without confusing them with the above mentioned problems. The novels with this kind of language are quite emotive and interesting. There is ample proof provided by monolingual writers who use conversation like features to connect with their readers. Mostly, this kind of effect is realized owing to spoken style writing.

Lakoff (qtd. in Suzuki 604) describes naturalistic representations of conversation in fiction where one can see that by using conversation like features such as ellipses, fragments, expletives, dialectal and colloquial forms in their main (that is, non-dialog) texts writers' connect with their readers.

Taking another aspect in her examination of Indian English writers, Spivak notes that in this planned, speech-like features are the declaration of their diversity in the globalized world. Her study focuses on the authors simulating the processes, structure and dynamism of an everyday conversation, by which they attempt to involve readers in order to control and manipulate them.

> In the wake of swiftly changing global cosmopolitan identities riding the foam on waves of diversified Diasporas, what was an upper-class, upwardly mobile or upwardly aspiring private relationship to a vernacular in national peripheral space is literally "re-territorialised" as the public declaration of ethnic identity in the metropolitan space of the newish migrant writer… ( Khair, 102).

A similar conclusion is reached by Meenakshi Mukherjee when she opines that "recent Indian English fiction appears to be assuming the transparency of Indian English much more readily and unproblematically than the generation of Rao and Anand did" (Khair 110).

In connection with the use of words and phrases of Indian languages with or without English translations that are also sometimes italicized in Kiran Desai, Tapan Ghosh discusses the rationale behind such a usage:

> Such audacious mixing of English and other lexical items lends a diasporic feel to her language and makes it a suitable medium to evoke the multicultural and polyglossic reality that the novel depicts…for example: "No ghasphoos, no twigs and leaves", Angrezkatarah. Like the English" (78).

Desai's characters continually deploy literary multilingualism, to portray the movement in person and the mind, for instance, the judge lying awake at night

while reminiscing about his experiences in Britain. This can be substantiated with the views given by Tejinder Kaur,

> Thus, we find that Desai foregrounds the idea of home not as a fixed but as in transition ambivalent location by portraying different migrants relating differently to the concepts of home, homeland and the lands of adoption as per their situation, settlements and attitudes. She further writes that in the text through the multiple experiences and situations located in India, Desai has also shown that the Diasporic experience is linked not only with the transnational land, across political borders, rather it is more a matter of what Jan Mohammad calls, "the positionality of the subject" during the historic political clashes of power politics between communities and races (134).

In the extract quoted above Kaur investigates the use of conversation-like features in texts of present day Indian English writers. It can be argued that fiction containing dialogic features may be grouped under the general label of an involving and persuasive text type. Novels' using exclamatory expressions of both Hindi and Bengali and interrogatives such as "Arey?" allows the writer to construct the intended reader's cognitive environment, simulate the interaction with him/her, create a discourse where the reader is given an implicit message and thus involved as a participant in the authors explicit message. This, in turn, contributes to the creation of reader involvement. In this way, other studies in English concur that writers who use exclamatory particles are motivated by the intention to increase the texts' involvement with the readers.

Further, it is noticed that social interaction has moved from rules of written discourse to more oral structure. As Lakoff says, "As a culture we are contemplating — if we have not taken already — a leap from being written-oriented to being oral-oriented" (qtd. in Suzuki: 605). It is apparent in this globalized world that this is prevalent in Indian society as well. It has further established that Desai, Divakaruni, Ghosh and Mistry are using various structural characteristics of spoken discourse in their writing. Specifically, they place Hindi, Bengali before an English sentence or use exclamatory particles freely, follow spelling rules of English into Hindi and Bengali words. Moreover, these writers reformulate their sentences. This kind of usage makes their literary discourse looks as if it were constructed dynamically and spontaneously.

It can be said that the major reason why the novelists taken up for study reflect spoken discourse in their literary discourse in this manner is that this style of

writing is an endeavour developed by the writers to engage, involve, and connect with their readers. In today's world in any form of communication the boundary between spoken and written discourse is not as strongly marked as it was earlier. Specific places where they use spoken style writing indicate that the use of this style is not accidental but it is consciously used in order to create a mutual cognitive environment for the reader to comprehend. Thus, these authors may be reflecting as well as expressing contemporary society wherein freer language rules are viewed without contempt and "orality" provides better opportunities for learning and understanding a language.

**Conclusion**

To conclude one can say that analysing the manifestations of literary multilingualism was of great interest and significance to understand the overall 'effects' of the Diasporic writers such Ghosh, Divakaruni, Desai and Mistry. Moreover, it is a topical issue, which led to very noteworthy results. The proposed analysis of three different manifestation of 'literary multilingualism' within a Relevance Theoretic framework positioned the selected novels as multilingual texts reflecting the language situation in a globalized world. The conclusion drawn from the textual evidence showed that use of literary multilingualism in specific places in the texts produced communicative effects vis-à-vis understanding of the texts. A different manifestation lead to a different communicative effect i.e. Pragma- Markers and S-Markers produced 'cognitive environment' for the reader to understand and appreciate the text. Further, the analysis of the eight texts selected for this study with the help of Relevance Theory and Sociolinguistics and Cross-Cultural approaches explicated that the selected use of literary multilingualism infused element of reality into the novels. Thus, the present work established that literary multilingualism adds to the overall readability of these novels.

**Works Cited**

Ahmad, Aijaz. *In Theory: Classes, Nations, Literatures*. London: Verso, 1992.

Auer, Peter. *Bilingual Conversation*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 1984.

—. "A Conversation Analytic Approach to Code-switching and Transfer." *Codeswitching: Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. Ed. M. Heller. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter, (1988) 187-213.

—. "Bilingualism in/as Social Action: A Sequential Approach to Code Switching." Paper read at the ESF-Symposium on "Code-Switching in Bilingual Studies: Theory, Significance and

Perspectives." Barcelona, 21-23 March, preliminary version, 1991. 319-352.

—. "The Pragmatics of Code-switching: A Sequential Approach." *One Speaker, Two Languages: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives On Code Switching*. Ed. L. Milroy & P. Muysken. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge UP, 1995. 115-135.

—. "Introduction: Bilingual Conversation Revisited." *Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity*. Ed. P. Auer. London & New York: Routledge,1998.1-24.

—. "From Codeswitching via Language Mixing to Fused Lects: Toward a Dynamic Typology of Bilingual Speech." *The International Journal of Bilingualism* 3 .4 (1999): 309-332.

—. "Why Should We and How Can We Determine the 'Base Language' of a Bilingual Conversation?" Eds. X.P. Rodríguez-Yáñez, A.M. Lorenzo Suárez & M.C. Cabeza Pereiro. *Estudios de Sociolingüística: Linguas, sociedades e culturas*, 1.1, 2000.129-144.

Bhatia, Tej K., and William C. Ritchie, eds. *The Handbook of Bilingualism*. Wiley Blackwell, 2006.

—. "The Bilingual Mind and Linguistic Creativity." *Journal of Creative Communication* 3:1 (2008): 5-21.

Bhat, Raj Nath. "Globalization and English Language in India: An Overview." *Problematizing Language Studies: Cultural, Theoretical And Applied Perspectives : Essays In Honor of Rama Kant Agnihotri*. Eds. S. Imtiaz Hasnain and Shreesh Chaudhary. DK Agency (P) Ltd.2010.574-582.Web.

Chafe, Wallace L. "Integration and involvement in speaking, writing, and oral literature." *Spoken and Written Language: Exploring Orality and Literacy*. Ed. Deborah Tannen. Norwood, NJ. Ablex, 1982. 35-53.Web.

Chakravarty, Urjani and Rashmi Gaur. "Environment Constructs as a Communication Tool." *Atlantic Literary Review* 12.2 (June 2011):86-95.

Clancy, Patricia M. "Written and Spoken Style in Japanese Narratives." *Spoken and Written Language: Exploring Orality and Literacy*. Ed. Deborah Tannen. Norwood, NJ.:Ablex, 1982. 55-76.Web.

Divakaruni, Chitra Banerjee. *The Mistress of Spices*. London:Black Swan, 1997.

—. *Queen of Dreams*. New York: Anchor, 2004.

Desai, Kiran. Hullabaloo in the Guava Orchard. U.K: Faber and Faber Ltd, 1998.

—. The Inheritance of Loss. India: Penguin Books India, 2006.

Dutta, Hemanga and P. Rajeswari. (2015). "Language Attitudes, Code Mixing and Social Variables: Evidence from Bilingual Speakers of Hyderabad." *Texas Linguistics Forum* 58: 30-39. Proceedings of the 23rd Annual Symposium about Language and Society-Austin. April 17-18, 2015.

Ghosh, Amitav. *The Hungry Tide*. London: HarperCollins, 2004.

—. *Sea of Poppies*. New Delhi: Penguin Viking 2008.

Ghosh, K. Tapan. Ed. *The Fiction of Kiran Desai: Focus on The Inheritance of Loss*. New Delhi: Prestige Books, 2009.

Gumperz, John J. "Hindi-Punjabi Code-Switching In Delhi." *Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Linguists*, 1964. 1115-24.

—. "The Sociolinguistic Significance of Conversational Code-Switching." *Working Papers of the Language Behavior Research Laboratory*, No. 46. Berkeley: University of California, 1976.

—. *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1982.

Grosjean, Francois. *Life with Two Languages: An Introduction to Bilingualism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1989.

Knauth, K. Alfons . "Literary Multilingualism I: General Outlines and Western World." *Encyclopedia of Life Support Systems* (EOLSS), *Developed under the Auspices of the UNESCO*, Eolss Publishers, Oxford ,UK, (2007). Web. Accessed on 30 August 2012.

Kaur, Tejinder. "Problematizing issues about Home, Homeland, Diaspora and Belongingness in Transnational and National Lands: A Study of Kiran Desai's *The Inheritance of Loss*." *Four Indian Novelists*. Ed. R.K. Dhawan. New Delhi: Prestige Books. 2009.127-140.

Khair, Tabish. *Babu Fictions: Alienation in Contemporary Indian English Novels*. New Delhi: Oxford UP, 2001.

—. Ed. *Amitav Ghosh: A Critical Companion*. Delhi: Permanent Black, 2003.

Khushu-Lahiri, Rajyashree and Urjani Chakravarty. "Revisiting Classics: Relevance of Jane Austen's Pride and Prejudice." *East West Journal of Humanities*. 2.2 (2011):112-122.

—. "Performing India in America through Pragma-Cultural Markers." *Comparative American Studies an International Journal* 12.1-2 (2014): 25-31.

Mistry, Rohinton. *Such a Long Journey*. India: Penguin Books Ltd. in association with Faber and Faber, 1998.

—. *A Fine Balance* .London: Faber and Faber, 2006.

Paranjpe, Makarand R. "Vernacularizing the 'Master' Tongue: Indian English and its Con Texts." *Indian English and Vernacular India*. Eds. Makarand R. Paranjpe and G.J.V Prasad. New Delhi: Pearson, 2010. 91-108.

Saxena, Akshya. "Hindi, English, and 'Hinglish': Colonial Cousins and the Revernaculari-zation of 'National' Language." *Indian English and Vernacular India*. Eds. Makarand R Paranjpe and G.J.V Prasad. New Delhi:Pearson. (2010):47-63.

Satoko, Suzuki. "Vernacular Style Writing: Strategic Blurring of the Boundary between Spoken and Written Discourse in Japanese." *Pragmatics* (IPrA) 19. 4 (2009):583- 608.Web.

Sebba, Mark. "Multilingualism In Written Discourse: An Approach To The Analysis Of Multilingual." *International Journal of Bilingualism* published online 16 April 2012.Web.

Accessed on 11 September 2012 from <http://ijb.sagepub.com/content /early/2012/04/12/136700

6912438301>Sperber, Dan and Deidre Wilson. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell, 1995.

—. "Relevance Theory". 2002. Web. Accessed on 20 September 2006 from <cogprints.org/2317/0/ relevance_theory.htm>

—. "Relevance Theory". Eds. G. Ward & L. Horn. Handbook of Pragmatics. 2004. Oxford:Blackwell.607–632. Web. Accessed on 7 October 2009 from <http://www.dan.sperber.com /relevance_theory.htm.>

—. *Explaining Culture: A Naturalistic Approach*. Oxford: Blackwell. Accessed on 12 October 2010 from < books.google.co.in/books?isbn=0631200452...>

—. Ira Noveck. "Introduction." *Experimental Pragmatics*. Palgrave. Eds. Ira Noveck & Dan Sperber. 2004. Web. Accessed on 12 September 2010 from <http://www.palgrave.com / PDFs/1403903506.Pdf>

Stouck, David. "'Hahnji' means 'Yes, sir': Reading Sameness and Difference in Canadian Writing." *Writers of Indian Diaspora: Theory and Practice*. Ed. Jasbir Jain. Jaipur/ NewDelhi: Rawat Publications. 2003:63-72.

Sridhar, Shikaripur N. and Kamal K. Sridhar. "The Syntax and Psycholinguistics of Bilingual Code Mixing." *Canadian Journal of Psychology/Revue Canadienne De Psychologie* 34.4 (1980): 407.

—. "The Ecology of Bilingual Competence: Language Interaction in the Syntax of Indigenized Varieties of English." *World Englishes* 11.2-3 (1992): 141-150.

## Web Sources

Indian English — Who or What is Indian English? Accessed on 21 October 2011 from <http://encycl.opentopia.com/term/Indian_English>

Braedyn,Amanda-Makenzie. "Intercultural Communication: Culture's Impact on Communication." Posted on Nov 8, 2010. Accessed on 20 April 2011 from <http://suite101.com/article/intercultural-communication-cultures-impact-on communication-a303600> Matsumoto, David, Seung Hee Yoo and Jeffery A. LeRoux. "Emotion and Intercultural Communication." *Handbook of Applied Linguistics, Volume 7: Intercultural*

*Communication*. Eds. Helga Kotthoff and Helen Spencer-Oatley. Mouton — de Gruyter Publishers. Chapter3 by Jen W on May 21, 2011.Web. Accessed on 20 September 2011 from <http://www.slideshare.net/beijingmusic/chapter3>

Miguelbengoa. "The Characteristics of Spoken Language." 16 February 2008.Web. Accessed on 20 January 2013 from <http://miguelbengoa.com/elt/?p=60>

责任编辑：柏 灵