

1998

Speaking of the Raj: Kipling, Forster, and Scott on the English Language in British India

Victoria K. Tatko

Eastern Illinois University

This research is a product of the graduate program in [English](#) at Eastern Illinois University. [Find out more](#) about the program.

Recommended Citation

Tatko, Victoria K., "Speaking of the Raj: Kipling, Forster, and Scott on the English Language in British India" (1998). *Masters Theses*. 1742.

<https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/1742>

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

THESIS REPRODUCTION CERTIFICATE

TO: Graduate Degree Candidates (who have written formal theses)

SUBJECT: Permission to Reproduce Theses

The University Library is receiving a number of request from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow these to be copied.

PLEASE SIGN ONE OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS:

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university or the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.


Author's Signature


Date

I respectfully request Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University **NOT** allow my thesis to be reproduced because:

Author's Signature

Date

Speaking of the Raj:

Kipling, Forster, and Scott on the English Language in British India
(TITLE)

BY

Victoria K. Tatko

1973 -

THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

Master of Arts

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1998

YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE

DATE

ADVISEE

DATE

ADVISEE

ABSTRACT

In my thesis I examine how language, particularly the English language, participated in the Raj, as depicted thematically in Rudyard Kipling's Kim (1901), E. M. Forster's A Passage to India (1924), and Paul Scott's The Raj Quartet (1966-1975): The Jewel in the Crown (1966), The Day of the Scorpion (1968), The Towers of Silence (1971), and A Division of the Spoils (1975). I show that all three authors portray language as central to British colonialism in India; the connection between the English language and the Empire grows increasingly problematic as the linguistic situation becomes a metaphor for the state of the doomed Raj.

In the section analyzing Kipling's Kim, I argue that language functions as a vital, yet limited colonial tool used by what I call Kipling's wise British administrator in preserving the empire. The text connects the English language with order, rationality, and military efficiency while in Kim the Oriental languages facilitate relational and spiritual pursuits. As Kipling's wise administrator must intimately know and be responsible for the Indian people, both sets of languages complement each other and are needed for effective management of the realm. British characters, however, are depicted as linguistically superior to Indians in acquiring languages, an ability that Kim uses to justify imperialism in India. Indian characters, in contrast, fail to acquire fluency in English and thus lack the rationality and order that Kipling depicts as necessary for self-government. I further argue that in Kim Kipling uses linguistic relations didactically to present his utopian vision of how the empire ought to be governed. The text also provides negative examples to illustrate that British imperialists should not be scornfully ignorant of India's people, cultures, and languages. I posit that Kipling not only perceived

threats to the Raj, but wrote Kim as a warning to a linguistically snobbish Britain.

In the section discussing E. M. Forster's A Passage to India, I argue that the English language catalyzes the novel's cultural and personal conflicts. Both Indians and Britons reveal very different methods of interpreting and employing language. British characters use language to discover truth and to order reality, an enterprise that proves to be nearly impossible in Forster's India. In contrast, Indian characters often employ language in what Forster's narrative voice describes as "truth of mood," using words that enhance a situation's aura but may or may not be intended literally. Members of each group frequently misinterpret the speech of members of the other group; this miscommunication leads to the most tragic conflict of the novel, the Marabar Caves incident. The novel suggests that only through mutual affection can miscommunication be avoided or kept at a minimum. Although Forster's narrative voice appears often sympathetic to the Indians' plight, I further argue that it distances itself from both Indian and British groups.

In the third section I argue that Paul Scott's The Raj Quartet uses the English language thematically to expose the illusions and lamentable failures of the Raj. By depicting the persecution of Scott's Hari Kumar, an Indian raised to speak and think as a Briton, the text reveals that the Empire rests not on objective truths, but rather on illusions. Language in general and English in particular are exposed as culturally based and culturally subjective; English, therefore, fails to be the common, uniting language for multi-tongued India. Further, historical accounts of the dying Raj are presented as subjective and fragmented, yet characters persistently write such accounts in an effort to bring order to the turbulent period. I additionally argue that Scott's Raj

Quartet inverts Kipling's Kim and exposes the myth of the colonial Bildungsroman. Scott distorts Kipling's wise, linguistically diverse British administrator into the sadistic, oppressive Merrick who employs language as a torture device. In this context, many characters sympathetic to the Indians' plight abandon language altogether--especially English, with its cultural and political baggage--and adopt silence. Other sympathetic characters pursue linguistic expression, but do so more privately, seeking order and understanding of the Raj's chaotic wreckage.

Because these novels of Kipling, Forster, and Scott reveal a respect for India, her peoples, and her cultures--each expressed in its own way--never do they advocate the complete domination of the English language over the Indian tongues. Even Kipling's Kim limits English's domain, supports the Indian peoples' retention of their own languages, and even advocates linguistic diversity among Britons. Forster and Scott more pessimistically depict problems encountered when a language is transplanted into a country whose forms challenge the Western mind. Yet all three authors implicate the English language to share blame for the Raj's troubles and, ultimately, its failure.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge my indebtedness to the social psychological and sociolinguistic theories of Henri Tajfel, Howard Giles, Richard Bourhis, and Donald Taylor. The work of these scholars deepened my understanding of language and helped to expand my analysis of language in the six novels examined.

I acknowledge with gratitude the assistance of Dr. Anne Zahlan in the completion of my thesis. Her invaluable guidance, encouragement, and advocacy directed me through every stage of the thesis process and was indispensable to me for completing this thesis.

I am also indebted to my parents, Richard and Marjorie Klein, who have always supported my educational endeavors; without their assistance I would never have begun my master's program, let alone complete a thesis. My parents-in-law, John and Gail Tatko, also contributed valuable encouragement, support, and even critique of my thesis drafts.

Finally, I would like to thank my husband, Brett, who not only assumed household and child-care duties so that I could be free to work, but bore with my frustrations and continually prodded me along both in my thinking and my writing.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction	1
II. Speaking in Tongues: Embracing Linguistic Diversity in Kipling's <u>Kim</u>	6
III. Speaking at Cross-Purposes: Misinterpretation in Forster's <u>A Passage to India</u>	26
IV. Culturally Speaking: Subjectivity and Illusion in Scott's <u>The Raj Quartet</u>	50
V. Conclusion	75
Notes	77
Works Cited	80

I

In what sociolinguist Braj B. Kachru describes as "the second diaspora of English" (231), the English language accompanied its conquering speakers in imperial expansion throughout the globe. The language of that small island off the west coast of Europe became widely established in five continents as "a primary tool of communication, administration, elitism, and, eventually, linguistic control" (232). Through Britain's acquisition of empire, the English language gained status and power from its conquering speakers--often at the expense of the colonized peoples and their languages. Expressing ideas similar to Robert Phillipson's concept of linguistic imperialism, African thinker Ngugi wa Thiong'o states that through the imposition of the colonizers' language, English, the "colonial child was made to see the world and where he stands in it as seen and defined by or reflected in the culture of the language of imposition" (17). Through the language-conveyed cultural values (Ngugi 13), the English-speaking colonial child connected "his own native languages . . . with low status, humiliation, corporal punishment, [and] slow-footed intelligence and ability or downright stupidity" (18). In this way, Ngugi asserts that the English language influenced the relationship between colonizer and colonized by illuminating the conflicting paths toward, on the one hand, social mobility, industrialization, and economic growth but, on the other, devaluation of indigenous culture, peoples, and languages. Thus, when selecting which language they would speak, members of indigenous groups were often forced to choose between progress and ethnicity, social status and cultural tradition, alienation and shame.

Thus do many postcolonial intellectuals, such as Chinua Achebe and Ngugi wa Thiong'o, retrospectively perceive language's role in colonialism. Yet, how did the British perceive a linguistic diaspora so extensive that the sun never set on the English language? With enthusiasm? With reserve? Did they recognize how their language facilitated the colonization of, for example, India, a land that historically has heard the interactions of many diverse tongues? Did Britons themselves perceive the language as synonymous with power, colonial alienation, subjugation, exploitation, and proselytization of British culture? To answer these questions and to explore three British perceptions of English as a colonial language, I have turned to fictional works of three prominent writers of colonial India: Rudyard Kipling's Kim (1901), E. M. Forster's A Passage to India (1924), and Paul Scott's The Raj Quartet (1966-75), which consists of four novels--The Jewel in the Crown (1966), The Day of the Scorpion (1968), The Towers of Silence (1971), and A Division of the Spoils (1975).

While emphasizing the historical impact of British literature of India, Allen J. Greenberger in The British Image of India: A Study in the Literature of Imperialism 1880-1960 (1969) identifies three major periods of English writing about India--The Era of Confidence, 1880-1910; The Era of Doubt, 1910-1935; and The Era of Melancholy, 1935-1960 (4-5). Thus, to Greenberger, Kipling's Kim (1901), Forster's A Passage to India (1924), and Paul Scott's The Raj Quartet (1966-1975) represent three generations of British literature about India, as they also present progressive depictions of the English language's role in the Raj. In fact, while the novels increasingly reflect the deterioration of British imperialism in India, they all depict language in general and English in particular as central to the colonial project. Through dialogue and narratorial commentary, these British novels of India all illuminate the

power of the language in colonialism while also exposing its very hazardous weaknesses.

In the studied works, the depiction of English shifts from Kim's lauding of English as a necessary, but limited rational tool for the British administrator to A Passage to India's view of the language as a catalyst for cross-cultural misinterpretation and conflict and finally to Scott's lament that English carries too much British cultural and political baggage to unify India or to order the dying Raj's chaos. Indeed, all three authors present English, spoken by British and Indian characters, as an integral feature of the Empire and its functions. As a medium of communication, as a tool, and as a weapon, English for these three authors is intimately connected with the state of the empire in India.

Historically, English accompanied its expansionist speakers into the Indian subcontinent, yet, as Snehmoy Chaklader records, it did not initially, under the direction of Warren Hastings, the Governor-General of India, "disturb the linguistic medium in courts and administration . . . and traditional education" (56). However, after approximately twenty years of debate, in 1835, Lord Macaulay, envisioning Indians becoming competent in the western sciences, triumphed over the reigning Orientalists of Hastings' breed (Trivedi 176). In addition to promoting western science education, Macaulay had little regret for English's replacement of Indian languages and literatures:

I have no knowledge of either Sanskrit or Arabic, but I am quite ready to take the Oriental learning at the valuation of the Orientalists [that is, European scholars] themselves. I have never found one among them who could deny that a single

shelf of a good European library was worth the whole native literature of India and Arabia. (qtd. in Herz 15)

Macaulay's influence firmly planted the English language in the Indian educational system; as Percival Griffiths notes, "English and Western learning were henceforth to have preference over Sanskrit and Arabic studies" (249-50). Incidentally, many Indians favored this shift in educational content and language; for example, Raja Rammohan Roy, whom Chaklader dubs "the father of modern India," was a great advocate of English education because it countered the Orientalists' "calculated attempt 'to keep this country in darkness'" (56).

As more upper and middle class Indians learned English, they demanded that this newly acquired language, now spoken by Hindu and Muslim alike, become the language of the courts and administration, a transition that, not surprisingly, Macaulay's breed of colonial bigwigs supported (Chaklader 56-7). Despite and perhaps because English "did not go deep into the [common Indian] people," it soon acquired the status of an elite language, spoken by learned professionals, educated Indians, and the British rulers (Chaklader 60). Indeed, the language became so embedded in India that this linguistic legacy of British Empire still survives--albeit controversially--in Indian literature, government, business, and industry.

In the historical context of Macaulay's Anglicized Indian education, the British could be accused of playing god by making Indians in their own linguistic image. Yet, in the works studied, neither Kipling nor Forster nor Scott supports the promotion of English as India's common, unifying language. Indeed, all--especially Kipling, the so-called "bard of empire"--oppose linguistic Anglicization of India and predict dire results for this project. In fact, the English language functions in these novels as a metaphor

for empire and the state of its health: in Kim, for what the Raj should be achieving; in A Passage to India, for what the Raj is failing to achieve; and, in The Raj Quartet, for what the Raj intended, but utterly failed to achieve.

II. Speaking in Tongues: Embracing Linguistic Diversity in Kipling's Kim

When a writer is known as "the bard of empire," interpreting his works in a postcolonial age can at first lead to some rather obvious and distasteful conclusions. Yet, label notwithstanding, many complexities emerge in Kipling's texts, complexities so subtle as to be obscured by his "bard" identity. When the bard becomes just Kipling, his novel Kim whispers of colonial fears, the fragility of the empire, perceived threats, and rising Indian nationalism. The text does, of course, speak more loudly on the right way to run an empire, focusing on the figure of Kipling's wise British administrator, who knows the land and its people. In this near utopian vision, language functions as this administrator's vital tool for maintaining the Raj. As English and the Oriental languages possess complementary strengths and weaknesses, Kipling's administrator must be careful to apply the right language to each situation, acting and speaking for the good of the empire.

As Edward Said perceptively observes, "Kipling not only wrote about India, but was of it" (133). Born in India in 1865, Kipling spent his first five years speaking Hindustani with his ayah. In Something of Myself, he writes that this ayah had to caution him, "Speak English now to Papa and Mama." Rudyard then "spoke 'English,' haltingly translated out of the vernacular idiom that one thought and dreamed in" (4), an experience he later projected into the eponymous Kim who "tapped his foot impatiently as he translated in his own mind from the vernacular to the clumsy English" (Kim 122). After a very traumatic English education, in 1882 Kipling returned to India, where he toiled for seven years as a journalist in the Punjab. Following what he called

his "Seven Years' Hard" in the land which strongly influenced his later writings, he left India for the United States, South Africa, and later, in 1900, England, where he wrote Kim (Pinney xxv).

Kipling's twelve formative years in India reveal themselves not only in his confident depictions of an intimately familiar subject, but also in his colorfully delicate renderings of Indian dialogue. Stylistically contrasting English to the Oriental languages in both style and manner, as Stephen Hemenway observes, "Kipling usually lets the reader know which language his characters are speaking" (24). For example, Kipling's English characters employ modern English while the Hindustani or Urdu-speaking characters' speech appears more archaic. More subtly, as Hemenway notes, "when [characters] . . . converse in Urdu, there is an appropriate gentleness and solemnity in Kipling's English renderings" (24). Further, Kipling's familiarity with Hindustani allows his narrator to translate difficult Indian words within the text ("It is my new chela [disciple] that is gone away from me . . ." [26, Kipling's brackets]; or "'The house be unblest!' [It is impossible to give exactly the old lady's word]" [367, Kipling's brackets]).

Kim connects characters' use of English with order, efficiency, and rationality. Kim, a bilingual agent of British espionage, whose tongue is more comfortable in Oriental languages, resorts to thinking in English when circumstances require quick, logical calculations ("'By Jove!' Kim was thinking hard in English. 'This is dam'-tight place, but I think it is self-defence'" [323]). Using the English language also aids Kim in overcoming the mesmerizing spirituality of the East; when Lurgan Sahib tests Kim's mental agility through hypnotic tricks, Kim self-consciously invokes reason by switching from thinking in Hindustani to thinking in English:

'Look! It is coming into shape,' said Lurgan Sahib.

So far Kim had been thinking in Hindi, but a tremor came on him, and with an effort like that of a swimmer before sharks, who hurls himself half out of the water, his mind leaped up from a darkness that was swallowing it and took refuge in--the multiplication table in English!

'Look! It is coming into shape,' whispered Lurgan Sahib.

The jar had been smashed--yess [sic], smashed--not the native word, he would not think of that--but smashed--into fifty pieces, and twice three was six, and thrice three was nine, and four times three was twelve. He clung desperately to the repetition. The shadow outline of the jar cleared like a mist after rubbing eyes. (205-6, emphasis added)

Lurgan Sahib, surprised that his trick should be foiled, but recognizing that it failed due to Kim's mental processes, asks, "And then what did you do? I mean, how did you think?" (207, emphasis added). Resisting Lurgan's mesmerism requires rational thought and, therefore, requires the English language, also dubbed "the wisdom of the sahibs" (289). Kim replies, "'Oah! I knew it was broken, and so, I think, that was what I thought--and it was broken" (207, Kipling's emphasis).

Kim connects the English language not only with reason but also with military efficiency and order. In the first scene where characters speak English, Kim overhears the "sharp and decisive" voice of Colonel Creighton efficiently plan a military action immediately after receiving intelligence that such a move was necessary (54):

"It isn't a question of weeks. It is a question of days--hours almost . . . I'd been expecting it for some time, but this"--he tapped Mahbub Ali's paper--"clinches it. Grogan's dining here

tonight, isn't he?"

"Yes, sir, and Macklin too."

"Very good. I'll speak to them myself. The matter will be referred to the Council, of course, but this is a case where one is justified in assuming that we take action at once. Warn the Pindi and Peshawar brigades. It will disorganize all the summer reliefs, but we can't help that. This comes of not smashing them thoroughly the first time. Eight thousand should be enough."

(54)

Simple and direct, without image or meandering metaphor, Creighton's English speech facilitates his efficiency in decision-making. His words are like well-drilled soldiers--ordered, crisp, at attention, and briskly prompt in conveying information or carrying out commands.

This decisive language of English military efficiency contrasts with the meandering Oriental speech, woven with imagery, proverb, and metaphor, of the loyal old Indian soldier. Though the old soldier still dons "the uniform of ancient days," stands "like a ramrod" (66), and preaches the benefit of respect, marching, and civil order (72-3), his words are not well-drilled and efficient, but exude the patient relational virtues of loyalty and kindness:

"Seekest thou the River also?" said he [the lama], turning.

"The day is new," was the [old soldier's] reply. "What need of a river save to water at before sundown? I come to show thee a short lane to the Big Road."

"That is a courtesy to be remembered, O man of good will. But why the sword? . . . What profit is it to kill men?"

"Very little--as I know; but if evil men were not now and then slain it would not be a good world for weapon-less

dreamers. I do not speak without knowledge who have seen the land from Delhi south awash with blood.”

“What madness was that, then?”

“The Gods, who sent it for a plague, alone know. A madness ate into all the army, and they turned against their officers . . . My people, my friends, my brothers fell from me. They said: ‘The time of the English is accomplished. Let each strike out a little holding for himself.’ But . . . I said: ‘Abide a little and the wind turns. There is no blessing in this work.’”

(72-4)

While Kim connects English with efficiency, rationality, and order, its Oriental languages facilitate worthy relational and spiritual endeavors, especially those requiring delicacy, humor, or persuasion. Kim affirms Eastern spirituality as a worthy pursuit for all its characters, but one that is accessible only through the Oriental languages. Kim's most positive example of religious piety, Teshoo lama preaches in Urdu on Buddhist truth, seeks his Sacred river, and creates complex picture-parables of the Great Wheel of Life--"half written and half drawn" (22). When visited by the lama, the British Curator of the Lahore Museum, a sympathetic character modeled on Kipling's father (Said 133), chooses to converse with him on spirituality in Urdu (15-22); the language's reverent delicacy complements their subject of discourse. The Curator desires to learn how to create the lama's picture-parable, about which the lama later wisely comments, “The sahibs have not all this world’s wisdom” (256, Kipling's emphasis).

The Curator’s discussion with the lama also reveals Urdu's powers in interpersonal communication. The language delicately cements relationships, reveals affection with dignity, and gracefully alludes to

personal similarities as relational bonds. In Kim, the Oriental languages frequently dub those nonfamilial persons deserving affectionate respect with honorary familial titles, such as "mother," "father," "brother," and "sister." For example, after the Curator and the lama use Urdu to discuss spirituality, the two men, one English and one Oriental, have become as brothers: "We are both bound [on the Wheel of Life], thou and I, my brother. But I'--he [the lama] rose with a sweep of the soft thick drapery--'I go to cut myself free. Come also!'" (19). The language further reveals how the men have not only become brothers, but also have united as guildsmen:

'Be it so,' said the Curator, smiling. 'Suffer me now to acquire merit. We be crafts men together, thou and I. Here is a new book of white English paper: here be sharpened pencils two and three--thick and thin, all good for the scribe.' . . . 'I will take [your gift of the spectacles] and the pencils and the white notebook,' said the lama, 'as a sign of friendship between priest and priest--and now-- . . . That is for a memory between thee and me--my pen-case.' (21, emphasis added)

Just as the British Curator converses with the lama in the language which best facilitates their spiritual discussion and cements their relational bonds, several other of Kipling's wise British leaders recognize the value of both English and the Oriental languages; these leaders flexibly employ each language pragmatically as situation requires, acting and speaking for the good of the Empire and its subjects. For in Kim, as Mark Paffard observes, "The 'real' sahibs . . . are, indeed, experts on Indian languages and customs" (82). When a colonial situation requires not efficient, logical thought, but rather delicacy, humor, or persuasive flexibility, Colonel Creighton switches from speaking his native English to conversing in an Oriental language. For

example, when he attempts to use English to persuade Kim to become a chain-man in the Survey of India, "Kim pretended at first to understand perhaps one word in three of this talk. Then the Colonel, seeing his mistake, turned to fluent and picturesque Urdu and Kim was contented" (159). As Creighton demonstrates his fluency in "picturesque Urdu," Kim realizes that "no man could be a fool who knew the language so intimately, who moved so gently and silently, and whose eyes were so different from the dull fat eyes of other sahibs" (159). Moreover, through his Urdu, the Colonel persuades the boy to trust him and follow his plan for Kim's education; this he achieves not through rational argument, but through the relational powers of an Oriental tongue.

Thus, the wise Anglo-Indian administrator proves his capability to adapt his language to a variety of situations. He speaks Oriental languages when he perceives a situation would be improved by doing so. A minor, yet noteworthy example: when the "dark, sallowish District Superintendent of Police" passes the Sahiba, a prominent and wealthy personage, on the open road, he playfully chaffs her and demonstrates his vast knowledge of Indian culture and rules for relational interaction (103-4). The Sahiba suspects, "Hai, my son, thou hast never learned all that since thou camest from Belait [Europe]" (104, Kipling's brackets); she then discovers the cause: the District Superintendent was "suckled . . . [by] a pahareen--a hillwoman of Dalhousie" (104). Through the Sahiba, Kipling thus identifies his ideal agent of empire: "These be the sort to oversee justice. They know the land and the customs of the land. The others, all new from Europe, suckled by white women and learning our tongues from books, are worse than the pestilence. They do harm to kings" (104).

Beneath the wise British administrator's knowledge of languages and

customs lies not a lust for power, but rather what Colonel Creighton calls “a good spirit” (160). He recognizes Kim's "good spirit"--a lack of haughty cultural superiority--and, keeping in mind the boy's future as an agent of empire, warns him:

Do not let it be blunted at St. Xavier's. There are many boys there who despise the black men. . . . [T]hou art a sahib and the son of a sahib. Therefore, do not at any time be led to contemn the black men. I have known boys newly entered into the service of the government who feigned not to understand the talk or the customs of black men. Their pay was cut for ignorance. There is no sin so great as ignorance. Remember this. (160, emphasis added)

As Creighton reveals, ignorance of the Indian languages is absolutely inexcusable for Kipling's administrator.

Through Kim, raised among Indians and thus understanding India intimately, Kipling depicts the ideal education for his wise administrator. The best agents of the Raj, for Kipling, appear to be those who have gained intimate knowledge of India and the Indian languages in childhood. Kim achieves this not by design of his poor parents, but through their premature deaths after which he is raised by an Indian woman:

Though he was burned black as any native; though he spoke the vernacular by preference, and his mother-tongue in a clipped uncertain singsong; though he consorted on terms of perfect equality with the small boys of the bazaar; Kim was white. (7)

As far as the empire is concerned, Kim's formal education at St. Xavier's with its tyrannical schoolmasters ("the schoolmaster caught him after breakfast, thrust a page of meaningless characters under his nose, gave them senseless

names, and whacked him without reason" [143]) appears less important than the development of his understanding of India and of such things as the ability of "every beggar" to read "countenances" (53). As Mark Paffard notes, Kim's "education appears to consist of a series of holidays" (81), in which he freely roams and explores the Indian landscape. Accordingly, as Edward Said notes, Kim

can pass from one dialect, one set of values and beliefs, to the other. Throughout the book Kim takes on the dialects of numerous Indian communities; he speaks Urdu, English . . . Eurasian, Hindi, and Bengali; when Mahbub Ali speaks Pashtu, Kim gets that too; when the lama speaks Chinese Tibetan, Kim understands that. . . . [He is] like a great actor passing through many situations and at home in each. (158)

Because Kipling has endowed the white Kim with superior powers of linguistic acquisition, being raised as an Indian does not diminish his ability to acquire English, the language of reason. Rather, Kim's English, though at first "the tinny, saw-cut English of the native-bred" (115), eventually evolves to fluency and lacks most of the comic mispronunciations and "babuisms" of the Indian characters' English speech. In contrast to the Indians, who never master English customs or language, close to the end of Kim's "training," Kim's "face and . . . walk and . . . fashion of speech" have come to resemble those of a Briton (350), not an Indian as he did at the beginning of the novel.

While several of Kim's wise Anglo-Indian administrators prove themselves linguistically diverse, Kipling also offers representatives of unwise Anglo-Indians--with their "dull fat eyes" (159)--who do not recognize the value of Oriental languages and are revealed as foolish tyrants in their ignorance. The Anglican Chaplain of the Red Bull Regiment, the Reverend

Arthur Bennett is "an exceptionally unattractive specimen" (Said 137) whose "Hindustani was very limited" (115) and who ignorantly quips, "My experience is that one can never fathom the Oriental mind" (120). The Catholic Father Victor, in contrast, does not speak Oriental languages, but at least recognizes the benefit of doing so: "I'd give a good deal to be able to talk the vernacular" (122).

Just as Kipling portrays Kim as a wise Anglo-Indian administrator-in-training, he also offers a colorful example of the unwise Anglo-Indian-in-training--the odious, bullying drummer boy, who has been assigned to "not let [Kim] out of [his] sight" (135). As experienced elder in this new "civilized" world into which Kim has been thrust, the drummer-boy is assigned to act as mentor. This "guardian," however, fails to understand his relational responsibilities to his charge just as he fails to comprehend and fulfill what Kipling perceives as his linguistic responsibilities to the Indian people. Newly arrived from England, the drummer boy does not know Hindi and thus cannot understand Indians or appreciate their culture: "He styled all natives 'niggers'; yet servants and sweepers called him abominable names to his face, and, misled by their deferential attitude, he never understood" (144).

In contrast to the drummer boy, Kim, knowing the Indian languages and people, disabuses these Indian servants of the idea that he as an English boy would not understand retorts of "unnecessary insolence" (136). He rebukes Indians for overstepping the bounds of proper respect--which Kipling's Indian characters seem often prone to do--and then, discipline accomplished, establishes "perfect" understanding:

"My order is to take thee to the school." The driver used the "thou," which is rudeness when applied to a white man. In the clearest and most fluent vernacular Kim pointed out his error,

climbed on to the box-seat, and, perfect understanding established, drove for a couple of hours up and down, estimating, comparing, and enjoying. (161)

Thus, Kim frequently employs his understanding of language to discipline Indians he perceives as disrespectful, but always quickly reestablishes a positive, accepting relationship with them. He even applies discipline to his departmental superior, Hurree Babu, when Hurree fails to speak respectfully of Colonel Creighton ("'. . . and old Creighton--' He [Hurree] looked to see how Kim would take this piece of audacity. 'The Colonel Sahib,' the boy [Kim] . . . corrected" [293]). Servants especially appear surprised by Kim's knowledge of their language; as a result, Kim becomes known as "a white boy . . . who is not a white boy" (136)

When unwise, ignorant Anglo-Indians--usually freshly arrived from Britain--attempt to force the English language into Oriental linguistic territory of personal relations or spirituality, the result is comic, tyrannical, or, as the lama comments, "'wholly lacking in dignity'" (112). For example, the utterances of English speakers Catholic Father Victor and Anglican Reverend Bennett, who together represent British spirituality, reveal only their irreverence or hypocrisy. They, especially Bennett, evince no superior religious truth ("Father Victor, for three long mornings, discoursed to him of an entirely new set of Gods and Godlings--notably of a Goddess called Mary, who, he gathered, was one with Bibi Miriam of Mahbub Ali's theology" [158]). Rather, they only apply labels of intolerant judgment upon that which has been presented sympathetically, the Oriental spirituality of the lama: "Bennett looked at him [the lama] with the triple-ringed uninterest of the creed that lumps nine-tenths of the world under the title of 'heathen'" (Kipling 120). With labels from English, Bennett brands the lama's nobly depicted search for

the sacred river as "gross blasphemy!" (122). In contrast to the pious exertions of the lama, both priests use their spiritual energies in petty denominational competition ("I've given you a notion of religious matters, . . . and you'll remember, when they ask you your religion, that you're a Cath'lic . . . [158]) Moreover, these priests only mention higher spiritual issues by releasing oft repeated mild oaths, such as "'Powers o' Darkness below! '" (126).

Neither priest can respond in English--the language of order and efficiency--to the lama's pleas for relational and spiritual pilgrimage. Kim, already bridging the chasm between East and West, must translate the lama's entreaties; yet the British priests prove incapable of responding to the lama's genuine spirituality:

[The lama said,] "I do not understand the customs of white men. The Priest of the Images in the Wonder House in Lahore [the Curator] was more courteous than the thin one here [Bennett]. This boy will be taken from me. They will make a sahib of my disciple? Woe to me! How shall I find my River? Have they no disciples? Ask."

He [the lama] says he is very sorree that he cannot find the River now any more. He says, Why have you no disciples, and stop bothering him? He wants to be washed of his sins,'

Neither Bennett nor Father Victor found any answer ready. (125)

Thus, not only do the British priests prove petty, hypocritical, and also tyrannical to the orphaned Kim, but their silence reveals both the superficiality of their spirituality and the limitations of their language. Knowing no Oriental language, they can articulate no response to the pious lama. Accordingly, the lama, whose Urdu utterances convey wisdom, love,

and truth, warns Kim, "These men follow desire and come to emptiness. Thou must not be of their sort" (127). So thoroughly are the English priests stripped of true spirituality that B. J. Moore-Gilbert notes: "In the comparison of the Lama with the Christian figures in the book, Kipling dismisses the possibility that Britain's religion could be regarded as the ultimate justification for its imperial ambitions" (125).

While Kipling dismisses Christianity as a justification for empire, he certainly supplies other justifications in religion's place. As Edward Said notes, ". . . for him [Kipling] it was India's best destiny to be ruled by England" (146). I would go further to state that, for Kipling, it was also England's best destiny to rule India. To him, England and India each offered what the other lacked most. England brought efficiency, rationality, and military order; India contributed spirituality and relational wisdom. While the attributes that the British bring to this imperial relationship earn them the more dominant position, the Indians' qualities are equally important, if subordinate. Thus, each contributes in this male-female model to the overall well-being of the other; thus, Britain asserts its dominance, not to subjugate India gloatingly, but rather patiently to correct what Kipling sees as its peoples' frequently wayward tendencies.

Despite Kipling's positive portrayal of Indian spiritual and relational values, Kipling's narrator often mentions negative tendencies inherent in the Eastern person, expressing views that, as Edward Said observes, were prevalent in nineteenth-century European culture (150-1). For example, Kim, who "would lie like an Oriental," was shocked by the lama's speaking the truth, "which is a thing a native on the road seldom presents to a stranger" (26). For the good service of purchasing a train ticket for the lama, Kim pockets one anna per rupee of the price, what Kipling's narrator calls "the

immemorial commission of Asia" (41). Further, Kim's Indians often perceive and accept these negative traits. Hurree Babu, for example, connects his inescapable, irrational fears with his being a Bengali. Conversely, the old Indian soldier exemplifies the many Indians who loyally accept the superiority of the British group and the legitimacy of their rule (73-6), what Said describes as "Kipling's way of demonstrating that natives accept colonial rule so long as it is the right kind" (149). In fact, virtually no Indian characters appear to harbor anti-British views. As Said notes, while the rebellious Pathans historically caused great problems for the Raj, Kipling paints Mahbub Ali, the Pathan horse trader, as the character most trustworthy and accepting of the British empire in India (148).

Rather than rebelling, Kim's Indians appear either indifferent, yet respectful to the British--like Teshoo lama--or attempt to aid the empire and even assimilate with their colonial rulers. Hurree Babu, who works for the Empire in the Great Game of espionage, is the most notable example of an Indian who emulates the British. Whether through his employment or through a personal association with his rulers, Hurree includes himself within the British group ("Of course, we always do that. It is our British pride" [297, emphasis added]).

Further, Hurree adapts his speech patterns so that they mimic native English speech, behavior that sociolinguist Howard Giles would describe as speech accommodation.¹ Although Hurree knows many languages and can assume many identities, he often chooses to speak in English, especially whenever he has opportunity to speak unofficially with Kim, whose tongue happens to be much more comfortable in the Oriental languages. Yet, despite Hurree's attempts to speak English, his speech contains so many comic, exaggerated idioms that his words compromise the seriousness of his

meaning:

"I think," said the babu heavily, lighting a cigarette, "I am of opinion that it is most extra-ordinary and effeicient performance. Except that you had told me I should have opined that--that--that you were pulling my legs. How soon can he become approximately effeicient chain-man? Because then I shall indent for him. . . . Then order him to be jolly-dam'-quick." (213)

An "MA of Calcutta University" (217), Hurree does not make his errors of speech, we assume, because he lacks education or exposure to English. On the contrary, he makes many references to the British intellectual tradition, including Shakespeare (292), Wordsworth (217), and Herbert Spencer (241; 318). Aligning himself personally with this tradition, Hurree dubs himself a Spencerian, but demonstrates his true lack of rationality by praying to Spencer when afraid (318).

Hurree's British associates, such as Colonel Creighton, do not reassert their own superiority by ridiculing him or practicing what Giles would term speech divergence. Although no British character so liberally employs the idioms that Hurree appears to like best, such as "jolly-dam,'" "jolly good," "jolly-beastly" (295), "By Jove!" (295), and "dam'-tight" (244), Hurree never seems to notice that he overuses these idioms and often appears proud of his English "fluency." Kim, however, acknowledges the ridiculous nature of Hurree's speech; for example, he attempts to discipline Hurree, by asking ". . . why talk like an ape in a tree?" (294). While most others accept Hurree's English mimicry and his abandonment of the Oriental languages, Kipling himself depicts Hurree's--indeed, all Indians'--English as highly comical, mispronounced, and exaggerated. Kipling's portrayal of Hurree's ridiculous

attempts to mimic the British reveals that Kipling himself probably does not accept what Giles would describe as Hurree's move toward speech convergence. Instead, Kipling sets up Hurree's speech as failing the "public school" standard and, thus, reasserts English linguistic superiority.

In contrast to Hurree's speech, Kipling's British characters, when speaking Urdu or Hindustani, do not exaggerate phrases or otherwise speak in a comical manner, but are able to master the Oriental languages. For example, without mispronunciations or errors in grammar, Colonel Creighton demonstrates his easy fluency in the Indian vernacular and can apply imagery and metaphors like native speakers (i.e., "Yes, and thou must learn how to make pictures of roads and mountains and rivers--to carry these pictures in thine eye till a suitable time comes to set them down upon paper" [159, emphasis added]). While Hurree repeatedly demonstrates his inability to understand the thought pattern behind the English idiom, Creighton proves his ability to think as Kipling's Orientals think--in "picturesque" (159) metaphor and imagery.

Contrasting with Hurree, Kim, who grew up speaking the Indian vernaculars, masters the English idiom sufficiently that he eventually avoids many of the "babuisms" that plague Hurree's mimicry: "'Thank you verree much, my dear. . . . Next time,' Kim went on, 'you must not be so sure of your heatthen priests. Now I say goodbye'" (353). Further, Kim--like Colonel Creighton--unhesitatingly accepts both the Indian and English cultures and demonstrates no need to separate the two or belittle Indians, like the drummer boy and the British priests do so liberally. Indeed, Kim need not separate himself from the Indian culture in speech or behavior: understanding of India is not only encouraged by the most respected Briton, Colonel Creighton, but is also inherent in Kim's place in the Great Game.

Ability to speak the English language well is, in Kipling's Kim, a positive value which even the uneducated Indian characters recognize. For example, the Ao-chung man who assists Kim and the lama against the French and Russian spies degrades these foreigners. Though white, as he observes, they lack both fluency in English and the English temperament: "Oh, but these are not Angrezi sahibs--not merry-minded men like Fostum Sahib or Yankling Sahib. They are foreigners--they cannot speak Angrezi as do sahibs" (326). Kipling's Indians who apply such judgment may also comprehend, however unconsciously, that they themselves, even if "merry-minded," fail to speak English fluently and thus must also be inferior.

Through Kim's complementary relationship between Britain, with the English language, and India, with its Oriental languages, Kipling presents a near utopian image of British imperialism in India. Although the physical environment appears at times "difficult, sometimes hostile" (Said 138) toward the British, Kipling's Indian characters--despite tendencies toward dishonesty, disrespect, and sloth--never display belligerent sentiments toward the British. For example, the only account of "the Mutiny"--what "to a contemporary reader," notes Edward Said, was "the single most important, well-known, and violent episode of the nineteenth-century Anglo-Indian relationship" (146)--is voiced, not by a bitter Indian nationalist, but a loyal pro-British Indian soldier. Kim's Indian characters do not challenge British rule possibly because Kipling's utopian Empire affords them a respected, although subordinate status. As Said notes, "So far is Kipling from showing two worlds in conflict that he has studiously given us only one, and eliminated any chance of conflict appearing altogether" (148).

Yet, we must not hastily assume that Kipling's artistic portrayal corresponded with his perception of reality in the Raj. Famous for his

omissions and concealments, even and especially in his own autobiography, Something of Myself, Kipling was a writer who, as Thomas Pinney notes, "remind[ed] . . . the reader that only certain kinds of things are to be talked of" (xxv-xxvi).² Among topics not to be discussed appears to be the rising Indian nationalism, which surfaces only distantly and vaguely in Kim--through the distant five northern native kings who flirt with foreign European powers and thus justify the Great Game (55, 295). This peripheral mention of Indian nationalism does not imply, however, that it did not concern Kipling.

Edward Said observes, "Kim was written at a specific moment in his [Kipling's] career, at a time when the relationship between the British and Indian people was changing" (135). Indeed, Kipling worked on the novel during the Boer War, a conflict which Samuel Hynes describes as "a cruel, expensive struggle between the world's strongest nation and one of the weakest" (17). Hynes identifies a shift in Kipling's mood around 1900:

Kipling's decline was parallel to the decline of the cause and the values that he believed in: class and conquest, self-abnegation and stoicism, practical science, the values that would lead to a Kipling world, a world governed by white men with machines.
(19)

Published in 1901, Kim, in fact, lies between the two poems that Hynes uses to illustrate Kipling's growing cynicism. "Recessional" (1897), as Hynes comments, proclaims "that all empires were transitory, that imperialists were foolishly boastful, and that it was vain to put one's trust in force"; yet the poem asserts that Britain's empire is held in place by God's will (Hynes 19-20). Five years later and following the war that shocked Kipling's idealistic vision of perfect imperialism, the poem "The Islanders" (1902) reveals a demoralized Kipling who "fierce[ly] denounc[es] . . . the English people" (Hynes 21). The

poem accuses Britain of being idle, self-centered, and unsupportive of colonial troops and others toiling in the colonies; "the English had let the Empire down" (Hynes 21):

Given to strong delusion, wholly believing a lie,
 Ye saw that the land lay fenceless, and ye let the months go by
 Waiting some easy wonder: hoping some saving sign--

 Idle--except for your boasting--and what is your boasting worth
 If ye grudge a year of service to the lordliest life on earth? (lines
 33-38)

When placed between these two poems, Kim not surprisingly condemns the "dull, fat sahibs" and attempts to describe his ideal colonial agent, who he believed would blow away the gathering clouds of imperial strife. Further, Kipling subtly discredits the rising Indian nationalism as he depicts Indians who cannot practice order and rationality any more than they can successfully acquire the English language. Kim additionally attempts to reinforce the colonial status quo by depicting Indians as inherently dishonest, insolent, and slothful--traits that do not condemn them as subjects, but bar them from becoming independent. Because Kipling's Indians cannot master English, the language of order, rationality, and military efficiency, they surely would not be capable of successful self-government.

If Kipling perceives the threat of Indian nationalism--and I posit that he undoubtedly does--he knows whom to blame: the unwise British administrators who understand neither the land nor its people and so cannot provide either the discipline or the encouragement that Kipling suggests that Indians need. Thus, directed at a primarily British readership, as Stephen Hemenway notes (26, 29), Kim contains a strongly negative depiction of

unwise administrators, who do not recognize the positive qualities of India or their own limitations; the novel subtly warns of the impending collapse of the Raj--if left to these unwise Britons. One year later, after the hollow victory in South Africa, Kipling would write less obliquely and attempt to abuse Britain out of its fat, idle complacency in "The Islanders"--accusing "Ye stopped your ears to the warning--ye would neither look nor heed--" (line 9).

Critics, such as Francis Hutchins and Edward Said, have viewed Kim as helping to create "[a]n India of the imagination . . . which contained no elements of either social change or political menace . . . [and was] devoid of elements hostile to the perpetuation of British rule" (qtd. in Said 149). While, undoubtedly, Kim helped to propagate this imaginative construct, ironically, as I have argued, Kipling perceived the fragility of his ideal India, where sahibs intimately knew and valued the Indians they ruled. The strong didacticism within the novel convinces me also that Kipling could already foresee dangers lurking along the imperial path. Edward Said rightly observes that no Indian "challenges British rule, and no one articulates any of the local Indian challenges that must then have been greatly in evidence--even for someone as obdurate as Kipling" (148). Yet, I assert that, through his depictions of linguistic administration, Kipling himself does critique British rule, questioning not whether Britain should rule India, but which type of Britons should govern it. Thus, lurking in the gaps of what Kipling excluded from Kim's fictional panoramic view of India lies a sense of paradise threatened, paradise slipping away. This hidden menace in Kim emerges as a dark, towering obstacle in Forster's A Passage to India; Kipling's careful utopia of linguistic partnership between Britain and India contrasts with A Passage to India's inadequate, one-sided domination of the English language, a linguistic tyranny that catalyzes sociopolitical conflict in the Raj.

III. Speaking at Cross-Purposes:

Misinterpretation in Forster's A Passage to India

While Kipling became intimately acquainted with India during his early life, an older E. M. Forster spent about one year in the country prior to publication of A Passage to India in 1924 (Hemenway 65). Perhaps, Forster was less biased and could more “sensitive[ly] and perceptive[ly]” observe British-Indian relations (Hemenway 58). Yet, the differences between these authors' encounters with India do not alone account for the gulf between Kim and A Passage to India. In particular, during the passing of twenty-three years, British-Indian relations had become more strained; embittered by the Amritsar Massacre in 1919, Indian leaders discouragely perceived a lack of progress toward self-government (Das 46-8; Herz 17-20). Communication and negotiation between the two cultures limped forward at best. Yet why was the Raj experiencing so many problems? In A Passage to India, Forster confronts this question and depicts language, particularly the English language, as a catalyst to the Raj's conflicts and failures of intimacy between the two nations.

Forster met Indians long before he first traveled to India. During his education he became acquainted with Syed Ross Masood, the Indian friend to whom A Passage to India is dedicated. After overcoming some relational turbulence, Forster and Masood became life-long friends. Forster's introduction to India thus came through a cross-cultural friendship with an Indian, a theme that figures largely in his novel of India. Forster commented in his obituary tribute to Masood:

My own debt to him is incalculable. He woke me up out of my rather suburban and academic life, showed me new horizons and a new civilization and helped me towards the

understanding of India. Until I met him, India was a vague jumble of rajahs, sahibs, babus, and elephants, and I was not interested in such a jumble. Who could be? He made everything real and exciting as he began to talk . . . (qtd. in Kidwai 127)

Invited to visit India, first in 1912 and then in 1921, Forster, "by hobnobbing almost exclusively with native princes and their retainers and with relatively well-educated Indians," was not forced to learn any Indian language with fluency, but "generally remained isolated from the throbbing multitudes and the cadences of their speech" (Hemenway 59).

As Forster was not proficient in any Indian language, he must have encountered limitations when writing dialogue between Indian characters. As Stephen Hemenway notes, Forster "seldom reports conversations between Indians in the novel" (59). Although several important scenes depict Indian characters interacting with each other, Indians speak most frequently in company with a Briton, in what Hemenway considers an unnatural, inhibiting environment, where the Indian characters may not "give rein to their genuine feelings" (59). Thus, characters often speak English to one another--even Muslims to Hindus; dialogue is frequently littered with Indian characters' (over)use of particularly English expressions, such as "jolly" (8) or "By Jove" (95), and other comic errors of grammar or diction.

For Forster's Britons in A Passage to India, language is a means to gain a surer and more accurate understanding of reality as they seek to classify the objects, people, and events that surround them. Yet in Forster's India such classification proves not entirely possible; rather, his India is a muddle of disorder with a frustrating tendency for nothing to go "right . . . whether done by the English or the Indians" (Greenberger 113). In fact, the country eludes

even the constricting regularities of the English language. For example, when Britons Ronny and Adela decide not to marry after “examin[ing] the difficulty so frankly and coolly” (91), they catch sight of an unknown Indian bird that defies static labels:

“Do you know what the name of that green bird up above us is?” she asked, putting her shoulder rather nearer to his.

“Bee-eater.”

“On no, Ronny, it has red bars on its wings.”

“Parrot,” he hazarded.

“Good gracious no.”

The bird in question dived into the dome of the tree. It was of no importance, yet they would have liked to identify it, it would have somehow solaced their hearts. But nothing in India is identifiable, the mere asking of a question causes it to disappear or to merge in something else. (91)

For Ronny and Adela, the labeling of the bird would help to order their Indian existence, yet in Forster's India, as Greenberger notes, “Nothing is what it seems and the most enormous of contradictions can be bound up in one thing” (114). Identity in Forster's India fails to remain static long enough to be defined; nor can an Indian identity be grasped by those unaccustomed to the dynamic and “a-rational.”

Interestingly, Forster experienced problems when he attempted to write the novel while in India: “[The pages] seemed to wilt and go dead and I could do nothing with them. I used to look at them of an evening in my room at Dewas, and felt only distaste and despair. The gap between India experienced and India remembered was too wide” (Hill 99). Only back in a more orderly England could he, encouraged by Leonard Woolf, finish the novel that was to

be his last (Giroux 94). It appears as if the English language, not only for Forster's characters, but also for himself, could not do justice to what he saw as India: "I could never describe the muddle in this place. It is a wheel within a wheel" (Hill 77).

Though liberal-minded and a friend to Dr. Aziz, the British Mr. Fielding also seeks to order his environment through language. When he goes to visit the supposedly ill Aziz, Fielding attempts to comprehend the situation by applying binary extremes. Immediately upon entering, he queries, "I say! Is he ill or isn't he ill?" and then, after being greeted, but not answered, he persists, "Well, are you ill, Aziz, or aren't you?" (118). Fielding's British mind seeks an answer that excludes logical fallacies of identity: "ill," he reasons, can never be simultaneously present with "not ill." Hamidullah, an Indian, however, responds with a seemingly illogical answer that Fielding cannot at first comprehend: "He is ill and he is not ill . . . And I suppose that most of us are in that same case" (119). Only after Hamidullah suggests this more illogical identity--what Gerald Brennan might mean by "all the ambiguities which lie in the Indian mind and . . . clash with English moral positivism" (53)--does Fielding assent. His agreement, however, appears dependent not so much on his acceptance of a nonbinary, illogical--or allogical--classification, but rather on his growing friendship with Hamidullah: "Fielding agreed; he and the pleasant sensitive barrister got on well. They were fairly intimate and beginning to trust each other" (119).

Thus, Forster's British characters attempt to use language to evaluate reality objectively and communicate verbal truth. From his perspective as a magistrate, Ronny Heaslop toils in India, not to be "pleasant" to Indians, but to pursue the "more important" task of maintaining order "by force" (52). In A Passage to India, British justice and the court system vainly endeavor to

apply--like Fielding--binary logical judgments of truth and falsehood, innocence and guilt in a country which defies such logical identifications. The narrative voice comments: "Every day he [Ronny Heaslop, the magistrate,] worked hard in the court trying to decide which of two untrue accounts was the less untrue, trying to dispense justice fearlessly, to protect the weak against the less weak, the incoherent against the plausible, surrounded by lies and flattery" (52). This passage conveys a sense of how language, a reliable foundation for justice in Britain, squirms out of control in the Indian courtrooms, where all accounts are "untrue" and defy the binary classifications in which the British mind finds solace. Alas, as Judith Scherer Herz notes, "[Forster's] British characters do not know how to operate in such a space" (88).

While the British characters value literal truth and use language to order reality, Forster's Indians--particularly Muslims--value relationships and often employ language to develop intimacy.³ As Herz observes, "for most of the Indian characters, the heart must inform the tongue" (77). Often when a force threatens to destroy a relationship's mood, Indian characters pursue what Forster's narrative voice terms "truth of mood" (76)--using words that fit the aura of a situation, but that may or may not be meant literally. Other Indians tend to interpret truth of mood correctly; for example, Mahmoud Ali, Hamidullah, and Aziz understand the servants who are late in serving dinner: "He [Mahmoud Ali] raised his voice suddenly, and shouted for dinner. Servants shouted back that it was ready. They meant that they wished it was ready, and were so understood, for nobody moved" (8).

The Indian Dr. Aziz repeatedly employs truth of mood to preserve relational atmosphere. For example, Aziz alters literal truth when he explains to Fielding why Adela Quested abruptly abandoned the Marabar

Caves expedition:

“It is quite natural about Miss Quested,” he [Aziz] remarked, for he had been working the incident a little in his mind, to get rid of its roughnesses. “We were having an interesting talk with our guide, then the car was seen, so she decided to go down to her friend.” Incurably inaccurate, he already thought that this was what had occurred. He was inaccurate because he was sensitive. He did not like to remember Miss Quested’s remark about polygamy, because it was unworthy of a guest, so he had put it from his mind, and with the knowledge that he had bolted into a cave to get away from her. He was inaccurate because he desire to honour her, and--facts being entangled--he had to arrange them in her vicinity, as one tidies the ground after extracting a weed. Before breakfast was over he had told a good many lies. (174-5, emphasis added)

Here Aziz attempts to rescue his expedition's friendly feeling while Fielding seeks to know what actually happened to Adela Quested; Aziz's sensitive inaccuracy clashes with Fielding's pursuit of literal truth. Although Fielding remains loyal to Aziz even when Aziz's inaccuracy is exposed, the gap between the two friends' use of language and truth widens, straining their friendship.

Although both Indians and Britons perceive--at least on a primary level--the other's tendency to employ language differently, rarely does either group attempt to make allowances for the other's use of language. Ronny the magistrate still attempts to force the British legal system into an incompatible Indian culture; Aziz and Hamidullah cannot accept Adela's courtroom recantation because it "did not include her heart" (272). Members of each

group continue to apply their own standard when interpreting meaning in statements by members of the other--a misapplication accentuated by the fact that all communicate cross-culturally in the "same" language. As a result, miscommunications--both comic and tragic--plague social interactions between the two cultures.

However, when representatives of the two groups interact without language, they escape most of the inevitable miscommunications and achieve a mutually respectful fellowship. For example, when Aziz avoids the dismal "Bridge Party," he instead spontaneously practices polo with a young British subaltern; Michael Orange describes the event as "the most graceful bridging of the racial abyss that the novel offers" (146):

The ball shot away towards a stray subaltern who was also practising; he hit it back to Aziz and called, "Send it along again."

"All right."

The new-comer had some notion of what to do, but his horse had none, and forces were equal. Concentrated on the ball, they somehow became fond of one another, and smiled when they drew rein to rest. Aziz liked soldiers--they either accepted you or swore at you, which was preferable to the civilian's hauteur--and the subaltern liked anyone who could ride.

"Often play?" he asked.

"Never."

"Let's have another chukker."

As he hit, his horse bucked and off he went, cried, "Oh God!" and jumped on again. "Don't you ever fall off?"

"Plenty."

"Not you."

They reined up again, the fire of good fellowship in their eyes. But it cooled with their bodies, for athletics can only raise a temporary glow. Nationality was returning, but before it could exert its poison they parted, saluting each other. "If only they were all like that," each thought. (60)

Although athletics' artificiality, a mutual interest in an external activity, and temporary equality aid this encounter's "good fellowship," it is mainly the sparse use of language by Aziz and the subaltern (only twenty-three words in all) that prevents the cross-cultural misinterpretation language catalyzes.

In contrast, when Briton and Indian interact with abundant language, the inevitable misunderstandings result in conflict. The novel's most major crisis--the Marabar Caves incident--begins when Aziz attempts to rescue the mood of Fielding's tea party from pessimism by spontaneously offering an invitation:

" . . . Aziz and I [Fielding] know well that India's a muddle."

"India's--Oh, what an alarming idea!"

"There'll be no muddle when you come to see me," said Aziz, rather out of his depth. "Mrs. Moore and everyone--I invite you all--oh, please." (73)

Unpremeditated, Aziz's invitation expresses truth of mood--words whose effect could enhance the newborn intimacy of friendship, but that are not intended literally. British Adela Quested, however, interprets his invitation to the letter, accepts it, and then asks for his address. His expression of mood thus misinterpreted as verbal truth, Aziz falls into a panic:

Aziz thought of his bungalow with horror. It was a detestable shanty near a low bazaar. There was practically only one room in it, and that infested with small black flies. "Oh, but we will

talk of something else now," he explained. "I wish I lived here. See this beautiful room! Let us admire it together for a little."

(73)

By redirecting the conversation, Aziz evades Adela's misinterpretation and then attempts again to rescue the mood by admiring Fielding's spacious room. Adela, however, fails to perceive the meaning of his evasion and later again mentions Aziz's invitation whereupon:

He [Aziz] thought again of his bungalow with horror. Good heavens, the stupid girl had taken him at his word! What was he to do? "Yes, all that is settled," he cried. "I invited [sic] you all to see me in the Marabar Caves." (79)

Of course, Adela easily accepts this substitution ("I shall be delighted" [79]), and, thus, Aziz's misinterpreted "facile remark" (139) initiates the fated trip to the Marabar.

After Forster's narrative voice depicts Adela, a Briton, misinterpreting Aziz, an Indian, the situation is reversed as Aziz misunderstands Adela's comments on the Marabar. While Adela, Aziz, and a guide "continued the slightly tedious expedition" of the Marabar Caves (166), Adela realizes she does not love her fiancé and begins talking about marriage to Aziz. Hearing that he has a wife and three children, she speculates:

Probably this man had several wives--Mohammedans always insist on their full four, according to Mrs. Turton. And having no one else to speak to on that eternal rock, she gave rein to the subject of marriage and said in her honest, decent, inquisitive way: "Have you one wife or more than one?" (169)

In asking this question, Adela Quested reiterates what Forster sees as the fundamental British flaw: an undeveloped heart. From their first meeting,

Adela values Aziz not affectionately, but for the intellectual understanding he can give her about India ("I want to ask you something. Dr. Aziz," she began. "I heard from Mrs. Moore how helpful you were to her in the mosque, and how interesting. She learnt more about India in those few minutes' talk with you than in the three weeks since we landed" [70]).

Indeed, Adela and other British characters, such as Superintendent McBryde, Ronny Heaslop, and Collector Turton, echo Forster's statement in Abinger Harvest about British imperialist agents:

They go forth into it with well developed bodies, fairly well developed minds and undeveloped hearts. And it is this undeveloped heart that is largely responsible for the difficulties of Englishmen abroad. (4-5)

Consequently, when "in her honest, decent, inquisitive way," Adela asks Aziz how many wives he has--without a developed heart's help--her "fairly well developed mind" (Abinger 4) cannot comprehend how this question will pain him. Unfortunately, the "[s]hocked" Aziz interprets Adela's question as if she had intended to insult him (169). The question

challenged a new conviction of his community, and new convictions are more sensitive than old. . . . But to ask an educated Indian Moslem how many wives he has--appalling, hideous! . . . [T]hinking, "Damn the English even at their best," he plunged into one of them [the caves] to recover his balance. (169)

Thus, A Passage to India contains centrally two incidents of mutual misunderstanding that show the incompatibility of the two cultures--despite the best intentions. What, after all, was the historical Amritsar Massacre but an indescribably horrible misinterpretation of posted proclamations, of

gatherings, of personalities, of the entire colonial relationship? Although Empire certainly complicates relations between the two cultures, even on socially neutral ground, successful understanding is near impossible. In A Passage to India, these two misinterpretations and a third that is left unexplained--Adela's experience in one of the Marabar Caves--force Aziz into a new nationalist consciousness and the two communities, British and Indian, into open competition.

Through Adela, Forster reveals how even after disaster, the two cultures cannot learn how to understand each other. After the tragic events of the Marabar Cave expedition, Aziz's trial, and her retraction of the accusation, Adela has learned more about herself and her undeveloped heart, but not how better to communicate cross-culturally. She cannot adequately apologize to the man she insulted primarily because, as Fielding comments, she has "no real affection for Aziz, or Indians generally" (288-9): "her behavior [in court] rested on cold justice and [literal] honesty; she had felt, while she recanted, no passion of love for those whom she had wronged" (272). While she has sacrificed acceptance by her own race to the distant ideal of Justice in withdrawing her accusation of Aziz, the narrative voice remarks, "the girl's sacrifice--so creditable according to Western notions--was rightly rejected, because, though it came from her heart, it did not include her heart" (272). If Britons could correct this fundamental flaw, A Passage to India appears to suggest, India and Britain could develop a beautiful friendship through the Raj. The wise Mrs. Moore also perceives, "One touch of regret--not the canny substitute but the true regret from the heart--would have made [Ronny Heaslop, her son] a different man, and the British Empire a different institution" (53).

As C. C. Eldridge writes, "Forster believes . . . mutual incomprehension

and personal misunderstanding to be at the root of colonial problems: without friendship between the races the British Empire 'rests on sand'" (175). Thus, in A Passage to India, a developed heart and capacity for mutual affection in friendship forms the foundation for (and perhaps the hope of) effective cross-cultural interaction. Although A Passage to India pessimistically predicts disaster in British-Indian relations, two exceptions--Aziz's friendships with Fielding and with Mrs. Moore--elude complete muddles with different degrees of success. While Adela Quested always interprets language on a literal, intellectual level and cannot access or develop her feelings, Fielding also employs words literally, yet often allows his feelings to express themselves through language; because of his often spontaneous feelings, Fielding and Aziz can attempt friendship.

Yet, the two different methods of interpreting language complicate Aziz and Fielding's friendship and add to the customary turbulences accompanying intimacy. Although Fielding "had dulled his craving for verbal truth and cared chiefly for truth of mood" (76), he only wishes that "he too could be carried away on waves of emotion [like Aziz]" (127). Despite Fielding's respect for relational mood, he continually must combat his primary tendency to interpret language literally. For example, Fielding questions Aziz's metaphoric application of the word "brother":

"You [Aziz] would have allowed me [Fielding] to see her [Aziz's wife]?"

"Why not? I believe in the purdah, but I should have told her you were my brother, and she would have seen you. Hamidullah saw her, and several others."

"Did she think they were your brothers?"

"Of course not, but the word exists and is convenient. All

men are my brothers, and as soon as one behaves as such he may see my wife."

"And when the whole world behaves as such, there will be no more purdah?"

"It is because you can say and feel such a remark as that, that I show you the photograph," said Aziz gravely. (125-6)

Despite Fielding's warm-heartedness, his British tendencies ultimately refuse to submit to the demands of his friendship with Aziz. Near the end of the novel, when Fielding becomes exasperated by Aziz's exaggerated phrases (303), the narrative voice comments, "Tangles . . . still interrupted [Fielding and Aziz's] intercourse. A pause in the wrong place, and intonation misunderstood, and a whole conversation went awry" (305). While early conflicts are soon resolved because Aziz senses "Fielding's fundamental good will" (70), later disagreements stain the fabric of their friendship, especially when Fielding sympathizes with the ostracized Miss Quested, departs for England, and chooses to marry an English woman.

If hope for cross-cultural friendship survives in A Passage to India, it relies upon a mutual understanding that can transcend the difficulties of language interpretation. Mrs. Moore, whom Aziz calls "an Oriental," understands the Muslim doctor. She persistently believes in his innocence because she "knows people's characters" and feels "it isn't the sort of thing he would do" (228). Because she can sense his character, she interprets his language correctly despite her British background. Thus, Aziz and Mrs. Moore fail to develop those dangerous miscommunications so prevalent between Briton and Indian; during their first meeting in the mosque, for example, they overcome several initial misunderstandings through respect and persistence (17-21).

Yet, the situational machinery of A Passage to India drives these two intimates physically apart. If Mrs. Moore remains close to Aziz after his trial, she does so only as a ghost, a memory, or the folk-legend which has sprung up around the incantation "Esmis Esmoor." If their friendship survives--as we are told Fielding and Aziz's friendship does not--it is as an equally ghostly form existing in Aziz's mind or in some other private metaphysical realm.

Just as most of Forster's Indian characters have learned the English language, they have also adopted Western concepts, in Aziz's case European science and medicine. Aziz chooses also to mimic European dress, "wearing pumps" (16), "starch collar, and hat with ditch" (69); however, as he explains to Fielding, he and other Indians do so "to pass the police" (69). The westernized Aziz appears to seek to imitate the British not necessarily because he truly desires to emulate them, but because he can perceive no other option, given economic and sociopolitical considerations such as supporting his children and living peacefully. By the end of the novel, the agitated Aziz has become more emphatically mercenary: "Clear out, all you Turtons and Burtons. We wanted to know you ten years back--now it's too late. If we see you and sit on your committees, it's for political reasons, don't you make any mistake" (360).

Similarly, Forster's Indians' adoption of English is forced by their state of colonial subordination; this position propels them not just to use their ruler's language, but also dictates exactly what they may (or must) and may not say. For example, when talking with Mrs. Moore, Aziz initially calls Mrs. Callendar "A very charming lady" (20)--probably because that is the only acceptable thing he as an Indian may say about a white woman. Yet, as soon as Mrs. Moore questions whether Mrs. Callendar is actually charming, Aziz

blurts out the true feelings that the colonial situation prohibits him to verbalize:

She has just taken my tonga without my permission--do you call that being charming?--and Major Callender [sic] interrupts me night after night from where I am dining with my friends and I go out at once, breaking up a most pleasant entertainment, and he is not there and not even a message. Is this charming, pray? But what does it matter? I can do nothing and he knows it. I am just a subordinate, my time is of no value, the verandah is good enough for an Indian, yes, yes, let him stand, and Mrs. Callendar takes my carriage and cuts me dead . . . (21).

Thus, as the two characters develop a friendship in the mosque, Mrs. Moore's sympathy breaks the Raj's power over Aziz's speech ("He was partly excited by his wrongs, but much more by the knowledge that someone sympathized with them" [21]). Her friendship with Aziz--at least in this way--contributes to his emancipation.

Aziz and other Indian characters acquire solidarity as they use the English language to develop nationalistic, anti-British arguments. In Chapter II, Aziz, Hamidullah, and Mahmoud Ali complain about Anglo-India, but do so in a relational context--"whether or no it is possible to be friends with an Englishman" (7); they have not yet developed rational, nationalistic arguments and eventually drift back toward a blurry nostalgia for Queen Victoria and the good Reverend and Mrs. Bannister (8-9). In Chapter IX, however, Hamidullah, in particular, uses English to attack rationally the excuses that support Britain's colonization of India. After discovering, through Fielding, that "the West doesn't bother much over belief and disbelief these days," Hamidullah pointedly questions Britain's justification

that she holds India in the name of Christianity ("Excuse the question, but if this is the case, how is England justified in holding India?" [120]). When Fielding attempts to evade the question by claiming he personally just "needed a job," Hamidullah persists, "Well qualified Indians also need jobs in the educational. . . . Then excuse me again--is it fair an Englishman should occupy one when Indians are available?" (120). Perhaps because this persistent rational argument threatens to damage the relational mood, Hamidullah qualifies, "Of course, we mean nothing personally. Personally we are delighted you should be here, and we benefit greatly by this frank talk" (120-1).

Actually, Fielding's use of language in avoiding Hamidullah's rational attacks drifts toward truth of mood rather than verbal truth: "There is only one answer to a conversation of this type: 'England holds India for her good.' Yet Fielding was disinclined to give it. The zeal for honesty had eaten him up. He said, 'I'm delighted to be here too--that's my answer, there's my only excuse'" (121). Fielding's elusive answer reveals the fundamental paradox of British language in A Passage to India. Britain claims to prefer verbal truth and professes to administer objective justice. A closer look reveals, however, that the British, more than the Indians, hide their acts of injustice--injustice that the text exposes in Britons' personal affronts and very particular insults to Aziz and other Indians--behind truth of mood. While the Indian characters most frequently apply truth of mood to relational situations, Forster's British subtly use language to support the truth of, as Francis Hutchins reveals in The Illusion of Permanence, the fictional myths that preserve the Raj's atmosphere:

They [the British men] had started speaking of 'women and children'--that phrase that exempts the male from sanity when it

has been repeated a few times. Each felt that all he loved best in the world was at stake, demanded revenge, and was filled with a not unpleasing glow, in which the chilly and half-known features of Miss Quested vanished, and were replaced by all that is sweetest and warmest in the private life. (203)

While the British pursue their colonial myths, the Indian characters begin to unite and simultaneously to separate their speech from the British, starting with Mahmoud Ali's courtroom call for Mrs. Moore. As the tumultuous crowds chant her name, its pronunciation becomes "Indianized" into a Hindu-like invocation "Esmiss Esmoor" (250-1):

The tumult increased, the invocation of Mrs. Moore continued, and people who did not know what the syllables meant repeated them like a charm. They became Indianized into Esmiss Esmoor, they were taken up in the street outside. In vain the Magistrate threatened and expelled. Until the magic exhausted itself, he was powerless. (250)

As Edward Said notes, Mrs. Moore becomes "less a person than a mobilizing phrase, a funny Indianized principle of protest and community" (203). The Indians thus attach their own cultural values to the words and maintain their own group's distinctiveness through the repetition of this battle cry.

Prophetically, this alteration anticipates what sociolinguist Peter Strevens terms the "localized forms of English, "where dialects take on speaker groups' characteristics and idiosyncrasies (23). Yet, from the British perspective, Ronny Heaslop inwardly feels, "It was revolting to hear his mother travestied into Esmiss Esmoor, a Hindu goddess" (250). The British, who associate their language with utility and power, cannot comprehend the spiritual metamorphosis that the name, Mrs. Moore, undergoes.

While the outside crowds "Indianize" Mrs. Moore's name, in the courtroom prominent Indians disprove two negative race-inclusive judgments by which the British justify their colonial superiority. Mr. Das, the magistrate trying Aziz's case, refutes the notion that Indians cannot administer discipline, justice, and order; likewise, Amritrao, the prominent barrister from Calcutta, destroys the perception that Indians cannot properly speak English, that civilized language. First, maintaining order, justice, and discipline, Mr. Das, the magistrate, as the narrative voice reveals, "had controlled the case, just controlled it. He had shown that an Indian can preside" (256, emphasis added). Whether or not Forster's "polyvocal" narrative voice (Herz 74) pronounces this judgment in favor of Das objectively, from a British perspective, or--more likely--from Das' own viewpoint is largely irrelevant as the statement indicates the text's overall acknowledgment of the Raj's false justifications for empire.

Second, in Aziz's trial the barrister Amritrao demonstrates his ability to speak English properly without any of the comic "babuisms ascribed to them [Indians] up at the club" (68), which most, if not all, of Forster's other Indians display repeatedly throughout the novel. Amritrao proves himself as able a master of the language as even Kipling's wise administrators are of Oriental tongues:

"Excuse me--" It was the turn of the eminent barrister from Calcutta. . . . "We object to the presence of so many European ladies and gentlemen upon the platform," he said in an Oxford voice. "They will have the effect of intimidating our witnesses. Their place is with the rest of the public in the body of the hall. We have no objection to Miss Quested remaining on the platform, since she has been unwell; we shall extend every

courtesy to her throughout, despite the scientific truths revealed to us by the District Superintendent of Police; but we do object to the others." (245, emphasis added)

Thus, prominent Indians demonstrate their ability to speak proper English and administer order, discipline, and justice; they expose the illegitimacy of their subordination to the British in these two critical areas. For although the behavior of other Indians, such as "silly and useless" Mahmoud Ali (246) and traitorous Dr. Panna Lal (262-3), may confirm previous negative judgments about Indians, Amritrao and Das stand as proof for the world--and interested Indians--to see the illegitimacy of the former evaluation.

While the Indian characters continue to speak English after Aziz's trial, they do so largely to communicate with the British, especially with Fielding, their sympathetic friend. Yet, after Fielding departs for England and marries, Dr. Aziz rejects the English language as he spurns all that accompanies British India. Departing to an Indian state, because he "could write poetry there" (299), he refuses to correspond (in English) with Fielding, believing him to have married his old enemy, Adela; the more violently he refuses Fielding's friendship, the more traditional Oriental poems does he write.

While the Indians developed their nationalistic arguments in English, Indian solidarity--as much as it exists, if only temporarily, in the novel--is closely linked with Indian poetry written in non-English languages. Thus, in A Passage to India, Aziz's poetry, in particular promotes Indian unity. Mr. Das, the magistrate who presided over his case, asks Aziz to write a poem to submit it to Das' brother-in-law's magazine. Aziz responds:

"My dear Das, . . . I will write him the best I can, but thought your magazine was for Hindus."

"It is not for Hindus, but Indians generally," he said

timidly.

"There is no such person in existence as the general Indian."

"There was not, but there may be when you have written a poem." (296, emphasis added)

Though Aziz never writes the poem for Das, contemplation of it "led him towards the vague and bulky figure of a mother-land," an idea to which "the Marabar Hills drove him" (298). Yet seeking solidarity, Aziz stumbles into the problem of language: "[H]e longed to compose a new song which could be acclaimed by the multitudes and even sung in the fields. In what language shall it be written? And what shall it announce?" (298). English carried implications of subjugation, but in the text most of the Indian languages inherently contain religious or geographic overtones. Neither Aziz nor A Passage to India solves the issue of language for a united, independent India although both eventually predict its existence.

Indian poetry in general, as Judith Scherer Herz observes, "cancels divisiveness" and neutralizes "language as a means of separation and division" by uniting opposing Indian factions (84):

Issuing still farther from his quilt, he [Aziz] recited a poem by Ghalib. It had no connection with anything that had gone before, but it came from his heart and spoke to theirs. . . . The squalid bedroom grew quiet; the silly intrigues, the gossip, the shallow discontent were stilled, while words accepted as immortal filled the indifferent air. Not as a call to battle, but as a calm assurance came the feeling that India was one . . . (113)

Yet, to the British, Indian poetry can be isolating and disturbing. After hearing Professor Godbole's song about Shri Krishna and the milkmaid, a

song that led the Western ear "in a maze of noises, none harsh or unpleasant, [but] none intelligible" (84), Adela later realizes, "I enjoyed the singing . . . but just about then a sort of sadness began that I couldn't detect at the time . . . no, nothing as solid as sadness: living at half pressure expresses it best" (266).

In the novel's final section, the nationalist Aziz has so separated himself from the British and their language that he speaks Urdu to Fielding, when visiting his Indian state. While first stating in English his intentions to detach ("My heart is for my own people henceforward" [339]), Aziz then applies this divorce to his speech: "Speaking in Urdu, that the children might understand, he said, 'Please do not follow us, whomever you marry. I wish no Englishman or Englishwoman to be my friend'" (339). Later he again attempts to separate his speech from the British Ralph Moore ("State doctor, ridden over to enquire, very little English" [346]), but Ralph's "Oriental" heart draws Aziz again into friendship with a Briton ("Never be friends with the English! Mosque, caves, mosque, caves. And here he was starting again" [349]), emphasizing the cyclical, not necessarily linear, nature of Aziz's path.

When British India feels threatened by Indian solidarity, English becomes a weapon, a means to keep the "ruled race" in its colonial place. When the British "Turtons and Burtons," such as Major Callendar, Mrs. Turton, and Superintendent McBryde, perceive that the Indians desire to separate from the colonial relationship, they attempt to reinforce racist labels and stereotypes. The strong names assigned to the Indians emphasize the difference between the two groups and the dark-skinned peoples' inferiority. Young Mrs. Blakiston "dared not return to her bungalow in case the niggers attacked" (200, emphasis added); Superintendent McBryde who asks Fielding, "Why mix yourself up with pitch?" (189, emphasis added). Other derogatory labels applied to Indians include "swine" (239) and "buck niggers" (240).

In contrast to these "Turtons and Burtons," Fielding and Mrs. Moore, sympathize with the Indians' plight. Fielding, aligned with the Indian "confederacy," attacks the racist labels other Britons attempt to strengthen and redefines them in neutral terms; the term "black" becomes "coffee," and "white" becomes "pinko-gray" (65). Mrs. Moore, who believes in Aziz's innocence and the injustice of his imprisonment, separates herself from the British group in her cranky silence. Refusing "to be dragged in" to their "ludicrous law courts" (222), Mrs. Moore appears to know "more than [Aziz's] character, but could not impart it" (228) and dislikes her "duty to talk" (227): "'Say, say, say,' said the old lady bitterly. 'As if anything can be said! I have spent my life in saying or listening to sayings; I have listened too much. It was time I was left in peace'" (222). In what Michael Orange calls her "refusal to trust words" (154), Mrs. Moore, sympathizing with the Indian group, retreats from the British and their language, distrusting both.

While Forster's narrative voice often remains sympathetic to Indians oppressed by the British, his text--like Kipling's--depicts Indianized English as comic and exaggerated, something that "prevent[s] the reader from taking the Indian characters seriously" (Hemenway 61). This near-mockery occurs consistently throughout the novel and parallels that non-language-centered sarcasm directed at most British characters. In fact, as Edward Said notes, "Forster's ironies undercut everyone from the blimpish Turtons and Burtons to the posturing, comic Indians" (203). Thus, Forster's narrative voice effectively stands apart from both Indian and British groups. This separation corresponds closely to the sentiments Forster revealed to his friend Masood:

When I began the book I thought of it as a little bridge of sympathy between East and West, but this conception has had to go, my sense of truth forbids anything so comfortable. I think

that most Indians, like most English people, are shits, and I am not interested whether they sympathize with one another or not. (Letter to Masood, 27 Sept. 1922)

Yet despite distancing from both Indians and Britons, in A Passage to India, Forster appears to recommend that the Briton enter India with an interest in friendship--just as the respectfully shoeless Mrs. Moore enters Aziz's Mosque and as Forster personally entered India under the auspices of Syed Ross Masood's warm fellowship. Only through the development of the British heart can the cultures circumvent the otherwise inevitable misunderstandings of language that create tragic situations, like the fictional Marabar Caves incident or the real Amritsar Massacre,⁴ and threaten the Raj. Blame for colonial estrangement must be thus placed primarily on Britain--just as Kipling criticizes the unwise British administrator. For Forster, the responsibility for reconciliation rests with the people from the British Isles; yet in A Passage to India he, perhaps knowing this group's tendencies too well, appears rather pessimistic about the possibility of such a reconciliation.

It is a pity that the two groups cannot get along--primarily that the British cannot develop an affectionate respect for the Indians because, as G. K. Das notes, "A Passage to India portrays an India of perennially attractive interest; it portrays an India whose people, their stream of life, their civilization, religions, and culture, all have peculiar attractions" (90). By maintaining distant, haughty superiority, Anglo-Indians forego all the intricate charms that India offers. Thus, Forster appears to wish not that colonization had never brought the two groups together, but that Briton and Indian were more compatible. If they could have achieved a mutual affection--as did Mrs. Moore and Aziz--then perhaps they could have avoided the tragic miscommunications that language catalyzes, and the colonial

project would have begun an intimate national friendship. Forster censures not Britain's colonial enterprise, but rather its people.

In the novel's elegiac last sentence, the landscape's hint of hope delays the possibility of Aziz and Fielding's friendship to some later, indefinite time:

But the horses didn't want it--they swerved apart; the earth didn't want it, sending up rocks through which the riders must pass single file; the temples, the tank, the jail, the palace, the birds, the carrion, the Guest House, that came into view as they issued from the gap and saw Mau beneath; they didn't want it, they said in their hundred voices, "No, not yet," and the sky said, "No, not there." (362)

The sky's overriding words, however, appear to prohibit the relationship permanently ("No, not there" [362]); as Herz notes, "The very soil prevents connection" (125). The colonial project has gone too far; it is too late for mutual understanding, and there are too many problems and too many wounds. The British and Indian camps have been too well established for the groups to meet in a neutral middle; as Benita Parry observes, "here there is no middle way to compromise and reconciliation" (133). The tragedy, therefore, is the lingering desire for intimacy without any hope of consummation. The "half-embrace" (297), the half kiss (362) typify what Sara Suleri terms the "mythologies of colonial friendship" (132) between peoples who, as Forster's narrative voice remarks, "know too much about each other to surmount the unknowable easily" (297). Against such overwhelming forces that distort the two nations' best intentions, it is perhaps best, after all, as Mrs. Moore chooses, to abandon the language that catalyzed this conflict and remain silent, lamenting the inexpressible and avoiding the inevitable "boum" of the Marabar Caves.

IV. Culturally Speaking:

Subjectivity and Illusion in Scott's The Raj Quartet

Michael Gorra in "Rudyard Kipling to Salman Rushdie" comments that Paul Scott's The Raj Quartet "provides the synthesis in the dialectic that Kipling and Forster began" (645). Though I do not interpret Kipling and Forster as the Hegelian thesis and antithesis of the Anglo-Indian novel, Gorra's implication is valid in that both Kipling and Forster derived their novels from history, but were affected in their vision by the contemporary existence of the British Empire in India. In contrast, Scott, as Gorra writes, "can try to define what it [the Raj] meant, rather than simply document an attitude toward it" (645). Yet, few scholars have recognized the benefit of Scott's hindsight; Robin Moore records the author's frustration with his literary-academic audience. As he wrote to Dorothy Ganapathy, the friend to whom he dedicated The Jewel in the Crown, "The one thing I've had to fight here is the awful English literary-academic fixation on Kipling and Forster. For heaven's sake! Did nothing happen between 1924 and 1945?" (qtd. in Moore 121). Of course, his rhetorical question accentuates that, yes, plenty happened, particularly in the deterioration of colonial relations. Scott's Quartet attempts to portray this decay and, in doing so, emphasizes the English language's role in exposing the illusions of the Raj plus its complex, lamentable failure.

Paul Scott did not become acquainted with India until his military duties in World War II brought him to the country. Although, as Patrick Swinden writes, "his novels leave us with the impression of a man thoroughly at home with his Indian subject" (3), Scott "knew nothing of India before his arrival in 1943," when he was transferred from Britain to be

commissioned in the Indian army (Weinbaum 4). During the three and a half years he served in India and Malaya, Scott absorbed British India of the 1940s, which he vividly depicted in many of his novels, including his masterpiece, The Raj Quartet. When Scott returned to England in 1946, Francine Weinbaum comments, "he was a somewhat cynical, brooding, and reflective man, his youthful fervor gone" (4). In a writing career plagued by alcoholism and financial stress (Weinbaum 7-10), Scott made several visits to India, "recharging the batteries" and often developing close friendships, particularly the one with Dorothy Ganapathy.

While Kipling perceives the English language as bringing order and rationality to India and Forster presents it as the catalyst of cross-cultural conflict, Paul Scott in The Raj Quartet portrays the sociopolitical consequences of English as the ruler's tongue. As this lengthy work primarily focuses on attempting to understand why the imperial project in India failed so lamentably, causes of the linguistic problem are suggested as well as many often irreparable effects. Moreover, while revealing the injustices, prejudices, and ultimately the failure of the Raj, the text depicts the English language as subjectively culture specific and as complicating the "violent opposition" of colonial relations between Britain and India (Jewel 1).

Most dialogue between characters in The Raj Quartet occurs in English. In contrast to Indians portrayed by Kipling and Forster, Scott's Indians, most of whom demonstrate an excellent command of English, do not appear foolish through errors of grammar, diction, or pronunciation. Overall, Scott's Quartet lacks the stylistic representations of character speech employed by Kipling and Forster. Though the tetralogy is not devoid of humor, its tone and themes do not support the comic babuisms that have seeped into much of the earlier British literature of India, nor does the work encourage the

devaluation of Indians implicit in such renderings.

When characters' discourse occurs, however infrequently, in an Indian language, most often the speech appears similar to fluent modern English. At times, the change of language is perhaps only vaguely discernible through style or manner of speech. An example is the slight inclusion of proverbial metaphors ("The pot of honey . . . tastes better after a long abstinence" [Jewel 213]) or vaguely archaic syntax or diction ("I should feel shame for my son to serve it [the administration of a foreign government]. Better he should oppose the administration in the courts to help his own people" [Jewel 209]). Rather, non-English speech is usually indicated either by the narratorial commentary or by the reader's knowledge of previously communicated character qualities; for example, devout Hindus who disdain western education and language are unlikely to converse in English.

In The Raj Quartet, not only does thought define language, but also language defines thought. For example, born into a devout Hindu family that discouraged Westernized education, the young but perceptive Duleep Kumar recognizes that, because he was not raised to think like an Englishman, he could never truly speak like one (Jewel 206). Rather, as he later tells his son Hari, he could never escape his Indian cultural background; it defined his ability to use language and thus prevented him from speaking English other than in superficial imitation:

. . . everything I said, because everything I thought, was in conscious mimicry of the people who rule us. We did not necessarily admit this, but that is what was always in their minds when they listened to us. It amused them mostly. Sometimes it irritated them. It still does. Never they could listen to us and forget that we were a subject, inferior people. The more

idiomatic we tried to be the more naïve our thinking seemed, because we were thinking in a foreign language that we had never properly considered in relation to our own. (Jewel 206)

Thus, Duleep recognizes that language is not an objective system, but emerges from culturally instilled thought processes absorbed during childhood.

Observing that the British exploit Indians' imperfect English as a justification for keeping them out of positions of importance, Duleep arranges to have his son, Hari, raised to think like the British so he could speak like them; thus, Hari's linguistic ability would lead him to the prominent civil position from which Duleep's internal Indianness had barred him.

Yet, through Duleep's tragic linguistic ambitions for his son, Hari, the text exposes the entrapment in which the colonial powers place the Indian. Scorned when ignorant, Indians are mocked when they emulate British intellectualism: ". . . all they were admiring or sympathizing with was the black reflection of their own white ideals. Underneath the admiration and sympathy there was a contempt a people feel for a people who have learned things from them" (Day 311). Further, Indians are loathed by the British (and also by other Indians) when they achieve the perfect Anglicization that Lord Macaulay historically desired (Griffiths 247, 484). In The Raj Quartet, Hari Kumar embodies the tragedy of Indian ambition within the colonial system. Against the overwhelming powers of "white solidarity and white supremacy" (Jewel 7) in India, this character never can reconcile the internalized Englishness of Harry Coomer, who speaks with a "public school" accent, and the physical Indianness of Hari Kumar, as British India denies that anyone with a dark skin could speak "public school" English. Neither Briton (Jewel 251) nor Indian (Jewel 111) permits Hari Kumar to express externally through language who he is internally--an English boy with English thought

processes. Thus, he remains an outcast of both groups, standing apart, a product of the colonial project.

Ultimately, the basis for Hari's rejection by both Indian and British groups lies in how he thinks about himself and, because The Raj Quartet so closely links thought with language, how he expresses himself verbally. Duleep Kumar tells him, "It is not only if you answer the phone a stranger on the other end would think he was speaking to an English boy of the upper classes. It is that you are that boy in your mind and behavior" (Jewel 206). As Francine Weinbaum observes, "[Hari's] wealth and schooling gave Hari qualities that could only hurt an impoverished Indian back in India: a British sense of alienation from the country, an upper-class British accent, and a public-school air of superiority which will not permit him to humble himself" (132). When his destitute father's suicide forces Hari to return to the India he does not remember, he perceives himself as an equal with the British, rather than the inferior, dark-skinned being that most of Scott's British characters see. Because in England he was allowed to be equal, if not superior, to the British in education, wealth, and athletic skill, Hari refuses to bow down to the tenet of white racial superiority that emerges east of Suez.

Thus, the character of Hari Kumar, whom Lady Manners describes as "the left-over, the loose-end of our reign, the kind of person we have created" (Jewel 465), exposes the illusions of the Raj's social snobbery. The person of Hari reveals that the Raj did not subjugate Indians because they were innately inferior--unable to master the English language, think rationally, control the whimsical flowing of emotions, or, in short, be "civilized"; rather, under these superficial excuses, white supremacy rests fundamentally on skin color. The British in India deny Hari, who internally is an English boy of the upper classes, a place within their society largely because a brown skin covers his

body. Thus, the character of Hari undermines many of Britain's historical justifications for colonization and Macaulay's plan for Indian independence--as Duleep so wrongly believed, "that [the British] were waiting for Indian boys who would be as English, if not more English, than they were themselves, so that handing over the reins of power they would feel no wrench . . ." (Jewel 216). By exposing as peripheral the Raj's justifications for colonialism, Hari threatens its very existence and leaves its rulers floating without place in a complex foreign land. As Michael Gorra notes of Hari:

The skin disavows the voice; but then the voice disavows the skin. Which one does one believe? . . . perhaps the Raj sees in Hari a sign that its own day is over. . . . What if one believes the voice or, rather, finds no necessary contradiction between the voice and the face? That is even more dangerous, for it forces the white English to confront the nature and the basis of their own cultural identity. (After Empire 41)

As the British cling to an illusory identity and continually deny that Hari is what he claims to be--a brown Englishman--they appear to embody what David Spurr calls colonialism's "perpetual need for self-affirmation," "reaffirm[ing] its value in the face of engulfing nothingness" (109).

While Hari's identity and his rejection by British India expose what Francis Hutchins would call the Raj's illusion of permanence, the conflict between Hari and Ronald Merrick exposes how race relations in India have become a vicarious outlet for ancient British class conflict. Just as language catalyzes the central disharmony in A Passage to India, words begin "the affair at Bibighar" (Jewel 134):

Merrick. A clear voice. As if speaking to a servant. That tone. That language. The Englishman's Urdu. Tumara nām kya hai?

What's your name? Using the familiar tum instead of the polite form. And Kumar. Looking surprised. Pretending a surprise not felt but giving himself up to its demands. Because it was a public place.

"What?" he said. And spoke for the first time in my hearing. In perfect English. Better accented than Merrick's. "I'm afraid I don't speak Indian." That face. Dark. And handsome, far handsomer than Merrick. And then Sub-Inspector Rajendra Singh began to shout in Hindi, telling him not to be insolent, that the Sahib was asking him questions was the District Superintendent of Police and he had better jump to it and answer properly when spoken to. When he had finished Kumar looked back at Merrick and asked, "Didn't this man understand? It's no use talking Indian at me." (Jewel 134, Scott's emphasis)

Here in the Sanctuary and later in an Indian prison, Merrick's persecution of Hari serves two purposes. On one level, Merrick, by overcoming Hari physically, asserts his racial superiority and displays the weakness of the ruled Indian races and dark skins. Yet, on a deeper level, Hari's English accents, "better accented" (Jewel 134, Scott's emphasis) and "so much more English even than Merrick's," align him with the British "sharp clipped-spoken accents of privilege and power," which stir up "old resentments" (Jewel 136). Thus, because "[t]he hierarchy of races mirrored the British class system" (Eldridge 145), middle-class Merrick, with his defining middle-class English accent, can assume upper-class superiority through race while simultaneously attacking the oppressive, haughty upper class embodied in Hari's "public school" English, the upper class who would never let Merrick rise from his lower origins and would keep him "invisible" in England.

As The Raj Quartet illustrates that language precedes from cultural thought processes, the text also presents language as embodying cultural characteristics. Just as Scott's British maintain superficial altruistic justifications for imperialism in India, but hide underlying greed, power, and racial superiority, their native language becomes a vehicle for deception despite its apparently objective and rational character. For example, when comparing the English language with Hindi, Duleep Kumar explains to his son that English

cannot be called truthful because its subtleties are infinite. It is the language of a people who have probably earned their reputation for perfidy and hypocrisy because their language itself is so flexible, so often light-headed with statements which appear to mean one thing one year and quite a different thing the next.

(Jewel 206)

Ahmed Kasim, son of the famous All-India Congress politician, Mohammed Ali Kasim, perceives that "In India [where] nearly everybody spoke metaphorically . . . the English . . . spoke bluntly and could make their most transparent lies look honest as consequence" (Day 107).

In The Raj Quartet, language, so closely connected with its home culture's characteristics, also carries inherent subjective cultural interpretations of situations, people, or reality in general. For example, ardent nationalist Pandit Baba exposes the propaganda and thought manipulation behind the English word "riot" and its application to nationalist uprisings. Viewing English as "the language of a foreign power, the language of . . . [the] jailers [of the Indian leaders]" (Day 104), Pandit Baba expounds to young Ahmed Kasim:

"Yes, I see," Ahmed said, . . . "Then you were in Mayapore

during the riots.”

“Which riots are you meaning?”

“The riots in August last year.”

. . . He [Pandit Baba] now looked at Ahmed as if he felt he had been threatened with violence.

“You must be speaking of something that has escaped my notice,” he said at last. . . . “I am not remembering any riots in Mayapore in August 1st year.” He paused, continued. “A riot--and since you are knowing English somewhat better than me, perhaps you will correct me or corroborate--a riot I believe according to English dictionary refers to the violent actions of unlawful assembly of people. In Mayapore and India in general only I remember spontaneous demonstrations of innocent and law-abiding people to protest against the unlawful imprisonment without trial of men such as your father, and in Mayapore, particularly, demonstrations against the unlawful arrest of innocent men accused of a crime none of them committed. If this is what you are mistakenly calling riots, then--yes, I was in Mayapore at this time, when many people suffered the consequence of resisting unlawful acts by those supposed to be in lawful authority.” (Day 108)

Thus, Pandit Baba reveals language's power to manipulate how we perceive reality and the mental control that Britain exerts over Indians; for him the language of the foreign power acts as a weapon of subjugation that “threaten[s him] with violence.” Pandit Baba further advises Ahmed, “When you speak of riots you are speaking as the English speak. You must speak like an Indian, and think like an Indian” (Day 109). Incidentally, the fictional

Pandit Baba perceives the power of the colonizers' language much as African author Ngugi wa Thiong'o does. As Ngugi maintains, to use a language is to shift so that one sees things from that language's cultural perspective or viewpoint (16); thus,

the most important area of domination was the mental universe of the colonised, the control, through culture, of how people perceived themselves and their relationship to the world. . . . The domination of a people's language by the languages of the colonising nations was crucial to the domination of the mental universe of the colonised. (16)

The text uses Pandit Baba's exposition of the word "riot" to challenge the reader's acceptance of the word's application to the Mayapore uprisings; just as Baba challenges Ahmed, his comments expose the cultural bias of the various British narratives. As Scott's narrative voice portrays Pandit Baba as knowledgeable, the reader must question the validity of a label applied throughout one lengthy volume and the beginning of a second. In doing so, the text implicates, involves, and invites the reader to reevaluate prior judgments about cultures and characters.⁵

The reevaluating reader must recognize that, from the beginning of The Raj Quartet, the English language has been connected with propaganda and the subjectively cultural British perspective. For example, Edwina Crane, a missionary teacher, often uses the famous allegorical picture, The Jewel in Her Crown, to teach Indian children the English language ("This is the Queen. That is her crown. The sky there is blue. Here there are clouds in the sky. The uniform of the sahib is scarlet" [Jewel 19]). Mr. Cleghorn, a fellow teacher, would often comment, "'Ah, the picture again, Miss Crane, . . . admirable, admirable. . . . To teach English and at the same time love of the

English" (Jewel 19).

Other connections between language and subjectivity include the propaganda implicit in the Quartet's journalistic narratives. These newspaper clippings, often relating historical events, contain cultural value judgments that are determined by who (an Indian or Briton) owns the newspaper, who reads the articles, and whether the organization is concerned about receiving governmental praise or censure. In particular, those newspapers that strongly align themselves with British India, such as the Ranpur Gazette, can be seen to engage in what David Spurr describes as "the rhetoric of affirmation in colonial discourse" (110). Spurr writes, "that affirmation is the rhetorical gesture in which the subject actually constitutes itself through repetition, allies itself with the law, and strengthens itself against imminent danger from without or within" (110). In a Ranpur Gazette article describing both Daphne Manner's rape and the attack on Edwina Crane, the reporter employs self-affirming statements, such as "Her family is one that distinguished itself in service to India" (Towers 43) and offers conclusions that affirm British India's exclusively lawful position:

The authorities showed foresight in arresting members of Congress within a few hours of the committee passing the resolution. It behooves us all to be equally on our guard. And it is to be hoped that those who are guilty of these vicious and outrageous attacks on two innocent Englishwomen and the murder of the Indian school-teacher will quickly be brought to justice. (Towers 45)

Through the culturally subjective views inherent in language, the text draws the reader's attention to the numerous discrepancies in both written and oral first-person accounts of history. The narrative often jumps from one

person's journal to a newspaper article, back to another person's journal to a letter, another letter to a police report, all independent elements that at times are connected by third-person narration. Because these accounts originate largely from the novels' characters, through an "intricate layering of one character's point of view upon another's" (Gorra After Empire 19), the reader discovers the psychology of the major figures through their narratives; in these narratives, the characters reveal their sympathies, their strengths and weaknesses, how they view the world and the imperial project. Therefore, much of the commentary on British-Indian relations filters to the reader through a mesh of personal and cultural biases, not emerging as objective Truth, but often rather as what Francine Weinbaum calls "opposing rights" (119). Yet, the characters as well as their historical situation appear more vivid and, moreover, truer--lower case "t"--because of their subjectivity. As Richard Morris notes about Barbie Batchelor's narrative, "Barbie's voice--her private thoughts lends intimacy and emotion to her account conveying the power of her grief and guilt. The reader empathizes with the character because the reader hears the anguish in Barbie's own voice. The account becomes more personal and thus more real" (48, emphasis added). Though some versions of history appear more reliable than those told by less positively depicted characters, even those characters' narratives whom the reader wants to believe only appear as "truer" and do not avoid subjectivity.

Not only does the text emphasize the subjectivity of the various narratives, but also many narrators self-consciously doubt that they can accurately express the muddle of 1940s British India. Daphne, in journalizing her version of the Bibighar rape, recognizes "how short of perfect re-enactment an account like this must fall" (Jewel 388). Perceiving that reality cannot be captured in a two-dimensional chronicle, she comments that

language cannot reproduce feelings like “uncertainty” and “clumsiness” (Jewel 388), feelings that give a situation its “roundness.” Barbie Batchelor, a prolific writer, also doubts language's ability to convey reality: “Always remember . . . that a letter never smiles. You may smile as you write it but the recipient will see nothing but the words” (Towers 7).

Verbal language, as well as written language, often lacks the ability to transmit meaning in The Raj Quartet. For example, Barbie Batchelor misinterprets Mabel Layton's night mumblings, which she hears as “Gillian Waller,” an unknown woman's name. Sensing the urgency behind Mabel's words, Barbie delicately attempts to discover the identity of this mysterious Gillian Waller, but fails. Despite her intentions, Barbie cannot interpret the words to understand Mabel's true meaning, a restless haunting about the 1919 Jillianwalah Bagh massacre in Amritsar. Driven to mutter about “the Indian victims of [Dyer's] slaughter” (Moore 97), Mabel's use of language appears compulsive, yet does not ease her pain or relate it to her friend Barbie.

Barbie's quest to understand Mabel's mumblings joins the search for truth that pervades the novel. Characters, narrators, and reader simultaneously seek a firmer epistemology--what exactly did happen in the Bibighar Gardens or, moreover, during the end of the Raj? The length of Scott's Quartet--in the Avon editions a massive 1,984 page work--emphasizes that recording the Raj's demise and its lamentable failure cannot be achieved concisely. As Arthur Pollard comments, “. . . the value of [Scott's] approach lies in the way he is able to suggest that what happens has many appearances and that the truth is neither simple nor easy to attain” (171). This desire to discover the truth is complicated by Scott's vision that no event can be isolated from other events in time, but that “a historical event has no definite beginning, no satisfactory end” (Jewel 125); “There are the action, the people,

and the place; all of which are interrelated but in their totality incommunicable in isolation from the moral continuum of human affairs" (Jewel 1). Scott, as Michael Gorra notes, "disrupts chronology to counterpoint one moment on that continuum with another, insisting that we see it as inseparable from its causes and consequences" (After Empire 20).

Scott does not write this complex account alone. Though some of his characters opt for despairing silence, several of Scott's protagonists--and a few antagonists, if these two binary categories apply--join him in prolifically writing private memoirs and sometimes public accounts. Perron and Daphne journalize their perceptions of the dying Raj; Barbie Batchelor writes an abundance of letters, never intended to be sent, as she contemplates her failures as a missionary teacher. Hari, under the name Philoctetes, writes to lament what Patrick Swinden describes as a "Paradise lost" (Swinden 101); in doing so, Hari may be attempting to convince himself that his paradise--England--did once exist, but, more, through his writing Hari can escape the chaos of the fading Raj by recreating a shadowy elysium:

I walk [he writes], thinking of another place, of seemingly long endless summers and the shade of different kinds of trees; and then of winters when the branches of the trees were bare, so bare that, recalling them now, it seems inconceivable to me that I looked at them and did not think of summer just gone, and the spring soon to come, as illusions, as dreams, never fulfilled, never to be fulfilled. (Division 557)

For Daphne, a written account of her version of the Bibighar acts as "an insurance against permanent silence" (Jewel 364). Despite Daphne's misgivings about her account's accuracy, she pursues her project because it too provides a brief, if imperfect regaining of her paradise--being with Hari:

Perhaps as much an assurance against permanent silence it is a consolation prize to me, to give me a chance to have him with me again in a way that is more solid than unfettered recollection, but still insubstantial. But second best is better than third--the third best of random thoughts un-pinned down. Oh, I could conjure him now, just with this scratchy old pen, in a form that might satisfy you better, but do more or less justice to what he actually was. . . . But it was never uncomplicated. (Jewel 388)

For Scott also, India in the 1940s is "never uncomplicated." Language, although laden with cultural subjectivity, provides a means, however qualified and limited, of regaining the paradises lost. To Scott the imperial project in India stands as a lost utopia, a failed potential; the possibility of a beautiful relationship is negated and ruined, not by any inherent inferiority of Indians, but by the hypocrisy, white supremacy, and class hatred British imperialists brought with them. Certainly, language, particularly the English language with its sociopolitical baggage and cultural limitations, cannot facilitate healing the two nations' wounds. Scott's last conflict is an internal choice: How does one react to this muddled tragedy? Does one spin a bittersweet flurry of words to lament what has passed? Or does one settle into desperate silence and collect dust in Sir Nello's jumbled museum of unclassified, miscellaneous artifacts of a bygone age?

As characters in The Raj Quartet struggle with what to do about language, particularly the English language, the text portrays Indians' path to mental and political independence as jumbled and diverse. Several Indian leaders, both historical and fictional, loudly protest the colonial subjugation implicit in Indian acceptance of English. Deputy Commissioner White relates

that Gandhi "was ashamed to have to speak in English in order to be understood by a largely Indian audience," pointing out the mental colonization of "[m]ost Indian leaders [who] prided themselves on their English" (Jewel 333). Similarly, Scott's fictional Pandit Baba, the renowned scholar, revolts against the use of "the language of a foreign power and . . . [of the] jailers [of the Indian leaders]" (Day 104). The narrator comments:

His [Pandit Baba's] refusal . . . to speak English did not mean he spoke it badly or was not proud of understanding and being able to speak it; but it was fashionable among Hindus of Baba's kind to decry it, to declare that once the British had been got rid of their language must go with them; although what would be put in its place was difficult to tell. (Day 104)

Thus, for those Indians attempting to separate themselves from the British, the political baggage that English carries negates any positive value as a supposedly neutral language for the multi-tongued subcontinent.

Further, The Raj Quartet reveals how the English language, historically heralded, as Snehamoy Chaklader records, as a means to unify India (56-61), superficially disguises British efforts to prevent Indian unification. This observation closely resembles, as Howard Giles, Richard Bourhis, and Donald Taylor note, the findings of Mazrui and Zirimi's (1975) sociolinguistic study: Mazrui and Zirimi observe how the transethnic language, Kiswahili, was inhibited in colonial Africa because it could have united the indigenous peoples and thereby threatened the colonial powers (341). Though few pro-British characters in The Raj Quartet admit a similar exploitation of Indian diversity, Deputy Commissioner White believes that "the English, however unconsciously and unintentionally, created the division between Muslim India and Hindu India" (Jewel 331). White ponders the issue:

I suppose the widespread use of a foreign language has exaggerated their [the Indians'] natural politeness. I've often wondered whether things wouldn't have gone infinitely better for us if our civil servants had been compelled to acquire complete fluency both in Hindi and in the main language of their province and forced to conduct every phase of government in that language. Gandhi was right, of course, it was shameful that in talking to university students he had to speak a foreign language . . . because it was probably the only language they all shared in common. We did nothing really to integrate communities, except by building railways between one and the other to carry their wealth more quickly into our own pockets." (Jewel 334, emphasis added)

Politically aware Indians conceive Britain's underlying tendency to exploit Indian diversity. As Francine S. Weinbaum notes, "In his capacity as Mayapore Gazette reporter, [Hari] Kumar overhears conversations which lead him to believe that the English openly depend on Indian political division to extend their own rule" (113). Upon his arrest, likewise, Mohammed Ali Kasim states to Governor, Sir George Malcolm, "Meanwhile, Governor-ji, we [the All-India Congress] try to do the job that your Government has always found it beneficial to leave undone, the job of unifying India, of making Indians feel that they are, above all else, Indians" (Day 19). Thus, certain Indians can perceive that the British employ the English language to keep India, not only trapped within the language's subjectivity, but also disparately disjointed under the deceptive gloss of linguistic unity.

While some Indians seek to dissociate themselves from the British by casting off their rulers' language, other Indians have fully embraced the

language and its thought patterns. A noteworthy example is Lady Lili Chatterjee, whose "funny old tongue is only properly at home in English" (Jewel 71). The very comfortable, easy-to-follow English of Lili, who Scott's Daphne says is "[t]rying to lie back and enjoy what we've [the British] done to her country" (Jewel 452), successfully integrates peculiarly British idioms, such as "bash off" (Jewel 89) and "cotton on" (Jewel 70), idioms which Kipling's Hurree Babu and Forster's Aziz could never master. Having successfully mastered the English idiom, Lili need not mimic British speech as Hurree and Aziz do; in fact, she appears to emulate the British less for "Indian snob reasons," than for a friendship that admirably overcomes that "little obstacle of the colour of the skin" (Jewel 73). Yet, as The Jewel in the Crown's narrator observes, numerous other Indians adopt English for more practical reasons, eyeing "chances as government contractors or petty civil servants and . . . [knowing] that the gift of conversing fluently in English was therefore invaluable" (Jewel 38).

While separating themselves from Anglicized Indians, The Raj Quartet's version of Forster's British "Turtons and Burtons" also disattach themselves from many originally British customs now adopted by Indians. The narrator relates, for example, how Britons in Mayapore who stayed on after Independence remain "aloof" from any public activity on the maidan, including flower shows, the gymkhana competition, and cricket (Jewel 163). Those activities which originated in British India are now identified with Indians; thus the Britons who desire to distance themselves from Indians abstain from activities which in England they would most likely enjoy:

Indeed, you might ask one of them . . . whether she went to the flower show last month and be met with a look of total incomprehension, have the question patted back like a grubby little ball that has lost its bounce, be asked, in return, as if one

had spoken in a foreign language she has been trained in but shown and felt no special aptitude or liking for: "Flower show?" and to explain . . . "Why yes--the flower show on the maidan," will call nothing forth other than . . . an indication that one has suggested something ridiculous. (Jewel 164)

Select terms of English--like "flower show"--have, it appears, fused into the Indian languages or at least into Indian English. In a way, this British woman has separated part of herself from her cultural self, language, and customs in order to preserve her disattachment from Indians.

In contrast to those British characters who attempt to reinforce their superiority, other Britons choose a sympathetic attitude, discernible in some speech patterns, toward the Indian social group. These characters, such as Edwina Crane, Daphne and Ethel Manners, Barbie Batchelor, Mabel and Sarah Layton, Sister Ludmila, and Guy Perron, choose to pursue a course toward racial love, what Weinbaum describes as "the novels' major positive value or true protagonist" (125). Among those practicing sympathetic behavior are Miss Crane who silently commits suttee in an old shed, Daphne Manners who visits a Hindu temple and loves an Indian, and Sister Ludmila who ministers to the dying poor of Mayapore.

As the text does not distinguish Indian characters' discourse and use of language--in English or in the vernacular--from British characters' linguistic patterns,⁶ several British characters who sympathize with the Indians choose silence to distance themselves from the language of British India. For example, Sarah Layton, who sympathizes with Indians, especially Ahmed Kasim, whom she later comes to love (Division 616), rejects language to communicate with Ahmed, but rather opts for silent communication. While riding with him, she surprises him and closes the gap that the Raj demands

an Indian male must keep between himself and a British woman:

She caught him before he had time to hang back, and so confronted him in the act of reining in, but having done so she could not find an acceptable way of explaining her impulsive action, either to him or to herself. Curiously, though, . . . she thought that the world might be a more interesting and useful place to live in if there were more such empty gestures as the one she apparently made. They were only empty in the sense that there was room in them for meaning to be poured. That kind of meaning wasn't found easily. It was better, then, to leave the gesture unaccompanied. To make up words just for the sake of saying something would be incongruous. (Day 125)

The silence behind Sarah's unconventional gesture represents a neutral ground for cross-cultural communication; this silence appears as a type of language, or at least a space, that does not carry prior associations, cultural, or sociopolitical baggage. Silence is also the medium through which Sarah and her father communicate after his release from a German POW camp: "He said nothing. She felt that she understood his mood" (Division 120).

In fact, those British characters who employ what Howard Giles would term speech convergence with the Indians do so with very antagonistic intentions. Merrick, whose "Urdu was fluent" (Day 151), possesses in many ways the linguistic abilities of Kipling's wise administrator, Colonel Creighton, yet Scott reveals that Merrick employs his skill for a very different purpose. Using language as a torture device, Merrick punishes a prisoner for defecting into the Indian National Army while in a Japanese concentration camp and for then taking up arms against the British:

In Pankot they do not yet know the story of Havilar Karim

Muzzafir Khan who let himself believe in the lies of Subhas Chandra Bose [the leader of the rebel Indian National Army?]. But soon they will know. And they will be dumb with shame and sorrow. The wild dogs in the hills will be silent and your wife will not raise her head.

The Punjab officer [Merrick] spoke a resonant classic Urdu. It was a language that lent itself to poetic imagery but Perron had heard few English men use it so flexibly, so effectively, or to such a purpose. . . . Perron thought he [the prisoner] might break down. He believed this was the officer's intention and he was appalled. He would have understood better if the officer and the prisoner were of the same regiment because by tradition a regiment was a family and the harshest rebuke might then be ameliorated by the context of family concern . . . Then, if the man wept, it would be with regret and shame. If he wept now it would be from humiliation at the hands of a stranger. (Division 49, Scott's emphasis)

Language for Merrick becomes a weapon of power, a torture device similar to the cane and trestle that Hari Kumar claims Merrick used on him (Day 298).

Thus, in a world where British characters adopt Indian languages to facilitate brutal subjugation and assert dominance, it becomes clear why, not only Sarah Layton, but several other British characters sympathetic to the Indian plight revert to silence to express their shifted allegiance. Edwina Crane wordlessly becomes suttee, an act that in its reticence resembles Barbie Batchelor's determined, if addled vow of silence: "I have nothing to give you in exchange she had written, not even a rose: written on a pad because she no longer spoke" (Division 134). Words fail in colonial relations just as they fail

for Barbie to express what she has discovered about India: "She remembered a great deal. But was unable to say what it was. The birds had picked the words clean" (Towers 385). Barbie, who Robin Moore observes "represents displacement and a sense of lost mission" (93), takes on silence--as she simultaneously takes on insanity; the rejection of language becomes Barbie's penance, yet reveals her despair for the unknown Indian (Towers 89).

Another primary character chooses silence in an act that shows not sympathy but complete despair. Sadly, the duality and nothingness of Hari Kumar aligns him with both the British and Indian groups and, therefore, with neither. Rejected by Indians and Britons and accepted only by the gawky Daphne Manners, Hari soon painfully relinquishes his ties to the British group, yet only superficially accepts membership among Indians. Battered and subdued by Merrick, throughout his two years of imprisonment without trial, Hari remains silent. His silence simultaneously expresses his resistance to the British penal system, faithfulness to his promise to Daphne about her rape ("You know nothing. Say nothing" [Jewel 425]), and refusal to align himself completely with Indians by accepting their languages. Once released and with no social group to which he can belong, he fades into the dirty slums of an Indian city, where he ekes out a death-like existence without community, without a future.

Thus, Hari embodies the loving and yet hating relationship between Britain and India, which Scott so carefully weaves throughout his masterpiece of cultural, colonial interaction. How does an Indian separate completely from Britain, so long-standingly present and fused with his identity? How can a Briton compete against India, that which for over two hundred years has been "The Jewel in the Crown" of the British self? This paradox only emphasizes the unexplainable--the massive muddle of

two nations in violent opposition, not for the first time nor as yet for the last because they were then still locked in an imperial embrace of such long standing and subtlety it was no longer possible for them to know whether they hated or loved one another, or what it was that held them together and seemed to have confused the image of their separate destinies. (Jewel 1)

While urging the Briton to move toward the Indian in sympathetic understanding despite the lateness of the hour, The Raj Quartet laments the distortion of what Francine Weinbaum describes as "the Well-Intentioned Raj" (117). Weinbaum comments:

Despite the recording of actions based on self-interest and justified by the illusion of principle, the Quartet is at pains to show "as inaccurate, [the] picture of a tyrannical and imperialistic power grinding the faces of its coloured subjects in the dust." . . . The Raj had meant well, and the Quartet records its good intentions. (117)

Weinbaum observes the failure in British policy, the "complex . . . product of opposing factions" (117) and the Hegelian tragic "conflict of two opposing rights" (119). Thus, Scott's Quartet depicts how crushing pressures trap and collapse the Raj, a dying star, in upon itself, taking with it in its explosion of heated, old passions those orbiting, hovering individuals whose memory cannot recall any other sun. Yet, Scott depicts how the original star of the Raj did once appear very similar to the one that shines in Kipling's Kim; Kipling's Raj also means well, and Kipling labors long to relate didactically how it could, in his opinion, do well for both Britain and India.

Thus, when Scott's Quartet inverts Kipling's Kim, it does so not because the intentions of empire differ but because something or somebody

somewhere went terribly, horribly awry. Forced into this crazy, misbegotten world, Scott's Hari, we see, is an anti-Kim who exposes the myth of Kipling's colonial Bildungsroman. While the racially British Kim spends his formative years as an Indian, learning to think and act "Orientially," he later regains his British status without losing the benefits of his Indian education. In contrast, racially Indian Hari Kumar is educated in England to think and speak perfect English, but is forced to return to India where these qualities prohibit his successfully adaptation into his newly gained racial heritage. Thus, through the character of Hari Kumar, Scott exposes many of the Raj's justifications as illusions and reveals the specter of race as a, if not the, major cause of the colonial relationship's failure. Because Kim can temporarily tint his skin when he needs to "become" Indian again, he can successfully thrive in both worlds. On the other hand, Hari is doomed to failure, never being able either to wash off his skin's color or to discard his English thought processes. Thus, Scott exposes Kipling's fallacious justifications of the Raj--the Indian's supposed inability to govern due to innate racial weaknesses--to be superficial veneers over the underlying belief in white supremacy.

In a further inversion of Kim, the Quartet depicts language as still the tool of the British ruler, one that can be flexibly adorned and employed as situation demands; yet, in the complex chaos of colonial failure, it is not language, but the British administrator, that has changed. Kipling's wise British administrator, who dedicates himself selflessly for the good of the empire and its subjects, enters into a parental and yet marital relationship with India. In The Raj Quartet, however, this doctrine of man-bap, "Mother-Father"--"the relation between British paternalism and Indian loyalty" (Moore 93)--has soured into what the character Barbie Batchelor calls "the combination of hardness and sentimentality" (Towers 374) and what critic

Francine Weinbaum identifies as a misguided illusion (151). Thus, while the Raj had good intentions and individuals, such as Scott's Deputy Commissioner White, who mitigates racial tensions, Britain carried its own problems into the colonial relationship and could not resist the temptation of believing that it actually was mother, father, husband, brother, and everything to India. That there was something deadly and corrosive in "posing as gods" (51), as Forster's Mrs. Moore puts it,⁷ becomes apparent when Britain, for all her good intentions and high ideals, could not sustain the man-bap relationship without developing the poisonous doctrines of "white solidarity and white supremacy" (Jewel 6-7). As Miss Crane realizes while she sits in the rain holding the dead Mr. Chaudhuri's hand, the imperial system has collapsed. As Michael Gorra notes, Miss Crane recognizes that "the British can no longer protect those whom it is their self-appointed mission to protect. . . . Not only can [they] no longer preserve the order they take as a justification for their rule; they are themselves responsible for its destruction" ("Kipling to Rushdie" 647).

In the Quartet, the language these god-impersonators speak functions as a metaphor for the Raj; on one level, it labors to unify disparate parts, bring rational order, and introduce western ideals while, on another deeper level, it releases what Ngugi wa Thiong'o terms "a cultural bomb," by making people "want to identify with that which is furthest removed from themselves" (3). The language offers unity, but only shallowly on terms of its own host culture; it also affirms that culture's illusion of false divinity by offering a standard of judgment which endorses its British speakers' notions of racial superiority and devalues those who speak "the tinny, saw-cut English of the native-bred" (Kim 115).

V

After Macaulay's victory over the "Orientalists" in the 1830s, British imperialists advocated the adoption of English as India's common, unifying language. Kipling's Kim, Forster's A Passage to India, and Scott's The Raj Quartet all thematically depict an alternate vision of the English language's role in imperial India. Even Kipling, the so-called "bard of empire," does not support unqualified adoption of English by the Indian people or herald the language as the solution to India's diversity. Rather, his Kim embraces the linguistic diversity of the subcontinent and reserves mastery of English for his British colonialists, who alone can effectively employ the language's powers of rationality and order. Further, the novel scorns those who, out of ignorance, apply English to all situations, especially relational or spiritual endeavors, that the text designates to the Oriental languages. If anything unifies India in Kim, it is the character of Kim; by embodying the best of the British and Indian cultures, Kim becomes the physical child--the two shall become one flesh--of Kim's complementary marriage of "male" Britain and "female" India.

Forster's A Passage to India depicts the prevalence of Macaulay's English education of Indians, yet reveals very emphatically that forcing Indians to adopt English, British linguistic territory, has catalyzed many woeful misunderstandings between the two cultures. When Indians and Britons converse in the same literal language, this "shared" medium becomes a deceptive illusion of cross-cultural communication: both groups employ different standards of interpretation, creating conflict and tragedy. Yet, as the Indian characters develop solidarity and nationalism throughout the novel, the text does not offer a definitive non-English unifying language. While

they can be briefly united through the spirit of Indian poetry, Forster's Indians--and even those few sympathetic Britons--remain in a state of partial alienation embodied in the tragic half-embrace and half-kiss. Thus, if the pessimistic A Passage to India offers a language of unification, it lies disturbingly in the echo of the Marabar Caves, that reduces everything to the same meaningless "boum."

Scott's The Raj Quartet directly exposes the illusion of Macaulay's Anglicized India. The text reveals how the culturally subjective and loaded language of English cannot facilitate sociopolitical unification of India any more than it has ever been able to unite Britain's ancient factions of class conflict. Further, The Raj Quartet reveals the language's inadequacy to construct an objective, coherent account of history, especially that of the chaotically complex 1940s in British India. Yet, Scott's India lacks even the unification that would come from complete rejection of the British and their language; so long have the two countries been wrestling against one another that they can no longer distinguish whether their relationship is one of love or hate. Consequently, the Indian populace in The Raj Quartet is fragmented into levels of British toleration or emulation. If in this isolating, alienating situation a language for unification exists, it is the language of silence and emptiness, adopted by many British characters sympathetic to the Indian plight. Yet, the text reveals that even silence can be unreliable, a product of insanity, or as equally isolating as death.

As the imperial project in India declined, the writers Rudyard Kipling, E. M. Forster, and Paul Scott depict these increasingly problematic images of language relations and cross-cultural communication between Britain and India. Yet all three authors, regardless of their respective views on the ultimate outcome of the Raj, suggest extremely similar ideals for British

characters, namely that the Briton move from self-satisfied complacency to understand the Indian and personally emulate valuable aspects of the Indian culture. Yet these authors all choose, despite their depictions of English's limitations or problems, to portray the Raj employing the very same language their texts limited, blamed, or lamented. Indeed, acquaintances, biographers, and critics report that Kipling, Forster, and Scott were very deliberate, almost obsessed in scribing their expressions of Indian colonialism. All three wrote these works about India while not in India; but once returned to England, they employed their mother tongue creatively to express their memories of that distant, diverse land.

NOTES

¹Giles' theory of speech accommodation proposes that an individual who desires approval and wishes to integrate with another individual or group will attempt to align herself socially with this other person or group by reducing linguistic dissimilarities between herself and that person or group. This behavior Giles terms speech accommodation. Giles also theorizes that non-converging speech behaviors occur when an individual wishes to maintain a separate identity, particularly his ethnicity, from another person or group. In this behavior that Giles calls speech divergence, the individual will either maintain his speech pattern or increase linguistic dissimilarities between himself and the other person or group (Giles, Bourhis, and Taylor 321-4).

²Kipling is not alone in excluding certain subjects from his artistic renderings of India. Allen J. Greenberger notes that many Anglo-Indian authors of Kipling's era joined him in omitting certain topics from their writings. Greenberger notes, "As interesting as the things that the authors of this period wrote about . . . is what they did not discuss," namely rising Indian nationalism (5).

³Forster's Hindus, such as Professor Godbole and Dr. Panna Lal, appear to possess different cultural values and thus employ language to different purposes. Yet what these purposes actually are, it is difficult to determine; these Hindus, particularly Professor Godbole, often appear completely unintelligible to both Muslims ("the comparatively simple mind of the Mohammedan was encountering Ancient Night" [81]) and Britons: "Well, the expedition where [a terrible catastrophe] occurs can scarcely be called a successful one,' said Fielding, with an amazed stare. [Godbole replied,] 'I cannot say. I was not present.' [Fielding] stared again--a most

useless operation, for no eye could see what lay at the bottom of a Brahman's mind . . ." [195]).

⁴Scholar G. K. Das very thoroughly notes the close connection between the historical Amritsar Massacre (1917) and Forster's Marabar incident (46-52).

⁵ This tactic of narrational surprise is not unique to Scott, but is used by writers such as George Herbert, Jane Austen, and Joseph Conrad. For example, a reader of Jane Austen's Pride and Prejudice is led to reevaluate Mr. Darcy after absorbing many unreliable, subjective opinions about his character.

⁶Scott does occasionally distinguish lower class forms of English, by pronunciation, diction, or particular expressions, such as "havin' a lark" and "All the same we dropped a right clanger, didn't we, sir?" (Day 186). Such instances are perhaps rare because, as most British characters are from the upper classes, very few characters who would have such distinguishing speech patterns appear and engage in dialogue. More often, narratorial commentary outside the characters' discourse will relay necessary information about accent or aural qualities of speech, such as "But the voice was still resonant. It was a good voice, but not public school" (Day 147)).

⁷Kipling also makes this point in his short story "The Man Who Would Be King" and his poem "The Islanders."

Works Cited

- Austen, Jane. Pride and Prejudice. Ed. Donald Gray. 2nd ed. New York: W. Norton, 1993.
- Brennan, Gerald. "Morgan." E. M. Forster: Interviews and Recollections. Stape 52-3.
- Chaklader, Snehomoy. Sociolinguistics: A Guide to Language Problems in India. New Delhi: Mittal, 1990.
- Das, G. K. E. M. Forster's India. Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield, 1977.
- Eldridge, C. C. The Imperial Experience: From Carlyle to Forster. New York: St. Martin's, 1996.
- Forster, E. M. Abinger Harvest. London: Edward Arnold, 1936.
- . The Hill of Devi and Other Indian Writings. Ed. Elizabeth Heine. Vol. 14 of The Abinger Edition of E. M. Forster. London: Edward Arnold, 1983.
- . A Passage to India. New York: Harcourt and Brace, 1965.
- Giles, H[oward]. "Linguistic Differentiation in Ethnic Groups." Differentiation between Social Groups. Ed. Henri Tajfel. London: Academic Press, 1978. 361-93.
- Giles, H[oward]., R[ichard]. Bourhis, and D[onald]. Taylor. "Towards a Theory of Language in Ethnic Group Relations." Ed. Howard Giles. Language, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations. London: Academic Press, 1977. 307-348.
- Giles, Howard, and Philip Smith. "Accommodation Theory: Optimal Levels of Convergence." Language and Social Psychology. Ed. Howard Giles and Robert N. St. Clair. Baltimore: University Park, 1979.
- Giroux, Robert. "Meeting 'an Old and Valued Author.'" Stape 91-7.
- Gorra, Michael. After Empire: Scott, Naipaul, Rushdie. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1997.

- . "Rudyard Kipling to Salman Rushdie." The Columbia History of the British Novel. Ed. John Richetti. New York: Columbia UP, 1994.
- Greenberger, Allen J. The British Image of India: A Study in the Literature of Imperialism 1880-1960. London: Oxford UP, 1969.
- Griffiths, Percival. The British Impact on India. N.p.: Archon Books, 1965.
- Hemenway, Stephen Ignatius. The Anglo-Indian Novel. Vol. 1 of The Novel of India. 2 vols. Calcutta: Abinas, 1975.
- Herz, Judith Scherer. A Passage to India: Nation and Narration. New York: Twayne, 1993.
- Hutchins, Francis G. The Illusion of Permanence: British Imperialism in India. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1967.
- Hynes, Samuel. The Edwardian Turn of Mind. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1968.
- Kachru, Braj B. "The Second Diaspora of English." English in Its Social Contexts: Essays in Historical Sociolinguistics. Ed. Tim William Machan and Charles T. Scott. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1992. 230-252.
- Kidwai, Jalil Ahmad, ed. Forster-Masood Letters. Karachi, Pakistan: Ross Masood Education and Culture Society of Pakistan, 1984
- Kipling, Rudyard. "The Islanders." Collected Verse of Rudyard Kipling. New York: Doubleday, 1907. 202-5.
- . Kim. New York, Puffin Books, 1987.
- . "Recessional." British Poetry 1880-1920: Edwardian Voices. Ed. Paul L. Wiley and Harold Orel. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969. 169-70.
- . Something of Myself and Other Autobiographical Writings. Ed. Thomas Pinney. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990.
- Moore, Robin. Paul Scott's Raj. London: Heinemann, 1990.

- Moore-Gilbert, B. J. Kipling and Orientalism. London: Croom Helm, 1986.
- Morris, Richard. "Politics and the Narrative in Paul Scott's Raj Quartet." Thesis. Eastern Illinois U, 1990.
- Ngugi wa Thiong'o. Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature. London: James Curry, 1986.
- Orange, Michael. "Language and Silence in A Passage to India." E. M. Forster: A Human Exploration. Ed. G. K. Das and John Beer. New York: New York UP, 1979.
- Paffard, Mark. Kipling's Indian Fiction. New York: St. Martin's, 1989.
- Parry, Benita. "A Passage to India: Epitaph or Manifesto?" E. M. Forster: A Human Exploration. Ed. G. K. Das and John Beer. New York: New York UP, 1979. 129-41.
- Phillipson, Robert. Linguistic Imperialism. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1992.
- Pinney, Thomas. Introduction. Something of Myself and Other Autobiographical Writings. By Rudyard Kipling. Ed. Thomas Pinney. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990. vii-xxxv.
- Pollard, Arthur. "Twilight of Empire: Paul Scott's Raj Quartet." Individual and Community in Commonwealth Literature. Ed. Daniel Massa. Msida: U of Malta P, 1979. 169-176.
- Said, Edward. Culture and Imperialism. New York: Vintage Books, 1994.
- Scott, Paul. The Day of the Scorpion. New York: Avon, 1979.
- . A Division of the Spoils. New York: Avon, 1979.
- . The Jewel in the Crown. New York: Avon, 1979.
- . The Towers of Silence. New York: Avon, 1979.
- Spurr, David. The Rhetoric of Empire: Colonial Discourse in Journalism, Travel Writing, and Imperial Administration. Durham: Duke UP, 1993.

Stape, J. H., ed. E. M. Forster: Interviews and Recollections. New York: St. Martin's, 1993.

Stevens, Peter. "The Localized Forms of English." The Other Tongue: English across Cultures. Ed. Braj B. Kachru. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1982. 23-30.

Suleri, Sara. The Rhetoric of English India. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992.

Swinden, Patrick. Paul Scott: Images of India. London: MacMillan, 1980.

Trivedi, Harish. Colonial Transactions: English Literature and India. Manchester: Manchester UP. 1995.

Weinbaum, Francine S. Paul Scott: A Critical Study. Austin: U of Texas P, 1992.