CONCLUSION

When history was craving for a transition from an old political order to social dispensation, Rabindranath Tagore was born. The end of colonialism, the uprising of 1857, the rise of Nationalism and the eclipse of Queen Victoria’s rule has signaled a new epoch and awakening. Tagore’s family belonged to a class of landowners who were primarily responsible for the success of Colonial empire. It is during these times of mid 19th century India has awakened to the emergence of new intellectual class which is the product of new universities in Calcutta, Bombay and Madras. The contribution of these universities has crossed the cross cultural education and extended beyond the boundaries of so called traditional intellectuals. Undeniably, cutting across the limitation of colonial education, Tagore’s address through his life and literature is confined to the middle classes who had nourished the colonial English education. The opening up of new opportunities to introduce new genres of literatures though limited to the humanist and liberal bourgeois, created an intellectual space which has accommodated Tagore and his social, literary and philosophical legacy. This went in parallel with the social reform movements of Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Ishwarachandra Vidyasagar etc. The discourse of social reform served a large purpose in resisting the tradition despite inconsistencies and contradictions. It is unwise to view this discourse in isolation as it has pervaded into manifold activities of civil society.
These times have witnessed a wide range of associative activities addressing the broad spectrum of social and cultural events.

The domain of literature was subjected to transformative change along with the great changes in colonial administration, intellectual orientation and socio-political activities in the nation. It is very pertinent to reflect on the aspect that in the first thirty years of Tagore’s life, many significant writers who initiated a niche of modern literature were born. Among the popular writers Munshi Premchand (1880), Purushottam Das Tandon (1882), Maithilisharan Gupta (1886) of Hindi Literature, Narayan Apte, Krishnaji Keshave Damle of Marathi literature, D.V. Gunduppa, Masti Venkatesha Iyengar, Subramania Bharathi of Tamil literature and Hira Singh Dard, Bhai Vir Sing of Punjab are popular. Many of the younger contemporaries of Tagore passed away before he reached the age of thirty years.

In world literature, the Belgian poet-dramatist Maurice Maeterlinck, the English writer Rudyard Kipling, the Irish poet W. B. Yeats, the French novelist and essayist Romain Rolland, the Italian Philosopher Benedetto Corce, the British playwright John Galsworthy and the French author Andre Gide are very popular and won Noble prize for their brilliant and intellectually stimulating works in literature. Tagore had the privilege of interacting and sharing companionship of all these writers. Yeats and Andre Gide were among those who played an important role in making Tagore’s *Gitanjali* accessible in translation to many people. During his stay in Europe, he developed a personal contact with Rolland and Croce which developed into mutual admiration. But Tagore could not become
a part of circle of mutual admiration of younger contemporaries. Hermann Hesse who won the Noble prize in 1946 and Stefan Zweig developed a close and intimate relationship with Tagore. But Thomas Mann and Frantz Kafka were unimpressed and dismissed the excellence of Tagore in their private opinions. An exception to this is Juan Ramon Jimenez the noble prize winner of 1956, Translated Tagore into Spanish.

After winning the noble prize, Tagore was widely appreciated and admired across the world despite the changing political and cultural contexts. But this favourable situation has dwindled due to Tagore’s consistent criticism of Western nationalism. The translators began to express their dissatisfaction over the poor quality of translations. Apart from these, Tagore was caste in stereotypical presentations. This has caused a long and steady trend of depreciation of his reputation. This stood in contrast to the iconization of Tagore in India during the last years of his death. It is revealed to the world, that the west has overcome the euphoria of Noble Prize created by itself, when the encomiums showered on Tagore were completely exhausted. Some how, the tide turned against Tagore in England and US after 1920s. However, there are avid readers of Tagore’s works continue to proliferate. For instance, philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein developed the habit of reading the poems of Tagore. In 1938, when he was writing *Philosophical Investigations*, Ludwig has translated parts of Tagore’s *King of the Dark Chamber* saying that Tagore has expressed his own religious ideal. As an ultimate universal example, the poet Wilfred Owen, saying last goodbye to his
mother, before going to the war quoted *Gitanjali* while dying in the war front. These examples remain as universal when one explores the question of the relevance of Tagore to the contemporary Global culture.

The recent research into British and North American archives and private papers, establish the construction of the image of the Sage Tagore continues like wild fire. It is pertinent to observe Ezra Pound's great enthusiasm: “Tagore got the Noble Prize because after the cleverest boom of our times, after the fiat of omnipotent literati of distinction, he lapsed into religion and the award was a matter of convenience for the Swedish Academy in the face of the conflicting claims of the European authors” (Pound to Iris Barry, 25 January 1917, Dutta and Robinson, 1995. 227). It is on these lines, the west has preferred to construe Tagore as a sage and India tried its best to appropriate the stereotype. But there has been a systematic study into the enigmatic personality of Tagore overcoming the barriers of translation.

It is commonly understood that the impact of Tagore was perceptible in distant nations across the world and regions in India. In acquiring a decisive proof to defuse the impact or influence, the scholars are given the possibility of relying on highlighting the parallel growth literature in English and regional languages on par with the pervasive influence of Tagore’s personality. But Tagore’s claim is greater than any parallel development in literature. In fact, the recognition of plurality of literatures that paved the way for the emergence of Dalit/Sublatem literatures knowingly accept Tagore as a catalytic agent and a common icon.