Chapter 7

CONCLUSIONS

The study, *Literary Theories of Gayatri Spivak, Homi Bhabha, Ania Loomba, Gauri Viswanathan and Ganesh Devy: An Assessment* is a great appraisal of their work. It is a noteworthy contribution in the Indian literary criticism. It may help the research students to have an access of their work as a guideline to their new investigation in literary criticism. Their contributions are the milestones in the Indian literary criticism. They have proved themselves prominent and significant in the global scenario. They tried to take our Indian literary criticism on a global rank. The impact of many Western theorists and critics is observed on their work. Their work will prove to be a kind of an important help to understand the Indian literary field. We could get a kind of angle of analyzing and assessing a work of art. They proved themselves as a scholarly readers and analyzers of work of foreign authors.

The conclusions of this study are presented on different ways. First of all, their contribution on an individual level is focused. It includes the charges and criticism if, leveled against them too. Then their contribution is presented with comparative style to analyze their individual talent. All prove that they are well-known and reputed postcolonial critics and theorists. Further the sources of their study and the influences of native or Western theorists on their work is discussed. Finally, the global significance of their contribution is highlighted. Here, it is noticed that they have improved our Indian image on global scenario. Their work is an evidence of our talented and outstanding performance in the field of literary criticism.
7.0 INDIVIDUAL PERFORMANCE:

i) Gayatri Chakravorty-Spivak established a good record by publishing her translation work, *Of Grammatology*. Spivak is the best cultural and literary theorist who addresses a vast range of political questions with both pen and voice. Her texts lively reflect her unmistakable voice as she speaks on questions of representation and self-representation, the politicization of deconstruction; the situation of postcolonial critics; pedagogical responsibility; and political strategies. She has undertaken lot projects to present her position in Indian critical tradition. She describes herself as a “para-disciplinary, ethical philosopher”. The most interesting about her engagement of the postcolonial predicament is the uneasy marriage of Marxism, feminism and deconstruction that underlies her critical work. Spivak combines Marxism and deconstruction in the name of postcolonial feminism. This mixing style of Spivak seems to be very complicated for a common reader. Her work reflects her special respect for common and ordinary people. She expresses her sympathy for common working class, females and underprivileged people. Breaking rules of the academy and trespassing Disciplinary boundaries was her project.

ii) Homi K. Bhabha was received by all scholars as a great storm in the field of literary criticism. His work reflects the significance of reading that helped him to derive some ideas, concepts, views from his influences. He takes an analysis of thought’s complexity and a philosophical approach, stressing difference from Derrida and Foucault. This helped him to understand how the meaning of terms and ideas change in accordance with context. From that, he also has developed a critical thought emphasizing process. We can observe that, this thinking is specific to each situation, and cannot offer a ‘global’ answer to specific problems or issues without understanding specific histories. He is certainly a
thinker to be reckoned with across a broad range of critical concerns. He adds further that he was not interested in being a descriptive and expository writer. He made all theoretical framework of his own and so attempting new connections, articulating new meanings, always takes the risk of being not immediately comprehensible to readers. He also expressed his satisfaction with the empowerment that get from his work as well as empowering others. Many critics leveled the charge against Bhabha that he is dense and obscure in his writings. He answers them saying, ‘I use the language I need for my work’.

   iii) Ganesh Devy has proved himself as thorough nativist. His many scholarly papers reveal his attack on complacent Indian literary critics as an irrationally adulatory “sect, living with self-induced hypnosis and thriving on the import of alien totems”. Devy expects from Indian literary critics and scholars to oppose Western literary theory into Indian critical and classroom practices. According to him, that invasion handicaps to understand present needs of Indians both to decolonize Indian conscience—which does not mean rejecting or ignoring all Western ideas- and to criticize that consciousness from a current and practical perspective- which does not mean discarding tradition, but examining and re-interpreting established Indian patterns of thought. His work reflects his acuteness in social, cultural and literary analysis. His breadth, depth and sensitivity of understanding are of outstanding quality. His courage and enormous energy of critical work capacity is of unsurpassable one. He deeply rooted in our bhasha traditions and utterly dedicated to the cause of freeing Indian literary criticism from the shackles of Euro-American dominance. Many scholars sense that Ganesh Devy is endangering his professional career and perhaps his present happiness, by the unrelenting intensity of his challenges to received views. He has a complex and detailed cultural agenda frightening and irritating and exhilarating to many of his peers and elders is undeniable.
iv) Ania Loomba impressed the critical scenario by her outstanding critical book, *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*. Ania Loomba proved herself as a dominant theorist in the contemporary Indian criticism. Her style of writing is very simple and illustrative one. Her writing becomes the worthwhile contribution in Indian literary criticism. The clarity in her presentation of ideas with necessary explanations is the speciality of her work. She is a fine reader who could provide a kind of commentary on contrary opinions about various concepts. Ania Loomba’s research focuses on Renaissance literature and history, which she examines through the lenses of gender studies and colonial and postcolonial studies. She has written extensively on early modern drama and culture, Shakespeare, modern performances and adaptations of Shakespeare, the women’s movement and feminist theory and politics. She examines the key features of the ideologies and history of colonialism, the relationship of colonial discourse to literature, the challenges to colonialism, surveying anti-colonial discourses and recent developments in post-colonial theories and histories and how sexuality is figured in the text of colonialism, and also how contemporary feminist ideas and concepts intersect with those of post-colonialist thought. Her achievement, in some senses, is the most considerable of all, because she works mainly in the most prolifically minded and competitive field within English Studies, namely Shakespeare.

v) Gauri Viswanathan is known as one of the great literary theorists and critics in the history of Indian literary tradition. Her work is both first-class history and theory that is very important for the general reader as well as for humanists, educators and policymakers. Her book, *Masks of Conquest* can be a good reference book for all those are involved in the field of education. Her style of presenting the thought is noteworthy as she has applied the analytical method. She proved her thorough scholarship and intellectuality. She argues that in the political gamesmanship of colonial administration, the literary text served as a mirror of the ideal Englishman, removed from the activities of the colonial state. Though she
could not generate any special new theories of her own, she has got a special recognition as a theorist in American scenario. She studied the impact of British rule on Indian society. She also took interest in the 19th century British and colonial cultural studies and the history of modern disciplines. Centering on colonial subjects in British India and on minority communities within Britain, she sees in religious conversion both a mode of resistance and an alternative epistemology.

7.1 SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES:

Some similarities and differences in their work are observed. Many of them express their views on the concepts like Feminism, Hybridity, Colonialism/Postcolonialism, Historiography, subaltern/Otherness, Culture, Nativism etc. in their work. All of them have used English language as their medium of expression. The influenced of the Western critics and theorists is common in every theorist with a little exception of Ganesh Devy. Many of them have read Western theorists and analyzed their work. They have expressed their scholarly opinions about theories to prove them an outstanding theorists even on the International level.

i) ON FEMINISM:

Feminist literary criticism primarily responds to the way woman is presented in literature. It has two basic premises: one, ‘woman’ presented in literature by male writers from their viewpoint and two, ‘woman’ presented in the writings of female writers from their point of view. Gayatri Spivak and Ania Loomba have pleaded female roles in social life. Gayatri Spivak strongly denies the common definition of ‘woman’ which rests on the word ‘man’. She tries to provide a definition of woman with a deconstructive perspective. Ania Loomba
objects the concept ‘Nation’ is an imagined community as it is profoundly gender biased. She points out that, anti-colonial or nationalist movements have used the image of the nation-as-mother to create their own lineage, and also to limit and control the activity of women within the imagined community. Gayatri Spivak’s ordering ethic-political concern has been the tendency of institutional and cultural discourses/practices to exclude and marginalize the subaltern, especially subaltern women.

Gayatri Spivak refers Marx and Freud while formulating her assumptions regarding feminism. She also refers the concepts of use-value, exchange-value and surplus-value of Marx for analyzing the woman. According to Spivak, the idea of the womb as a place of production is avoided both in Marx and in Freud. She states that if this is taken into consideration, the notion of penis-envy will be replaced by womb-envy to challenge the male dominancy. Loomba views that Marxist thought has failed to theorize the specificity of gender oppression. She further comments that the exploitation of their labour power was obscured by a gender-blind economic analysis that failed to integrate class with other forms of social division. She expresses ahead that in Marxism also in a wider intellectual sphere, women’s oppression was seriously under-theorized.

Gayatri Spivak points out that the feminist movement aims at overthrowing social practices that lead to the oppression and victimization of women. Their quest is for self-knowledge and self-realization which can in turn lead to relationships based on mutual understanding and respect. Her argument—that Western feminism has been historically complicit in the project of imperialist expansion—is one of the most difficult and troubling aspect of Spivak’s contribution to feminist thought. She combines Marxism and deconstruction in the name of postcolonial feminism, and at the crossroads of literary studies and philosophy. Loomba opines that feminist movement needed to challenge dominant ideas of history, culture and representation. The feminist struggle has emphasized
culture as a site of conflict between the oppression and the oppressed. She observes the fact that black and colonized women suffer from both from racial and gendered forms of oppression simultaneously. She expects that black post-colonial feminists and women activists must lead to challenge this complex positioning of women.

Spivak’s feminism may well seem as initially unreadable as her deconstruction. She refers the deconstruction perspective as “man” as it exists within the “metaphysical” tradition can produce a female element which does not signify female person. Spivak speaks about what she can do within literary criticism as a woman. According to Loomba, the question of culture and ideologies was vital that comes in the study of feminist thought. She points out that the oppression of the women has been seen as a matter of culture that takes place within the family. Spivak cautions against the universal claims of Western feminism, and emphasizes instead how the specific maternal conditions, histories and struggles of the ‘Third World’ women are often overlooked by Western feminism. Loomba states that woman is constructed in opposition to the specter of the Memsahib who neglects her home and husband, the image fuses together older brahminical notions of female self-sacrifice and devotion with the Victorian ideal of the enlightened mother, devoted exclusively to the domestic sphere.

ii) ON HYBRIDITY:

Homi Bhabha, and Ania Loomba have tried to theorize Hybridity. Ganesh Devy also talks about the hybrid existence in brief. Homi Bhabha claims that a salient characteristic of colonial culture is its hybridity, its “in-betweenness”. He is the theorist of cultural hybridity and in-betweenness, so he himself is “a mediating figure between activists and academics”. Ania Loomba records that postcolonial studies have been preoccupied with the issues of hybridity- with the in-betweenness, diasporas, mobility and cross-overs of ideas
and identities generated by colonialism. Bhabha’s theories of mimicry and hybridity have coloured postcolonial discourse so deeply that even those who have not read Bhabha’s work now use them as points of reference. He States that hybridity marks those moments of civil disobedience within the discipline of civility as a sign of spectacular resistance. He further extended the theory of resistance in his theorization of the ‘Third Space of Enunciation’ as an assertion of difference in discourse. Ania Loomba refers Macaulay’s idea about to create Europeanized natives: A class of persons, Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinion, in morals and in intellect. Here she states that colonial hybridity is a strategy premised on cultural purity, and aimed at stabilizing the status quo.

Homi Bhabha’s term, “Hybridity” is very much important and is currently in fashion with postcolonial critics. It refers to the kind of political and cultural negotiation between the colonizer and the colonized. On the other hand, Loomba states that the hybridity provides a means to re-examine the problems of nationality, location, identity and historical memory. Homi Bhabha’s term, ‘hybridity’ in colonial text, answers Spivak’s question ‘Can the Subaltern Speak?’ in the affirmative way. It indicates that subaltern has spoken. Loomba argues that Bhabha’s concept of hybridity is both influential and controversial in post-colonial studies. Bhabha suggests that liminality and hybridity are necessary attributes of the colonial condition. Ania Loomba argues that Nationalist Struggles and Pan-Nationalist Movements were fuelled by the alienation and the anger of the colonized and so cannot be understood within the parameters of current theories of hybridity. Ganesh Devy States that in the field of historiography, if the policy of hybridity is used it may prove to be wrong. At present, we observe that the history of Indian literary work is designed mixing the Western and Desi models. Ania Loomba opines that the ‘hybridity’ of both a colonizer and colonized can be understood only by tracing the vicissitudes of colonial discourse, or the mutations in European culture. Bhabha states that the term ‘hybridity’ bridges the gap
between the West and the East that is the colonizer and the colonized. Ganesh Devy strongly recommends our scholars to write in their own respective mother tongue and apply our own critical theories to analyze and interpret, avoiding imported theories and thoughts. Here he gives importance to indigenous quality rejecting hybridity or total importation of some foreign ideologies that may not suit to our culture. (Devy, 2006:7-8)

iii) ON COLONIALISM/POSTCOLONIALISM:

Gayatri Spivak, Homi Bhabha and Ania Loomba have based their theories on colonialism/postcolonialism. Spivak is the best known as a postcolonial theorist. She has proved to be a leading postcolonial critic who uses deconstruction to problematize the privileged, academic postcolonial critic’s unknowing participation in the exploitation of the Third World. Homi Bhabha has become one of the most recognized names in the critical current known as postcolonialism, a current with a distinct interest in ethnicity and culture. Gayatri Chakravorty-Spivak’s literary criticism has greatly informed and influenced the practice of reading literary texts in relation to the history of colonialism. Bhabha states that Postcolonial studies have been preoccupied with issues of hybridity, creolization, and with the in-betweenness, diasporas, mobility and cross-overs of ideas and identities generated by colonialism. Ania Loomba argues that colonialism reshapes often violently, physical territories, social terrains as well as human identities. She adds ahead that it locks the original inhabitants and this generates the complex and traumatic relationships in human history.

Spivak’s name is associated with post-colonial criticism for she has demonstrated the rhetorical and political agency of postcolonial literary texts to question and challenge the authority of colonial master narratives. She repeatedly emphasizes that the production and reception of the 19th century English Literature was bound up with the history of imperialism. Loomba focuses the term post-
colonialism that applies two senses: temporal, as in coming after, and, ideological, as in supplanting. The post-colonialism doesn’t mark the demise of colonialism. She states that the term post-colonialism appears to be riddled with contradictions and qualifications. Spivak tries to point out the British policy of defining the colonial subject as inhuman, heathen or primitive and proving their imperialism as a civilizing mission. Her engagement with postcolonial texts is motivated by a desire to challenge the totalizing system of colonial discourse by focusing on instances of subaltern agency or resistance. According to Loomba, post-colonialism emphasizes concepts like, hybridity, fragmentation and diversity. It is a kind of reaction to colonialism which does not allow for differences between distinct kinds of colonial situations, or the workings of class, gender, location, race, caste or ideology among people whose lives have been restructured by colonial rule. Loomba argues that colonialism was the means through which capitalism achieved its global expansion. She adds ahead that European colonialism has applied a variety of techniques and patterns of domination as well as it produced the economic imbalance. She argues further that colonialism was the means through which capitalism achieved its global expansion. She argues and points out that the tensions about power and subjectivity have become central to the study of colonialism.

iv) ON HISTORIOGRAPHY:

Ganesh Devy and Gauri Viswanathan have focused on History and historiography. Ganesh Devy expresses his views on Historiography insisting the necessity of breaking the entire history of bhasha literatures into several shorter periods, but modified by contemporary forces. Gauri Viswanathan argues that the historical study of English literature was established in university colleges from 1852 onwards and the alliance between literature and history was given institutional expression in 1875 by merging of the chair of English literature with
that of history. She points out that the study of literary genres gradually became oriented in literary history. Devy expects that the Western influence must be separated from colonial influence and colonial period must be seen as a single unit of literary history. Gauri Viswanathan points out that ‘History’ was transformed into nothing less than the recasting of myth in a non-literary mode by means of which the discordances of Hindu society were forced into the open.

Devy objects modern Indian critics who believe Western literary traditions as models to set our history that indicate a sense of inferiority in their minds. According to him, Indian and Western literatures have their own kinds of excellence. He comments ahead that the bhasha critics tend to lose emotional touch with pre-British bhasha literatures because of their incurable sense of inferiority. Viswanathan adds ahead that Indian youth should have historical consciousness; otherwise they would remain shackled to the tyranny of forms. The historical approach served the twin objectives of rousing Indians to a consciousness of the inconsistencies in the native system of society while simultaneously leading them to recognition of the principles of order and justice in the Western. Ganesh Devy further objects the Western sequential periodization models of history to bhasha literatures. He states that the cultural history of literatures in Indian languages is far more complex than one imagines. Viswanathan expresses the importance of historical consciousness to preserve our own identity safe and sound.

According to Devy, being different periods of each language a single historiographic formula cannot prove adequate to describe each and every literature in India. He states that the literary history as practiced in India in the 20th century has been greatly interested in devising critical labels for periods, genres, styles and schools of literary writing. It indicates the influence of Western impact. Viswanathan points out that all the histories written by Englishmen were
essentially analytic in nature and that cannot be used as it is to Indian histories. Devy states that since the history of literatures in Indian languages is governed by their specific cultural features, it becomes necessary to bring in a discussion of these features. Devy argues further that the structures of historical narratives invariably depend on the sense of time share by the community for which the narratives are produced.

v) ON SUBALTERN/OTHERNESS:

Gayatri Spivak, Homi K. Bhabha and Gauri Viswanathan have emphasized the concepts Subaltern/otherness in their work. Spivak preferred to use the ‘subaltern’ to encompass a range of different subject positions which are not predefined by dominant political discourses. She states that this term suits as it can accommodate social identities and struggles of women and colonized. Homi K. Bhabha asserts that the colonist’s text contains a native voice, though an ambivalent one. The colonial text’s hybridity in the words of Bhabha means that the subaltern has spoken. Gauri Viswanathan points out the British policy of education, though they considered colonized as subordinate. They want to prove through literature the representation of to be educated as morally and intellectually deficient. According to Spivak, the flexibility of the term, Subaltern is very important as it can include all types of subjects especially of neglected group to bring them into the main stream. The Work of the subaltern group offers a theory of change. The insertion of India into colonialism is generally defined as a change from semi-feudalism into capitalist subjection.

Spivak accepted the subaltern movement because she herself is committed to articulating the lives and histories of such groups in an appropriate and non-exploitative way. Gauri Viswanathan gives reference of the educational position where imparting European culture to the lower ranks of society was strongly objected by aiming to educate them in their stations rather than above
them. Spivak expands the original definition of subaltern developed by Ranjit Guha and asks to include the struggles and experiences of women from the ‘Third World’. The emphasis on the gendered location of subaltern women expands and complicates the established concept of the subaltern. Viswanathan points out that British tactfully try to employ the structures of cultural domination inherent in the language of educational discourse on colonized society. Spivak also states that subaltern as female cannot be heard or read in the male-centered terms of the national independence struggle. According to her, the subaltern cannot speak means that even when the subaltern makes an effort to the death to speak, she is not able to be heard. ‘Subaltern’ means the colonized/oppressed subject whose voice has been silenced. Gauri Viswanathan also points out that the intention of British was to erase the voice of the colonized and blot out his identity to some extent and must be contented with at the outset.

According to Spivak, it is possible for us to recover the voice of the ‘subaltern’ and to establish her view point. She speaks of widow immolation in India on the plea of performing ‘sati’ at the pyre of the husband. Spivak laid stress on ‘gendered subaltern’ those women, who are doubly oppressed both by colonialism and patriarchy in the Third World countries. She argues that there are contexts, “wherein contesting representational systems violently displace/silence the figure of ‘gendered subaltern’ the concept of indifference in his work.

Banita Parry compares Spivak and Bhabha on the question of the ‘Subaltern Voice’ and points out:

For Bhabha, the subaltern has spoken, and his readings of the colonialist text recover a native voice. (1987:40)

This view is a kind of opposition to Spivak’s question, ‘Can the Subaltern Speak?’
vi) ON CULTURE:

The contribution of all theorists, in one or other way relates with the term ‘Culture’. All the theorists, included in this study have pointed out that no culture is pure now, as it is coloured with many shades. Gayatri Spivak is one of the leading theorists and cultural critics. She points out that the modern identities are designed with many contradictory factors such as, Ethnicity, Class and Gender. Homi Bhabha generated the concept-hybridity of cultures, refers to mixedness or impurity of cultures knowing that no culture is really pure. According to Bhabha, every culture is an original mixedness within every form of identity. Ganesh Devy is a cultural hero who represents a very important and useful invention in the evolving dynamics of Indian culture. He has a complex and detailed cultural agenda frightening and irritating to many of his peers and elders. He points out that the lapse in cultural memory causes the crisis in contemporary literary criticism. Gauri Viswanathan points out that the Anglicism is considered to be a cultural movement. Ania Loomba states that religious difference became an index of and metaphor for racial, cultural and ethnic differences.

Bhabha insists on hybridity’s ongoing process- hybridization. He further asserts that no cultures that come together leading to hybrid forms but cultures are the consequence of attempts to still the flux of cultural hybridities. Here the term ‘hybridity’ conjures up the notion of ‘in-betweenness’ which is further elaborated by the accompanying concept of ‘Diaspora’. The term ‘Diaspora’ evokes the specific terms of displacement but it looses its poignancy due to the effect of ‘hybridity’. Ganesh Devy objects the Western Framework of historiography, as being coloured by their culture, for Indian historiography. Here he prefers the Indian forms of culture.
vii) ON NATIVISM:

The School of Nativism has been proposed in recent years as a viable alternative to the distant traditions of India’s classical past and the alien traditions of the modern West. Ganesh Devy can be labeled as real nativist. He suggests this recent critical trend to free indigenous criticism from the tripartite relation of margā, West and desi. He strongly objects the imported theories and thoughts. Remaining theorists tried to present their ideas and theories that may be applicable to Indian context. Though they adopt some Western ideas and theories they tried to fit them on our own terms, conditions anyhow they could be integrated within Indian intellectual framework. All these theorists successfully established Indian literary theories applicable to Indian literary field. Their theories get the worldwide recognition so it is the reward that they gave to Indian critical world.

7.2 SOURCES OF THEIR THEORIES:

i) The sources of their theories can help us to know the influences of other theorists or critics on their work. Spivak’s work reflects the influence of Jacques Derrida, Karl Marx, and Antonio Gramsci. Spivak plainly confessed that she gave more attention towards- Immanuel Kant, George Wilhelm, Fredric Hegel and Karl Marx as her writing was copied from them. Spivak is strongly influenced by the Western scholars, theorists. Her work reflects the strong impact of French philosopher, Jacques Derrida. She expressed her views on ‘deconstruction’ being impressed by Derrida.

ii) The influences of many Western writers is observed on the work of Homi K. Bhabha. He has developed his ideas from the work of M. M. Bakhtin, Antonio Gramsci, Hannah Arendt, W. E. B. Du Bois, Albert Memmi, Frantz
Fanon, and many more. We also observe the key influences of Jacques Derrida and Michel Foucault, on his development as a critical thinker. He takes two terms: ‘Iteration’ and ‘the statement’ from Derrida and Foucault respectively.

iii) **Ganesh Devy** has proved himself as thorough nativist. The influence of Bhalchandra Nemade on his work can be easily observed by a common reader. Devy expects from Indian literary critics and scholars to oppose Western literary theory into Indian critical and classroom practices. According to him, that invasion handicaps to understand present needs of Indians both to decolonize Indian conscience-which does not mean rejecting or ignoring all Western ideas- and to criticize that consciousness from a current and practical perspective- which does not mean discarding tradition, but examining and re-interpreting established Indian patterns of thought. We observed his acuteness of social, cultural and literary analysis. He deeply rooted in our bhasha traditions and utterly dedicated to the cause of freeing Indian literary criticism from the shackles of Euro-American dominance.

iv) **Ania Loomba** proved herself as a dominant theorist in the contemporary Indian criticism. She refers Macaulay’s idea about to create Europeanized natives: A class of persons, Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinion, in morals and in intellect. Ania Loomba refers Cuban writers R. S. Retamar, Paul Gilroy regarding the term hybridity: The intellectual and political cross-fertilization that resulted from the black diasporas or the movements of black people not only as commodities but engaged in various struggles towards emancipation, autonomy and citizenship. Her work does not prove the influence of any specific theorists or critics in complete. She is a fine reader who could provide a kind of commentary on contrary opinions about various concepts. Ania Loomba’s research focuses on Renaissance literature and history, which she examines through the lenses of gender studies and colonial and postcolonial studies. She has written extensively on early modern drama and
culture, Shakespeare, modern performances and adaptations of Shakespeare, the women’s movement and feminist theory and politics. She seems to be walking along with many of the postcolonial theorists.

v) **Gauri Viswanathan** is known as one of the great literary theorists and critics in the history of Indian literary tradition. Her work is both first-class history and theory that is very important for the general reader as well as for humanists, educators and policymakers. No specific influence of any Western or native theorist/critic observed in her work. She proved be an individual and distinguished theorist. As like Ania Loomba, she travelled with many of the postcolonial theorists and critics who struggled for their identity on global literary scenario. In short, the differences in their expressions regarding various theories mark their special identity as a theorist. At present, many of them stay in America and so the American way of life-style is the part and partial of their life. Here their mixing with Western writers forced them to adopt their style of writing and presenting the thoughts. Only Ganesh Devy lives in India, keeping a constant touch with native culture.

vi) This study includes various Western and native concepts adopted by Indian literary theorists. Gayatri Spivak adopts deconstruction, feminism, Marxism etc. and analyzes work of art. Homi K. Bhabha adopts hybridity, mimicry, uncanny, concepts as a tool of analyzing literary work. Ganesh Devy adopts nativism as the main concept that may help to get rescue from Western slavery. He points out that this may be the tool of decolonization. Ania Loomba adopts colonialism and post-colonialism to study literary work. Here she presents the position of Western and native people facing many difficulties of literary dominance and subordination. Gauri Viswanathan adopts concepts like hybridity, subaltern that helped her to present her views on literary world. She symbolically states that Western world have two faces real and showy (unreal). She focuses the Indian situation during the British rule where no liberty was given in a real sense.
7.3 THE GLOBAL SIGNIFICANCE:

Globalization, in its present form, is a process that breaks down boundaries between countries and transforms the world into a global village. The major theorists selected here have crossed the boundaries of our nation and settled into foreign land adopting their culture and language. The notion of a global village indicates an attempt to discover uniformity and homogeneity in various literatures. Globalization, on the other hand, should acknowledge and appreciate heterogeneity and plurality, and should judge the variety of desi (native) contents, themes, techniques, styles, etc. of different literatures in their individual contexts. The entire theorists, included in this study have proved themselves as global figures. Their contribution seems to be a grand representation of India on global level. The English language, they used, is getting the status of global language. Gayatri Spivak has done a wonderful job in translating many of the stories (Imaginary Maps, Old Women and The Breast Stories) of Bengali author, Mahasweta Devi to flash her on a global stage. This is the most positive way to emancipate literary works from the stranglehold of narrow nationalism. This translated work is strengthened by multicultural participation and appreciation. Her translation only could help the world to know the beauty of Devi’s literary work. The Globalization demands the exchange of information, ideas, thoughts, views, culture etc. from one country to another. Here they helped to fulfill that aim by studying and criticizing many of the Western writers and critics. Many of them are at present staying in America and publishing their work with the kind help extended by foreign publishers. Globalization in literature involves nativization as well as transnationalization. The nativistic line of criticism is now considering the Western critical concepts: modernism, post-modernism, realism, Marxism, deconstruction, feminism etc. which have been mechanically applied to Indian situation too. So, if we want to globalize our literature we should translate Indian texts into English.
To sum up, this study focuses the critical contribution of five dominant Indian theorists, critics in the field of Indian critical tradition. They have proved themselves as great achievers of due respect on global scene. Their contribution in literary criticism develops our confidence to say India also has great theorists and critics. They have established the necessary foundation of critical tradition like Sanskrit theorists in modern period. Given our cultural pluralism and multilingualism, it is certain that the unique feature of Indian criticism will be its essential heterogeneity. Our critical systems can acquire some kind of an Indian identity through a continual engagement with history. This study may prove as a tentative rough track to new investigators to walk on to search and find out the great and noteworthy contribution of many more Indian theorists and critics further. I may say that this study is a help to understand Indian work of art with more clarity. Many more Indian theorists and critics can be as like this study.