Ganesh Devy, an active social reformer in Tribal community at Tejgarh, Gujarat was born in 1950. He was educated at the Shivaji University, Kolhapur and the University of Leeds, U.K. He was a Commonwealth Academic Staff Fellow at Leeds, and Colerain and a Fulbright Exchange Fellow at Yale University. He also held a Jawaharlal Nehru Fellowship during 1994-96. He worked as a professor of English at Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda. Now he is a dominant activist in tribal community, Gujarat. He is also a chairman and leading personality of Bhasha Research and Publication Centre, Baroda to preserve and give wide publicity for literary work being carried out in different Indian languages.

Ganesh Devy was awarded the Sahitya Akademi Award for his book, ‘After Amnesia’, and the SAARC Writers’ Foundation Award for his work with denotified tribals. He has also won the reputed Prince Claus Award (2003) awarded by the Prince Claus Fund for his work for the conservation of the history, languages and views of oppressed communities in the Indian state of Gujarat. His Marathi book 'Vanaprashta' has received six awards including the Durga Bhagwat memorial Award and the Maharashtra Foundation Award. Along with Laxman Gaikwad and Mahashweta Devi, he is one of the founders of The Denotified and Nomadic Tribes Rights Action Group (DNT-RAG). To many of us, Ganesh Devy is a cultural hero. He represents a very important and useful intervention in evolving the dynamics of Indian culture. Devy, of course, is a professor of English, a translator, literary historian and bibliographer, besides being a lively
and engaging critic. He with Nemade, is provocative and opinionated, sometimes even given to extremes, but what is more important is that he is deeply rooted in our bhasha traditions and utterly dedicated to the cause of freeing Indian literary criticism from the shackles of Euro-American dominance. He with Nemade, wishes to make Indian criticism a more responsible, self-respecting, and Indo-centric activity. In that sense, both have brought the agenda of decolonization to Indian literary criticism. (Devy, 2004:39-41)

Ganesh Devy has demolished many myths and punctured many egos within Indian literary and intellectual circle. His allegiance to the ‘Desivad’ school of Indian literary criticism lends trenchancy to his attack on English literary academics. He has read and published several scholarly papers in seminars, journals and anthologies. We have recognized not only the acuteness of his social, cultural and literary analysis and the breadth, depth and sensitivity of his understanding, but also a kind of courage and enormous energy that, frankly, have been rather frightening. Devy has a complex and detailed cultural agenda frightening, irritating and exhilarating to many of his peers and elders. Considering the sheer magnitude of his work, even ignoring its ground-shaking dynamics, one wants at least to caution him about burning out, becoming over-committed. Many concerned Indian critics have urged him to husband his energies and use them more selectively to help effect some much needed literary critical and professional, indeed, even broadly cultural reforms.

Ganesh Devy’s latest published book: Vanprashta (Marathi) gives his wide experience of active work at Tejgarh, in tribal area. He told various problems rose during establishing Bhasha Research Centre. But his steady, balanced efforts could lead him to success. At present, he has forgotten his personal life and made life of tribes as his own. Keeping in constant contact with them, he tried to understand and solve their problems. He was also blamed as
extremist who instigated tribes against government and govt. officials which is
totally incorrect. He proved that many of the schemes which are expected to be
benefited by tribes to uplift their life and living standard were robbed by officials.
He is trying his level best to change government’s attitude towards tribes. (Devy,
2006:5-15) His works include:

1. *After Amnesia*: Tradition and Change in Indian Literary Criticism.
2. *In Another Tongue*: Essays on Indian English Literature.
4. *Painted Words*: An Anthology of Tribal Literature (ed.).
5. *Indian Literary Criticism*: Theory and Interpretation (ed.).
6. *Between Tradition and Modernity* (ed.).
7. *Adiwashi Jane Che.* (Gujarati)
8. *Vanprastha.* (Marathi)

Ganesh Devy’s *After Amnesia*, Sahitya Academi Award Winning
book (1993), is an original analysis of literary criticism in India. This book is such
a text that undoubtedly a timely and laudatory intervention in the process of
constructing an authentic historiography of Indian literary criticism. It is an
attempt to describe what is recognized by common agreement to be a crisis in
Indian Criticism and to explain it in historical terms. According to Devy, the
perspective of literature and literary criticism with a greater self-awareness, the
knowledge of native traditions and an insight into their modern transformations by
Western criticism will make easier for Indian critics to propose theoretical
formulations. In this essay, he argues that the colonial experience in India gave
rise to false images of the West as a superior culture and induced a state of
“cultural amnesia” and mistaken modes of literary criticism. It is this amnesia that
is responsible for the modern Indian languages- for instance, Marathi and Gujarati,
to look down as inferior having a short history of 100 years. It is inconceivable for
these languages to have produced great literature for half a millennium without developing some form of literary criticism. Therefore, it is necessary to postulate a more reliable literary history. Here he strongly opposes modern Western criticism which has displaced our traditional criticism. A lapse in cultural memory causes the crisis in contemporary literary criticism. Ganesh Devy also highlights several conflicting tendencies generated by colonial experience. One tendency is to imitate and get approval of colonizers and the second to resist the colonial influence to give rise to nativistic feelings. These conflicting tendencies result in a strange superficial cultural dynamics and its effect also tends to remain colonized culture static. Devy suggests an appropriate historiography to understand this cultural immobilization. So this book is the modest and tendentious attempt of Devy to describe some prominent features of the crisis in Indian criticism. Here he states that Nativism, a recent critical trend in Marathi, is an attempt to free Marathi literary sensibility and criticism from the prison of the tripartite relation of Margi, West and Desi. Nativism views literature as an activity taking place within a specific language and bound by the rules of discourse native to the language of its origin. According to Devy, each literature demands its own kind of literary historiography. Indian performance in this regard makes him nervous as this field has remained totally neglected. Our negligence provides a space for Western critics to establish their framework which is totally inappropriate. He demands Indian scholars to come ahead to form our own framework neglecting Western modern framework as being coloured by their culture. In short, this book moves from a description of the crisis in criticism towards proposing a tentative historiography of Indian criticism. (Dutta-Roy, 1999: 81-83)

Ganesh Devy has published many essays being written over a period of fifteen years in his book In Another Tongue. This book does not deal with a single theme but it displays a common perspective-conflict of the cultural contexts. It involves conflict between the mother tongue and English. Devy states that Indian literature in English is a curious cultural phenomenon as English is not
an Indian language. As India having many sophisticated literary languages, we have long-standing literary traditions too. He points out that students of commonwealth literature in Europe, Australia and North America tend to think that India has no literature other than that written in English is totally wrong. It is also assumed that English is the main literary language being approved as national language by Indian constitution. Devy strongly opposes this view by stating Indian English literature is the newest and the least developed branch of Indian literature. He also believes that as an Indian writing in English: other tongue or intimate enemy involves a conflict between the mother tongue and English.

Ganesh Devy points out that British introduced English literature in schools and colleges neglecting a long and rich Indian literary tradition. He states that since English literature was produced and praised by them, it acquired a high cultural status. Our two movements- Quit India Movement and Progressive Movement challenged this hierarchical cultural relationship which caused to diminish status-value attached to English literature considerably. He expects Indian scholars to frame Indian literary criticism reviving traditional framework. He also states that, in Indian universities, English or American canons may disturb to students to translate them in Indian cultural terms. He points out that multiculturalism in India strongly rejects alien culture which is the soul content of literary work. He feels nervous about a meagre representation of Indian English literature in commonwealth literature to display the realistic and complete picture of India.

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. He also suggests our scholars not to run after worldwide popularity by writing in English which may be poor presentation than in their own tongue. He asks them to translate of our great books in English to achieve worldwide fame. This book presents a remarkable
consistency, continuity and growth in thinking of Devy. Here he is trying to search not only a responsible critical practice but a profound and useful sense of critical authority. He also hopes that this comes from Indian critics continuing to gaining self confidence- an indubitable need in the face of the colonialis heritage. He believes that the critical authority in scholars (Indian) will come by developing and recovering a widely and well established tradition.

*Of Many Heroes* is an outstanding book by Ganesh Devy, to provide a very good guideline for historians to write literary history irrespective of Western style and method. It explores the literary history in India during the last two thousand years. Here he examines various historiographical statements in ancient, medieval and modern India. He also examines the impact of the experience of colonizing India on literary historiography in Britain. He gives brief account of some major 20th century theories of literary history in the West in juxtaposition with an account of historiographical approaches to literature in contemporary India. He examines the theoretical questions related to Para-literature, literary translation and oral tradition and argues for their inclusion in literary canons described by literary history. Devy convincingly argues here that literary historiography in India has its own native tradition and that the complexity of Indian literary tradition proves Western models inadequate as historiographical strategy.

The source of the anthology, *Critical Thought* is a project work that the editors had undertaken nine years back. The aim of that project was to bring together the best available specimens of literary criticism written in English by Indian scholars and writers during the 20th century. Here they also tried to see the native critical tradition and the Western influence, individuality and modernity in Indian criticism, and the Indian contribution to contemporary world canons of literary criticism. The anthology brings together under one cover some of the most important critical statements made by major Indian critics in the 20th century.
Ganesh Devy has established Bhasha Research and Publication Centre to preserve literature in tribal languages and oral traditions. His book, Of Many Heroes offers another challenging overview for Indian literary criticism from an indigenous, specifically a nativistic perspective. He says that India, being traditionally committed to orality and communal transmission, our literature, not of one but History of many heroes may well maintain our heavily oral and performative components, also because our population is still half literate. He strongly asserts that consequence of colonization and modernization can not allow us to find our own historical experiences to deal critically and understand clearly our great variety of traditional, oral transmitted cultural forms. Devy believes that proper historiographic work may prove meaningful and useful to minimize modern India’s apparent break with the past. Thus, half of the book is engaged in that historical reconstruction and reinterpretation. This will help to fill an enormous knowledge gap caused by the belief that “the Indian sense of time is cyclical, and that consciousness about history did not exist in India to the same degree that it did in Europe”. Devy exploringly demonstrates the quite desperate classical Indian metaphysical philosophies of time and of history to falsify above both assertions. He also seeks out and interprets subtle, complex and poetic or metaphorical thinking about epistemology, semantics, linguistics, cognitive psychology, aesthetics, and grammatology stretching from the Vedas through the Buddhist and Jain ascendancies into the 10th century and beyond to the 17th century and then rehearses the colonialized 19th century historiography.

Ganesh Devy also argues and expects that new scholars should recognize and understand Indian past scholars from the 10th century onwards with their transmission and development of varied Indian literature from other forms. He gives a detailed summary of British/European and internalized Indian colonialist historiography and their interrelationships. He states that before establishing the guiding principles of literary historiography, the relationship between the canon and para-literature and literature and the non-verbal arts must
be tackled. His final categorical arguments to set up straw men, to make logical
leaps, assertions without evidence and particularly to select often outmoded views
and elements of Western thought in order to oppose them to something more
agreeable and useful in a highly formalistic, even essentialist, Indian literary
history seems to be chauvinistically biased. In conclusion, this book forms a
sequel to his earlier essay on literary criticism, *After Amnesia*.

The life and career of Ganesh Devy strongly influence the mind of the reader. The man who rejected the settled life being bound with social bondage inspires lot. The term *Back to Nature* is fully applicable to him as he has started his life journey from rural to urban and back to total remote tribal life. His literary work gives a wide guidance and direction to many literary critics and writers. His love for nation and national/regional languages of India is noteworthy. This study includes Devy’s theories, Nativism and literary historiography. It also includes his views on an Indian writing in English, other tongue or intimate enemy that involves a conflict between the mother tongue and English. It also includes his ideas about tradition, cultural amnesia, the crisis in literary criticism, and the tripartite relation. Ganesh Devy has introduced many new concepts: Crisis in Indian criticism, Cultural amnesia, Nativism, Other tongue and Intimate Enemy and Historiography in Indian literary criticism that need to be examined and interpreted to state its value in understanding our own literatures in a real sense.

4.1 TRADITION AND AMNESIA:

The newly emerged languages, bhashas expressed regional and heterodox aspirations in protest against the hegemony of Sanskrit and the culture developed through that language. All bhashas had become literary languages by the end of the 15th century. So the emergence and survival of mature literary
traditions in so many languages is the greatest phenomenon in Indian cultural history. Sanskrit had a rich literary tradition of sixteen centuries (From Vyasa (the 5th century B. C.) to Bhoja (the 11th century A. D.) and this great tradition of creative literature had helped Sanskrit criticism in becoming an extremely sophisticated system of literary thought. Sanskrit grammarians, scholars and writers had thought profoundly about language and linguistics. They had developed theories relating to drama and poetry. They had a very fine conception of the whole field of literary criticism.

The Islamic rulers: Arabs, Turks, Mughals etc. had brought with them new cultural currents to India. The intimate contacts with Islamic cultures created for the bhasha literatures new possibilities of continuous development. During the 18th and 19th century, British rule introduced a new education system based on and spread through the English language, English literature as a civilizing influence. This literary education brought with it new literary models and critical concepts, from English and the continental languages. The violent intrusion of alien literary pressure produced many undesirable tendencies in bhasha literatures and the most damaging effect of it has been a cultural amnesia; which makes the average Indian intellectuals incapable of tracing his tradition backward beyond the mid-nineteenth century. (Devy, 1992:10)

Devy points out the unrecoverable and damaging effects of colonialism on bhasha literatures in following words:

Colonialism creates a cultural demoralization. It creates a false sense of shame in the minds of the colonized about their own history and traditions. This pattern of influence has deprived Indian critics since the period of high colonialism in India of a healthy relation with the past of the bhasha literatures. Trapped between an undiscriminating revival of the past and an uncritical rejection of it, between Sanskrit poetics and Western critical
theory, bhasha criticism today has ceased to be an intellectual ‘discourse’. And as a combined result of amnesia and disorientation, bhasha literatures, with literary histories ranging from five to ten centuries, seem to suffer damage from what is obviously an acute crisis in Indian literary criticism. (1992:10)

Here Devy strongly attacks the colonialism observing the adverse effects of it on Indian literatures.

4.2 THE CRISIS IN LITERARY CRITICISM:

Ganesh Devy points out that due to the combined effects of amnesia and disorientation (because of British rule) bhasha literatures seem to suffer from an acute crisis in Indian literary criticism. He records the prominent symptoms of the crisis as:

- a proliferation of non-productive commentaries on Western critical positions and thinkers; lack of initiative in modifying critical concepts, tools and criteria in the process of importation; inappropriate use of critical terminology developed in the West, mostly out of its original context, in an undisciplined way and without sufficient justification to use it; lack of scholarly material to support critical pursuits- want of literary biographies, translations of Indian and foreign works, editorial scholarships and relevant critical debate; inability to relate literatures to other arts, the media and the social and cultural phenomena; uncritical and uninformed attitudes to influence; absence of self-awareness and of tradition; arbitrary and mostly alien critical standards. (1992:10)

Studying this situation, the literary critics like, K. B. Marathe, Bhalchandra Nemade, Manasukhalal Jhaveri, R. B. Patankar, and S. K. Desai argued that
bhasha criticism has failed seriously. Devy lists some critical grounds on which it fails and generates the crisis in bhasha criticism. According to him, the obsessive interest in theory, the gap between various theories (being originated from different cultural contexts) and creative literature, are the characters of the crisis in bhasha criticism. He further points out that an awareness of the rift between theory and creative literature and the inability to mend the breakdown in critical discourse by creating a new and viable critical theory where the present intellectual vacuum exists, are the two basic elements of the crisis in Indian literary criticism.

Ganesh Devy states that India being a mere consumer of Western forms of intellectual substance, we observed the unhealthy and crippling impact of importation on native creativity in the field of literature and literary criticism. So in order to investigate exact site of the crisis, Devy suggests reviewing the actual practice as well as the nature of the perception of that crisis. According to him, for factual understanding of the crisis, prevalent attitudes to tradition, Western thought, Sanskrit literary tradition, the impact of colonialism and the bhasha literatures are necessarily needs to study by all. (1992:16)

The Indian sense of tradition as Parampara came in direct collision with the Western sense of tradition as useful conventions. So the meaning of the concept ‘tradition’ in contemporary bhasha usage wavers between conformity and change. The traditional sense of Parampara in India contains two essential components: Marga- the metropolitan or mainstream tradition and Desi- regional and subcultural traditions. The relationship between these two was further extended by Western intellectual tradition. And so Devy asserts that the modern Indian sense of tradition is described as a tripartite relationship involving desi-marga parampara and Western tradition, and each of these conflicts and collaborates with the remaining two in a variety of ways. Devy also states that the cultural opposition, Indian against Western in the field of literary criticism is wrong and misleading one. The contemporary Indian critics are at cross-roads and
must consciously choose their literary value-scale within the structure of binary opposition. He further points out that those two major trends: revivalistic and Westernizing in modern Indian criticism help bhasha writers to have easy access to Western and Sanskrit traditions of thought. (1992:20)

Ganesh Devy states that the culturally demoralized Indian intellectuals were willing to accept British culture as superior to the decadent Indian culture. The above thought made to believe that European culture was an ‘open system’. So he remarks that Indians did not start examining the intrinsic worth of Western knowledge before accepting it but blindly believing their superiority of culture. Devy also points out that the language variety of a politically dominant minority is treated as superior by the politically dominated majority. Similarly the Western knowledge: cultural and technological developments, the world-view, means a controlling nature, etc. of a ruling minority tends to be accepted as superior by the majority though it is utterly irrelevant to its own needs.

According to Devy, intellectual traditions are culture-bound and their existence depends upon the specific needs of the society and period. When these traditions are transplanted, they tend to lose their authenticity and utility. He further points out that a vast number of Eurocentric literary and critical concepts were accepted by writers and critics of Indians and assimilated in the educational process as inherently superior concepts during the colonial period. The process of intellectual importation in India created an imbalance in cultural trade as well as a rift between knowledge and reality. The cross-cultural metamorphosis is not taken into account by Indian literary criticism. Devy adds further that Indian critic being influenced by colonial bias, could not preserve the sympathy for past Indian literature. (1992:24-25)
While talking on the relationship between modern India and the Sanskrit tradition, Devy states that the link between these two traditions is tenuous due to:

i) The inner weakness of Sanskrit literary tradition,

ii) Repeated waves of foreign influence and lack of official patronage to Sanskrit literature during colonial rule,

iii) Continuous social transformation and growing linguistic heterodoxy, and


Devy argues ahead that the modern Indian critic believes the glorious Indian literary tradition, but does not use this as a living tradition (as reference). There is no projection of past into the present and vice versa; means there is no organic connection among the both. On the contrary, European scholars have done the remarkable work in the areas of Indian history and culture. As a result, the modern Indian scholarship owes a debt of gratitude to Indology. Here Devy observed the lack of connection between ancient India and modern India. Devy objects the Indology as it romanticizes the past and views it from an entirely a historical perspective to impair Indian own attitude to its past. He states ahead that India’s self knowledge was readily and radically affected by an alien intellectual influence.

According to Devy, the past of India was glorious in comparison with the stark present and due to Indology’s easy assimilation with the Indian tradition, its originality of culture was declining. He further points out that moving from our own idealistic world-view to a pragmatic world-view, became the cause of inflection in our self image. The modern critics believe that they have access to Western traditions of thought. So Devy argues that their relationship with Western is of two dimensional: hierarchic (lower place to Indian critics) and of one sided
and that made their link with Sanskrit tradition the weak one. Devy talks about two processes: Sanskritization and Westernization in the context of literary criticism as: Sanskritization means to return to, or to revive Sanskrit poetics, whereas Westernization means the tendency to imitate or to draw upon Western criticism.

To meet present Indian critical needs, Devy observed the two trends in Indian critics: follow exclusively either Western or Sanskrit Criticism and combine the two trends. He further points out that the most influential scholarly work goes into the direction of the later choice. Devy objects both these trends as they are distant traditions and he suggests the bhasha traditions that are closer at hand to breakthrough the present crisis in the literary criticism. (1992:30-31) To sum up, Devy strongly reacts against the colonial impact on Indian sensibility that made us incapable in transforming our literature creatively. He expressed his views on the colonial impact on Indian sensibility in following words:

A serious misconception of the colonial influence lies behind the view that the British period is a watershed in Indian cultural history. This exaggerated view of the colonial impact has given rise to two antithetic beliefs: that the colonial encounter has produced in Indian culture all that is modern and progressive, and that it has taken away all that was sacred and valuable in Indian culture. (1992:37)

Objecting the colonial influence, he further states that the whole span of British rule does not show a single, consistent and linear graph of literary influence as we observe a variety of forces: liberalism, nationalism, modernism, industrialization, urbanization, revivalism etc. with its constant fluctuations. In short, the British influence on Indian literature and criticism was fragmented into a variety of trends. The modern critics believe the colonially sanctioned hierarchic structure of literary values indicated and deep-seated sense of inferiority of their minds.
Devy states that each literature, Indian or Western, has its own kind of excellence. He further points out those Indian critics who believe ready-made Western formulas, have a sense of inferiority, so they lose emotional touch with the pre-British bhasha literatures for appreciation. He also feels happy to know that today’s Indian critics feel emotionally in tune with the ‘great’ Sanskrit classics. Sanskrit theories are paraded with pride in national and international forums. Many Marathi critics have devoted themselves to unearthing Sanskrit critical texts and theories.

According to Devy, literary criticism is not a set of abstract values, techniques, standards, and notions. It is a sub-system of a given culture. He states ahead that if it does not grow organically from the native soil, or take root in it when it is of alien origin, it will fail to function as criticism, even though it may have that outward linguistic form. In Indian-language criticism, the greater need at present is to overcome the cultural amnesia rather than to create a theory of coloniality.

4.3 CULTURAL AMNESIA:

Ganesh Devy has expressed his views on modern Indian psyche that suffers from amnesia. He points out the disorder in Indian culture’s psyche as modern India failed to connect itself emotionally with ancient India which indicates nothing but a failure of memory. He further points out the uneasy relationship between the modern critics and the pre-British literary traditions. Devy believes that the history of the bhasha literatures has been recorded with praiseworthy scholarly care but the same is not found in the literary criticism of bhashas. Devy asserts that literature is the key to opening the heart of medieval Indian culture or a means of connecting modern India with pre-British and thereby decolonizing the modern Indian sensibility. (1992:46)
Ganesh Devy comments that the modern Indian critics feel a false emotional proximity to Western and Sanskrit ideas and repress the bhasha tradition giving importance to colonial experience. Here he states that the relationship with Western and Sanskrit is virtual and idealized one but not an organic one. He adds ahead that the Western ideas, being guided and conditioned by colonial context seem to be an alien graft on Indian culture. Like the same, the Sanskrit heritage has percolated into the modern Indian consciousness after being filtered through bhasha literature and culture. So Devy asserts that both these heritages (Sanskrit and bhasha) must be seen as a single historic continuity.

Ganesh Devy records two sources of modern Indian critics’ emotional affinity with Western and Sanskrit ideas as: the *Jajus-faced* relationship that the Indian mind has with *marga* and *desi* traditions; and the *pan* traditions as against the ‘local’ traditions resulting in identity crisis and the cultural demoralization caused by the colonial experience. Here Devy strongly states that a colonial encounter teaches the colonized a new intellectual idiom, impairing in the process, the natural native style of thinking. (1992:49-50) He adds ahead that the colonial domination causes serious dislocations and fragmentations in the intellectual discourse of colonized. He argues further that it canonizes alien, usually irrelevant, systems of intellectual totems and deprives the rhythm and syntax of previously existent value systems of their charm and meaning and this disorder manifests in the form of cultural repressiveness and amnesia. Here he states that the current affliction of cultural amnesia is compounded by the traditional Indian anxiety over the loss of memory.

Devy tries to refer Coomaraswamy to illustrate the terms- Amnesia and Memory: ‘Amnesia’ is considered by Brahminical texts as the basic attribute of human consciousness and ‘memory’ as a power that is independent of intelligence. Coomaraswamy defines memory as ‘a kind of latent knowledge’ and amnesia as ‘a condition of the human mind’. (Lipsey, 1977:49-65) According to
Coomaraswamy, Memory and Amnesia become a symbolic representation of ‘an omniscient self’ and ‘the contingent ego’ respectively. As per experimental psychology, amnesia is related to violent unconsciousness, repression of memory.

Ganesh Devy states that cultural amnesia is an inevitable consequence of colonialism. He further points out that it happens when a dominated culture or its constituent features are branded as inferior by a dominating culture. He states ahead that if amnesia destroys the native perception of the immediate past, it also helps as a strategy to preserve the self-respect of the dominated culture as well as to win approval from the dominating culture. Devy again refers the Freudian concept:

The colonizing force is seen in the role of a present hated and feared and imitated by the colonized culture, which starts perceiving itself as a ‘child’ who fears its own impotency and fantasizes about the productive power of the ‘parent’. Then, the intimidated child engages itself in acts to win the approval of the parent to enable itself to define its own new identity. (1992:53)

Here Devy points out that history ceases to be history and becomes an extended spectrum of fantasy and amnesia. He points out further that the Indian renaissance and Indian nationalism tacitly accepted cultural amnesia as an indispensable condition for progress. Devy views that in India, Westernization has brought with it a regressive tendency of Sanskritization in the sense of reviving a distant past and repressing the immediate past. So he states that due to cultural amnesia, Indian culture has regressed during the colonial period. He strongly criticizes the colonial impact in the following words:

The worst part of the colonial impact was that it snatched away India’s living cultural heritage and replaced it with a fantasy of the past. This
amnesia, which has affected our awareness of native traditions which is still alive, is perhaps the central factor of the crisis in Indian criticism. (1992:55)

Here Devy points out that the present state of amnesia in Indian literary criticism underlines two urgent needs: i) to re-examine the British impact on Indian literary traditions, and ii) to formulate a pragmatic literary historiography for bhasha literatures. He further suggests that a redefinition of cultural identity becomes necessary before articulating the existing value-structures in criticism or to formulate new theoretical positions. And for that the idea of going back to the bhasha past can be immensely fruitful for evolving a more relevant historiography.

4.4 HISTORIOGRAPHY:

The literary historian stands at a crucial point of intersection of the plane of facts, diverse and apparently unrelated or only superficially related events, with the plane of reasons, unity and logical explanations that hint at the principle running along the dynamics of facts. The literary critic ought to have a comprehensive vision of the literary situation under survey as well as acute sense of critical discrimination. Ganesh Devy gave the reference of the term, ‘History’ on etymological level. Initially, the Greek *histor* meant ‘judge’ both a noun and a verb, before it gave rise to *historein*, ‘to narrate’. When it was accepted by Latin, it became *historia* and acquired the meaning of ‘enquiry’. The English term ‘history’ combines all these meanings: ‘to judge, to narrate, to enquire’ as well as ‘judgment, narration, and enquiry in the past’. He adds further that the English has given ‘history’, as have the other modern European languages derived from Latin, the dignity of being a human science. In India, Rajashekhara and Bhoja gave the concept of history in Indian tradition. Devy points out Bhoja’s view: history must produce meaning; it must have a logical sequence, as a foundation of Indian 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. He also expects that the Western influence must be separated from colonial influence and colonial period must be seen as a single unit of literary history. According to him, each bhasha has its own development and length that varies widely from one another and so the common historiography may be a wrong attempt. He further points out that the beginning of modern literature in each bhasha is a result of the indigenous dynamics of that bhasha rather than a product of the exogenous cultural pressures. So he states that though the impact of British literature on Indian literature is not quite insignificant, the bhashas seem to have their own continuous histories, guided by their own inner dynamics. He argues that the literature of the pre-British bhasha period is still a living heritage in India. Here he gives the reference of bhakti devotionalism or saint poetry (common term for pre-British poets) as a vast period from the 13th (Jyanadeva) to early 19th century (Tyagaraja) and it is wrong to pack great work from five centuries into a straightjacket of a single insensitive critical category.

Ganesh 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. He states that using incorrect ready-made Western formulas to appreciate our literature is wrong one. He views that any colonial interference with the culture’s self-image can create defects in historical sight. So he points out that a faithful reliance on the criteria of some imaginary universals (merely Western) indicates modern Indian critic’s legitimating of his amnesia. He adds ahead that
today’s Indian critic feels emotionally in tune with the ‘great’ Sanskrit classics and Sanskrit theories are paraded with pride in national and international forums.

Devy uses the term disorder in ‘culture’s psyche’ for Indian critics who relate with ancient India and not with the pre-British past. He views that the history of the bhasha literature has been recorded with praiseworthy scholarly care. He strongly believes that literature can be a key to opening the heart of medieval Indian culture, and also a mean of connecting modern India with pre-British India and thereby decolonizing the modern Indian sensibility. According to him, a history of literature which has no critical inwardness to the period to be historiographed can easily miss the vital spirit of its subject. It can also fail in conveying to its readers the feel of the total presence of literature. Devy sincerely believes that the idea of going back to the bhasha past can be immensely fruitful for evolving a more relevant historiography.

Ganesh Devy further objects the Western sequential periodization models of history to bhasha literatures. He points out the following temporal sequence of events in the process of transition (from Sanskrit to bhasha or Marga to Desi):

i) Decline of the Sanskrit as a literary language,
ii) Emergence of the bhashas,
iii) Decline of the Sanskrit poetics, and
iv) Emergence of bhasha criticism.

He further points out the deviations in above sequence as:

i) Sanskrit poetics does not show signs of decline several centuries after the emergence of bhasha literatures,
ii) No significant criticism in the bhasha traditions is in evidence.

Studying above situation, Devy suggests that this transition- from Sanskrit poetics to bhasha criticism demands a fresh and more adequate historiography. (1992:39-
Ganesh Devy points out the influence of the notion of canon and period on the Indian sense of literary tradition resulted in the denial of literary status to all non-secular and sectarian works. He argues ahead that traditionally, the links between the canonical and the non-canonical had been intimate and strong in India. Devy concludes, the impact of colonialism on Indian historiography is of great extent.

Ganesh Devy talks about literary theories developed in many languages where he comments that except for Sanskrit and Tamil to some extent no Indian language or literature has ever cultivated literary theory as an intellectual discipline or genre. He also points out that like Tamil, Pali, Telagu, Malayalam, Kannada languages have produced critical works of some significance, but no critical theory. According to him, no other but Bengali has been a leading literary language since its exposure to British influence in the 18th century. Here he argues that the lack of political freedom was responsible for the absence of intellectual disciplines like literary criticism.

Ganesh Devy states that the cultural history of literatures in Indian languages is far more complex than one imagines. According to him, being different periods of each language a single historiographic formula cannot prove adequate to describe each and every literature in India. He adds further that the common approach is invalid due to the vast variation of sociology, culture and political history from language to language. Some languages have been the languages of political domination and some of dominated one. One’s sociology is of trade, industry and general economic projectivity whereas one’s is of combative survival and these variations naturally reflected in the respective literatures. So he points out that a literary historiography not sensitive to the range and complexity of differences in Indian literary traditions stands the risk of distorting its subject.

According to Devy, 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. He 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. In his view about the nature of literary history he says:

Literary history is basically an apparatus of canon formation, which is a process of drawing and re-drawing the boundaries of fields of literary production in terms of what is socially acceptable and unacceptable. Literary history reflects the values of the society in which the historian lives, or for which he writes. A history of literature without these values and the judgements implicit in them is as impossible as a state without power-structure. (1998:5)

Here Devy remarks the importance of social issues in the writing of the literary history of any country. He adds ahead that the literary history has to negotiate a highly problematic relationship between the objective and subjective. According to Devy, literary history initially has to develop its system of symbolic representation- in which gradation, classification, designation become symbolic modes- simultaneously as it orders and selects literary events. Devy adds ahead that since literary history is expected to account for the aesthetic fluctuations within a literary tradition, it has to employ standards of excellence, criteria of assessment, categories of description and other apparatus developed by literary criticism, theory and aesthetics. At present literary history has been at the very heart of academic study and research of literature all over the world.

Devy argues that the structures of historical narratives invariably depend on the sense of time share by the community for which the narratives are produced. He states ahead that the norms of historiography of Western fail to be
observed in Indian society as Western discourses of knowledge about non-Western societies assume that the concept of time operative in traditional societies is ‘cyclical’ as opposed to ‘linear’ in Western societies. He points out further that if colonization adds to the history of the colonizers; it also takes away some history of the colonized. So he suggests ahead that it becomes necessary to re-examine if history is considered as an academic discipline, two popular assertions about Indian history: the first is that the Indian sense of time is cyclical, the second that consciousness about history is a unique gift of the West to India, and that such a sense did not exist in India to the same degree as it did in Europe. He also states that literary scholars except Sujit Mukharji to some extent have not made much progress in understanding the native traditions of literary historiography in India. He asserts ahead that due to the failure of internalizing Indian traditions the progress failed in a great extent. Here he says:

The result of not exploring the native conventions of literary history is the failure to understand the native processes of canon-formation and, therefore, the aesthetics of literature. Indian tradition is rich in literary theory. Most of these theories are available to modern Indian scholars as texts to which they cannot relate intellectually. Nor do they understand why the theories disappeared suddenly and mysteriously. (1998:16)

Here he wants to suggest the modern literary scholars who must pay attention towards the re-examining of Indian historiography on their own terms.

Referring to the idea of Rajashekhara, History is of two types: of a single hero, and of many heroes’, Devy gave title to his book- Of Many Heroes. Devy states that the plurality of relations with the literary past was a distinguishing mark of ancient Indian literature. So he suggests stepping out the concepts of genre and period, in order to understand the polyvalence of literary historiography in ancient India. Devy refers the six different categories of literatures: i) Suta
ii) Mantra, iii) Shastra, iv) Akshara, v) Prakrit and vi) Sangam, classified in the 10th century of Sanskrit tradition and points out that the classification combined the differences in race, religion and social status as the three criteria for literary historiography. He further states that these six categories can be placed in three broad categories: i) oral literature (suta and mantra), ii) Textual literature (shastra and akshara) and iii) Para-literature (Prakrit and Tamil). He adds ahead that though this classification had no ‘aesthetic justification’ it had received a general social sanction.

Devy points out that Jnanadeva’s ‘Bhavarthadipika' abandons the conventional historiography of stratification and announces to the world the arrival of new literary epoch in which the Suta, Shastra and Prakrit registers were melt together into one luminous bhakta speech. And this explicit ‘meta’ commentary reveals his ‘new’ literary history. He adds ahead that the simultaneity of his communication strategies is also the soul of Jnanadeva’s literary historiography. Referring various composers from saint poetry of different regions, Devy states that in the rich harvest of great literary creativity that strongly denied class monopoly as the basis for forming literary canons, the formation of sects became the historiographical strategy. Devy argues further that, sect formation has been the most central process of maintaining the progressive dynamics of society in India. He adds ahead that as sociological processes, sect-formation and canon-formation are analogous processes that gave rise in course of time to written histories of literature (1998:46-55).

Ganesh Devy presents the situation of history writing during pre-colonial period where he gives references of various multi-lingual writers of history. In the beginning, histories were composed in verse but in the 13th century, paper availability made it in prose form. Devy points out further that in the 17th century, history had become an independent science with its own methods of recording facts and examining the causes of important events. He adds ahead that
during that century, India started producing ‘literary histories’. He argues further that *tawarikhs* and *tadkiras* as good examples of histories in pre-colonial period:

The tawarikhs and tadkiras were exercises in biographical criticism and history. They contained encyclopedic information, made interesting through their anecdotal style, about scholars, schools, poets, saints and men of letters. These histories often had a moral and theological argument. However, the material they contained used to be reliable as history, due to the extreme care taken to maintain accuracy in chronology and dates. (1998:58)

Genesh Devy analyses the work of Badaoni-History writing, and points out that he does not use ‘period’, ‘genre’, ‘canon’ or ‘language’ as principles of literary history. But he uses the ‘sect’ as the central principle. He also attempts a total integration of oral and written as well as marginal and central. Here Devy believes that canon formation may be a common experience for all literatures in the world, but the processes through which canons are formed in a given literary culture are likely to be peculiar to that particular literary tradition.

Then after, Devy studies Warton and states that his historiography defined the ground rules for the discourses of literary history; but it was inadequate. Later on, he refers Jones who could present the reality of Indian literary situation though limited to Sanskrit tradition. Then, Devy comes to Sri Aurobindo who offers an original historiography for Indian literature. He points out that Aurobindo’s historiography avoided Jones’s lopsided appreciation of the past and Macaulay’s thoughtless negation of the tradition of Indian literature. Here he strongly asserts that Sri Aurobindo was the first original historiographer of Indian literature during the 20th century. He adds ahead that Sri Aurobindo’s historiography had made a happy reconciliation between the past (Sanskrit) and the present (*bhasha*). Devy points out that the European literary historiography
uses the paradigm of a single dominant literary tradition. On the other hand in India, the longevity of bilingual writers practice is substantial one. And so, Devy strongly asserts that considering the major differences between literary practices in India and Western countries, it is obvious that the concept of a single dominant literary tradition, a single and fairly well-defined literary canon and historical criticism couched in a unidirectional philology will not prove adequate to interpret the history of literatures in any Indian languages.

Ganesh Devy talks about Crane’s historiography that attempts to establish the primacy of practical criticism over philological criticism in the sphere of literary history. According to Crane, history is not all historical criticism; it is, in fact more of a practical formal analysis of forms, techniques, and materials of art. Here Devy states that Crane considers the aesthetic aspects of literary art to be of supreme importance and this kind of literary historiography overlooks the pre-constructional condition of literature. Devy points out that the critical standards and procedures of evaluation applicable to Western and European literatures are handicapped for literary works outside Western or European cultures. Devy further points out those critical standards, values, procedures originate within specific cultural and historical contexts, and are relevant and useful for those specific traditions and contexts. Thus the critical concepts to be used as tools of literary history need to be culture-specific. He argues further that the discourse of literature cannot be autonomous; it is created and acquired meaning within a culture where it is circulated as a system of meaning. So he strongly asserts that if literature is not an autonomous system, Crane’s historiography needs to be radically altered before putting it to use in postcolonial literary cultures. (1998:102)

Here he concludes that all have to think of literary historiography in terms of their own history and culture. He states ahead that the sophisticated Western discourse of literary history may be useful to pose for ourselves some of
the central problems that were repeatedly posed by Western literary historiography for itself. And he suggests examining some of the contemporary Indian approaches to literary history.

Ganesh Devy states very positively that the most common trend in literary historiography in modern India, and also the most dominant one at present, is the trend of regionalism. He points out ahead that the linguistic regions and literary histories are seen as identical areas. So the literary productions in a language outside the territorial region of that language are left out of the historical account. Devy accepts Sujit Mukharji’s formation of literary historiography expecting two major needs: it ought to be culture-specific, and it should not be narrowed to the level of a single language or region. In other words, the literary history should highlight similarities between various literatures; but the comparison should stop at the national boundary. Then Devy comes to the concept of subaltern historiography, discussed by Gayatri Spivak and other Bengali scholars, and states that subaltern historiography fights the tendency to essentialize India. This method highlights the self-cognition of all literatures in India but fails to develop the larger category of ‘Indian Literatures’.

According to Devy, the three forms: Dalit writing, Feminist writing and ‘New’ literatures of protest are expecting a kind of revisions of history. Their historiography seeks to recast literary histories based on colonial, cultural and caste discriminations and deprivations. In response to the three postcolonial Indian approaches to literary history, Devy says:

The discussion of postcolonial Indian approaches to literary history indicates the range and variety of critical responses to India’s literary past. These approaches, though not fully developed philosophies of literary history, indicate the direction in which literary historiography in India has been moving during the twentieth century. Taken together, they indicate
that history is open to numerous interpretations, all of which can be ‘valid’ interpretations, and possesses, like a literary text itself, the quality of interminable indeterminacy. They suggest that the polemics of progress along the fixed line of transition from imagination to reason will diminish the complexity and diversity of the literary past and present in India. (1998:132)

Here Devy considers the significance of above three approaches to formulate a kind of literary history suitable to Indian context. Here he adds that literary historiography demands of a historian a multiple and complex mechanism of cognition with regard to India’s literary past. He points out the differences among the approaches regarding the phenomenological limits of literature: ranging from the universal (Sri Aurobindo), national (Sujit Mukharji), regional (the bhasha historiography) and the sub-linguistic/regional (dalit and subaltern historiography), that show the concepts of selfhood operating behind them are not identical. So he says that the literary historiography in India will gain by exploring the notions of self and other in Indian social practice and philosophical traditions. In conclusion, Devy argues that a literary history in India, if it has to be a properly ordered illumination of the literary past, will have to be a history to allude to Rajashekhara’s eloquent phrase, “Of Many Beings”.

Devy points out that the Indian tradition has given to every sensitive Indian the ability to internalize a multiplicity of traditions which was absent in Western tradition. He adds ahead that the historical facts that all literary traditions and movements in India resulted from a togetherness, of multiple traditions. Devy states ahead that the Western literary historiography has emphasized the primacy of imagination over memory while classifying, arranging, evaluating and representing literary events. And if a similar procedure followed in India, it will fail to do justice to the creativity in Indian literary tradition. Studying the various rise and fall in numerous Indian languages, Devy states:
Just as too little history makes historiography unnecessary, too much of it too makes historiography helpless. (1998:168)

Here Devy explains the idea giving very nice example of garden and a jungle. According to him, literary historiography developed in monolingual cultures and in cultures with a relatively shorter span of existence is like a rational argument about a manageable garden and Indian literary historiography is like entering the mythical jungle.

4.5 THE TRIPARTITE RELATION:

Ganesh Devy has introduced the concept, ‘the Tripartite Relation’ to focus the relationship between marga, videsi (alien) and desi. In the beginning, he points out the hierarchical positions among these traditions. Before going to the tripartite relation, he highlights the relations of marga and the desi traditions. He states that there is a split in their personality. The marga and the desi had, traditionally, a hierarchic relation, the main stream being considered inherently superior. According to him, the nature of literary fragmentation can be understood properly considering the fact that Indian society had developed a sophisticated cultural apparatus of intricately balancing various sub-cultures in relation to the mainstream culture. He explains the terms marga and desi as: marga means not only the mainstream but also the traditional, and desi means not only the regional but also the contemporary. (1992:78) Here, he states that the relationship between the two was based on the principle of a healthy exchange. He adds further that during marga’s heyday, Sanskrit poetics had acknowledged the importance of regional variations in poetics and dramatic styles.

Ganesh Devy points out that like the other cultural institutions in India, it carries the burden of the tripartite relation between the marga, the alien
and the *desi*. He adds ahead that the tripartite cultural relationship which determines the course of Indian literature in English can be seen at work in a large number of writers. Here Devy gives the fine example of R. Parthsarthy’s poem *Rough Passage*. According to Devy, during the first eight centuries of the present millennium, the exchange and opposition between *marga* traditions and *desi* traditions occupied a central place in India’s cultural transactions. He adds ahead that the Colonial rule or British contact added the *videsi* cultural transaction. So he states that in contemporary India we notice in our culture and literature, a triangular relationship between the three strands of tradition: *desi*, *marga* and *videsi*. Devy further points out that during colonial period *marga* and *videsi* get great prominent position whereas *desi* remained largely neglected. The debate regarding the medium of education either *margi* Sanskrit, Persian, *videsi* English or *desi bhasha* made a profound impact on the literary culture in modern India. (Paranjape, 1997:10)

Devy points out that the exchange of ideas and intellectual or cultural movements between the *marga* and the *desi* traditions, or between one *desi* tradition and another, took place through the system of cultural diffusion evolved all over India. He adds further that the country’s geography has been a crucial factor in determining its history and culture. He views that, in cultural transfer, geography played a central role. The network oriented geography performed the function of transferring and transfusing ideas from the *marga* to the *desi*, and the other way around. He points out that with the advent of Islam in India, the *marga* intellectual traditions stopped growing and survived in the decadent forms for several centuries and this picture helped the *desi* or *bhasha* traditions to grow to a greater extent to create a new identity and a new cultural space for themselves. He further states that this new situation had two important consequences: i) An increasing dialogue among various regional literatures, and ii) the reversal or roles between the *marga* and the *desi* was the emergence of a
hierarchy of literary values. This state influenced the development of the bhasha literatures up to the arrival of the British. (1992:78-81)

Ganesh Devy highlights that the possibility of cultural domination and mediation by Sanskrit was diminishing, helped the bhasha literatures to establish direct channel of communication with one another. The exchanges between one bhasha literature and another resulted in the bhakti poetry, the finest chapter in Indian literature. Devy points out that traditionally, marga traditions established literary criteria and aesthetic values for elitist literatures whereas desi designated rustic and vulgar literary expressions. And as a result the Sanskrit poetics had to defend itself against the Indo-Islamic cultural invasions as well as bhasha threats. Studying the pathetic situation of Sanskrit or marga tradition, Devy locates its position in critical scenario as:

During the Indo-Islamic period, the marga traditions were dominated by the Islamic cultural influence, and subverted by the rebellious sectarianism of the desi traditions. But during the initial phases of the British colonial rule in India, the marga traditions received some very vigorous but artificial respiration from the European Indologists. (1992:81)

Here he points out that the transition from marga to the desi in the field of literary criticism remained unfinished. According to Devy, during the bhakti poetry, bhasha literatures vindicated the vertical, regional and desi elements of culture against the hegemonic and over-rigid marga traditions. He argues ahead that bhakti was not a restricted but a composite concept and a pervasive movement which medieval India posed as an alternative to the hegemony of marga traditions and excessively sophisticated system of Sanskrit poetics. To focus the changing situation due to the emergence of bhasha literatures, Devy states:

The development of bhakti poetry was a natural consequence of the emergence of the bhasha literatures. Bhakti unleashed an emotionalism
which classical Indian literature had held under the strict control of conventions and rigidly defined social ethics. (1992:87)

Here Devy points out real freedom enjoyed by *bhakti* poetry that was not allowed in *marga* tradition being under the convention. Then he adds ahead the aim and nature of bhakti poetry in relation with *marga* traditions as:

Since the sole aim of *bhakti* poetry was to challenge the *marga* traditions, a tradition, of logically rigorous philosophic systems, its attitude to theory was one of indifference. It tried every kind of experimentation with style and diction, and replaced every established convention of poetry; but it never tried to formulate a statement of the new conventions of poetry. (1992:88)

Here he points out that *bhakti* poetry is a kind of reaction to *marga* tradition. It offers a kind of liberty that was not in *marga* tradition being governed by their conventions. He argues ahead that though the *bhakti* movement generated a substantial body of literature, it failed to initiate a new theory of literature due to a breakdown in the intricate network of the *marga* and the *desi* traditions. The *marga* tradition accepted only the theological contents of *bhakti*, neglecting its rebellious spirituality.

Ganesh Devy states in conclusion that, formal education belonged to *marga*, while the experience of life’s complexities was perceived and articulated through *desi* idiolects. He also points out that the literature was being produced in the bhashas, criticism continued to survive through Sanskrit. He argues that the modern mind, reared on Western Paradigms of literary history, may find this situation difficult to grasp. Devy strongly rejects the established view of this situation that considers it in terms of a failure, a sickness, a vacuum and an inability. Even he opposes that Indian literature had lost (for a period of half a millennium) its critical sensibility. Here he argues that criticism did become a
discourse, a monolingual system of intellectual premises about literature; but it remained a multicultural and multilingual enterprise. So he states ahead that multiculturalism and multilingualism need not be seen as symptoms of a great cultural failure and sickness merely because they have no parallels in Western literary history. During the initial contact with British, the Indian mind considered multiculturalism and multilingualism as natural conditions of existence, and continued to strive to maintain them as such even during the high period of Indian nationalism which was inspired by Europe’s monolingual-monoculture nationalism. Later on Devy lights on the relationship between Western and Indian in following lines:

The city and cantonment structure, with its politics of sex, race and culture, formed the essential typology of cultural relations in colonial India. Indians, with their experience of multiculturalism in the past, were able to face the colonial situation with maturity. The dual system of values itself became their weapon to fight colonialism in every area of culture, including literary criticism. (1992:99)

Here Devy points out the selfish and restricted relations of Western/British with Indians. He appreciates the multiculturalism and multilingualism of Indians as a strong weapon of fighting with colonialism. He further states that Indian criticism is gripped, and the tension caused by being ‘torn’ between ‘Westernization’ and ‘Sanskritization’, are epistemological rather than ontological features of Indian criticism.

Ganesh Devy argues that English criticism that was negligible branch up to the beginning of the 19th century acquired the great significance due to the provision of ready and vast market for critical texts by colonies. Seeing the extension possibility and utility of European literary criticism, English texts were exported to many colonies to achieve the great importance and it received a valued
marketable commodity status. Devy points out the changing sensibility of Indians regarding literary criticism due to the Western effect in following words:

Since that education worked as a channel to draw the ‘natives’ into the colonial market system, creating a class of culturally displaced Indians, such a displacement came to be valued. Imitating Arnold, Leavis, etc., this class then started maintaining that literary criticism is an index of a healthy culture. Thus, in India, literary criticism of the Western type was pressed into use after it came to acquire value. (1992:105)

Here Ganesh Devy comments the bhasha critical works due to its blind imitation of Western four types: i) Mimetic, with theories focusing on the relation between literature and the cosmos, ii) Pragmatic, with theories focusing on the relation between literature and reader/audience, iii) Expressive, with theories focusing on the relation between literature and the writer, and iv) Autonomous, with theories focusing on literature as a sovereign ontological object, without regard to the history of own origin of literature. Devy further objects the usefulness and value of these Western ideas as they were originated in the context of divergent metaphysical and social perceptions. He also objects wasted pursuit of theory of Indian critical talent that was totally irrelevant to literature in India. He also points out that the most crucial factor in the above type of transaction was the attempt to define the ‘self’ of Indian criticism in terms of ‘the other’ of the Western criticism, and the constant reference to ‘the other’ was the central feature in the self-definition of Indian criticism. Devy focuses the entry of the Western literary criticism in Indian situation as:

Hence, nationalism in the field of literary criticism involved acceptance of liberal Western ideas and paradigms of literature, together with the revival of Sanskrit poetics. An ideal imitation of the West in this field would have been to orient Indian criticism to the bhasha literatures just as English
literature. But colonialism produced tolerance for inappropriate models, a liking for theorizing and a loss of self-confidence. In the field of literary criticism, Westernization has taken the form of submission to the forces of colonization. (1992:109-10)

Here, Devy remarks that the modern period of Indian culture has transformed the bilateral relationship of the *marga* and the *desi* traditions into a tripartite relationship between the *marga*, the *desi* and the *videsi* (West), with respect to literary criticism. He also states that the relation consists of various patterns of collaboration as well as confrontation of these three traditions with one another. He further points out that the colonial experience of literary criticism based on economy affected the Indian perception of literary criticism. He also highlights that the ‘class-based’ and ‘Westernized’ perception in literary criticism has generated a crisis in literary criticism as it remained fragmented by the tripartite relation. He further points out that the colonial perceptions of history of the bhasha literatures, and the subsequent cultural amnesia, have made modern critics incapable of appreciating the pragmatic wisdom of the bhasha literatures in refusing to submit to the authority of the *marga* criticism.

Ganesh Devy describes the nature of the cultural amnesia referring to the literary theories developed three dominant Indian critics (theorists): Sri Aurobindo, Rabindranath Tagore and Ananda Kentish Coomaraswamy. Here he points out that ‘Indian modernism’ was more clearly imitative of the Western models than the Indian Romanticism was. He adds further that in Indian criticism, modernism brought with it the trend of pseudo-theorizing, for most of it was theory based on alien theories without any relevance to Indian traditions. He gives the reference of the modern Indian critic, B. S. Mardhekar in whom we all observe the fine blend of ancient Indian philosophy and modern Western ideology.
In summing up, Devy comments that in Mardhekar’s literary criticism, as like Aurobindo, the bhasha tradition of revolt against orthodoxy and authority was consumed and stilted by the colonial trend of theorizing. Finally he presents the real situation of tripartite relation that he observed in modern Indian critics in following words:

Sri Aurobindo tried to move away from the colonial paradigms and into the world of ancient Indian poetry. Mardhekar threw the marga traditions overboard, and wedded himself intellectually to the colonial tradition. The motivating force in both was the urge to create something new, to nativize and to vitalize. That urge was inherited from the bhasha traditions. To the extent that they represent the field, it can be said that the literary criticism in India displays patterns of the tripartite relation of the bhasha, the marga, and the Colonial/West traditions, and that, conditioned by a cultural amnesia, it still remains a fragmented discourse. (1992:119)

Here Devy presents the real situation of Indian literary criticism in the context of the tripartite relation of the desi, the marga, and the West traditions. According to Devy, the cultural amnesia’s presence caused to fragment the present discourse. In fact, the entire history of Indian English literature is a series of various patterns of conflict and collaboration between the Western, the marga and the desi cultural traditions.

4.6 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. The term, ‘nativism’ is applied in various fields of knowledge differently. This new movement at the beginning started in United States. If we
study this term we get following different definitions. A sociopolitical policy, especially in the United States in the 19th century, refers nativism as favoring the interests of established inhabitants over those of immigrants. It also indicates the reestablishment or perpetuation of native cultural traits, especially in opposition to acculturation. In Philosophy, it is considered as the doctrine that the mind produces ideas that are not derived from external sources. In anthropology, nativism means the social movement that proclaims the return to power of the natives of a colonized area and the resurgence of native culture, along with the decline of the colonizers. The term has also been used to refer to a widespread attitude in a society of a rejection of alien persons or culture. Nativism occurs within almost all areas of nonindustrial culture known to anthropologists. One of the earliest careful studies of nativism was that of James Mooney, who studied the Ghost Dance among Native Americans of the Western United States. In 1943, Ralph Linton published a brief paper on nativistic movements that served to establish the phenomenon as a special topic in anthropological studies of culture change. In politics, "nativist" refers to the socio-political positions taken up by those who identify themselves as "native-born", or in other words, nativism is a hostile and defensive reaction to the flux of immigration.

Ganesh Devy states the source of the term ‘native’ in ancient European languages, just as the equivalent Indian term ‘desi’ has its roots in its ancient Indian usage. The native refers to the person who does not travel much, land-locked, bound to his village and soil and who produces something of practical use to his community. He points out further that in Indian context, desivad is used as a synonym for the term ‘Nativism’ and desi belongs more to the area of descriptive linguistics than to cultural anthropology. He adds ahead that by the end of the 10th century, desi had come to be perceived in opposition to margi or marga and during the break-up of Sanskrit language into numerous languages; it was used to describe the new language. According to Ganesh Devy, ‘Nativism’
is a recent critical trend in Marathi. It aims to free Marathi sensibility and criticism from the prison of the tripartite relation. He argues that nativism views literature as an activity taking place ‘within’ a specific language and bound by the rules of discourse native to the language of its origin. He explains the nature and scope of nativism in following words:

Nativism understands writing as a social act, and expects of it an ethical sense of commitment to the society within which it is born. It rules out the colonial standard of literary history as a series of epochs, and the marga claim of the mainstream literature as being the only authentic literature. Nativism is a language-specific way of looking at literature. It rejects the concept-specific method of ‘universal’ criticism. As such, it gathers its main critical issues and themes from within the traditions of the literatures it examines, instead of approaching it with preconceived notions of good and bad literature. At the same time, it refuses to glorify history and tradition, and values realism. (1992:120)

Here Devy admires the trend of nativism as it gives platform to native issues and matters in literature. Though he believes, Bhalchandra Nemade as the principal advocate of nativism, he adds several other trends: the literature of regional trend, caste sensibility and even dialect sensibility in the coverage of Nativism. Nemade presents a tentative description of his variety of Nativism:

The present generation must have an unfailing nativistic awareness that the novel in Marathi is a creation of Marathi writers, who, in turn, are product of the Marathi society. Further, the Formalistic, unintelligent practice of picking up all and sundry works of art from languages all over the world for a comparative assessment of artifacts in Marathi- a tendency rife in our criticism- has to be avoided. It is dangerous for criticism to enter the comparative field without making a deep study of both cultures compared.
Culture is not a hot-house, but a soil-bound process; literature is not a theoretical with this awareness of literature as a phenomenon ‘born within its own language’, Nativism avoids seeking self-definitions by referring to the ‘Western Other’. (1992:120-21)

Nemade classifies Marathi novels to make clear awareness of the tripartite relation to generate the modern Indian literary discourse. According to him, novel is a social, linguistic and artistic activity, and therefore, it has a moral responsibility towards that particular society.

Referring to Nemade’s essay, Devy argues that Nativism is a new style of critical thought or a new, statement of nationalistic revival. Ganesh Devy admires Nemade’s statement that criticism is not valuable in itself but acquires value to the extent it contributes to the development of the literary culture. Devy expresses his sincere support to Nemade’s thought in following words:

Nemade’s essay is an excellent, though solitary, example of Nativism in literary criticism. It has opened the possibility of rooting criticism in the bhasha tradition. It shows a way out of the tripartite relation that kept Indian literary criticism fragmented and abstract. It is too early to say if Nativism will become the central force in Marathi criticism and end the transition that began with Rajashekhara a thousand years ago. (1992:123)

Here Devy points out the significance of the trend Nativism to develop our own line of thinking in a critical sense. He pleads this thought as a fit and appropriate one taking into account the Indian situation. He also strongly opposes the Western standards of analyzing Indian literature. According to him, India, being the country of multicultural and multilingual nature it requires its own individual ways of viewing literary creativity. He adds ahead that Western ways of viewing Indian literature are useless as Indian literature is a matter of revolt and heresy rather than that of imposition and authority of Western. According to Devy, Western critical
models, tools, standards evolved in Europe during the period of colonial expansion for the purpose of civilizing the primitive nations were applicable limited to monolingual and monoculture nations and totally unfit for bhasha context.

Ganesh Devy points out that the criticism cannot be an isolated and autonomous activity as it requires support and sustenance from larger assumptions about life, language, meaning and society. He adds further that it is conditioned by its specific geography, history, and linguistic range. And so he strongly states that the literature growing out of one type of underlying linguistic and metaphysical structure cannot be understood and studied by criticism growing out of another and alien type of underlying linguistic and metaphysical structure. In other words, Western criticism is incapable to study Indian literature. Ganesh Devy expresses his undesired to colonial period due to its wrong effect on Indian sensibility. He gives the nature and solution over it in following words:

To add to this undesirable fragmentation in the field of criticism, the colonial period has introduced amnesia in Indian criticism, which has distorted its memory of the bhasha literary traditions. Owing to the amnesia, the loss of self-confidence, the anxiety to postulate new theories and the fragmentation of criticism, the Indian critic is gripped with a fear of a crisis in criticism. In fact, that fear itself is the true crisis. Indian criticism will have to come out of it; and that is possible only through a nativistic self-awareness. A recovery of the memory of native literary traditions will reduce the anxiety about the absence of theory. What Indian literature need at present is a realistic historiography and not so much of a theoretical discussion. (1992:124)

Here Devy points out the amnesia in Indian criticism due to colonial period which has developed a crisis in Indian criticism. He suggests the solution of nativistic history or native criticism to remove cultural amnesia’s central problem in Indian
criticism. In conclusion, he pleads nativistic perspective to view our bhasha literatures and rejects readymade unwanted alien models. He also tries to plead that the tripartite relation developed fragmentation in the field of Indian criticism can be thrown away if applied and developed our own models.

Ganesh Devy expects that the Desivad in literary criticism must carefully guard itself against becoming a militant and closed ideology. It must bring to its practitioners a sense of self-discipline and self-search. He adds further that since the world has been shrinking as a cultural space and since the exchanges between cultures have increased, Indian literary critics face today the danger of becoming intellectual dependents of critics in other cultures and other contexts. Here he asks the Indian critics to think over all these problems seriously and try to find out the possible solutions to develop our own distinguished image.

Devy admires the Indian society and its structure as against Western society. He expresses his views to develop a positive attitude among all Indians to love their own life and situation as:

In fact, multilingual, multilateral education is the greatest strength of Indian culture at present. Multiculturalism and multilingualism have been the strength of Indian society from the twelfth century. That multiplicity was seen as degradation in the past, and is seen as weakness today. We need to get over the sense of guilt through an open-eyed approach to history in order to build a modern Indian critical discourse. (1992:129)

To sum up, Ganesh Devy is highly influenced by Bhalchandra Nemade’s views. He seems to be the real follower of Nemade. Here he expects that our fight should not be against the apparent confusion in literary criticism but against the lack of self-confidence and cultural amnesia. His feeling of self-reliance recalls back Gandhian philosophy of ‘Swaraj’ rejecting foreign, alien unwanted things or thoughts.
Devy is deeply aware of the oppressive nature of traditional Indian society, which had its own systems of suppressing the polyphony and polysymy of Indian society. Nativism, then, is a form of indigenism whose agenda can be summed up as a cry for cultural self-respect and autonomy emanating from the *bahujan samaj*—the majority of people who make up the plurality of Indian society. Nativism emphasizes the primacy of language in the production of culture. It favours and privileges the language and creativity of the masses over that of elites, whether these are Anglicized or Sanskritized. In a sense, it represents the much underrated and marginalized vernacularist position in the educational and cultural debates of early 19th century India. It is not necessarily a new theory or dogma, nor is it a set of clearly spelt out beliefs or principles. It is rather an attitude, movement, or outlook. It helps to situate a work of art in such a manner that its cultural affiliations are revealed. It emphasizes the locus of a work and enables a critic to place it *vis a vis* a particular society or country. Nativism, a new line of thinking, is now being given a voice and shape, however feeble and blurred.

Nativism is a world-wide phenomenon of cultural nationalism and self-assertion in which colonized and other marginalized literary cultures have begun to vociferate their differences from Euro-American, Universalist critical discourses. In India, it plays an important role in literary criticism as well as in other intellectual endeavours that helped to emerge the nativist positions in Indian philosophy, sociology, political theory, science, technology, architecture, textile designs, etc. Nativism treats literature and literary criticism as sub-system of specific linguistic cultures. Talking about Nativism, Harishachandra Thorat refers Nemade and Devy as important representatives of this trend. Here Thorat compares Nemade and Devy in following words:

Nemade prefers present whereas Devy prefers re-reading of the history.
Nemade accepts the importance of culture-assimilation idea but Devy
objects this. Nemade’s knowledge of *bhasha* tradition is good who always keeps ahead Marathi readers while writing. But Devy’s knowledge of Marathi and Gujarati tradition is limited and suspectable whose readers know nothing about those traditions too. Nemade enters into practical thinking whereas Devy limits himself to academic purpose only. Nemade avoids Western theoretical expression but Devy seems to be the master of its use. (2005:177)

Here Thorat points out that Nemade seems to be rather considerable in his ideology. Nemade is more practical than Devy. Devy is limiting himself to academic purposes only whereas Nemade goes beyond that. Nativism sees a triangular relationship of traditions in our culture and literature- *desi* (native), *marga* (national) and *videsi* (alien) traditions, and insists on an assertion of nativeness in literary criticism. In other words, it aims to foreground “the native or indigenous elements of our popular creativity”. All bhasha traditions in India are basically of *desi* traditions and Nativism seeks to place these traditions at the centrestage of critical evaluation by constructing a new hierarchy of relationships.

**4.7 OTHER TONGUE:**

Ganesh Devy points out that the Indian-English literature is the newest and the least developed branch of Indian literature. According to him, for a Indian, writing in English involves a conflict between the mother-tongue and English as this other tongue has been our ‘intimate enemy’ during the last two centuries. He argues that in general scenario of English literature in the world, Indian English Literature goes to down stage as mono-lingual cultures rank higher than multi-lingual cultures. He also states that, in countries where English is the only spoken and written language, literature in English blossom with greater ease than in countries where English is only an official or a library language. He adds
ahead that the major elements common to all areas of commonwealth literature were the English language and the colonial context with their unique native social and historical context. The worth of any Commonwealth writer depends on his intimate relation with his native landscape, society and culture- apart from his handling of the English language for creative purposes.

Devy argues that in modern times too, India has been producing high quality literature in nearly twenty languages and works belonging to Indian English literature are no better than those published in Indian languages. In short, the bulk with quality literature written in regional languages was abundant than in Indian English literature. According to Devy, a specific geographical base of each Indian language is typical plus point that lacks for Indian English Literature. He also states that the readership of Indian languages is several hundred times more than that of Indian English. So Indian English Literature is fighting an uneven battle for its survival in India; but it enjoys a higher prestige that its merit within the commonwealth spheres. The writers in Indian English enjoy the global reputations too.

Devy points out that Indian English Literature is less representative of Indian society than any literature in Indian languages and as a result the real India has remained inaccessible to Western readers/audiences as ever. Devy points out that Indian English literature seems greatly Indianized when looked at from outside India, but appears highly Anglicized when looked at from the Indian languages perspective. And so it has a dual personality. Devy views that India has a long history and tradition of writing in alien languages. Here he gives the references of languages like Sanskrit, Persian, and Arabic that were well-developed before they reached India. They were languages of rulers and were imposed on Indians from above. Later on they became the powerful mediums for the expression of Indian imagination and genius. According to Devy, Sanskrit ceased to be a non-Indian language as its literary development took place entirely
within India. Sanskrit offered India a language of dialogue with the soul and god, whereas Persian and Arabic shaped the dominant speech of political transactions. When English arrived in India these two had been so deep-rooted in Indian sensibility that English could not replace the already established dialects of thought to any great extent.

Devy states that the English language did, function as a powerful medium of the modern Indian understanding of materials as manifest in that discourse of science, industry, commerce and communication. And so English literature produced in India is literature in the ‘Other Tongue’ context. At present English language has been assimilated by most Indian languages. But Indian literature had experienced a lack of adequate critical response. He remarks the critical theoretical situation of Indian English as:

No critic has so far tried to describe Indian English literature on its own terms in order to offer at least a tentative framework of theoretical issues within which this body of literature can be investigated. Thus while a whole new body of creative works has become available, and has started posing interesting theoretical issues before us, no significant critical apparatus has emerged to meet the challenge during the last quarter of a century. (1995:40-41)

Here Devy argues that to have a theory of literature was felt in modern India only after the arrival of the British with their education system. The active literary criticism developed by Westerns percolated down to the Indian literary sensibility. According to Devy, Indian writing in English has kept revolving round the problems of alienation and its conflict with the writer’s inborn sense of commitment. And so the culture-conflict it reveals is a peculiar feature not exclusively its own but in a wider sense also forms the context of modern Indian culture. The Indian writing in English gives the narration of experiencing states of
mind, rather than an examination of a finished experience. In other words, it has not been able to relate itself meaningfully to the overall Indian literary culture and tradition as it has not inherited anything from the rich Indian heritage.

Devy points out that Indian English literature is undeniably one of the many modern Indian literatures. The difference between the other Indian literatures and this branch is that other literatures have well defined communities of readers who speak those languages as their primary languages whereas majority of readers of Indian English literature within India use English as their second language. The recent history of Indian literature in English shows that this branch of Indian literature has acquired a strong sense of individual identity and its own unique literary features.

R. B. Patankar comments Devy’s contribution saying that he speaks only about Marathi tradition and tries to generalize it with all bhasha traditions. His language of writing seems to be rather difficult and theoretical one that creates problem for common readers. Patankar further objects Devy’s comment of cultural amnesia regarding immediate past as we do not forget bhakti poetry, Panditi poetry and Lavani and ballads of great Marathi poets. Patankar adds ahead that Devy is ignorant about terminological language and only using it frequently, is the dominant feature of his style. Finally, he feels comfortable to call Devy’s book, *After Amnesia* a legend story or *Devy-puran*. (1999:107-10)

**4.8 SUMMING UP:**

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. 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. In other words, Devy embraces a critical agenda set against two academic vested interests: those who have vested heavily in British and American perspectives, and who have attempted to revive ancient and medieval Indian literary theories long abandoned and forgotten.

We observed his acuteness of 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. Ganesh Devy is a cultural hero who represents a very important and useful invention in the evolving dynamics of Indian culture. He is deeply rooted in our bhasha traditions and utterly dedicated to the cause of freeing Indian literary criticism from the shackles of Euro-American dominance. He, like Nemade, wishes to make Indian criticism a more responsible, self-respecting, and Indo-centric activity. In that sense they have brought the agenda of decolonization to Indian literary criticism. Devy has demolished many myths and punctured many egos within Indian literary and intellectual circle. His allegiance to the ‘Desivad’ school of Indian literary criticism lends trenchancy to his attack on English literary academics.

Devy opines that Indian scholars should try to decolonize indigenous Indian consciousness and raise Indian intellectual self-esteem. He argues that
attempting to adapt contemporary Franco-German-American theories to the Indian multicultural situation may debilitate available indigenous critical energies. Devy does not expect a grand theory but expect only a more extensive and more careful practice, specifically comparing Indian regional literatures with each other. He envisions an empirical base of native comparative practice with native writing to understand the contemporary Indian cultural situation. According to him, generating native comparative practice may be more appropriate and useful to analyze and guide India’s long and diverse cultural development. Devy also highlights several conflicting tendencies generated by colonial experience. One tendency is to imitate and get approval of colonizers and the second to resist the colonial influence to give rise to nativistic feelings. These conflicting tendencies result in a strange superficial cultural dynamics and its effect also tends to remain colonized culture static. Devy suggests an appropriate historiography to understand this cultural immobilization.

Ganesh Devy has worked on since 1985, as a founder editor of SETU (Journal of Indian Literature in Translation) as well as published in Gujarati and English which will bring to other English-reading Indians the fruits of regional literatures outside their multi-lingual capacities. Through his essays included in ‘In Another Tongue’, Devy has been searching for not merely a responsible critical practice but a profound and useful sense of critical authority. Devy believes that for living to mass cultural society of India, a stronger and more responsible criticism is necessary. He states ahead that the roots of the existence of Indian English literature are in India’s age-old bilingualism. The commonwealth period provided Indian English literature a sense of self and identity that was rejected by colonial rule. Devy very funnily states that the Indian literary critics and writers are to be of test-tube babies born without local forefathers.

Devy points out that, today India has nearly eighty languages, each spoken by more than a hundred thousand persons. In the numeralical strength of
speakers, English comes at the sixty seventh place. So the Indian English literature is a small segment of the entire spectrum of Indian literature. Devy states that English is the language through which India inherits the colonial legacy. It is the language of the communication with the world; but it does not have any geographical base as it is not a language of any particular Indian community. Devy argues that English is English in language but Indian in its sensibility. He adds ahead that the existence of English in India is somewhat like a hothouse cultivation so it is not fortunate enough to enjoy its greatness in the social and cultural life of India.

Ganesh Devy argues that during the waves of ‘Indian culture’ in U.K. and U.S.A. all sundry Indian English works enjoy limelight but it is treated as one constituent element of the mosaic of Indian literature. Indian literature in English is India’s youngest literary tradition, with a very short history of about a hundred years. Devy also states that English in India enjoys the language of ‘status’ but fails to be dynamic and remains ‘static’. Devy has demolished many myths and punctured many egos within Indian literary and intellectual circle. According to Devy the perspective of literature and literary criticism with a greater self-awareness, the knowledge of native traditions and an insight into their modern transformations by Western criticism will make easier for Indian critics to propose theoretical formulations.

Devy points out three distinguishing features of the post-colonial Indian English literature which are inevitable results of the sociology of this literature. Those features are: i) the attitude of the writers towards language, (not just the English language but language in general), ii) their interest in history (history is qualitatively different in that it does not read history in terms of high and low significance), and iii) these writers show signs of being compulsive talkers (love for speech) may even be a reaction to the attitude to language that prevailed in the previous generation. English language does not have its
independent sociological space in India; it lives like a subtenant in the consciousness of the bilingual Indian community of English speakers. Therefore, the sociology of Indian English literature is inevitably, that of marginalization and seclusion. The English language is a system of signs that circulates meaningfully within a given society. Further he states if signs have no society to circulate within, they will not form a system of meaning at all. Devy states that English literature happens to be a great cultural force that leaves one linguistically and aesthetically uprooted. The effect of English literary study in India is that the average students of it are violently uprooted from their own linguistic personality.

To sum up, the great impact of Bhalchandra Nemade’s views is observed on Ganesh Devy. He seems to be the real follower of Nemade. Here he expects that our fight should not be against the apparent confusion in literary criticism but against the lack of self-confidence and cultural amnesia. His feeling of self-reliance recalls back Gandhian philosophy of ‘Swaraj’ rejecting foreign, alien unwanted thoughts or things.