Chapter - I

Introduction : Towards a Socio-historical Approach
This study assesses English writings, mainly literary, originating in Gujarat during the period 1850 to 1950. This was also the period which saw the emergence of Indian Writing in English, a phenomenon which can be traced back to an interplay of the native and the foreign sensibilities. The writings assessed here are, from one point of view, a part of the larger corpus of Indian Writing in English. This study is guided, then, partly by an historiographical aim, to see how the new genre of literary writings in English developed at the regional level in Gujarat.

In this context, since 1968 when Raghavacharyuly, among others, set the trend, speculation regarding theoretical difficulties facing a literary historian in the Indian situation has been growing, and by now the field has attained the dimension of a specific problematic. Moreover, many perceptive studies have been brought out on individual genres. This increased activity implies a developing interest in theoretical issues regarding the genesis and growth of Indian English Writing.
The study also involves a larger issue, the question of the legitimacy of Indian English writing as a new literature. The critical interest centring around this question has yet not exhausted itself. English, it is claimed, played a role as a unifying agent when it became the medium of instruction, a decision which is a part of the history of education in India. A most significant chapter here for the nation as a whole and for Gujarat region in particular was the controversy between the Anglicists and the Orientalist. This controversy was apparently resolved in 1835 with the Macaulay Minutes. However, this led to an ironing out of the subtle regional differences pertaining to the use of English in India. For instance, the conclusion of the above mentioned controversy was preceded in Gujarat region by a period during which Elphinstone and others did good educational work. A.K. Forbes and his Gujarat Vernacular Society rendered similar service by bringing out translations of English books into Gujarati.

This suggests that though the universities were established in the three different regions simultaneously in the year 1857, the contact and the consequent influence of the English language, and through it of Western culture, on the Indians residing in those regions cannot be called similar and simultaneous. This contact is at the root of the emergence of English writings in
Gujarat region assessed here. A study of this particular set of writings should, therefore, take into consideration the uniqueness of the regional situation. Iyengar, for instance, contrasts the differing contemporary socio-cultural situations in Bengal and in Gujarat in this regard, and comments on how in Bombay "the movement for religious reform and regeneration, took the form of Prarthana Samaj, less eclectic than the Brahma Samaj and less militant than Arya Samaj." Again, referring to the Indians in Bombay he writes:

These were not like the 'Derozio men', but men seized with purpose, men who took themselves seriously, and thought and counselled and acted as responsible and mature leaders of a people just awakening from the stupor of the ages.

The justification for a region-based study thus lies not only in the differences in the chronology of events in matters of contact, but also in a wider sense, in differences in historical and temperamental terms affecting the people inhabiting a particular region. Another dimension to this activity of English writing in the region is indicated in Meenakshi Mukherji's remarks referring to the fact that historians of Indian writing in English usually begin their
accounts with a discussion of the writings of Dutts and Ghoshes. Meenakshi Mukherji states:

These were unusually talented and highly Westernized families which sent their children to England for education quite early in life so that England and English became a natural part of their mental make up. These writers could not constitute a trend. They were not natural products of the general social and cultural condition of their time, hence they cannot be evaluated against, nor related to, the history and geography of the India of their time.

This is the argument on which this study bases its chief and perhaps the strongest justification. All the writers, whose poems, novels or prose have been assessed here are "natural products of the general social and cultural condition of their time." These writers, with a few exceptions, hardly had any opportunity of exposure to the English way of life for any considerable period of time. Moreover, they came from a newly risen urban middle class, and often from the Parsee community whose roots in the traditional Indian culture and literature were not very deep.
Finally, Meenakshi Mukherji's observations raise a whole range of questions regarding what may be called the canon of Indian English writings. One of the aims of the present study is to provide a broader base for a redefinition of the canon.

Besides the 'literary' writings of obviously low literary merit, this study also covers a substantial number of 'non-literary' writings. The writings include not only the main varieties of the central genres - the lyric, the long narrative poem, the novel - but also some of the peripheral genres like the biography, the memoir, the travelogue. Such inclusiveness is justified in view of the larger aim of this study to cover an early phase of Indian English writing in order to understand the phenomenon at grass root level, as it were. At this level this writing is tangled with a variety of other writings. Thus, in terms of themes, largely because of the socio-historical context, the writings show certain common features such as a concern for reforms, a pervasive religious outlook, a consciousness on the part of the writers of their identity as Indians, a consciousness that they are presenting "Indian" material in an "alien" language.

The hundred writings assessed here thus include: anthologies of lyrics, long narrative poems, collections of short stories, novels, plays, biographies, autobiographies,
memoirs, histories, diaries and travelogues. For the purposes of assessment, these writings in different forms have been grouped under three broad categories: (i) Non-fictional Prose (ii) Poetry, and (iii) Fictional Prose; a final chapter is added on Translations. The study aims at opening up a fresh range of perspectives on the growth of Indian English writings as one of the new literatures.

(ii)

The period during which these writings emerged was characterized by crucial changes in the social life of Gujarat largely due to the contact with the British. The contact dates as far back as 1613, when the East India Company, with the permission of the Emperor Jehangir, opened their first trade centre at Surat; later on it was shifted to Bombay. During the subsequent years, Gujarat underwent a long period of disorder and gradual cultural decay, with the decline of the central Moghul authority, the emergence of the small princely states, and the raids for extracting revenues by the Marathas. The British, with a combination of tact and force succeeded in bringing, by the second decade of the nineteenth century,
the whole of Gujarat under their political control and to restore order in social life. It was then that far-reaching changes started taking place under the impact of the British. Gujaraties on their part welcomed the British and looked upon the 'Raj' as a bringer of peace and order. Gujarat remained relatively indifferent towards the 1857 mutiny and welcomed Queen Victoria's Proclamation.

By thus assuming total political control, the British restored peace and order in Gujarat, and unified it as one region bearing the mark of their hegemony. This led, as Neera Desai notes, to the transformation of what was an "ascriptive" society into an 'achieving' one. This is, however, a long term impact, and there were immediate changes which led to this final result. If the political unification of Gujarat was the first consequence, the second was the re-organization of Gujarati economy. The American revolution had an impact on the market for cotton-trade, and before the close of the century cotton-industry, and other ancillary industries came into existence. The beginning of this century saw the setting up of modern industrial textile units, the mills.
A. R. Desai, a well-known sociologist, commenting on this change, aptly recalls the following words of Karl Marx:

Sickening as it must be to human feeling to witness those myriads of industrious, patriarchal, and inoffensive social organizations disorganized and dissolved into their units, thrown into a sea of woes, and their individual members losing at the same time...their hereditary means of subsistence, we must not forget that these idyllic village communities...had always been the solid foundation of oriental despotism, that they restrained the human mind within the smallest possible compass, depriving it of all grandeur and historical energy. 18

In fact, the process of liberating this "human mind" from the "smallest possible compass" in which it had been "restrained" had started quite early. 19 But it was only with the entry of Gandhiji 20 that the diverse historical forces found a focal point over a period ranging from 1915 to 1947. Under Gandhi's direct or indirect leadership many "Satyagrahas" were carried out, both at the regional as well as national
levels, in which many Gujaratis participated. Bruce King observes in a different, larger context, it was "with the rise of the Gandhi-led nationalist movement, with its mixture of Hindu culture and Western social and political ideas that a modern Indian English literature developed." Bruce King further states that the interwar years were not the exclusive preserve of the nationalists; the internationalism of the previous decades continued to exert an influence. At the regional level, in Gujarat, the impact of Gandhiji was quite complex, for although he found followers for his programmes in large numbers, he had his opponents both within and without the Congress.

But Bruce King's view of the rise and growth of Indian Writings in English can be held as inadequate in the light of the fact of some rethinking which has been done on the issue of nationalism itself. As Susie Tharu puts it:

"A major issue 'released' for fresh investigation is nationalism. In the last decade and a half several studies have opened dimensions of nationalism hardly touched earlier. The nature of the national bourgeoisie, subaltern movements, the recovery of self, nationalist historiography, nationalist aesthetics, messianic movements, the woman question, Indian film, art and literary
history have each come in for scrutiny.
In the process theoretical frameworks, have been proposed and new strategies evolved to transform existing frameworks for other uses.22

In this light a broader, sociological approach has been adopted here for the analysis of this whole corpus of writings. It remains, however, to define the approach adopted here in more specific terms.

(iii)

The framework for an assessment of the writings discussed here is based mainly on the insights provided by Raymond Williams, the Marxist oriented British critic and thinker. In addition, some of the insights of other major theoreticians in the field of sociology of literature, theoreticians including Lucien Goldmann, Antonie Gramci, and especially Bakhtin have also been found useful in determining an approach proper for this study. Sociologists describe this process of change in its various stages, and, as we shall see later, an approach along these lines can help us trace the various stages reflected in these writings. Here, again, Raymond Williams' approach is found most suitable, since the aim is not only to see these writings from a sociological point of view,
but also to present an argument on the genesis and growth of Indian Writing in English.

A literary-critical approach which seeks to relate literature to society moves from "a conception of literature as produced by society, to the obverse of this - the idea that society is in some ways produced by literary activity". Raymond Williams' views give a most comprehensive account for they provide a theoretical model of the type "which is not restricted to one side of the equation, and which, at its best, will retain both a literary awareness and appreciation, and a grasp of the complexities of social reality."^23 The social situation of Gujarat between 1850 to 1950 may be restated in the light of Williams' concepts of "the dominant", "the residual", "the emergent", which is in fact, Williams' refinement of Gramci's concept of "hegemony".

"Hegemony" which literally means political domination (but in Gramci it means much more) can be legitimately used to describe the social situation in Gujarat from 1850 to 1950, the period of the British domination over India. This was a "hegemony" in Gramci's sense of the term, since the impact of the British "rule" extended far beyond the mere political domination. Through it the West caused far reaching basic
changes in the traditional way of Indian life. On the other hand, Gramsci’s "alternative hegemony" has its parallel in the nationalist movement which developed as a challenge against the British hegemony during this century. Raymond Williams’ comment on the creation of an alternative hegemony is interesting in the context of the Indian situation. Williams says:

The sources of any alternative hegemony are indeed difficult to define. For Gramsci they spring from the working class, but not this class as an ideal or abstract construction. What he sees, rather, is a working people which has, precisely, to become a class, and a potentially hegemonic class, against the pressures and limits of an existing and powerful hegemony.  

As Raymond Williams further observes, however, : "A lived hegemony is always a process. It is not except analytically, a system or a structure." 

This emphasis on culture as a process as against a "structure" or "system" is most crucial in Raymond Williams' scheme. For it leads him to develop and modify certain basic ideas, such as the notion of periods or of epochs. As
Williams puts it, 

...While retaining epochal hypothesis, we can find terms which recognize not only 'stages' and 'variations' but the internal dynamic relations of any actual process. We have certainly still to speak of the 'dominant' and the 'effective', and in these senses of the hegemonic. But we find that we have also to speak, and indeed with further differentiation of each of the 'residual' and the 'emergent', which in any real process, and at any moment in the process, are significant both in themselves and in what they reveal of the characteristics of the dominant. 26

The socio-political situation of Gujarat during 1850 to 1950 from this point of view may be characterized as being one of British domination upto 1947, in terms of the "epochal hypothesis". But seen as a "process" it will simultaneously include the undercurrents of the rising nationalism as "emergent", and the more or less feudal way of life based on the existence of small native states still continuing at the time as "residual". From a finer view-point, the dominant element in this process is the movement in the
direction of westernization, the rise and growth of secularism being emergent, and a fresh attraction towards orientalism, residual. The political struggle ended when India won freedom in 1947, but the wider struggle still continues.

This restatement, while showing the dominant, the residual and the emergent currents in the social situation of Gujarat during 1850 to 1950, gives us an insight into the whole changing situation as a process. The literary theory of Raymond Williams, following an analysis of culture, looks at writing as a material social process. In the following chapters, then, the aim is to see these hundred writings as representing the process which culminated in the emergence of Indian English writing.
The basic premise of Williams' approach, especially in *Marxism and Literature*, is that literary theory cannot be separated from cultural theory, though it may retain its own distinctive character within it. As Williams puts it:

Literary theory cannot be separated from cultural theory, though it may be distinguished within it. This is the central challenge of any social theory of culture. Yet while this challenge has to be sustained at every point, in general and in detail, it is necessary to be precise about the modes of distinction which then follow. Some of these become modes of effective separation, with important theoretical and practical consequences. But there is equal danger in an opposite kind of error, in which the generalizing and the connecting impulse is so strong that we lose sight of real specificities and distinctions of practice, which are then neglected or reduced to simulations of more general forms.
The openness inherent in his approach renders it especially useful towards explaining an emerging literature. Partly as a result of this, it has been found tenable to include in the list of the hundred writings reviewed here, items which are literary as well as a few which are non-literary.

According to Williams writing is a process rather than an object, and multiplicity is a very important characteristic of it. He says:

Indeed multiplicity can be realized in weak ways as often as strong. Where the specializing and containing categories operate at an early stage, multiplicity is little more than a recognition of varying 'forms of literature'. The point is not that these recognitions of variation are unimportant, on the contrary, they are necessary, though not always in these received and often residual forms. The really severe limitation is the line drawn between all these variations and other 'non-literary' forms of writings.
In assessing these writings in the light of Williams' theory, the first step is to surmount this "severe limitation". Accordingly, non-literary writings would serve to illustrate here an aspect of the "process" of English writing in India. But multiplicity goes beyond a mechanical inclusion of non-literary writing. This becomes clearer in the light of Williams' emphasis on creativity as a continuum. Williams writes:

Writing is so central a material social art that it has of course been used, and continues to be used, in all these forms and intentions. What we find is a true continuum, corresponding to ordinary and extra-ordinary process of human creativity and self-creation in all its modes and means. 29

Besides recognizing the multiplicity of forms, Williams also recognizes the multiplicity of intentions in the process of writing. He holds that to single out some of these intentions and to offer a literary theory on that basis is partial. While such a theory would recognize some elements
of writing, it would leave out some others. He writes:

Anyone who is in contact with the real multiplicity of writing and with no less real multiplicity of those forms of writing that have been specialized as literature, is already aware of the range of intentions and responses which are continually and variably manifest and latent. The honest muddle that so often arises is a consequence of pressure from both ends of a range of received and incompatible theories. If we are asked to believe that all literature is ideology, in the crude sense that its dominant intention (and then our only response) is the communication or imposition of 'social' or 'political' meanings and values, we can only, in the end, turn away. If we are asked to believe that all literature is aesthetic, in the crude sense that its dominant intention (and then our only response) is the beauty of language or form, we may stay a little longer, but will still in the end turn away.\textsuperscript{30}

To place the hundred writings within this framework:
In the specific socio-historical situation in which these writings emerged in the region, the English language played
a major role primarily as a means of communication at the formal and official level. It served as a bridge between the Britishers and the educated Indians, as well as developing as a chief means of intellectual discussion and debate among the class of educated Indians themselves. The low status of the regional languages, the official support to the English language, and the absence of an "Indian" national language further complicated this basic situation. Under such pressure, for a yet amorphous literature, it is understandable that the intentions of information and suasion, in their simplest sense, proved to be dominant and this is especially true of the developments which finally led to the emergence of Indian English Writing.\(^{31}\) Such a view will find support in the fact that even after coming into contact with English language and literature, the "literary" writing in English did not begin as a vogue in Gujarat till the beginning of the twentieth century. Further, major Gujarati authors in employing the English language continued to be led by "non-literary" intentions. Govardhanram's *Scrap-books* and Munshi's *I follow the Mahatma* are obvious illustrations of this point. But the list of such writings is much longer and it shows how throughout the period, the English language was used in Gujarat primarily for purposes of information and suasion.
This is where Williams' reference to aesthetic intentions as distinguished from what he describes as "other isolated intentions and responses, and in particular information and suasion" assume a particular relevance. What we find in the specific historical situation surrounding the emergence of these writing in Gujarat is not a negation of the presence of aesthetic intentions, but a "pressure" which renders these intentions as being only dominant. Among Indians, there was already present a strong desire to use this newly acquired language for creative intentions. It is important to note that, both these intentions, the impulse towards communication and suasion, as also the specifically aesthetic intentions, are often found to be mixed in the actual practice of English writing represented by these hundred writings. This mixing can be illustrated by citing various preferences. These writers prefer prose to poetry, because, rightly or wrongly, they thought these intentions more easily combine in prose than in poetry. In prose, again, there is a preference for realistic fiction which is "objective" (giving a picture of Gujarati life) yet "creative". But the most striking example is that of biography. The preference for novels as compared with biographies, shows how the intentions - aesthetic as well as informative - are always found mixed in the actual practice of writing.
These English writings reflect the historical currents which, so far as Gujarat was concerned, included the broader movement of cultural nationalism throughout the century, and the specific political struggle for India's liberation. Both the broader movement and the political struggle were, to use a loaded term, "bourgeois" in character. Under its pressure, the English writing(s) was obliged to Indianize itself. The Indianization of English writing was a movement which aimed at an expression of the "essential Indianness" in English language. Under its pressure also, "the social" was deformed as the "collective", the "individual" as the "private". The English writings produced under such pressures did not develop as fully social, and traces of this "social" element were "displaced" through "criticism", a typical bourgeois development.

It should, however, be observed that, these pressures played a positive role in the growth and development of Indian English writing. Perhaps, this writing might not have reached its present level of achievement without the interplay of these varied and even contradictory factors in the larger social and cultural background. This is a literature in a second language which was not the mother-tongue of any particular section of people in India. Moreover, these pressures were very real, natural and historical. But those very pressures, it should be asserted, hinder the growth of the truly social, limiting it to the collective. Such a growth was not possible during the
pre-independence days. With the end of the bourgeois political struggle the pressure has been somewhat lifted. What is required – especially because it is a literature in a second language – is a theoretical re-orientation in looking at this literature. Such a re-orientation is a pre-condition of the growth of truly "social" Indian English writing. The following sections attempt such a re-orientation towards what is basically a bourgeois literature. The faith which sustains such an exercise may be expressed in the following words of Raymond Williams:

Bourgeois literature is indeed bourgeois literature, but it is not a block or type; it is an immense and varied practical consciousness, at every level from crude reproduction to permanently important articulation and formation. Similarly the practical consciousness, in such forms, of an alternative society can never be reduced to a general block or celebratory kind. Writing is often a new articulation and in effect a new formation, extending beyond its own modes. But to separate this as art, which in practice includes, always partly and sometimes wholly, elements elsewhere in the continuum, is to lose contact
with the substantive creative process and then to idealize it: to put it above or below the social, when it is in fact the social in the one of its most distinctive, durable and total forms. 35

In this way some of the key ideas borrowed from Raymond Williams' theory serve to illuminate the nature and significance of these hundred writing. The chief gain lies in the fact that they point to an approach which goes beyond the conventional literary-critical categories such as form and content, or too rigid an emphasis on the distinction between the so-called aesthetic and communicative/suasive aspects of a work. These insights make for a framework which is supple enough to give a proper assessment of these hundred works. It enables us to place these works in a historical light, judging it as an aspect of a process which, beginning as it did in a certain historical situation, is still continuing. The framework provided by Williams however needs to be supplemented or modified with the help of the insights given by other theoreticians in the area of sociology of literature.
A procedure proper for an analysis of these hundred writings, will have to be largely content-based. The documentary aspect of the works of this range will almost inevitably have a priority over their literary or creative aspect. The difficulty inherent in such a project can be resolved if the basic nature of the inter-relationship of society and literary creation is seen in a proper light. The larger position adopted by Lucien Goldmann becomes relevant here. Commenting on the general assumption underlying his genetic-structuralist approach, Goldmann observes:

The essential relationship between the life of society and literary creation is not concerned with the content of these two sectors of human reality, but only with the mental structures, with what might be called the categories which shape both the empirical consciousness of a certain social group and the imaginary universe created by the Writer.

In this connection, Dina Khatkhate's study on Indian intellectuals offers a perspective on "mental structures" which shaped the "empirical consciousness" of this group of writers. According to Khatkhate four types of intellectuals emerged in pre-independent India: (i) imitative (ii) assimilative (iii) asseverative (iv) creative. We submit
that certain "distinct mental structures" came to govern these four types. In the subsequent chapters, especially in the chapters on poetry, and on prose-fiction, an attempt has been made to relate the structure of some of the works with these "mental structures".

Goldmann's ideas are useful here in another way also. Thus, he has a specific approach towards the idea of literary influence. Commenting on this aspect, Goldmann writes:

What are commonly called "influences" have no explanatory value and, at the very most, constitute a factor and a problem which the research worker must explain. There are at every moment a considerable number of influences which may have their effect on a writer; what has to be explained is the reason why only a small number of them, or even only a single one, has really had any effect, and also why the works which have exerted this influence were received with a certain number of distortions — and precisely with those particular distortions — in the mind of the person they influenced.
But these are questions to which the answer must be sought in the work of the author studied and not, as is usually thought, in the work which is supposed to have influenced it.\(^{38}\)

The discussion of individual works in different genres in subsequent chapters has been guided by this approach to the question of influence. In particular, the "influence" of English romantic poetry on these poets, the phenomenon of "imitation", has been analysed in this light in the chapter on poetry.

(vi)

Finally, there remains the fact of language, a most fundamental issue involved in a discussion of the growth of this literature. While our analysis in the following chapters proceeds in terms of describing these writings in the context of the changing social situation, it cannot totally set aside the fact that these English writings are produced by non-native users of English language. The issue of specific literary interest, then, is: What were the patterns of behaviour of the creative imagination for over a century at this level, given the bilingual context in which
most of these writings were produced? And it is on this central issue that some of Bakhtin's ideas are found helpful. It may be observed here that Bakhtin's view of the inter-relationship between literature and society is in many ways similar to that of Williams'. Discussing how far a literary work is determined by non-literary societal factors, for instance, Bakhtin observes:

The literary work is an immediate part of the literary environment, the aggregate of all the socially active literary works of a given epoch and social group. From a strictly historical point of view the individual literary work is a dependent and therefore actually inseparable element of the literary environment and is directly determined by its influences. It would be absurd to think that a work which occupies a place in the literary environment could avoid its direct influences to be an exception to its unity and regularity.
Bakhtin continues:

...The literary environment itself in its turn is only a dependent and therefore actually inseparable element of the general ideological environment of a given epoch and a given sociological unity. Both in its totally and in each of its elements literature occupies a definite place in the ideological environment, is oriented in it, and defined by its direct influence. In its turn the ideological environment in its totality and in each of its elements is likewise a dependent element of the socio-economic environment, is determined by it, and is permeated from top to bottom with socio-economic laws of development. 40

It requires a great intellectual rigour to fully illustrate the above view of literature with the help of these writings. Fully to illustrate or examine the validity of Bakhtin's approach lies outside the scope of this study. But some light can surely be thrown on a very important issue here by making use of some of Bakhtin's ideas. This will also help link up the discussion on these hundred writings with some
Bakhtin's concept of polyglossia is in some ways similar to Raymond Williams' idea of multiplicity of writing. While Williams seems to be referring to a broad range of various kinds of writings, Bakhtin has in mind the wider links between culture, on the one hand, and language on the other. Two of the ideas of Bakhtin which appear useful in the context of this study are polyglossia (also its extension heteroglossia), and the novel as a historical process. Bakhtin connects polyglossia and the history of European novel. He implies here that polyglossia - "many languages and many cultures crisscrossed with the intersecting boundary lines" - is a pre-condition for the development of the novel as a genre. In fact, he holds that the differences between the novel (and certain forms close to it) and all other genres - poetic genres in the narrow sense, are "fundamental" for they are basically linguistic. In this way the language of the novel is characterized by heteroglossia as against the monoglossia of the poetic genres. As Bakhtin observes "heteroglossia is an extension of his concept of polyglossia. If polyglossia is "the interanimation of major national languages (Greek, Lation) each of which was in itself already fully formed and unitary", the heteroglossia of modern European novel, "was prepared for by the polyglossia of the middle ages."
In this context, it is interesting to note that the conditions of polyglossia described by Bakhtin also obtained in India during the century under scrutiny. The educated Indians were bilinguals using the English language in professional circles as also in other spheres of public life and Gujarati, their mother tongue, in many cases at home. What Bakhtin has noted in connection with the Romans can be applied to Gujaratis with a certain aptness. Bakhtin writes, "The creative literary consciousness of the Romans functioned against the background of Greek language and Greek forms." Similarly, the Gujarati literary consciousness can be seen to have functioned against the background of the Sanskrit language and the classical literary forms. To this scene was added a new dimension when the writer was attracted towards English. Since this concerns the development of Gujarati literature, we may not pursue the parallel further in this direction. The "interanimation" entailing polyglossia in this particular case moved in another direction also, the "animation" of the English language as used by non-English speakers/writers in this region. This direction of the process of interanimation opened up when the Gujarati bilinguals, besides writing in Gujarati, also cultivated writing in English during the century.
This environment of English writing seems to have been determined by the ideological and socio-political life in which the British dominated. Hence these writings have a marked imitative character. This throws a new light on a critical opinion which has gained so much currency, that it was essentially the imitative instinct which produced a literary renaissance in various Indian regional languages, and, further, this also led to weak imitative writings in English. The binary character of the idea of interanimation implied in Bakhtin's views helps here. Just as the writings in the mother-tongues were animated by being written against, the background of the use of English, the English writings too were animated by being produced against the background of the exploitation of the resources of the regional languages, in this case Gujarati, with its roots in the rich classical tradition of Sanskrit. Some of our analyses in the subsequent chapters show how such interanimation was not absent even at lower levels of this range of writings.

Such an "interanimation" entailing polyglossia produces writings which Bakhtin calls "hybrid". In fact, Bakhtin's account of some Latin writings produced by Germans shows how they are hybrids and they are very similar to some writings described in the following pages, some of which are free translations. The conclusion drawn by Bakhtin on the hybrids
Languages quarrel with each other, but this quarrel-like any quarrel among great and significant cultural and historical forces could not pass on to a further phase by means of abstract and rational dialogue, nor by purely dramatic dialogue, but only by means of complexly dialogized hybrids. The great novels of Renaissance were such hybrids, although stylistically they were monoglot. The path towards the European novel, as Bakhtin says, was thus paved by polyglossia. In much the same way, the conditions of polyglossia which obtained in Gujarat during 1850 to 1950, and which produced hybrids, some of which have been assessed in the subsequent chapters, constitute a force or an impulse paving the way for Indian English writing and especially the Indian novel. Bakhtin uses the term "the novel" with a double implication: it refers to a specific genre, as well as a process. If we apply this to our situation, Indian English writings may be seen as a corpus of works, but they may also be seen as a process. The Indianization of English, in this light, may not be seen only as process leading at a particular convenient moment.
in future to a new language called Indian English; instead it is a process involving what may be described as "chronotops" of Indian writings in English.

In so far as India does not have a national language in the full or real sense of the term, the condition of polyglossia may at certain level, characterize the Indian literary consciousness as such, with its constant interplay of two or three or more languages at any given moment. Far from being a source of weakness, this situation with its scope for interanimation may be considered a source of strength. And so far as interanimation of English is concerned, rather than aiming at Indian English we can think of as many Englishes as there are regional languages.

A word may be put in at this stage in favour of "hybrids" in this connection. Kachru considers hybridization an important evidence of the process of the Indianization of English. Both Kachru and Bakhtin, though each in specific and widely differing contexts, refer to how hybridization sometimes involves an activity at the simple level of translation. From this point of view, translation with a specific eye on getting hybrid - transcreation could be viewed as a resourceful ally of the process of Indian writing in English, a point which finds ample corroboration in the analysis in the discussion of translation in this study.
The approach adopted for this study is, then, essentially flexible and eclectic, drawing as it does on the theoretical insights offered by critics and thinkers including Raymond William, Luci n Goldmann and Bakhtin. In essence, it attempts to arrive at a framework which would seek to go beyond some of the more conventional distinctions. It moves across - and this in almost programmatic terms - such distinctions as: the minor and the major in terms of a canon, the literary and the non-literary, and finally the foreign and the native, English and Gujarati. Such a perspective, it is hoped, would open up new possibilities in the field of literary history and comparative literature.

2. See John Oliver Perry, "Is Indian English an 'Alien Tongue'?" in The Literary Criterion 25.3 (1990), pp.38-55.

3. As Aijaz Ahmed writes: "...The cultural claim of English during the colonial period was that India was internally so fragmented, so heterogeneous, such a mosaic of languages and ethnicities that it needed a centralizing language to sustain its national unity - the nation in this discourse was co-terminal with exigencies of administration, and indeed state itself." Journal of Arts and Ideas 17-18 (1989), pp.125-26.
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