ENGLISH STUDIES AND THE QUESTION OF REFORM: A CASE-STUDY OF GUJARAT

SYNOPSIS

Submitted to:
The Department of English
Faculty of Arts
The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda
Vadodara, Gujarat, India – 390002

In conformity with the requirements
to fulfill the criteria for the Doctor of Philosophy Programme

Under the guidance of:
Dr. Deeptha Achar
Professor
Department of English
Faculty of Arts
The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda
Vadodara, Gujarat, India - 390002

Submitted by:
Ms. Trivedi Bageshree Nitin

November
2021

PROFESSOR
Department of English
Faculty of Arts
The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda
Vadodara - 390002.

Prof. Hitesh D. Raviya
Head, Department of English,
Vice Dean , Faculty of Arts,
The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda,
Vadodara, 390 002, Gujarat, INDIA.

23/11/21
Dean
Faculty of Arts
M. S. University of Baroda.

Introduction

The history of pre-nineteenth century Gujarat marks flux as the distinctive trait shaping the region. It witnessed periodic migrations from various contiguous territories and was a bustling trading zone dealing with diverse peoples from across the world.[1] Thus, transformations arising out of cultural contact may be inferred to be a consistent, rather than occasional, process for such a society. However, a particular form of change couched in the idea of reform assumed centre stage in the region in the first half of the nineteenth century. Its self-consciousness distinguished it from previous engagements with change. Reform was not retrospectively identified as the "spirit of the age" but was used as a contemporary identity marker by/for those engaged in the specific agenda of sociocultural change(s) it entailed; those identified as *sudhārak* (or reformer), being the proponents of *sudhāro* (or reform). Such reform had its ideological origins in the contact of native society with Western/English education and British liberalism and was oriented towards inserting native society into the timeline of modernity. As the century progressed, reform became a frame within which the directionality of modernity was contested when education in English was again at the centre of debates over consolidating a regional/national identity. In the twentieth century, a clean break between English and reform was sought as the latter was pursued (in debates over education and spelling reform) while the former was fully rejected as the adversary of "independent" native knowledge and identity[2]. Thus, while there was an attempt to elect English out, reform persisted as ineluctable. Further, its usage suggests its reification into an uncritical, ahistorical, category that assumed the necessity of "improvement". This research questions whether such a break between reform and English was possible given the complex imbrication of power and discourse in the processes of colonial modernity. It tests the

---

[1] See Samira Sheikh (2010).

[2] Contestations over this stand continued, however this approach did emerge as the dominant narrative of the period.

persistence of ideological biases through an analysis of not only language (English), but terminology (reform), and argues that the imbrication of these two in the complex debates over various identity markers (language, region, nation), as well as the instruments of standardizing these identities (institutions, formal education systems), must not be dismissed as an uncritical coincidence, but must be thoroughly investigated to understand the knowledge paradigms that may continue to inflect the disciplinary practice(s) of English Studies in higher education.

A survey of past interventions in English Studies in India highlights the significant role played by the advent of cultural studies in questioning its political bases. Cultural Studies was a move made, in a key iteration, by a group of scholars at the Birmingham Centre for Cultural Studies. Stuart Hall observes that until the emergence of this stream, the humanities' engagement with culture was rooted in "the Arnoldian project" structured by a distinct canonical and elitist tradition (13). The cultural turn brought into relief the crisis inherent in humanities which, among other things, was a crisis of the disconnect between education and life, or the classroom and the "real" world. While humanities encompassed primarily the study of history and literature, it is from within the discipline of (English) literature that its critique emerged, given that all the initial participants of the project were "formed in the Leavisite ethos" (Hall 14). In India, the initial set of the most sustained critical interrogations of Western hegemony in the humanities in the 1990s emerged out of what was termed the 'crisis of English' indicating conceptual ties with Cultural Studies.[3] While the cultural turn offered a conceptual-methodological opening into the crisis, the debates drew theoretical energy from postcolonial thinkers like Edward W. Said, Homi K. Bhabha, and Gayatri

[3] Gauri Viswanathan's *Masks of Conquest* (1989), though not the first, was one of the most impactful analyses that set the stage for other treatments of the subject.

Chakravorty Spivak, as well as the Subaltern Studies project.[4] The dimensions and stakes of the crisis for a postcolonial nation were different as the gap/dichotomy between education and life was not only a crisis of knowledge/discipline (what literature in English are we teaching, and how?) but a crisis of identity (why are we even teaching English literature?). Thus, while the solution in the West was oriented towards resisting national culture, the solution in a postcolonial nation logically pulled towards reclaiming a(n) (indigenous) national culture. Thus, it had to negotiate the question of English within the complex identity matrix of indigeneity, modernity, and colonisation.

The persistence of the problem even after such sustained critical intervention has been variously diagnosed. However, two common points emerge in recent treatments of the subject.[5] The first point concerns the function and content of the discipline. Global market trends as well as national socio-political dynamics argue for changing roles and ends of the study of English language and literature which preclude the solution of simply doing away with the formal discipline. The new roles, however, are juxtaposed with the institutional binding for British-American literature and theory created by the format of various national qualifying examinations. Further, the liberation of the curriculum from the British canon opens up an overwhelming problem of choice with respect to other literatures in English, over which the pragmatic limitations inherent in executing courses overpopulated with curricular diversity loom large. The second point concerns critiques of the discipline, specifically, the gaps in the historicization of English Studies in India thus far, emerging out of the respective theoretical bases and biases of each critical approach.

Thus, the understanding of the crisis has broadened in terms of accounting for larger global pressures, and wider circle of social actors and stakeholders. At the same time, it has

---

[4] Subaltern Studies refers to a move in Marxist/postcolonial history-writing initiated in the 1980s by a group of South Asian scholars to counter the hegemony of elite (Western) rationalist subject-position in history-writing and narrate alternative histories of alternative subjects.

[5] Banibrata Mahanta, and Rajesh Babu Sharma (2019), and Suman Gupta (2015).

deepened in including new theoretical approaches as the theoretical interventions in colonial processes developed. However, the crisis in itself persists. It becomes pertinent to ask, then, whether to move away from looking for (new) answers, to asking (new) questions, would constitute a useful methodological shift.

Decolonial thinking affords this shift with the crucial insight that in order to change the conversation, it is important to change the terms of the conversation (Mignolo 5). As discussed earlier, the survival of English Studies (as a discipline) draws its many complex justification(s) from the overarching frames of modernity[6] and globalization. These are also the two ideas that decolonial thinking challenges as processes of "epistemic destitution" (Mignolo 15) wrought by "*[c]oloniality*" defined as "*the underlying logic of all Western colonialism since 1500*" (Mignolo 8). The relationship between modernity and coloniality is that the rhetoric of the former legitimizes the latter (Mignolo 7). Historical studies of British colonialism in India confirm this. However, I further argue that the narrative of reform bolstered the justification for modernity itself, which in turn legitimizes coloniality.

Historical Background

A brief overview of three histories of English Studies representing three theoretical shifts in historizing, highlight the persistent presence of reform as a paradigm qualifying the enunciations of English across the colonial period. In *Masks of Conquest* (1989), Gauri Viswanathan identifies the Charter Act of 1813 as the defining moment that set the stage for the "appearance" of English education, specifically English literature, in India (23). Alok K. Mukherjee in *This Gift of English: English Education and the Formation of Alternative Hegemonies in India* (2009), agrees with Viswanathan in that the reformist impulse underlined the earliest interventions by "missionary educators of the late eighteenth and early

[6] Here, modernity not only refers to the instrumental motivation for English perceived as the access ticket to the 'modern' world, but also the historical-ideological role whereby English mediated the insertion of caste into modernity (See Dash (2009)), creating a new demand for access to English arising from the disadvantaged caste groups (Mukherjee 289-312).

nineteenth century" who found the Indian society to be primarily morally inferior to the British (109). For both, the key text that makes a compelling case for this perspective is Charles Grant's *Observations on the State of Society among the Asiatic Subjects of Great Britain, Particularly with Respect to Morals; and on the Means of Improving it* (1792). Mukherjee adds how this document was refashioned as the "Pious Clause" in 1793, "when the charter of East India Company came up for renewal" and "in 1813, Grant's "Pious Clause" found its way in the Charter Act" (115). Grant's treatise, thus, not only becomes the foundational text of English education, but also of reform in India. In *English Education and the Question of Indian Nationalism: A Perspective on the Vernacular* (2009), Santosh Dash observes how, over time, the English literary text became a repository of symbolic power, a metonym of the Englishman's morality, and a general signifier of "the best that was known and thought in the world" (35). Thus, what scholars seem to agree on is that the English (literary) text was chosen for the project of imperial consolidation primarily owing to its ability to reform without generating revolt. However, its status as a hybrid continued to create a slippage between its repetition(s), leading to unpredictability of the responses to the text. However, even as strategies and modes of implementation changed, reform continued to be the abiding logic for various shifts in the trajectory of English Studies in India.

Yet, none of the analyses choose reform as the variable through which to interrogate history. Perhaps, this has to do with the popular understanding of the decline of the so-called Age of Reform in India with the ideological shift towards revivalism in late nineteenth century. This belief is also predicated on an instrumental understanding of Reform as resulting out of the impact of European ideas in the colony; thereby, as being a phenomenon in/of the colony and not the metropole. However, the central question regarding how the common noun reform takes on a proper status with the capital 'R' takes one back to the metropole.

Reform with a capital R makes a distinct appearance in English public life around the Great Reform Act of 1832.[7] The act forms the nucleus around which the idea of an age of reform in Britain has been generally conceived by historians (Innes and Burns 1). Joanna Innes argues that this use of the term as a noun was "uncommon", the more "standard noun-form of the verb 'reform'" having been "'reformation'" (71). She traces this shift in usage to the Wyvillite campaign of early 1780s (71), that led to a significant shift in the semantic association of reform—from moral change to institutional change (82). The passing of the Act, moreover, came through after stiff resistance resulting in multiple revisions of the Reform Bill. Miles Taylor has argued how these revisions were directly impacted by the political tug-of-war over representation of colonial interests and coincided with "major turning-points in the history of the British empire" including, among others, "the renewal of the East India Company's Charter" (296). Innes believes that the age of reform "when the term was so heavily freighted as to be bandied about as a badge of identity, … or acclaimed as a cause fit to live and die for, had largely passed" after the 1830s (97). However, Patrick Brantlinger names his account of reform from 1832-67 as *The Spirit of Reform*, which establishes that the impact of the term and its currency in various discourse(s) did not dwindle with the logical end of an age, and the complex intersections and overlaps between the moral and institutional ideas of reform continued.

In India, as observed earlier, the moral discourse of reform inscribed itself within the institutionalization of English. However, historical analyses have not focused on it as a central point of interrogation. Further, comparatively limited scholarly attention has been devoted to Western India in the historicization of education and English. Further, the

---

[7] It is understood that the capital R is also in accordance with the stylistic norms of the English language requiring capitalization of the first letter of every content word in a title. The emphasis on the capitalization is to underline that when reform becomes a qualifier describing a parliamentary act or the spirit of an age, it represents the clustering of a distinct and specific set of meanings, which would persist even when the term is used without capitalization. Therefore, there is no intention to overinterpret the capitalization, or narrow the relevance of the discussion only to usage(s) with capitalization.

scholarly studies that do engage with Western India either largely focus on the Bombay Presidency with reference to the Bombay city within the larger context of Maharashtra and/or are designed as chronicles rather than critical histories. However, the transactions of the region of Gujarat with British colonialism were distinctive. Neera Desai makes a case for the study of "regional communities" on the grounds that, for each community, "the impact of the British rule has been varied and of different intensities" (2). This research aspires to address the research gap by attempting a regional historicization of English Studies.

The emergence of and major developments in the colonial education system in nineteenth-century Western India, in terms of policy shifts as well as institution-building, have Bombay and Poona as their immediate context. Jana Tschurenev argues that government funding played a crucial role in the success or failure of institutionalizing reform[8] in the Bombay Presidency. However, the shaping of the educational policy was based on a collaborational model where power would be shared by the colonial government with the "new urban elites in the port city of Bombay" while simultaneously "conciliating the old landowning and cultural elites in Poona" (Tschurenev 248). As a result, "[a]round the mid-nineteenth century", the twin cities emerging as "twin centres of vivid public debates on social and religious reform" and "[t]he colonial education system…took shape in a highly 'contested terrain' of public discourse, and in interaction with diverse Indian reform activists" (246). I shall limit my focus to the Bombay city with direct institutional, economic, and cultural ties with Gujarat; one that is largely missing between Gujarat and Poona.

The Bombay reformers distinctly came from the urban elite sections of the Parsi and Hindu communities and were inserted within the institutional setup of colonial education in the form of patrons, students and/or teachers. Further, Surat, owing to its geographical and

[8] This phrase refers to both setting up of institutions to promote sociocultural reform, and attempts to reform/develop existing institutions.

economic proximity with the city, constituted a sort of cultural continuum with Bombay. The implication of Surat reformers in the larger intellectual networks and institutional establishments can be observed in the case of Durgaram Mehta, identified as "the first radical reformer in Gujarat", who was also "a student of the first batch of normal class (1825) in Bombay", was a teacher to other influential reformers like Narmad and Navalram Laxmiram Pandya, and established the Manav Dharma Sabha in close alliance with and under the influence of well-known Bombay reformer Dadoba Pandurang (Raval 98). Further, R. L. Raval ascribes the failure of the Surat-Bombay reform initiative(s) in significantly impacting Gujarati society at large, to its radical stance, as well as its inability to create stable patronage supporting reform (160).

Ahmedabad also constitutes a useful entry-point into mapping regional reform, as it effects a break from the larger Bombay-Surat centre in terms of the nature and intensity of the movement(s). While Ahmedabad belonged to the Baroda state, it came under the British in 1817 following a treaty between the British and the Gaekwads, which was a welcome event for the native population as it brought about political and economic stability. Such perception of the British as the harbingers of peace and order, also shined an exceptional light on British ideology. Desai considers the native "intelligentsia…primarily nourished in English language and English literature in the first half of the 19th century" as influenced by the prevalent ideas of British liberalism (128). Further, she sees the impact of the influence in "[t]hese enlightened individuals" viewing "the extant society through the new lenses", leading to their identification as "reformers (Sudhārāwālā)" (128-29). Similar to the larger Presidency, reform in Ahmedabad developed within the network of government, missionary schools, and privately funded schools; civil society associations, and a growing print culture, beginning in the 1820s but fully developing in the 1840s. What set the trajectory of reform apart in Ahmedabad was the domination of the Gujarat Vernacular Society (GVS), established in

1848, in shaping not only print and literacy cultures, but also hegemonizing the narrative of reform through its mouthpiece—the periodical *Buddhiprakash* that it took over in 1854, as well as in the figure of its editor—Dalpatram Dahyabhai, who retained this position from 1855 to 1879. Further, Dalpatram's ideas and by extension the ideology of GVS were not shaped by exposure to Western education in the institutional setup but by exposure to Western ideas through the friendship with Alexander Kinloch Forbes. Thus, the origins and trajectory of reform in Ahmedabad in the initial stage were shaped by forces quite different from the Surat-Bombay centre.

While Ahmedabad was at the centre of British Gujarat, several other territories existed outside direct governmental control in the form of British Residencies and Native States. One of the principal native States—both in terms of size, as well as influence in shaping regional forces—was the Gaekwad state of Baroda. The chequered history of the Gaekwads and the British consisting of multiple phases of conciliation and confrontation, political intrigues over accession and territories, etc., illustrates local variation in the perception and reception of British presence in the region, and precludes any straightforward impact of British ideology on the sociocultural terrain of the region.

By the late nineteenth century, the self-conscious *Sudharak Yug* or Age of Reform(ers) waned in Gujarat and gave way to the *Sakshar Yug* or *Pandit Yug* as identified by literary historians. The alternative nomenclature in itself is interesting showing how the idea of a *pandit*, that is, a learned man, is grafted onto formal literacy—*sakshar*, thereby, equating scholarship with knowledge derived from the modern formal education system. While demands for education in the vernacular grew sharper, alongside criticisms of British policies, Desai argues that the native intelligentsia of Gujarat continued to remain supporters

of British rule (344).[9] She also adds how "the issues which emerged at the end of the 19th century as well as during twentieth century were not the ones of going back to the past educational systems, but to improve, refine, diversify the new educational system introduced in 19th century" (332). On the other hand, this was the period of flourishing of reforms in Baroda, as the new ruler—Sir Sayajirao Gaekwad III came of age.

In the twentieth century, Gujarat captured the attention of the nation as the centre of an organised and widespread movement for *swaraj* under the leadership of Gandhi. Gandhi charged English education with the tendency "to dwarf the Indian body, mind and soul" (10). Gandhi's critique was different in being directed not only towards English education but also European culture. Thus, he sought to resist not only English, but also English-influenced ideas. Yet, reform continued to be one of the chief concerns of his nationalist project as he defined reform, or what Tridip Suhrud terms "*sudhar* or civilisation through its moral dimension" (7).

Objective

This research aims to interrogate the transactions between the episteme of reform and the idea and practice(s) of English Studies in the region of Gujarat from nineteenth century to approximately mid-twentieth century. It does not claim to contribute to epistemic reconstitution per se, but rather proposes to examine a potential episteme—reform—that has inflected the institutional practice(s) of English Studies in the region. It, thus, hopes to create deeper insights into the epistemes that shape knowledge practice(s) to enable revising or dismissing them, or employing them with critical awareness of their ideological import. In doing so, it attempts to fulfil the following specific objectives:

---

[9] The term *pandit* also highlights the elitist bias of education that confined "scholarship" to only the privileged caste/class section of the society that had access to such education, while also revealing larger social hierarchies in the region. This persistence of a caste/class bias also marks the continuity in the *sudhārak* and *pandit* phases.

(1) To investigate how the term "reform" becomes a proper noun or a qualifier, that is, what distinctive cluster of meanings stabilizes around the term, any major shifts in the dominant understanding of the term, and reification of certain meanings resulting in an epistemic bias arising out of the usage of the term.

(2) To explore a connection between the prevailing reform discourse and the nature of English Studies in the dominant higher education institutions of Gujarat.

(3) To provide a regional history of English Studies to enrich historical understanding of the discipline, acknowledge the diversity of regional responses to colonialism and the uneven terrain of its conceptual articulation, analyse how official policies are negotiated by regional practices, and consider whether future policies or solutions can find meaningful insights in critical readings of the region.

Definition of Key Variables and Scope

1. English Studies – While colonial education policies were aimed at all levels of education, English remained largely steady as the medium of higher education. It is in this domain that the study of English language and literature shaped into a separate academic discipline, as practised in colleges and universities. Thereby, while the research is contextualized within broader debates over the question of English in education, it retains a specific focus on the study of English in higher education, and key institutions in the region offering such education.
2. Reform – The term refers in the initial stage to a specific rhetoric that emerged in the Gujarati society as it came into contact with Western ideas and culture and negotiated colonial modernity. In the stages after establishing the components of this rhetoric, however, the research moves on to investigate whether the term remains simply a rhetoric or turns into a discourse within which ideas are legitimized and delegitimized, and whether it moves on to assume the status of an episteme. The term

episteme, here, is understood using a broad application of Foucault's definition: "the strategic apparatus which permits of separating out from among all the statements which are possible those that will be acceptable" (197).

3. Gujarat - Gujarat as an independent state in India came into being only in 1960. During the period in which this study is located, Gujarat was not yet a separate and unified political entity. Therefore, this study makes reference to Gujarat as a region and/or province as identified in pre-1960 India.

It draws on Bernard S. Cohn's definition of regionalism to argue that, in spite of its political divisions, Gujarat could be imagined as a region based on "the sense of community shared by a significant proportion of the residents in an area", whose prerequisites include "a symbol pool, which uses the local language to create a set of terms which function to heighten the consciousness of self-identity of the members of the group; a selective transmission of certain elements within the symbol pool…and the establishment of an elite which acts to elaborate, preserve, and indoctrinate aspirants within the culture" (qtd. in Morrison 137). For the same reason, I focus on two urban centres—the British State of Ahmedabad, and Native State of Baroda, that arguably dominated the symbol pool of the region. These shall remain the focal points of the inquiry, located within the larger context of the Bombay Presidency.

Methodology

The trajectory of usage of the term "reform", whether in the metropole or the colony, highlights its pivotal role in the insertion of a society-polity into "modernity"—whether to legitimize the insertion, interrogate it, or resist it. Thereby, a critique of 'reform' cannot but also involve a critique of modernity—in this case, colonial modernity.

For decolonial thinking, modernity is always/already colonial modernity. As discussed earlier, the conceptualization of the research question is afforded by this theoretical

strand, that creates grounds to question not the "what" and "how" of "modernity" but the "why" of "modernity". It creates a theoretical opportunity to pose a new question, rather than to look for new answers to the same question.

I deliberately use the term decolonial thinking, rather than the terms decoloniality or decolonization to describe the theoretical approach, for three reasons. The first reason lies in the awareness that decoloniality and decolonization refer to two distinct theoretical positions with different geographical and intellectual origins. The second reason is that the research hopes to enrich the inquiry by harnessing the aligned critical approaches and terminology offered by both. The third reason lies in the awareness of the limitations of both approaches, and an attempt to avert a skewed argument arising out of the biases of either. In the domain of decoloniality, I primarily draw on the work of Walter D. Mignolo, among others. In the domain of decolonization, I draw on the recent work of Indian scholars.

While a decolonial approach frames the research question, specific methodological tools and arguments to investigate the question are drawn from the theoretical strands of postcolonialism and alternative modernities. While postcolonialism enables a critical interrogation of colonial modernity, alternative modernities questions the primacy of Western modernity, and explores non-Western alternatives.

The postcolonial methodology focuses primarily on Homi K. Bhabha's *Location of Culture*, for its critical thrust and conceptual framework, specifically, the problematization of categories of the Other, civility, etc., as well as the concepts of third space and hybridity, built on a complex interrogation of "the English book" (Bhabha 145) whose repetition "represents important moments in the historical transformation and discursive transfiguration of the colonial text and context" (Bhabha 150). Multiple other strands and concepts of postcolonial scholarship, that underlie the critical histories of colonial education and English studies that I consider, inhere in my analysis.

The approach of alternative modernities helps problematize cultural difference, and a position to stand outside the "trajectorism" of Europe (Appadurai 3). Within this approach, I refer to the theoretical insights of Appadurai, Avadhesh Kumar Singh, and others.

I engage definitional questions through the critical vocabulary of poststructuralism, given its ideological affinities with postcolonialism (being an inflection of poststructuralism through the lens of colonialism). As the design of the research question involves archaeology of an idea, I take into account problematization of the episteme by Michel Foucault, use his critique of Enlightenment to read the aspects of reform that it undergirds, and also consider his "archival thinking". I draw on the critical treatment of discourse, metanarratives, and transcendentals from the theoretical work of Foucault and Jacques Derrida, as the two key Western critics of modernity.

My methodological strategy is to trace key moments where the trajectories of reform and English Studies converge in Gujarat. I have approached the archive through openings provided by reading historical studies of the region, and then built the network of other primary material through reading of each text and its context(s). In this way, I have allowed the archive to guide my selection of texts, rather than approaching the archive with a view to find specific pre-determined texts.

Thus, each chapter consists of a study of a few central primary texts located within a polyphonic network of other primary texts to allow a rich understanding of the contexts of the key text(s). The nature of texts accessed from the archive include publications contemporary with the moment under study such as books, newspaper articles, articles from contemporary periodicals, policy documents, university calendars, administrative reports, speeches, documents related to the proceedings of various societies, government documents, etc.

Chapter Summaries

Chapter One opens the discussion with the moment of 1857 that represents the complex contradictions of colonial mechanisms whereby the first most impactful challenge to the empire—the Indian Revolt of 1857, and the emphatic consolidation of empire— the setting up of the Universities of Calcutta, Bombay, and Madras, can occur simultaneously. This moment helps capture the conflict between the sense of self-assertion and submission generated by the native contact with British liberal ideology. It also helps ground the question of reform, which was supposed to avert such a revolt, in the policy estimates of the British; and the ascendancy of which is believed to have summarily come to an end with the revolt. The context of 1857, then, helps establish that neither was the trajectory of reform movements seamless, nor did it generate an uncritically positive outlook towards English education as the instrument of "enlightenment". In Gujarat, 1857 did not spell the end of the reform movement, as there were negligible reverberations of the revolt in the region. The origin of the rhetoric of reform was not in the colony (resulting out of the "need" perceived by the "enlightened" native) but could be traced back to the political reform taking shape in England. The Reform Act of 1832 was primarily a liberal-utilitarian enterprise, and the same political philosophy "found a *project*" in the reform movement(s) in India (Mehta; qtd. in Aspengren 51), in bringing "a rationalised liberal-administrative state" to India (Chakravarty 3), as well as initiating change in the frame of reform, to avert a popular threat of change through revolt. Thus, one can expect a continuity of the liberal political component in the manifestation of reform in sociocultural terms in Gujarat. The breakdown of reform with the revolt in larger India, suggests a problem of translation of the "needs" of the colony to the colonizer. Gujarat, on the other hand, possibly indicates a case of successful translation. I have taken this conceptual basis to closely read a contemporary successful translation process in Ahmedabad—the translation in English by Alexander Kinloch Forbes of the *Bhut Nibandh* (1849) by Dalpatram. I consider this translation as emblematic of the trajectory of reform in

Ahmedabad. Dalpatram translated the idea of Gujarat to Forbes who wished to study the history and culture of the region. On the other hand, Dalpatram writing the *Bhut Nibandh* (for the essay competition announced by GVS) with the objective of contributing to the "reform" initiative suggests how Dalpatram successfully translated the liberal ideas of the West that he had acquired from Forbes. The success of the translation process is evidenced in the jubilant reception by Forbes and GVS, not only leading to large scale printing and dissemination of the essay, but its further translation into English which is specifically directed to the English audience (the coloniser). Clearly, Forbes wished to make an example of the essay, for the colonised and the coloniser. Thus, I use a close reading of the Gujarati text and the English translation to read the constitution of reform out of the transactions between the coloniser and the colonised. I not only study the symbolic process of translation, but also the material practices of translation and editing that constituted the parameter of "appropriateness" as colonial morality was imposed on the native public sphere. I contextualise the discussion within other prose writings of Dalpatram, and other reformers, as well as the larger context of the reform movement, including the rise of modern prose, print culture, reform associations, language cultures, etc., to tease out the dimensions of development of reform within the institutions of the public domain. With the setting up of universities in 1857, there was a criticism of the policy on English medium education by reformers including Dalpatram which is often read as an anti-colonial stance. However, I consider this as an indication of reform being converted from a loosely defined narrative governing sociocultural initiatives to an uncontested rationale enabling the insertion of Gujarati society into Western modernity, with the demand that vernacular be the medium of instruction so as to not interrupt the process of its modernization. I further study the anxieties over colonial self-image in the controversy over Baroda intrigues and Bombay *khutput* leading to the dismissal of Lt. Colonel James

Outram as the Resident of Baroda.[10] I study various documents written around the corruption scandal to analyse the challenge it presented to the colonial idea that corruption belonged either to traditional societies or to the civilizational and moral Other of the colonizer, that is, the Oriental despot (Kroeze 3). In this way, the chapter traces the institutionalization of specific moral narratives and the moralization of institutional practices, to trace the anatomy of reform in Gujarat that contextualized the institutionalization of English Studies in higher education in the region via the Presidency.

Chapter Two opens the discussion in 1882 when the new ruler of Baroda—Sayajirao Gaekwad III—dispensed one of his initial formal duties as a king which was the inauguration of the Baroda College—an institution that was to become one of the most influential hubs of higher education in the region, and the Indian Education Commission was convened in the Bombay Presidency to take stock of the impact of the Despatch of 1854 that had led to the establishment of universities and major changes in the education policy. The Indian Education Commission of 1882 is credited with building the idea of a "national" policy of education while also encouraging Indian private enterprise in education. This resulted in wider independent discussions regarding development of a "national" education at local and regional levels, as instantiated by T.K. Gajjar's *Note on the Development of a National System of Education for the Baroda State* (1888). Just as Dalpatram's encounter with Western ideas was not in the formal institutional framework as it was for other reformers, Gaekwad's encounter was also slightly different. Gaekwad's education was aimed at creating a statesman rather than a state employee. Reform assumes a distinctly political and institutional form in the work of Sayajirao Gaekwad. This radical king comes of age within the larger context of the rising tide of "nationalist" thought in the closing decades of the century. This chapter

[10] This refers to a scandal rounding the inheritance of a wealthy bank in Baroda manipulated by its existing manager, through alleged bribery of Bombay government officials, particularly, Mr. Reid, that Colonel Outram reported to the colonial government with a view to bring to their notice the popular native impression that the Bombay government was corrupt.

analyses how the domain of English Studies is shaped by the transition of the dominant narrative of reform from moral to institutional, from the Indian Education Commission of 1882 to roughly the University Reforms of 1904 culminating in the Indian Universities Act of 1904. It further analyses whether and how the "nationalist" question had implications for the pedagogic practice(s) of English Studies. The nationalist question is conceived broadly to include the national tradition of the Romantics in England which was part of the English literature curriculum in the colleges. The primary texts I study include the lecture notes on Tennyson's Victorian revival of a national Romance legend, developed into *Essays on Lord Tennyson's Idylls of the King* (1893) by Harold Littledale, Vice Principal and Professor of English Literature at Baroda College; as well as notes on literature and poetry compiled during his tenure at Baroda College by Aurobindo Ghose, one of the key nationalist thinkers of India, who also succeeded Littledale as Acting Professor of English in 1900, and Vice Principal in 1904, besides fulfilling several important roles for the state. Besides, I also look at memoirs of students at the Baroda College, administrative and official reports of the Baroda state as well as official commissions, other official documents related to Bombay University, as well as key political, literary, writings published independently or as articles in contemporary periodicals. These are contextualized using secondary literature that includes critical histories and analyses of various aspects of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in Gujarat and India.

Chapter Three is located in the 1920s beginning with the non-cooperation movement and the resultant education reforms couched in the demand for an anti-British national education, the establishment of a "national *vidyapith*"—Gujarat Mahavidyalaya in 1920, and the culmination of Gujarati spelling reform with the publication of the *Jodanikosh* in 1929. National education was perceived at the centre of the nationalist movement, and questions of language and institutionalisation remained at its heart. The call for reforming education

consisted of two aims—to free educational institutions from government control, and to change the medium of education to a combination of the "mother-tongue" and "national language" of Hindustani. The crucial necessity of institutionalization was recognized by Gandhi in his express views that the pursuance of developing these institutions was more fundamental than participation of teachers and students in on-ground activism during the civil disobedience movement. Such nationalization was aimed at remedying the intellectual and moral "weakness" that was generated by education in a foreign tongue constituted of foreign values. The Gujarat Mahavidyalaya—the higher education institution established under the Gujarat Vidyapith, was national not only in terms of the nature of education it offered, but also its scope. It was the institution established by the leader of the nationalist movement—Gandhi, it was part of the pan-Indian quartet of nationalist institutions alongside the Jamia Milia Islamia, Kashi Vidyapith, and Bihar Vidyapith, and thus, remained a centre of inspiration for other national education initiatives. These contexts portend resounding success for the institution and its potential to dethrone the English/Western hegemony in institutional practices. However, the practical operation of the institution demonstrated that the nationalist sentiment that swept popular activism was unable to successfully percolate higher education in the region. Education reform remained one of the most opposed points of Gandhi's non-cooperation programme (Rajendra Prasad 3). The Vidyapith struggled with raising of funds, availability of teachers in vernacular languages, as well as enlisting students in greater numbers. Interestingly, while Gandhi strongly contended English as a medium of instruction, he did not elucidate his position on English as a subject of study, except in stating that study of literatures in all languages was useful. Neither did he desire immediate changes in the curricula of higher education. Further, he called for translations in the vernacular language (here, Gujarati) in order to "enrich" the same. In this context, I study whether and how the position of English Studies is modulated within this changing definition of reform. I consider

whether the challenges faced by the institution point to the function of reform as an episteme that resists vernacularization of higher education. I also contextualize these within the larger discussions on university education in the Presidency, as well as demand for a separate government-funded regional university initiated by Gaekwad in Baroda. I read this through a constellation of primary texts surrounding the nationalization-vernacularization debate as well as Gujarat Mahavidyalaya, including official documents related to the Mahavidyalaya and Vidyapith; reports, speeches, etc. pertaining to the institution in particular and national education in general; writings in newspapers, contemporary periodicals like *Navjivan*, *The Educational Review*, etc., as well as independent publications, official reports related to various institutions, etc.

Chapter Four proceeds from the 1949 moment when independent universities were formed in the region in the form of Gujarat University and The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda. It analyses the documents concerning constitution of these universities for the parallels with or revisions on the idea of reform imbricated in higher education as observed in the previous chapters. In this way, it first, constructs the origins of independent university education in the state. It, then, proceeds to survey the post-independence revisions in policy, especially focusing on the disciplinary/institutional practice(s) of English Studies. It reflects on the relative achievements and limitations of experiments and innovations in disciplinary practices of English Studies. It reflects whether persistence of specific epistemes, among other factors, account for the inability of the discipline to fundamentally reinvent itself. It takes into account the interconnected histories of reform and English to argue that higher emphasis be placed on close historical reading to understand the parallel development of English and the vernacular where the two inform and inflect each other. The collaboration also holds in the developments of intellectual currents, literature(s), print culture(s), etc. which directly impinge on literary/cultural studies. Thereby, revisions of the discipline that

adopt an either/or or a centre/margin approach would be simplistic and superficial. In the context of the Gujarat Vidyapith, Gandhi once remarked that even if the same book is taught at an institution built within the non-cooperation movement and a government-run institution, *how* it will be taught will be fundamentally different in the former (197). Building on this, I make an experimental proposal that primarily focuses on altering the *how* (the pedagogic practices) over the *what* (curricular content) of English Studies. I propose a methodology of using co-texts in the curriculum, and introducing non-Western epistemes for critical analysis of texts, as two methods to create more radical readings of English literature.

The Conclusion surveys the trajectory of reform and English in the course of all chapters and discusses the implications of the same for an understanding of the rhetoric of reform, the region, as well as institutionalization of English. It argues that the reappearance of the vocabulary of reform in significant moments of transition in the debate(s) over English cannot be dismissed as a historical contingency and must be critically examined to understand how reform inflected the articulations of English, and vice versa. In sum, it avers that critiquing the epistemes which structure our understanding of the subject can at once challenge both the theoretical hegemony of the West, as well as address the crisis of studying the canon without necessarily having to do away with the canon.

Works Cited

Appadurai, Arjun. "European Self-Making and India's Alternative Modernities." *China, India and Alternative Asian* Modernities, edited by Sanjay Kumar, et al., Taylor and Francis, 2019, pp. 3-17.

Aspengren, Henrik Chetan. *Social Imperialism: And how it was Applied in the Bombay Presidency 1895-1925.* 2010. University of London, PhD dissertation. *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.*

Aurobindo. *Early Cultural Writings*. Pondicherry, Sri Aurobindo Ashram Publication Department, 2003.

Bhabha, Homi. "Signs Taken for Wonders." *The Location of Culture*. 1994. Routledge, 2014, pp. 145-174.

Brantlinger, Patrick. *The Spirit of Reform: British Literature and Politics*, 1832-67, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1971.

Chakravarty, Gautam. *The Indian Mutiny and the British Imagination*. Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Dash, Santosh. *English Education and the Question of Indian Nationalism: A Perspective on the Vernacular*. Delhi, Aakar Books, 2009.

Dahyabhai, Dalpatram. *Bhut Nibandh*. 1870. Gujarat Sahitya Akademi, 2000.

Desai, Neera. *Gujarati Society in Nineteenth Century: An Analysis of Social Change*. 1964. The M.S. University of Baroda, PhD dissertation.

Forbes, Alexander Kinloch, translator. *Bhut Nibandh: An Essay, Descriptive of the Demonology and Other Popular Superstitions of Guzerat*. By Dalpatram Daya, Bombay, The Bombay Gazette Press, 1849.

Foucault, Michel. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, edited by Colin Gordon, Pantheon Books, 1980.

Gajjar, T.K. *Note on the Development of a National System of Education for the Baroda State*. Bombay, The Examiner Press, 1888.

Gandhi, Mohandas Karamchand. *Evil Wrought by the English Medium*, edited by R.K. Prabhu, Ahmedabad, Navajivan Publishing House, 1958.

---. "Gujarat Vidyapith." *Navjivan*, Feb. 1928, pp. 196-97.

Grant, Charles. *Observations on the State of Society among the Asiatic Subjects of Great Britain, Particularly with Respect to Morals; and on the Means of Improving it. Written Chiefly in the Year 1792.* The House of Commons, 1813.

Gupta, Suman, et al., editors. *Reconsidering English Studies in Indian Higher Education.* Routledge, 2015.

Hall, Stuart. "The Emergence of Cultural Studies and the Crisis of the Humanities." *October*, vol. 53, Summer 1990, pp. 11-23.

Innes, Joanna. "'Reform' in English Public Life: The Fortunes of a Word." *Rethinking the Age of Reform: Britain 1780-1850*, edited by Burns and Innes, 2003, Cambridge University Press, 2007, pp. 71-97.

Innes, Joanna, and Arthur Burns. Introduction. *Rethinking the Age of Reform: Britain 1780-1850*, edited by Burns and Innes, 2003, Cambridge University Press, 2007, pp. 1-70.

Kroeze, Ronald, et al. Introduction. *Corruption, Empire and Colonialism in the Modern Era: Towards a Global Perspective*, by Kroeze, et al., Palgrave Macmillan, 2020, pp. 1-19.

Littledale, Harold. *Essays on Lord Tennyson's Idylls of the King*. London, Macmillan and Co., 1893.

Mahanta, Banibrata, and Rajesh Babu Sharma, editors. *English Studies in India: Contemporary and Evolving Paradigms*. Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd., 2019.

Mignolo, Walter D. "Epistemic Reconstitution(s), Colonial/Imperial Differences and Border Thinking." Seventh Balvant Parekh Memorial Lecture 2019, 12 December 2019, Balvant Parekh Centre for General Semantics and Other Human Sciences, Baroda. Lecture.

Miles, Taylor. "Empire and Parliamentary Reform: the 1832 Reform Act Revisited." *Rethinking the Age of Reform: Britain 1780-1850*, edited by Burns and Innes, 2003, Cambridge University Press, 2007, pp. 295-311.

Morrison, B. Review of *Regions and Regionalism in South Asian Studies: An Exploratory Study*, by Robert I. Crane. *Pacific Affairs*, vol. 43, no. 1, Spring 1970, pp. 136-139.

Mukherjee, Alok. *This Gift of English: English Education and the Formation of Alternative Hegemonies in India*. 2009. Orient Blackswan, 2013.

Prasad, Rajendra. "Rashtriya Shiksha." *Navjivan*, Sep. 1922, pp. 3.

Raval, R.L. *Socio-Religious Reform Movements in Gujarat during the Nineteenth Century*. 1983. Gujarat University, PhD dissertation.

Sarth Gujarati Jodanikosh. 1929. Gujarat Vidyapith, 2012.

Sheikh, Samira. *Forging a Region: Sultans, Traders, and Pilgrims in Gujarat, 1200-1500*. Oxford University Press, 2010.

Suhrud, Tridip. *Writing Life: Three Gujarati Thinkers*. New Delhi, Orient Blackswan, 2009.

Tschurenev, Jana. *Empire, Civil Society, and the Beginnings of Colonial Education in India*. Cambridge University Press, 2019.

Viswanathan, Gauri. *Masks of Conquest: Literary Study and British Rule in India*. 1989. London, Faber and Faber, 1990.