



PEDAGOGY OF LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND CASTE

B. Venkat Raoⁱ

The EFL University,
Hyderabad, India

Abstract:

India has many languages, and each language has produced its own appreciably rich cultural and literary histories. Thus, language is an integral part of literary lives. On the other hand, each of these linguistic communities was inhabited by many caste communities. Caste has been an intricate and unmistakable phenomenon in the social, religious, cultural, and political fabric throughout India. There is a dominant myth that Sanskrit, popularly known as a classical language, is the mother of all Indian languages. The pedagogy of the Sanskrit language has played a significant role in codifying and legitimizing (Brahmin) caste hierarchy in the name of sacred/classical texts/literature. Questions of caste, language, and literature are thus inextricably interwoven and complementary to one another. It is obvious that the Sanskrit language has worked in the service of creating and consolidating a caste-based hierarchy that arose from, among other things, through the work of philosophers and intellectuals of classical languages and their textual discourses throughout pre-colonial and postcolonial India.

Keywords: caste, India, languages, literary texts, Sanskrit, Dalit discourse

1. Introduction

"From Sir William Jones to Max Mueller, many Orientalist scholars tell us that there is a language in India called Sanskrit. But after coming here I have not heard a single person speak that language, nor seen anyone write it. Therefore, I do not believe in the existence of this language. The whole thing is likely to be a trick played on us by Messers Jones and the rest who have invented this language to acquire respectability for themselves." (quoted in Meenakshi Mukherjee)

This paper is an attempt to re-examine and unfold how Aryan Brahmins claimed and maintained the supremacy of Sanskrit language and literature over indigenous languages and literatures. They claimed that the classical language and literature in India was nothing but Sanskrit. The contentious point is: how come the Aryan Brahmins, who claim to have come from Central Asia, and whose Sanskrit language and literature had never been allowed to any caste groups in India, can be read as Indian classical language and literature? For instance, the classical

ⁱ Correspondence: email venkatroaboddu@gmail.com

language and literature of the Greeks are historically cherished by all Greek people. Ironically, even today in the post-colonial context, Aryan Brahmins who have acquired English education adroitly claim the supremacy of their cultural, linguistic, and literary hegemony even in Indian writings in English. This paper is an attempt to explore the trajectory of this claim and to expose the politics behind such an implicitly racist and casteist Sanskrit language and literature foisted in the minds of gullible Indian people for generations.

Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin argue that *"Language becomes the medium through which a hierarchical structure of power is perpetuated, and the medium through which conceptions of 'truth', 'order', and 'reality' becomes established"* (p. 7). In India, the classical languages are regarded as the custodians of India's ancient and profound cultural legacy, preserving the rich history, literature, and traditions of their respective communities. By conferring this status, the government seeks to honour and protect the linguistic milestones of India's diverse cultural landscape. Of late, the government of India promotes the Sanskrit Language through three Central Sanskrit Universities (CSUs) established by the Central Sanskrit Universities Act, 2020 and located in New Delhi and Tirupati, by providing funds to them for teaching and research in the Sanskrit Language leading to the award of degrees, diploma, certificate to students. The Central Institute of Indian Languages (CIIL), Mysore works for the promotion of all Indian languages, including four classical languages – Kannada, Telugu, Malayalam and Odia. The government spent ₹2532.59 crore on the promotion of Sanskrit between 2014-15 and 2024-25. That works out to ₹230.24 crore every year (on average) for Sanskrit and ₹13.41 crore every year for the other five. Whereas Tamil, the first language to be designated as a "classical" language in 2004, received ₹113.48 crore under the Grants for Promotion of Indian Languages (GPIL) scheme, 22 times less than the amount spent on the promotion of Sanskrit, which was given the same status in 2005. The combined funding of the remaining four Kannada, Telugu, Malayalam, and Odia which received classical language status between 2008 and 2014, was ₹34.08 crore only. Many critics and writers argue that the allocation is biased, as Sanskrit has a negligible number of speakers compared to the other living languages that have significantly more native speakers, whereas Sanskrit is used exclusively in rituals, particularly by Brahmin priests. The Brahmins as a community also do not interact in day-to-day communication in Sanskrit at all.

2. English language in colonial contexts

The British colonial era had clearly empowered traditionally dominant caste discourses. It was during this time, on the one hand, that English became the language of powerful Brahmins predominantly. On the other hand, colonial modernity opened up a meager space for marginalized voices due to the establishment of educational institutions by the missionaries and the concerted efforts of Thomas Babington Macaulay, who advocated for the introduction of Western education in India. Thus, thinkers such as Jyotiba Phule, E.V. Periyar, B.R. Ambedkar and others could articulate strong, alternate paradigms against a Brahminical discourse through their committed philosophical and literary writings. It is from these writings that Dalit literature of the recent decades draws its intellectual inspiration and continues to raise questions about caste, language, and literature.

A cursory look in hindsight shows that we, the people of India, know that the pedagogy of Vedic literature produced in the Sanskrit language has been the monopoly of Aryan Brahmins who did not allow any Indian native to learn and recite their language and literature. They justified, in fact, cruel punishments meted out to people who may happen to accidentally hear or to recite any Sanskrit *sloka* or verse. Scholarship has clearly established that the general population could not get any proper education even in their local dialects until British colonial intervention. The East India Company (EIC), formed in 1600 CE and active in the Indian subcontinent, did not involve itself in the field of education and maintained a “neutral” stance in socio-cultural, educational, and political matters. It was in 1813 CE, when a Charter Act renewed their existence in the subcontinent, that the question of educational policies arose, and there were debates between the Orientalists who supported Sanskrit/indigenous education and the Anglicists who advocated Western education. There was considerable to-and-fro on the need for tilting the balance towards an English Education system.

The Charter Act of 1793 included repeated requests made to the British Parliament. There were also efforts by Christian missionaries to open educational institutions in the colonies, though as is well known, the intention was to propagate their religion. Charles Grant, a missionary working in India, wrote in 1792:

“The true care of the darkness is the introduction of light. The Hindus err, because they are ignorant, and their errors have never fairly been laid before them. The communion of our light and knowledge to them would prove the best remedy for their disorders; and this remedy is proposed from a full conviction that if judiciously and patiently applied, it would have great and happy effects upon them, effects honorable and advantageous for us.” (148)

What is quite evident is the conviction that the Sanskrit systems of knowledge, religion, belief and manners were flawed, and there was a felt need to replace them with Christianity and Western knowledge systems. Charles Grant, who was designated the Christian Director of the East India Company, was sure about his duty—education and evangelization were the only remedy for a people immersed in “superstition.” There was also an effort to popularize the study of Natural Sciences in the colonies—we know that after the Industrial Revolution, England was at the height of its belief in the study of empirical sciences. Charles Grant was sure, similarly, that the introduction of the Western knowledge systems would certainly be beneficial for India.

“By planning our language, our knowledge, our opinions and our religion, in our Asiatic territories, we shall put a great work beyond the reach of contingencies; we shall probably have wedded the inhabitants of those territories to this country” (220).

The British Parliament acceded to the request of the missionaries but allowed education to be imparted in Sanskrit language and literature, citing the need to promote indigenous forms of education. Macaulay, in his Minutes, clearly mentions the funds granted solely to Sanskrit (Brahmin) scholars from the Charter Act of 1793 to the Charter Act of 1833; Macaulay writes as well about Sanskrit scholars who remained unemployed even after 12 long years of dedicated study and training. Social reformers like Vennilakanti Soob Rao from Madras Presidency, Raja

Ramohan Roy from the Bengal Presidency, and Gurujada Appararao from the coastal Andhra region also identified several flaws in practicing and disseminating the pedagogy of a Sanskrit educational system. Instead, they advocated for a Western education system along with English medium of instruction. Rammohan Roy was categorically opposed to any decision on spending government money for the establishment of Sanskrit schools in Calcutta. In "A Letter on English Education" (1823) written to the then-Governor General of India, Roy stated the matter in the following words:

"We now find that the governments are establishing Sanskrit schools under Hindu Pundits to impart such knowledge as is already current in India. This Seminary (similar in character to those which existed in Europe before the time of Lord Bacon) can only be expected to load the minds of youth with grammatical niceties and metaphyseal distinctions of little or no practical use to the possessors or to society. The pupils will there acquire what was known two thousand years ago, with the addition of vain and empty subtleties since produced by speculative men, such as is already commonly taught in all parts of India.... no essential benefit can be derived by the student of Mīmāṃsā from knowing what is it that makes the killer of a goat sinless by pronouncing certain passages of the Vedas, and what is the real nature and operative influence of passages of the Ved, etc." (qtd. in Sen, appendix 37-39)

During their colonial rule, the British made concerted efforts in acquiring mastery and command over many Indian languages for the purpose of facilitating governance and control over the region. Bernard Cohn, in his seminal essay "The Command of Language and Language of Command" (1985), argued that *"the conquest of India was a conquest of knowledge."* Cohn further made the point that *"language as command was not only a domestic or personal matter, but a matter of state"*, and the emphasis was *"on the use of language as the key to understanding Indians, hence being able to control them."*

3. Sanskrit and European responses

William Jones, a linguist and a judge appointed to the East India Company in Calcutta, was the first to find a link between three ancient languages, namely, Greek, Latin and Sanskrit and has been regarded as the father of linguistics. His placing of Sanskrit at the apex of other languages, at first, received wide support from European scholars, soon after his translations of the Sanskrit texts started appearing in Europe. In a discourse delivered in 1786, Jones proclaimed that he had found a linguistic kinship between three ancient languages, Sanskrit, Latin and Greek, and that the possibility that the three languages may have originated from a common ancestor would forever change the history of the world. These early discussions make clear that British administrators, intellectuals, and missionaries were willing to promote and disseminate their language, literature, and religion to the natives and also equally wished to learn various indigenous languages. Contrary to this, the Aryan Brahmins who came to India centuries before the British had not made efforts to promote their Sanskrit language and their Vedic religious scriptures to indigenous people in India. Ironically, these very Brahmins claim that their Sanskrit language and its literature are Indian classical language and literature. The Aryan and also the

British conquest of India is thus a conquest of narrative authority. They conquered and represented the diversity of Indian pasts through homogenizing narratives.

It was during British colonialism that more educated Brahmins became closely associated in many ways with colonial administrative and educational institutions, and could subsequently acquire proficiency in the English language to regain narrative control in reviving Vedic language and literature. At the same time, a section of educated Brahmins also took progressive initiatives in questioning the authority of the Sanskrit language and its traditional literature. However, such progressive Brahmin initiatives were overshadowed by conservative groups.

4. English language in post-colonial contexts

Following independence, Brahmins overwhelmingly took over Western education in English medium. They occupied institutions such as universities, the judiciary, bureaucracy, and media houses. They entered professions that operated through the English language and became influential teachers, journalists, lawyers, politicians, engineers, doctors, and so on. They firmly established a hegemonic role for the English language in the place of the so-called sacred Sanskrit. However, ironically, they remained mentally, spiritually and culturally rooted in a Brahmanical world view in order even as they ensured they were able to exploit the material benefits of Western technological advances. They systematically promoted the English language as a means to communicate with various nations of the world; their skills and ability to speak and write in the paradigms of the West quite naturally created a sense of superiority in relation to the non-English-speaking members and communities of our nation.

Thus, the English-speaking caste/class—"the interpreters" of Macaulay—form more or less a homogeneous and hegemonic group in a nation of diverse peoples, and this is the class that produces writers in English. Svathi Joshi points out that the period after independence has witnessed

"...an increasing proliferation of English by a class of people. This class has intensified use of English in public discourses. The English-knowing class is, as a result, deeply entrenched in power; it has in fact become the vanguard of the Indian nation, and all those who do not speak English are excluded from participation in power. This has created segregation, in a hierarchical relationship of dominance and subordination, centrality and marginality, between the users of English and the vast populations that constitute India who have no knowledge of English." (22)

The English-educated intelligentsia, therefore, shares a conceptual framework that is uniform throughout the country and produces a regime of knowledge about Indian culture and history in a discourse that has been largely shaped by their education. Research by scholars such as Gauri Viswanathan, Meenakshi Mukerjee, Tesjaswini Niranjana, Susie Tharu, and others has shown how English education was introduced in the colonies as a mode of social control; in particular, English literary studies functioned as a 'discipline' in both England and India through a strategy of containment and management.

5. The legacy of language, literature and caste in post-colonial contexts

Indian Writing in English is a product of this class of writers, and it occupies a very prominent position in imposing and shaping the literary, cultural and intellectual outlook of this class in the country. People who write in English belong to this class and took the advantage of the English language well enough to be creative writers. People who could read literature in English in India are also of this privileged class, who feel more comfortable with the English language than their mother tongues. Quite similar to how British Literature could establish the White man's superiority and influence the mindset of the then-educated Indians, Indian writers in English later on adroitly imposed their Brahmanical ideology by embedding Vedic cultural values and systematically naturalizing them through their writings in English.

K.R. Srinivasa Iyengar, a pioneer of Indian Writing in English (IWE) and literary critic, is known as the founder of the "canon" of IWE through his teaching of Indian English texts and his critical writings. His work *Indian Writing in English* is considered a foundational text for the formulation of the new discipline and the new canon- IWE. He makes out a strong case for considering IWE as "*one of our national literature.*" In his words,

"We cannot list Rammohan Roy and Ranade, Vivekananda and Aurobindo, Tilak and Gokhale, Tagore and Gandhi in the calendar and turn a blind antipathy towards the language they use as the forceful means of communication their meaning and message to India and the world. These stalwarts were among the makers of modern India, and what they said and wrote must therefore be cherished as our national literature; English, then, is one of our national languages, and Indo-Anglian literature too is one of our national literatures." (15)

Thus, Brahmin writers, critics, historians and linguists have been conspicuously utilized Vedic language Sanskrit and colonial modern language English for their vested interests. Together, the White man's burden and the Brahmin man's burden became a *force majeure* of a new approach in the literary conceptualization and representation of India in IWE. Literary historian and feminist scholar Prof. Susie Tharu points out that:

"The attempt to establish an Indian tradition and develop in the reader an authentic Indian sensibility that would replace and/ r complete the primary European sensibility of the 'ideal reader' was underwritten by even larger contradictions. The "Indian tradition" commonly derived from Vedic and post-Vedic texts and therefore an upper caste, indeed Brahminic one, as elitist as its western counterpart" (p. 35).

K. Satyanarayana, Dalit theorist and critic, points out that this particular characterization of the discipline explains to us how certain authors were included in the canon and how certain authors such as Ramabai, Phule, Periyar and Ambedkar were delegitimized and excluded from the canon constructed by Brahmin literary historians in order to avoid the critical debate on the questions of gender inequality, caste discrimination, caste atrocities and cultural hegemony of Brahmanism. Merin Simi Raj critically notes the debate between Makarnad Paranjape and K. Satyanarayana on the question of Caste in Indian English fiction. Parajape denies it totally and

defines Indian English Fiction as a site for a 'casteless space' where as K. Satyanarayana presents the counterargument that the Brahmin authors have violated merely caste rules and not the identity of caste itself (p.84-85)

6. The non-Brahmin Sudra upper castes perspective

Initially, the dominant Sudra upper castes reacted firmly against Brahmins' sacred language and sacred texts. Intriguingly, the Sudra upper castes had initiated an organized struggle in the early twentieth century against the Brahmin monopoly in colonial educational institutions, bureaucracy, and political representation. They started non-Brahmin movements in Madras Presidency and in Bombay Presidency against the overwhelming representation of Brahmins in all domains. V. Geetha categorically notes that Periyar, in the Tamil context, strongly felt that language is inherently political. He viewed Sanskrit not mere language but as a hegemonic tool used to institutionalize caste hierarchy. For him, Sanskrit, in particular, was not neutral—it was the language of Brahmanical scripture, employed to encode divine justification for inequality. Uma Ramaswamy notes that:

"The entire non-Brahmin movement rested on a few basic ideas which emerged from the writings and pronouncements of its leaders. The leaders first questioned the sanctity of the sacred texts. These were argued to be the creation of the Brahmins for the purpose of vesting themselves with ritual exclusiveness and keeping the sudras in perpetual servility. Through the karma theory the Brahmins rationalized their own superior position as well as the lowly status of the sudras. The Hindu theodicy of suffering was considered the opium of the credulous masses. The bitterness of the non-Brahmins over the caste system allegedly created by the Brahmins can be gauged from the fact that the title of an important work by a prominent leader attacking Brahminical superiority reads Aryakavi Kutantram (literally, cunning of the Aryans). The second notion was that the Brahmins were alien Aryans." (292)

Uma Ramaswamy further points out that the Telugu people have been at the helm of the non-Brahmin movement in India. Justice Party leaders such as the Rajas of Panagal, Bobbili, Pithapuram, Chellapalli, and Venkatagiri, and leaders such as Munuswamy Naidu and Sir C.V. Reddi were at the forefront of such movements. In the Telugu-speaking regions, the movements against Brahmins were spearheaded by Kammas, Reddis, and Velamas, the very castes from which these leaders hailed. Reddis, Kammas, Balijas, and Velamas, along with some of their offshoots, were substantial landowners and had a strong tradition of political dominance. What they lacked to claim high status effectively was modern Western education and ritual status. It will be obvious as we go along that it was the Brahmin monopoly over ritual status and government jobs which these castes systematically attacked. (291)

The non-Brahmin movement threw up a whole array of leaders. Some believed that Brahmins were their arch enemies and were unmitigated in their hatred towards them. The other group attacked Brahminism rather than the Brahmins. For instance, landowning Kammas' prominent leader like Tripuraneni Ramaswamy Choudar in A. P., could not only contain the caste and linguistic hierarchy of the Brahmins; they had also created an alternative modern

educational institution, political organizations and even priestly figures against the whole Brahmanical theoretical and ideological structures. Ramaswamy further explains, as his son Gopichand, voicing his philosophy, later wrote, "*Epics such as Bharatam, Bhagavatham and Dharma Sastras are not sacred texts*" (p. 293).

7. Dalits and deconstruction of language, literature, and caste

The above discussion lays out the long-drawn and concerted efforts to deconstruct the Brahminical idea of language, literature, and caste. Modern Dalit-Bahujan intellectuals, from Phule, Periyar, and Ambedkar to contemporary intellectuals and writers, strongly believe that mainstream Indian writers who wrote extensively either in regional languages or in English could not expose the hierarchical and hegemonic practices of the caste system in India. Contemporary Dalit-Bahujan theorists, critics, and writers have expressed ideas to the effect that all Indian languages are influenced by Sanskrit and therefore carry within them oppressive socio-linguistic paradigms. These scholars argue that English is, in contrast, a democratic language which has and can liberate oppressed sections of the population across the Indian subcontinent. Recently, Dalit critics and writers have raised a number of critical questions about Indian literatures and Indian literary history. Alok Mukherjee, a literary theorist and a human rights activist, aptly sums up the significance of Dalit writing:

"Indian literary history and theory, as well as the teaching of Indian literatures, are spectacularly silent about Dalit Literatures, yet Dalit cultural and critical productions make a significant critical intervention in the thinking and writing about Indian society, history, culture and literature... Dalit writers interrogated the dominant, casteist constructions of Indian identity. They were greatly influenced by Dr. Ambedkar and Mahatma Jotirao Phule. Through his examinations of Indian history, mythology and the sacred texts of Brahminism, Ambedkar made a powerful case of a distinct Dalit identity. His works enabled future generations of Dalits to assert themselves as subjects through political activism, organizing, and literary and critical writing" (p.1)

Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, in his seminal essay titled *Annihilation of Caste*, wrote:

"The Brahmin's primary concern is to protect "his interest" against those of the non-Brahmins; and the non-Brahmin's primary concern is to protect their interests against those of the Brahmins. The Hindus, therefore, are not merely an assortment of castes, but are so many warring groups, each living for itself and for its selfish ideal." (p. 52)

The non-Brahmin leaders and intellectuals made an attempt to expose the Brahmin monopoly on modern materialist opportunities such as employment and political representation. However, they could not pose a critical threat to the Brahmin's cultural and religious authority over the Shastras written in Sanskrit. Ambedkar identified the problem for caste hierarchy lies with Brahmanical Shastras, which sanctified and naturalized the caste hierarchies. He points out that:

"What matters is how the Shastras have been understood by the people. You must take the stand that Buddha took. You must take the stand which Guru Nanak took. You must discard the Shastras; you must deny their authority, as did Buddha and Nanak. You must have the courage to tell the Brahmins that what is wrong with them is their religion- the religion which has produced in them this notion of the sacredness of Caste." (p. 61)

His great efforts led the country towards modernity in general and democracy of the Indian society in particular. He correctly understood the importance of English as a vital and powerful instrument to free the Dalits from the century-old miseries, sufferings, insults and stigma inflicted on them by the caste system. When it was being debated as to what should be the national language of India after independence, Ambedkar was the only national leader who vociferously battled for English while others were against it. The National Standard, dated 4th July, 1953, reports that *"Dr. B.R. Ambedkar, former Law Minister of India, has pleaded for the retention of English as the medium of instruction in colleges and universities at any cost. In an interview, Dr. Ambedkar remarked that English was the richest of all languages and said: I don't believe any other language in India, including Hindi, can be used instead of English in schools and colleges"*. However, he said Hindi lacked *"literature and depth"*, both of which the English language possessed (Ambedkar, Vol. 17, Part Two, p. 385)

Ambedkar had written and published in English. His anti-Brahmanical scholarship and profound philosophical and political works in English have been inspiring many Dalit, feminist, progressive activists, writers and scholars in India and abroad. For instance, a prominent atheist, Sanskrit scholar, founder of Dalit Mahasabha of AP, Katti Padmarao proclaimed how he had been transformed by Ambedkar's philosophy and resolute to practice five principles he laid down: writing, reading, building institutions, setting up libraries and practicing what Ambedkar had advocated for annihilation of the caste system to counter the Brahmanical cultural imperialism (K. Satyanarayana 33). Another prominent Marathi Dalit critic and writer, Baburao Babul, examines Indian literature and concludes his discussion by declaring that *"the established literature of India is Hindu literature"* (Dangle 289). He substantiates his argument with a detailed examination of the religious and secular literature of the Hindus. He shows that Sanskrit literature and the saint literature represented the two ruling varnas, the Brahmins and the Kshatriyas. Similarly, K. Satyanarayana, a Dalit scholar and critic, points out,

"One can notice that there are two important functions of Dalit writing. Firstly, Dalit writing attempts to deconstruct 'the dominant, casteist construction of India identity' and secondly, it constructs a distinct Dalit identity."

He further theorises that these writers, through a Brahmanical epistemic break, had dismantled their caste hierarchy and hegemony (p. 7).

8. Conclusion

Across the ages, even in pre-colonial and post-colonial times, the Brahmins who claimed to have reached India from the central Asia had brought their Aryan culture and their Sanskrit language

along with them. In the course of the time, they gained cultural and linguistic authority over the natives. They could not allow their Sanskrit language and literature to be learnt by anyone until the arrival of British colonialism, which had also empowered their linguistic and religious authority. Again, the Brahmins acquired the British colonial language, English and solidified their powerful position further. With the emergence of British colonialism, a few of the non-Brahmin communities also got into modern English education. During this time, a few noted intellectuals like Jyotirao Phule, Periyar and Ambedkar seriously exposed the linguistic, cultural, religious and philosophical problems with Brahminism. Thus, many vibrant non-Brahmin and Dalit writers and intellectuals identified the problem with the pedagogy of the Sanskrit language, which had played a significant role in codifying and legitimizing (Brahmin) caste hierarchy in the name of sacred/classical texts/literature and how questions of caste, language, and literature were thus inextricably interwoven and complementary to one another. They also obviously understood that Sanskrit, as a classical language, had worked in the service of creating and consolidating Brahmin hierarchy and their textual discourses throughout pre-colonial and postcolonial India. In post-independent India, particularly a good number of Dalit writers resolutely took up the literary project to retrieve afresh democratic and humane principles rooted in profound Buddhist philosophical thought by dismantling the cultural imperialism, literary and linguist hegemony of the Brahminical pedagogy.

Creative Commons License Statement

This research work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0>. To view the complete legal code, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/legalcode.en>. Under the terms of this license, members of the community may copy, distribute, and transmit the article, provided that proper, prominent, and unambiguous attribution is given to the authors, and the material is not used for commercial purposes or modified in any way. Reuse is only allowed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

About the Author

Dr. B. Venkat Rao teaches in the Department of English Literature at The EFL University, Hyderabad, India. His teaching and research interests center primarily on Indian writing in English, Postcolonial Studies, 19th Century British Novel and Dalit Studies.

References

Ambedkar, B.R. 1989. *Annihilation of Caste* in Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches Vol. 1: Dr. B. R. Ambedkar and His Egalitarian Revolution. Higher Education Department of Maharashtra. Retrieved from <https://www.mea.gov.in/images/CPV/Volume1.pdf>

- Ambedkar, B.R. 2003. *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches Vol. 17 Part Two: Dr. B. R. Ambedkar and His Egalitarian Revolution*. Higher Education Department of Maharashtra.
- Anand, S. 1999. Sanskrit, English, and Dalits. *Economic and Political Weekly*. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4408224>
- Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. Ed. 1989. *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures*. London and New York: Routledge. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.2307/3731472>
- Cohn, Bernard. 1985. "The Command of Language and the Language of Command." In Ranajit Guha (Ed.), *Subaltern Studies IV*. Retrieved from <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781315237336-5/command-language-language-command-bernard-cohn>
- Dangle, Arjun. Ed. 1992. *Poisoned Bread: Translations from Modern Marathi Dalit Literature*. Hyderabad: Orient Longman. Retrieved from https://books.google.co.in/books?id=FCIwAAAAMAAJ&source=gbs_book_other_versions_r&cad=2
- Dasgupta, Probal. 1993. *The Otherness of English: India's Aunty Tongue Syndrome*. Delhi: Sage. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.1994.tb00316.x>
- Ganvir, A.J. (2013). The English Language Teaching and the Dalits in India in the Present Scenario. In D.D. Shete (Ed.), *Teaching English Language: Modern Approaches* (pp. 161-162). Khaparkheda: B.S.W. College, Khaparakheda. Retrieved from <https://www.scribd.com/document/471863881/The-English-Language-as-an-Instrument-of-Dalit-Emancipation>
- Grant, Charles. *Observations on the State of Society Among the Asiatic Subjects of Great Britain*. 1792, <http://archive.org/details/observationsonst00gran/page/n13/mode/2up?q=err>
- Geetha, V., and S. V. Rajadurai. *Towards a Non-Brahmin Millennium: From Iyothee Thass to Periyar*. Samya, 1998.
- Ilaiah, K. 1996. *Why I Am Not a Hindu*. Calcutta: Samya. Retrieved from <https://archive.org/details/whyiamnohindusu0000ilai>
- Iyengar, K.R. Srinivasa. 1987. *Indian Writing in English*. Sterling Publishers. Retrieved from https://books.google.ro/books/about/Indian_Writing_in_English.html?id=doleAAAIAAJ&redir_esc=y
- Joshi, Savti. Ed. 1991. *Rethinking English: Essays in Literature, Language, History*. New Delhi: Trianka, 1991. Retrieved from https://books.google.ro/books/about/Rethinking_English.html?id=7BiAAAAMAAJ&redir_esc=y
- Khair, Tabish. 2001. *Babu Fictions: Alienation in Contemporary Indian English Novels*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press. Retrieved from <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Babu-Fictions%3A-Alienation-in-Contemporary-Indian-Khair/251e0c5c1c6d31982fe579f57179e001186d3ba7>
- Mukherjee, Alok. "Reading Sharan Kumar Limbale's Towards an Aesthetic of Dalit Literature: From Erasure to Assertion." *Towards an Aesthetic of Dalit Literature*, by Sharan Kumar Limbale, 2004, www.scribd.com/document/790916261/Towards-an-Aesthetic-of-Dalit

[Literature-Histories-Controversies-and-Considerations-1-Ed-9788125026563-8125026568.](#)

- Mukherjee, Meenakshi. 2000. *The Perishable Empire: Essays on Indian Writing in English*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press. Retrieved from <https://archive.org/details/perishableempire0000mukh>
- Merin Semi Raj. 2015. *Caste in Indian Fiction: Footnotes to a Post-Mandal Debate*. EPW. May, vol. 21. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24482232>
- Niranjana, Tejaswini, Sudhir, P., & Dhareshwar, Vivek. Eds. 1993. *Interrogating Modernity: Culture and Colonialism in India*. Seagull Books. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/65163383/Interrogating_modernity_culture_and_colonialism_in_India_Introduction
- Rajan, Rajeswari Sunder. Ed. 1991. *The Lie of the Land: English Literary Studies in India*. Delhi: Oxford University Press. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0041977X00009162>
- Ramaswamy, Uma. "The Belief System of the Non-Brahmin Movement in India: The Andhra Case." *Asian Survey*, vol. 18, no. 3, Mar. 1978, pp. 290–300. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2643221>.
- Rege, Sharmila. 2006. *Writing Caste/Writing Gender*. New Delhi: Zubaan. Retrieved from https://sites.fhi.duke.edu/socialmovementslab/files/2018/02/SharmilaRege_WritingCaste.pdf
- Sen, Amiyakumar. *Raja Rammohun Roy, the Representative Man*. Calcutta: Calcutta Text Book Society, 1967. Retrieved from <http://archive.org/details/dli.bengal.10689.13070/page/n5/mode/2up>.
- Satyanarayana, K. and Susie Tharu. Eds. 2013. *The Exercise of Freedom: An Introduction to Dalit Writing*. Navayana. Retrieved from <https://archive.org/details/exerciseoffreedom0000unse>
- Satyanarayana, K. and Susie Tharu. Eds. 2013. *From Those Stubs, Steel Nibs are Sprouting: New Dalit Writing from South India*. HarperCollins Publishers India. Retrieved from <https://archive.org/details/exerciseoffreedom0000unse>
- Sharma, Meenakshi. 2003. *Postcolonial Indian Writing: Between Co-option and Resistance*. Jaipur: Rawat Publications. Retrieved from https://books.google.com.na/books?id=PKNIAAAAMAAJ&hl=it&source=gbs_citations_module_r&cad=5
- Tharu, Susie. 1991. "Tracing Savitri's Pedigree: Victorian Racism and Image of Women in Indo-Anglian Literature." In Joshi, Svati, ed. *Rethinking English: Essays in Literature, Language, History*. New Delhi: Trianka. Retrieved from <https://indianmedicine.eldoc.ub.rug.nl/66328/>
- Viswanathan, Gauri. 1998. *Masks of Conquest*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press. Retrieved from https://books.google.ro/books/about/Masks_of_Conquest.html?id=yXhvSgAACAAJ&redir_esc=y