

Rupayan Mukherjee and Jaydip Sarkar (eds.)

# **Popular Literature**

Texts, Contexts, Contestations



Rupayan Mukherjee and Jaydip Sarkar (eds.)

# POPULAR LITERATURE

Texts, Contexts, Contestations

*ibidem*  
Verlag

## **Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek**

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

ISBN-13: 978-3-8382-1666-9

© *ibidem*-Verlag, Stuttgart 2022

Alle Rechte vorbehalten

Das Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist ohne Zustimmung des Verlages unzulässig und strafbar. Dies gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und elektronische Speicherformen sowie die Einspeicherung und Verarbeitung in elektronischen Systemen.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form, or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise) without the prior written permission of the publisher. Any person who does any unauthorized act in relation to this publication may be liable to criminal prosecution and civil claims for damages.

Printed in the EU

To Naughty, Titli, Tintin and Rai  
The Irreducibles



## Preface and Acknowledgements

As we introduce the present volume, the Pandemic has frowned once more. The National newspapers accompany our morning coffee with information of newer breaths becoming air; news channels tirelessly report on the mortality records that are being continuously unmade and remade with each passing hour. It is perhaps impossible to escape a growing sense of nihilism which is slowly adapting to this catastrophe of humanity. An intimidated consciousness, increasingly made aware of the fragility of existence, has often pondered if one can afford to write when the elementary premise of survival has been jeopardised. As we wrecked our brains off and laboured with our mediocrity to produce the book you have in hand, we increasingly realised that we, as the intelligentsia, still live within the ivory towers of indifference. While Rome burnt and is burning still, we lived and are still living warm within our world of reading and writing, contentedly fiddling our thoughts.

Our only apology can be that as scholars and learners of Literature, reading and writing is the only possible mode of response available to us. Armed with no other techne but a nominal ability to read and write, we can only pursue the same, even in the time of exception or emergency. Also, wisdom has so long enlightened us about the need to read, about the possible vitality which reading promotes on the face of adversity. The Bible had helped a shipwrecked and an islanded Crusoe to regain hope; the photograph of an unknown boy seated amidst the ruins of Blitz and reading has become the image of sustenance. For all of us who were quarantined and isolated, either due to the disease in us or due to the disease in us of catching the disease, reading could serve as the only possible mode of dialoguing with the world, of responding to the ailment of the age. We chose to read and deliberately read literatures which are often identified as 'Popular' – an adjective that corresponds to forbidden categories like 'collective', 'mass', 'multitude' which, in these times that are being consistently eclipsed and overshadowed by the fear of contagion, have been heavily

controlled, governed, censored and partitioned. Marooned in our secluded islands of solitude, we could not conceive of a better escape from our inferno of isolation. We read and wrote on Popular Literature because it allowed us, even if feebly, to engage with the intimation of the forbidden fruit called mass.

While the Pandemic has possibly been an immediate motive for us, one can also contemplate this volume as a response to the prevalent trends of academic thought that are often guided by, almost unconsciously, hierarchical considerations. In our academic circuits, we often come across high-brow Arnoldian academicians who cherish a firm faith that the term 'Popular Literature' is a fanciful oxymoron. For them, Popular and Literature are an irreconcilable twain which can never meet. One of ourselves had once encountered a superannuated Professor who had expressed his discontent at the incorporation of 'trivial texts' like *Half Girlfriend* and *Sonar Kella (The Golden Fortress)* in the recently modified syllabus of English major in Indian academia. Such texts, he observed gravely, lacked 'serious substance'. He had, in that same conversation, also lamented the fact that Shakespeare was now taught by 'anyone and everyone' which, in his erudite opinion, was a heinous act of sacrilege. After all, not everyone could do justice to the genius of the visionary Bard! The listener was tempted but refrained, keeping in mind the reverence that the senior deserved, from asking "But then...he was a Popular playwright on the Elizabethan stage, wasn't he? Then how could he be substantial?"

The present volume has tried to look beyond such reductive tendencies of reading which fail to find substance in Popular Literary works. The chapters have tried to trace serious contentions in Popular literary texts and have tried to interpret canonical literary texts as Popular Literature. In doing so, the book has tried to problematise the idea of Popular Literature and has proposed that, contrary to reigning presuppositions, Popular Literature is not an easily determinable category which can be unproblematically identified with the frivolous. Above all, it has tried to contemplate the possibilities of reading beyond hierarchical presumptions. The volume can claim its success only if it manages to prompt young



readers to read, reflect and think non-hierarchically and without presumptuous biases.

The Book would not have been possible without our contributors who have generously provided us their labours. We are grateful to all of them, particularly to Madhuparna Mitra Guha who has managed to provide us her piece within a very short notice. We take this opportunity to thank ibidem press for expressing their interest in the work and extending their whole hearted support to ensure the deliverance of the book.

Finally, we are grateful to our family for providing us the necessary support and comfort by ensuring that no mundane concerns of everyday intervened into our Minerva towers of contemplation.

Rupayan Mukherjee  
Jaydip Sarkar  
7<sup>th</sup> April, 2021



# Contents

Preface and Acknowledgements .....	7
<i>Rupayan Mukherjee</i>	
Introduction.....	13
<b>Section I. Juvenile Literature.....</b>	<b>37</b>
<i>Rupayan Mukherjee</i>	
The Proper and the Pure: Biopolitics, Law and Subjectivity in Rudyard Kipling's <i>The Jungle Book</i> .....	39
<i>Arnab Dasgupta</i>	
Making the Chessboard Smooth: Popular as "Nonsense" in <i>Through the Looking Glass</i> .....	61
<i>Mitarik Barma</i>	
Narrative Function and Identity in Paulo Coelho's <i>The Alchemist</i> .....	73
<b>Section II. Science Fiction .....</b>	<b>99</b>
<i>Shirsendu Mondal</i>	
Hail the Monster and Fie the Man: The Construction of Monstrosity in <i>Frankenstein</i> .....	101
<i>Rajadipta Roy</i>	
Rethinking Sciences, Situations and Bamboo-groves in Ray's Science Fictions: <i>Guessing Who Speaks What</i> .....	117
<i>Jaydip Sarkar</i>	
Utopia as Dystopia: Subjectivity at the Limits of Subjection in Ray Bradbury's <i>Fahrenheit 451</i> .....	139

**Section III. Crime and Detective Fiction..... 159**

*Pinaki Roy*

Reclaiming the Elementaries of Context: Ponderings on  
Doyle's *The Hound of the Baskervilles*..... 161

*Mandika Sinha*

"Our mysterious neighbour, Mr. Poirot": Locating the 'Other'  
Detective in *The Murder of Roger Ackroyd* ..... 179

*Shubham Dey and Rupayan Mukherjee*

"What Shall I see in my dreams tonight?": Reading the  
Repressed in Wilkie Collins's *The Woman in White* ..... 193

**Section IV. Romance ..... 207**

*Puja Chakraborty*

Trauma as Calamity or Capital?: The Aporia of Representation  
and the Ethics of Reading in Anne Frank's *The Diary of a Young  
Girl* ..... 209

*Jaya Sarkar and Goutam Karmakar*

Phantasmagoria of the Hegemonic Cultural Structure:  
Interrogating the Indian Urban Facade in Chetan Bhagat's  
*Half Girlfriend*..... 223

*Madhuparna Mitra Guha and Rupayan Mukherjee*

Relocating the Classic as Popular: Reading *Jane  
Eyre* as a Romance. .... 239

**Post Script ..... 257**

*Anisha Ghosh*

Why my Children Love Cinderella and I Don't: Negotiations  
with a Classic-Popular Fairy Tale..... 259

About the Contributors..... 273

# Introduction

*Rupayan Mukherjee*

Artists are the antennae of the race, but the bullet-headed  
many will never learn to trust their great artists.  
Ezra Pound

You are the majority – in number and intelligence,  
therefore you are the power – which is justice.  
Charles Baudelaire

In the world's largest democracy, where the contagion of post-truth is increasingly saturating the political climate, the word 'Popular' has started to evoke an unpleasant stench. The stench is swiftly identifiable, almost equable, with a headless mass that gather wisdom from WhatsApp universities, uncritically ruminate the ideologies that are propagated by the system and are deeply convinced by the predictable tendencies of Populist politics. As diverse governments introduce innovative policies which are directed only at their target vote-banks (determined on the principle of majority), as celebrities (mostly 'stars' from mainstream entertainment industry) participate in musical chairs to contest in impending elections and deliver popular dialogues in their electoral campaigns to acquire political credibility among the gathered swarming flock, as gross numbers are written, sung and played at political meetings to please the accumulated public, the stench grows an olf more. *All the perfumes of Arabia* fail to sweeten the stench that intensifies with each report of mob-lynching and *khaap-panchayat* where the overwhelming mass subjects the singular, who is often an already disenfranchised subject, to the brutalities of collective violence. Ironically though, the same stenching people who populate the signifier 'Popular' ought to be "solemnly resolved to constitute India into a Sovereign Socialist Secular Democratic Republic" and must possess a rudimentary political consciousness and wisdom to preserve and perpetuate the Spirit of the Nation. The irony around the people and popular, like gravity, is so founded and encompassing that it is

barely noticed. Only a contemplative Hamlet or an unkempt but unconforming Berenger<sup>1</sup> who has not yet turned into a rhinoceros is able to notice that *Something is rotten in the State (pun intended) of the World's largest democracy.*

These Hamlets and Berengers are critical of the evolving populist tendencies of governance which relies on the strategic use of the "empty signifier" (Chatterjee 2020, 91) called 'people' to manufacture a climate of political antagonism between "...the people and their enemy". (Ibid., 100) The polarised categories of 'the people' and its 'enemy' are often floating in nature and is often conceptualised on "...existing solidarities such as ethnic, linguistic or religious identity" as well as "...new solidarities...such as distinctions between the wealthy few and the exploited many, or domiciles and immigrants, or a party long entrenched in power and those excluded." (Ibid.) Populist politics is thus relational in nature, for its validation and sustenance, it has to imagine and invent an Other.

This Other-oriented essence of the Popular is not exclusive to the domain of the political. It is also equally relevant and fundamental to an evaluation of Popular Literature. Defining and determining Popular Literature is impossible without considering its arch-other category called Literature. Ken Gelder's thoughtful observations on Popular Fiction elucidate that although Popular Fiction and Literature are "...mutually antagonistic, but they need each other for their self-definition." (Gelder 2004, 13) This relational need of the Other to act as a Foil, and thereby determine, fashion and validate the self, suggests the formulation of an identity in difference.

Gelder identifies a host of contexts, characteristics and aspects on whose premises the *identity in difference* of Popular Fiction is established: artistic intention, craftsmanship and readership being fundamental among them. In other words, he argues that the field of Popular Fiction characteristically departs from Literature in their intention "to reach a large number of readers" (Ibid., 20), in their preference for simplicity and an ingenuous and unproblematic repulsion towards "tangled plots" and "intense formal artistry" (Ibid., 19), and in promoting and catering to a readership that is

unthinking and does not read “seriously” (Ibid., 23) but “uncritically” (Ibid., 38), solely for leisure and entertainment.

Jacques Derrida’s ponderings on the idea of Literature expost the nuances that are often inextricably associated with the discourse of literature and the literary. Derrida, unlike Gelder, does not necessarily consort to an essentialist understanding of Literature as “the kind of writing...produced by...Jane Austen, George Elliot, Henry James, James Joyce, William Faulkner...” (Ibid. 11) which “...deploys a set of logics and practices that are different in kind to those deployed in the field of popular fiction”. (Ibid. 12) For Derrida, literature is not an exclusive category that is hierarchically distinguished from its other – Popular fiction. Instead, Derrida understands literature as a “strange institution” (Derrida 1992 (b), 36) marked by a characteristic paradox. Derrida explains this paradox as follows:

““What is literature?”; literature as historical institution with its conventions, rules, etc., but also this institution of fiction which gives in principle the power to say everything, to break free of the rules, to displace them...The institution of Literature in the West, in its relatively modern form, is linked to an authorization to say everything...” (Ibid., 37)

In what follows, Derrida argues that the “institution of literature in the West in its relatively modern form...” shares a correspondence with the “modern idea of democracy”. (Ibid.) However, that is not our concern for the time being. Instead, we are interested in Derrida’s forked understanding of “The space of literature” as “...not only that of an instituted fiction but also a fictive institution which in principle allows one to say everything.” (Ibid., 36) Literature, as Derrida argues, is suggestive of an ambiguity and holds together contrary tendencies. On the one hand, literature for Derrida is overwhelmingly accommodative/ absorptive as it “allows one to say everything, in every way” (Ibid.) and thus “is an institution which tends to overflow the institution.” (Ibid.) Simultaneously, Derrida observes, answering the epistemological question “What is literature” seems ‘unserious’ without “an analysis of my time at school...and of the family in which I was born, of its relation or non-relation with books, etc.” (Ibid.) Hence, Literature seems to be

suggestive of a characteristic paradox. It is, on the one hand, essentially (almost irreducibly) free and non-hierarchical that absorbs all that is written. Simultaneously, its essence is determined and construed by the intricate considerations of the cultural-ideological.

Derrida also observes that "...there is no text which is literary *in itself*." (Ibid., 44). Instead, the essence of the literary, which Derrida calls "literarity", "is the correlative of an intentional relation to the text, an intentional relation which integrates in itself, as a component or an intentional layer, the more or less implicit consciousness of rules which are conventional or institutional – social, in any case." (Ibid.) For Derrida, literarity is often influenced by the poetics of reading which is fundamental to the intentional relation that the reader has with the text. Intention, in its phenomenological connotation, holds the reader as much responsible as the author in determining the nature and essence of the literary. Terry Eagleton observes that "All literary works...are 'rewritten', if only unconsciously, by the societies which read them; indeed there is no reading of a work which is not also a 're-writing'". (Eagleton 1996 (a), 11) Of course, Derrida is quick to mention that he does not interpret or understand literarity as "...merely projective or subjective – in the sense of empirical subjectivity or caprice of each reader". (Derrida 1992(b), 44) Instead, Derrida claims, "The essence of literature, if we hold to this word essence, is produced as a set of objective rules in an original history of the "acts" of inscription and reading". (Ibid., 45) For Derrida, "the literary character of the text is inscribed on the side of the intentional object, in its noematic structure...and not only on the subjective side of the noetic act." (Ibid., 44) The obtuse expressions 'noetic' and 'noematic' have phenomenological references and J Hillis Miller observes that "Noetic means "apprehended by the intellect alone", while noematic refers to "...features in what is to be known that makes them knowable, subject to noesis". (Miller 2002, 62) The noematic in a literary text, as Derrida opines, is constituted by ""in" the text features which call for the literary reading and recall the convention, institution, or history of literature". (Derrida 1992(b), 44) Reading, for Derrida, is very much in concordance with this noematic structure and the positionality of the reader is a subjectivity that 'includes' and recognises "the



noematic structure" (Ibid.). The reader is thus "linked to an inter-subjective and transcendental community" (Ibid.) and reading as an act is an always-already institutionalised and ideologised enterprise.

## Interrogating the Canon

Terry Eagleton introspects into the indisputable pertinence of ideology in determining the literary worth (or what we might, contrary to Eagleton's claim, dare to call literary essence) of a text and in categorising Literature as a discipline. Rather clairvoyantly, Eagleton asserts that "Literature, in the meaning of the word we have inherited, is an ideology". (Eagleton 1996, 19) Eagleton's socialist commitment haunts his genealogical interrogations on the origin of the institute called Literature and he finds in the promotion of the ideology of literature an organised endeavor to sugar-coat typical middle-class sensibilities. He further argues that the canonisation of 'English Literature' in England had happened in the early twentieth century, in the aftermath of World War I and with the inauguration of English Departments in the ancient Universities like Oxford and Cambridge. Reflecting on the influential role that the Cambridge based journal *Scrutiny* played in determining the trajectory of English Literature and developing the canon, Eagleton observes:

"*Scrutiny* redrew the map of English literature in ways from which criticism has not yet recovered. The main thoroughfares on this map ran through Chaucer, Shakespeare, Jonson, the Jacobean and Metaphysicals, Bunyan, Pope, Samuel Johnson, Blake, Wordsworth, Keats, Austen, George Eliot, Hopkins, Henry James, Joseph Conrad, T.S. Eliot and D.H. Lawrence. This was 'English literature': Spencer, Dryden, Restoration drama, Defoe, Fielding, Richardson, Sterne, Shelley, Byron, Tennyson, Browning, most of the Victorian novelists, Joyce, Woolf and most writers after D.H. Lawrence constituted a network of 'B' roads interspersed with a good few cul-de-sacs. Dickens was first out and then in; 'English' included two and a half women, counting Emily Brontë as a marginal case; almost all of its authors were conservatives." (Ibid., 28)

The map of English Literature, redrawn by *Scrutiny* and elucidated by Eagleton, holds a position of undisputed authority for any individual who inhabits the imagined community of English Studies. While Eagleton argues that the Leavisite current, substantially preached by the *Scrutiny*, "...has entered the bloodstream of English studies in England...has become a form of spontaneous critical wisdom as deep-seated as our conviction that the earth moves round the sun" (Ibid., 27), one can arguably erase the geo-political limit of 'England' stated in the aphorism. Indeed, barring a few exceptional departures, the worldwide canon of English literature has considerably conformed to the 'map' stated above. The academic programme of English major at various Universities across the world, even after the recent interventions of Culture Studies and New Literatures, can be unproblematically accommodated within the standardised map of English Literature. Ngugi wa Thiong'o, the African novelist and intellectual, living geographically far away from Eagleton's England, remarks that the charm of the "Leavisite selected 'Great Tradition of English Literature'" (wa Thiong'o 1987, 90) had cast its spell in Universities which were territorially located in Africa. "The syllabus of the English Department..." as wa Thiong'o remonstrates "...meant a study of the history of English Literature from Shakespeare, Spenser and Milton to James Joyce and T.S. Eliot, I.A. Richards and the inevitable F.R. Leavis." (Ibid.) wa Thiong'o observes, that the formation, sustenance and the reception of the English literary canon in Africa had (and still has) a deep rooted association with imperialism whereby "...the content of the syllabi, the approach to and presentation of the literature, the persons and the machinery for the determining the choice of the texts and their interpretation, were an integral part of imperialism in its classical colonial phase, and they are today an integral part of the same imperialism...in its neo-colonial phase." (wa Thiong'o 1981, 5)

In her magnum opus *The Masks of Conquests*, Gauri Viswanathan observes that the institutionalisation, and thus the canonisation, of English in the colonies had happened "long before it was institutionalized in the home country". (Viswanathan 2015, 27) Viswanathan is critical of Eagleton's "token acknowledgement"

(Ibid.) of the correspondence between the institutionalisation of English as a discipline and the birth of the Empire. Echoing Wa Thiongo, Viswanathan claims that the canonisation of English literature is so intimately associated with the politico-historical event of Imperialism that it is problematic to place the two within a cause-effect design. One is often at a loss to determine if the institutionalisation of English is a cause or an effect of imperialism. Viswanathan opines that English literature acquired “surrogate functions” (Ibid., 33) in the backdrop of imperialism, all of which cannot be listed in the limited scope of an Introduction. To state in a nutshell, it is Viswanathan’s contention that the initiation of English in the academic circuit of colonised India and the formulation of the English canon played a significant role in the consolidation of the Empire. The mimic man, “a class of persons Indian in blood and colour, but English in tastes, in opinions, in morals and in intellect” (Macaulay 1835, 8), was the imperfect, but desired, outcome of the Anglo-cultural pedagogic model and the perfect embodiment and exemplar of a colonised subject who was dominated with consent. The holistic description of the private life of the Bengali babu by Deborah Baker is incomplete without a mention of the “Family libraries of...calf-bound copies of Tennyson, Wordsworth, Coleridge, Shelley, illustrated folios of Shakespeare, and the entire run of Sir Walter Scott’s Waverley novels...” (Baker 2018, 52)

What thus stands out is the intimate relationship of the literary canon with power and its typically political disposition. The political essence that is revealed is considerably dependent on the position of the revelator, i.e., the nature of the introspective gaze which considers the canon. For a feminist intellectual like Virginia Woolf, the canon is a patriarchal construct which systematically denies recognition to deserving women writers like Shakespeare’s imagined sister Judith. Differently, for the avant-garde Bengali novelist and intellectual Nabarun Bhattacharya, the canon is the repository of petty bourgeoisie sensibilities promoting a spirit of conformism, which must be unmade by imagined poets and intellectuals like Purandar Bhaat who write profane and unrefined verses in a crude language that is largely obscene and often sexist. What is thus revealed is the transitive nature of the canon, a face that is revised and

re-invented with every intervention of interpretation. Charles Altieri observes that "...what I claim to be canonical (or to be criterion for determining canons) does depend on norms that I establish, or at least, on institutional norms that I certify". (Altieri 1983, 40) Terry Eagleton is of the opinion that the parameter of value, on which the constricted category of the canon rests, is "...a transitive term: it means whatever is valued by certain people in specific situations, according to particular criteria and in the light of given purposes". (Eagleton 1996, 10) One can extend Eagleton's argument further to suggest that it is not just the value of the canon but also the nature of the canon which is transitive. Or else, it is also possible to interpret Eagleton's 'value' as not necessarily a valorised 'worth' but an implied significance that is unfolded through critical evaluation and interpretation and whose nature and essence is dependent on the position and perspective of the critical gaze. Frank Kermode argues that the canonisation of the literary text is considerably dependent on the continuity of attention and interpretation that the text motivates. (Kermode 1979, 78) The evaluation of the text, which can either be an appraisal or a critique (Frank Kermode claims that the literary canon is actually defined "by attacks upon it" (Ibid., 81)), significantly determines its canonicity.

Hence, one can argue that canons are hauntological in nature. In their pervasiveness and consistent recognition (a recognition that happens even in denial) they resemble the historic. The critique of the canon through denial only foregrounds its relevance, just as the wistful urge to live unhistorically only implies the inescapability of history and historicised existence. The canon breathes when it is accepted, it thrives when it is denied. Reverence and denial are distinct means which eventually accomplishes the same end, the validation of the canon. Like the Eliotian tradition, the canon is diffusely related to the artist through an inescapable trope of measurability, "in which two things are measured by each other" (Eliot 1932, 15).

The problematic relationship of modern Bengali poetry with the aesthetic model typified as *Rabindrik* can aptly illustrate the paradoxical position of the canon with relation to art. *Rabindrik*, a prevalent and overused word in the Bengali language, connotes a

“distinctive style” (Chatterjee 2001, 304) of, chiefly aesthetic, expression that is often identified with the 1913 Nobel laureate Rabindranath Tagore. It is a matter of little contention that Tagore occupies a formidable presence in the Bengali cultural field and is a “canon in himself” (Ibid.). In an interview, the celebrated Hindi and Urdu poet Gulzar, rather unambiguously, and to an extent reductively, observes that in the cultural life of Bengal “...that one man (Tagore) is the culture of the entire community...the children begin their learning from him...there is perhaps no other instance where a single man becomes the culture of the entire community.” (Live, 5:48-6:23) Apparently, there are generalising strains in Gulzar’s comments. Yet, like most other generalisations, the assertion is partially true. The various modernist literary movements in Bengal, which aspired to *make it new*, believed that an unconditional rejection (annihilation in some cases) of *Rabindrik* sensibilities and consciousness was a fundamental requirement for the arrival of modernity in literature. These heterogeneous movements, with each departing from the other in their outlook, historicity and praxis, can be branded together on the basis of their anti-*Rabindrikata*/cism. The poets of Kallol, Krittibaash and Hungry generation unanimously agreed that modernity and *rabindrikata* were mutually antagonistic and for the first to arrive it was essential to reject the second.

However, the rejection of *Rabindrikata* and Tagore never meant an absolute autonomy from their sublime shadow. On the contrary, as the renowned modern Bengali poet Buddhadeva Bose notes in an interview, the post-Tagore modernists like Bishnu Dey, Sudhindranath Datta and Bose himself “showed a serious involvement in Tagore. This involvement took many forms: parody, imitation, submission, rejection, revolt.” (Bose 1966, 43) Bose’s comment emphasises the eternal truth that revolt or rejection is an-other way of involvement and establishes an-other relationship that is founded on the premises of non-relation. In his Memoir *Awrddhek Jiban (Half-a-Life)* Sunil Ganguly remarks that the readers of Bengali literature have often failed to comprehend the actual essence of Rabindra-birodh, i.e., the intentional antagonisation of Rabindranath, among the modern Bengali poets and litterateurs.

For him, the true essence of Rabindra-birodh was not to discard or unrecognise the bard's creative authority. It was more an attack on the systemic tendency of Purists who believed that nothing 'literary' has been produced in the post-Tagore era of Bengali literature. (*Awordhek Jiban* 204) Elsewhere, Ganguly remarks that the "people's obsession with Rabindranath, that mindset they carried where he was the only 'poet' who existed..." (Ganguly 2010) significantly motivated him to adopt an Anti-Rabindranath stance.

What we hence have is the classic case of the canon evolving as a referential point, which must be considered or alluded to even when the contemporaneous seeks to depart from it. The Canon is, to quote Charles Altieri, "...a permanent theater helping us shape and judge personal and social values" (Altieri 1983, 40) Altieri argues that Canons serve "as dialectical resources" (Ibid., 47) whereby it both serves as a model and a challenge for the aspiring artist. He asserts that "Canons make us *want* to struggle..." (Ibid., 48) and in its dichotomous relevance as both a model and a Foil, canons are inescapably relevant to the artists and their art.

Reflections on the canon also point to its contingent and non-singular and non-exclusive nature. It is often problematic to determine a pure canon in a literary-cultural field for there is often not one but many canons. To complicate the possibilities of an inference further, multiple canons often exist simultaneously. Graham Holderness explores this curious but rather recurrent condition of 'many canons in simultaneity' (emphasis mine) in form of a personal reminiscence. Holderness claims that although his "first encounter" (Holderness 2014, 74) with the canon of English Literature had happened in the 1960s when he was a student of English, he had been introduced to "...another canon, a more popular one..." (Ibid., 75) before his formal studies in English began. This "another canon" was a Christmas gift to him from his parents and it was "...a set of ten books called the 'Presentation Library'" (Ibid.). Holderness re-monstrates that "the ten books represented a mixture of different canons". (Ibid.)

Holderness's reminiscences clearly exemplify the pluralistic disposition of the category called Canon. Furthermore, it also considers the canon outside the institutional limits of academia. In

asserting the existence of “another canon, a more popular one”, Holderness problematises the binarised distinction between the Canon and the Popular. Instead, his assertion implies that it is perhaps necessary to revise our (fore)understanding of the Canon as a sacrosanct category that is hierarchically superior to its *baser Other* (i.e., Popular) and far removed from the profanities that is usually associated and identified with the latter. Does Popular as a category hold its claim to the canon? If so, what are the founding parameters and classificatory principles on which such an alternative canon can be constructed and maintained? Is such a canon non-striated in nature or is it governed by more intricate considerations of readership? Can such an alternative canon support the possibilities of free reading or does it eventually commodify the literary? Such questions are perhaps not irrelevant to ponder upon.

In his Presidential address of the Modern Humanities Research Association, later titled as “The Popular Canon”, Jean Francois Botrel observes that “Nothing seems further from potentially canonical literature than our subject (Popular Literature)” (Botrel 2002, xxx). Botrel is critical of the canonised categories of “‘popular’, ‘infra’ or ‘para literature’, ‘minor literature’” and finds in such “disqualifying epithets” (Ibid., xxix), the unnecessary intervention of the intelligentsia (Botrel calls them “the guardians and supporters of the canon”). For Botrel, such categories barely refer to the literature of the people. Rather, in absence of a genuine intent to “...provide a basis for the de facto development of a popular canon” (Ibid. xxxi) the “literature of the voice” (Ibid.) is often unacknowledged and hence remains perpetually uncanonised. Botrel’s thought-provoking essay ends with his assertion that “The popular canon seems...to be the canon that is established notwithstanding the apparent submission to legitimate learning tastes...it is not an explicit, decreed canon, but an implicit, *de facto* one, having no official status, but tacitly and stubbornly opposed to the Canon of the Other...” (Ibid. xxxviii)