things, than from their articulation, assuming that words are not characters of things themselves, or that words are things, whose characters are written into the reader, irrespective of their characterization, or that words both precede their character and succeed their papered sign. Nevertheless, Longinus's "borrowed instrument", his majesty, is Hebraic, borrowed from Moses in the *Old Testament*. However, Longinian sublimity is on full display in Theomachy, the "combat of the gods" (125), where critical opinion has traditionally oscillated between classical travesty, in the portrayal of an excess, and the hyperbole of the sublime. Vozar himself wants Milton's "Vergilian gravity" (129) to be accepted on his hyperbolic terms ("humorously pedantic Latinism", etc.), and his "borrowed instrument", at times, borrows too much, from allusions, allusive sources and indebtment to depart from allusion on his terms, for once, writing nothing but allusive invoices. Towards the conclusion of the book, the author retreats into the antitrinitarianism of *De Doctrina* where, through the divine scripture alone, can an aperture, leading towards the Christian God, be found (139), alongside representations of the *timor idololatricus* (divine dread of idols, as opposed to *timor dei*, God-fearing), in the same text, connotative of the Sublime fear directed towards a divine, Christian deity (146).

SHOUVIK NARAYAN HORE
The Sanskrit College and University, Kolkata

SIMPLICITY AND PURITY: POETS, FARMERS AND PARSIS OF GANDHI'S GUJARATI AND READING GANDHI IN TWO TONGUES. By Tridip Suhrud. Studies in Comparative Literature, Jadavpur University. Hyderabad: Orient BlackSwan, 2023, 46 pp.

Brinda S Narayan notes that Tridip Suhrud, with "disarming modesty", had admitted to being addressed in "four pithy words" by the members of the academia; he described himself as a "scholar of modern Gujarat". Narayan introduces Suhrud as a Professor at the National Institute of Design, the Director of the Sabarmati Ashram, a pioneering figure in preserving and digitizing the Ashram's resources, and most importantly a translator of M K Gandhi's Gujarati texts into both Hindi and English; she speaks of his academic and scholarly roles while striking a conversation with him, on one occasion, regarding translation practices.

Suhrud has successfully invited academic scrutiny for his translations of and on Gandhi; his works include the latter's autobiography *The Story of My Experiments with Truth* (2010). Suhrud's edition claims its expertise at annotating and contextualizing Gandhi's text like no other Gandhian scholar; in fact, it is, arguably, Suhrud who has engaged with Gandhi's literary language with fine detailing. This text entitled*, Simplicity and Purity: Poets, Farmers and Parsis of Gandhi's Gujarati and Reading Gandhi in Two Tongues* presents two of the more pertinent essays from Suhrud's scholarship on Gandhi.

While a reader may strive to find Suhrud's collection of essays in the academic market with only some degree of difficulty, Orient BlackSwan in association with the Department of Comparative Literature, Jadavpur University presents a series "for students, scholars, and teachers of comparative literature, arts, and other humanities departments" with an ambition "to explore a range of histories, theoretical reflections as well as innovative approaches and concerns relevant to the field of comparative literature". As the "General Introduction" to the text mentions, this project deals with the "imperatives of comparative literature"; it is both "intercultural and interdisciplinary" of which insights from *bhasha* literature and their translations serve an important role. The introductory section from the text provides a glimpse to the readers on the various cultural paradigms that relate closely to the greater concerns of the project.

The book contains two chapters that present Suhrud's essays. The first chapter must have been a decisive pick by the editors as it deals with a lesser-known Gandhi and his Gujarati consciousness.

Journal of Comparative Literature and Aesthetics Vol. 47, No. 4, Winter 2024 [240-242]

Suhrud's essay, "Simplicity and Purity: Poets, Farmers and Parsis of Gandhi's Gujarati" may be read with critical attention to three arguments. To begin with, Suhrud studies Gandhi's bilingualism in the Gujarati and the English languages. The author almost historicizes Gandhi's experiences and charts the events after Gandhi's return to India in 1915. Suhrud notes Gandhi's troubled relations with the Gujarati Sahitya Parishad, his contentions with K M Munshi (the president of the Parishad in 1917), his admiration for the novelist Govardhanram Tripathi (despite his dislike for the novel as a generic form) and Gandhi's ideas on the class-based nature of the Gujarati language; all of which led to Gandhi's refusal to preside over the Parishad in 1925. In this discussion, Suhrud takes a cue from Sudhir Chandra to comment on Gandhi's intricate engagement with Gujarati: "It was the minimalism of one, who, possessing a wealth of words, allusions, and associations, had chosen to make less more." The author also records Gandhi's involvement with the "first major centers of Indology" including the Gujarat Vidyapith and he elucidates on Gandhi's interest in archival work as much as his disdain for what he read to be an act of class control over the Gujarati language by the trading class; he notes that it was the same trading class who defined the contemporary Gujarati intelligentsia.

Gandhi's attentive engagement with Gujarati, to Suhrud, manifested intriguingly in the former's works, especially in a text like *Hind Swaraj*. Suhrud is meticulous in his efforts to read through Gandhi's Gujarati rendition of the text and its English translation. He remarks that this text was exceptionally significant in studying Gandhi partly due to its claim to being the only text that was translated by Gandhi himself. He cites multiple instances of Gandhi's careful but cultural translation concerning terms like *sudharo* which had been used "in two senses"; both civilizational conduct and the idea of *dharma*. Similarly, he points out that Gujarati words like *adhunik* were translated by Gandhi not in the sense of the strictly 'modern' but with a connotation of transience and defilement. The longest discussion is, perhaps, regarding the term 'swaraj' where, as Suhrud points out, both the ideas of a sovereign political state and the moral conduct of one's being establish a differential relation to one another. He notes how Gandhi variably uses the terms "home rule" and 'the ability to rule over the self" as a floating equivalent to the Gujarati word '*swaraj*'. Thus, Suhrud studies Gandhi's translations from a minutely informed cultural vantage point.

The third argument of the chapter is also the most interesting one. Suhrud records instances that substantiate Gandhi's discomfort with the genre of the novels. He notes that Gandhi had attributed Gujarati's decadence, 'sensuality', and 'effeminacy' to the 'mercenary' nature of the Gujarati trading class and found the genre to be an extension of Western hegemony. He argues in his essay that Gandhi had hoped that Gujarati would take refuge in poetry to invigorate itself. In this context, he records Gandhi to have defined poetry through "faith and prayer"; one that could appeal to the humbler sections of the society.

To him, Gandhi's quest to democratize the Gujarati language would function through the repeated use of quotidian terms that belonged to the order of spirituality or *bhakti*. Gandhi had defined *bhakti* as one that placed "faith in the essential goodness of all human beings" and affirmed the "potential of all human beings to recognize pain and suffering of others". Suhrud notes that this ability to suffer founded the more crucial aspect of Gandhi's *satyagraha*. Interestingly, Suhrud also discusses what Gandhi understood to be poetry in another sense; poetry was not a generically limited term to Gandhi but the condition of a refined essence.

In the second chapter, "Reading Gandhi in Two Tongues", Suhrud reads Gandhi with a greater focus on his autobiography. He traces Gandhi's text and locates the unease with which Gandhi attempted to write it down. To Suhrud, both the novel and the autobiography were colonial genres borne out of a Western temperament. He argues that these foreign literary expressions had created a tension in the indigenous Indian mind which could also be noted in Gandhi. This frames Suhrud's broader claim to Gandhi's choice of the Gujarati title against the title of his autobiography in English. In Gujarati, *Atmakatha* implies an engagement with the soul as opposed to the egotistical self of the Western autobiography; again, the term *Atmakatha* is only featured as the subtitle of the

Gujarati autobiography. On the contrary, the English autobiography "An Autobiography" occupied the titular space. Suhrud elaborates on this argument to note how subjective experiences and objective narration engage with each other to address Gandhi's narrative methodology.

Suhrud, also, touches upon Gandhi's narrative of his South African experience and analyses the translative barriers in reading the terms 'history' and '*itihasa*' together as equivalents. He understands Gandhi's affinity to summarize Ruskin's *Unto This Last* (1860) instead of translating it from a similar vein of thought. In his reading, Suhrud explores an arduous terrain of language, culture, and politics that had not, hitherto, received enough attention. Hence, Suhrud's text is instrumental in understanding both Gandhi as a character and *Gandhivaad* as a performative aspect of an experience.

Suhrud's text is presented through a close reading of Gandhi's writings; in deed he attempts to construct Gandhi's 'self' in and through the act of translation. Translation, in all its impossibilities, is a performance of reiterating both meaning and essence, if not the stringent form of the text. Thus, Suhrud, almost in a Derridean model, deconstructs Gandhi in order to create meaning. Suhrud's translation is an act of affirming what one may call the politics of absences across texts which could only be explored through the semantic implications of culture.

AYAN CHAKRABORTY
Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi

ROMANTIC WOMEN'S WRITING AND SEXUAL TRANGRESSION. By Kathryn Ready and David Sigler (Eds.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2024. 208 pp.

Overcoming gender inequality was a developmental goal and the world is yet to achieve it. Women face various forms of discrimination across the ages and the period of Romantic Age in the history of English literature was no exception. Interpretations of British Romanticism have focused primarily on the five famous male authors: Wordsworth, Coleridge, Shelley, Blake and Keats. Evidently, this interpretive gender-bias has ignored the accomplishments of women authors. One of the central characteristics of Romanticism would have to be the decadent erotic and morbid themes represented in *The Romantic Agony* (1933) by Mario Praz where he comprehensively discusses that imagination which culminates in sexual longing, activities and transgressions. These phallocentric actions are what Anne K. Mellor defines in *Romanticism and Gender* as "masculine Romanticism." (19) Transgression, according to *Oxford's Advanced Learner's Dictionary,* is "an act that goes beyond the limits of what is morally or legally acceptable" (1631). Kathryn Ready and David Sigler's edited book *Romantic Women's Writing and Sexual Transgression* talks about how Romantic women writings sexually transgress and how this transgression is represented in their artistic works.

David Sigler introduces the book with the conceptual meanings of sexual transgression and perversion. He begins by quoting Praz where he insists how the Romantics provided a psychological aspect of the process of refining perversity. He follows it up with a series of quotations and definitions to conceptualize the terms 'sexual transgression' and 'perversity'. He discusses Richard C. Sha's *Perverse Romanticism* claiming that "Perversion enables us to reimagine Romanticism from the ground up" (3). He mentions that the gendered, traditional studies of Romanticism encouraged the perception that women and their writings stayed within the particular sexual and mental limits. If they transgressed, it was only done secretly and not publicly. This is done to such an extent that women writers of that era were not even considered Romantic writers. This is because according to the Romantic scholars, male authors possessed the desire to produce works which sexually trans-

Journal of Comparative Literature and Aesthetics Vol. 47, No. 4, Winter 2024 [242-244]