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ABSTRACT
The history of feminism in India is more often than not traced back to the post independence era. However a closer analysis suggests the presence of the feminist movement in India even during the earlier phase in the form of writings of Tarabai Shinde, Pandita Ramabai, Rukhmabai to name a few. In this context the current work seeks to understand the feminist strand in the writings of Tarabai Shinde, one of the earliest proponents of women’s rights. Known for her much celebrated work “Stri Purush Tulana” (A Comparison Between Women and Men), originally published in Marathi in 1882, she launches an unequivocal attack both on patriarchy and brahmanism. Her writing is a critical take on upper-caste patriarchy, and is hence hailed as the first modern Indian feminist text. Being so, it was received with much criticism and antagonism. The prerogative of this paper is to thus highlight the central tenets of her work and in so doing map out the feminist voice in her writings.
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INTRODUCTION:
Etymologically derived from the French word feminisme, feminism can be best described as a challenge to the oppression and marginalization that women face in diverse contexts. The genesis of the term “oppression” lies in the Latin term for “press down” or “press against”. This root suggests that the oppressed, suffer from some kind of restriction on their freedom. Oppression is a result of human agency, humanly imposed restrictions on people’s freedom. Feminism as a term emerged long after women started questioning their inferior status and thereby sought to transform the status quo.

History suggests that women’s voices and struggles have not been heard nor have they been recorded, this alternatively is indicative of a void in women’s literature. However the fact remains that women have always thought about their lives and have tried to resist their subordination. Women were not seen as political creatures for most part of history, their lives were seen as confined to the home and the hearth. Consequently not much is known about women’s political aspirations as their voices in general were not considered worthy of record. The little

---

1 Feminism is defined as the belief that women should be allowed the same rights, power, and opportunities as men and be treated in the same way, or the set of activities intended to achieve this state.
2 Hooks, Bell. Feminism is for Everybody: Passionate Politics. Routledge, 2014
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that is recorded finds the most explicit manifestation in the testimonies of early “feminists” like Tarabai Shinde, Pandita Ramabai and Rakmabai who were articulate in their critique of Brahmanical superiority. While the entry of women at the centre of debate and deliberation in most parts of the country like Bengal happened late, such a process was relatively faster in the case of Maharashtra.

Recent years have seen an explosion of interest not just in women’s history as such but also in texts written by and for women. India has been no exception to this trend, and several anthologies or reprints of Indian women’s writings have already appeared. Dr Rosalind O’Hanlon’s brief but important book is a major contribution to this developing genre. It effectively combines a translation of a polemical tract titled “Stree Purush Tulna” first published in 1882, by an otherwise obscure Marathi writer, Tarabai Shinde, with a long introductory essay, placing the author in the context of her times. My prerogative in writing this paper is to navigate through the plight and psyche of women in the 19th century. The larger conceptual framework employed in this paper is the feminist discourse within the ambit of which it attempts to study Tarabai Shinde’s “Stree Purush Tulna”. Rosalind O’Hanlon’s translation of the text titled “A Comparison Between Men and Women” has facilitated for me a better understanding of the text. Therefore in my attempt to capture the pertinent themes raised by Tarabai, my vantage point shall be Hanlon’s translation of this early feminist writing.

Stree Purush Tulna is a swinging attack on male hypocrisy and deceit, prompted by the celebrated Vijayakshmi case, in which a young Brahmin widow was sentenced to death (later commuted to transportation) for the murder of her illegitimate child. Tarabai radically questions the nineteenth century patriarchal stereotypes about women being called immoral and vehemently ridiculed all the men who used the Shastras to justify their superiority. She vociferously critiqued the one-sided, partisan code of conduct of ‘pativrata’ arguing that if he is to really be like a God to his wife, then shouldn’t he behave like one?”. She was critical of the Dharmashastras that held women “as the axe that cuts down trees of virtue’ by listing the crimes committed by men running across the gamut of taking bribes to murder. It is this that makes her question of how many women occupied prisons. The answer to her as it is to all of us is pretty nuanced.

Before I graduate to centrally flag the key debates that have been raised in the literature it is quintessential to throw some light on the lady who in many ways can be viewed as perhaps one of the early feminist writers. Conversely it is also imperative to discuss the context of her writing in order to grasp a well conceptualized understanding of the text. As Gadadhar Govind Pathak remembers Tarabai Shinde was a short and dumpy woman who always carried a stick in her hand. She had earned the reputation of being an independent hardy and somewhat pugnacious woman whose shortage of “proper feminine traits” was due to too much of reading. Hailing from a prosperous Maratha Family, Tarabai herself was a victim of “marathmola”. She acknowledges that just like other Maratha women she too was “kept locked up and confined”. However married within the Gharjavai system, she enjoyed relatively larger freedoms at her natal home than what her contemporaries like Rashsundari Devi writing in Bengal could have even imagined.

4 Tarabai Shinde is considered to be flagbearer of Indian feminism. She is known for her published work, Stripurush Tulana (“A Comparison Between Women and Men”), originally published in Marathi in 1882 through which she protests patriarchy and caste.

5 Pandita Ramabai Sarasvati, is a crusader for the emancipation of women, and their education. Due to her immense knowledge, she became the first woman to be accorded the titles of Pandita as a Sanskrit scholar and Sarasvati.


7 It is a form of seclusion that was meant for women
Hanlon argues that it is such domestic conditions that enabled her to push her way into the masculine world of reading writing and publishing. She further goes on to argue that at the most fundamental level the opposition to a woman’s writing comes from the senior women of the household. Therefore it shall be no false claim to argue that the peculiarity of our patriarchal structure is that the oppressed is more often than not also the oppressor. In contemporary times this is resonated by the human trafficking nexus where women have come to become central agents in the flesh trade. Be it the mere imagery of pimps in the brothels or the execution of rackets kidnapping and selling girls for some thousand rupees, these are stark realities that makes a shiver run down our spines.

Comprised of 52 printed Marathi pages the text brings to light an angry Tarabai who is flabbergasted at the way women are held guilty of everything that happens and everything that does not happen. Writing amidst a hostile and chauvinistic male readership she launches into a bitter denunciation of the men who were culpable. She rightly postulates that it were men who in their attempt to ape the alien rulers went about destroying the Indian manufacturers; it were the priests who had made all sorts of absurd religious rules for women including restrictions on widow remarriage and the notion of pativrata; yet again it were men in the form of religious writers, reformers, politicians, journalists and the like who in trying to reinforce this dogmatic values demanded that women ought to continue to confirm to these “natural roles”. A woman would be an ideal homemaker according to these patriarchal norms, Tarabai suggests if on being kicked by her husband she would say “Don’t do that my lord; you might hurt your foot”.

Therefore in a society that was itself rapidly changing and men were increasingly laying their hands on larger and wider freedoms, they were constantly at task in monopolizing power for themselves so as to subjugate the very psyche of the other sex. Therefore as Tarabai most aptly remarks in the introduction to her text, her central task is to “defend the honour of all my sister countrywomen” As Hanlon interestingly points out that in exploring the wider milieu in which Tarabai wrote, three trends become easily visible ie. Brahmanical hegemonic values and religious texts were increasingly getting diffused across the entire Hindu society: caste hierarchies were becoming rigid and impermeable and a growing dichotomy between what Partha Chatterjie calls the Inner v/s Outer Domain was being sketched. The peculiarity of the Indian National Movement lies in that it drew a sharp distinction between the two domains. While the former translated into the masculine material domain of economy and statecraft where the superiority of the west was acknowledged and therefore it was considered essential to ape the British in this realm. However at the opposite end of the spectrum the nationalists believed that greater is the emulation in the outer domain, greater shall be the need to keep the sacrosanct inner domain ie. the sphere of culture was beyond the purview of the colonial state. This was seen as a realm that was superior to the western values and hence should be regarded as the inviolate site of Hindu spiritual values. Whatever change was required could be brought about internally. Family, marriage and questions of women were seen as constituents of this inner superior domain.

The corollary to this as pointed out by Lata Mani is that these long term changes subordinated women more firmly to caste and family authority and consigned them to a domain of “private life” supposedly outside politics. However whenever the need for reforming this inner domain was articulated be it by the colonizers, the social reformers or the nationalist

---

leadership it was at the cost of excluding the voices and views of women themselves. They were no longer seen as a source of expertise on even those issues that hurt them so closely and deeply. Sati for instance was a subject on which women in the pre-colonial era openly articulated their thoughts and idea. However gradually with he coming in of the colonial set up, the hierarchies of caste, class and sex further freezed. The Indian public opinion came to be recognized as a masculine opinion that in turn pushed women to the periphery.

It is in context of this that Tarabai’s take on politics can be most aptly understood. Men having gained new set of power and privileges under the colonial rule, their insatiable desire for power pushed them towards self aggrandizement. On the parallel level they tried pushing women out of these benefits and lock them into an ossified religious culture for which men now had no regard. She says that though reformers pretended of changing the decadent elements of the society who does actually do anything? Therefore she argued for active state intervention, to make it easy for women to lead an independent life of worth and dignity. She is thus found caught up in a political culture that saw the colonial state as a potential instrument of social change.

One of the most pressing problems that women across the length and breadth of the country were left to confront was the “problem” of “widow remarriage”. At the onset the question that perturbs my rationality the most is why at all is remarriage for a widow a problem? The genesis of this problem lies in the Brahmanical notion of chastity and wifely devotion that adhered to an imagery of an ideal pativrata woman who was an auspicious ornament to her family and an assurance of beatitude to her husband. Remarriage thus would amount to societal inferiority and embarrassment.

Tarabai makes the point that it is not merely the social difficulties’ of widows themselves that concerned her, rather the way in which the dread of widowhood shaped the behavior of all married women. She wonders that when God’s own wish was to join two people to make a pair what right does man has to keep a woman alone on the death of her husband. Why is a woman to bear the brunt of her husband’s death? If this is the parameter for devotion then why does it not apply for men? Why is it so that they have the right to happily get married within ten days of his wife’s death while women have to spend the rest of their lives in solitude? It is such a skewed masculine psyche that makes patriarchy so rampant in our society.

From being a central tenet of Brahmanism, gradually the opposition to widow remarriage spread to other communities as well. These included Guajarati’s, Bhatia’s, Bhosle, Mane and others. “Enforced Widowhood”, though a long standing practice of Brahmanism is of recent origin in these middling communities. Thus while the grip of restrictions on widow remarriage continued to get tighter and liberal reformers were stuck at the periphery, widows like Vijayalakshmi continued being marginalized.

However the chauvinistic overtones are most apparent herein. While the notion of chastity forbid them from getting into a second marriage, the same notion could be adjusted to view women as being sexually available by the same self appointed watchdogs of the society. A path breaking legislation in this regard came in 1856 with the passing of the Widow Remarriage Act after a long struggle waged by many but led stringently by Ishwarchandra Vidyasagar.10 Child marriage is yet another form of discrimination that is perpetuated against women. Its most ruthless form comes when a young girl is made to marry a man almost double her age or more. Malabari, in his attack on child marriage declared that the Hindu shastras did not support

10 The Hindu Widows’ Remarriage Act of 1856, is one of the most pioneering legislations in the history of India. Spearheaded by Pandit Ishwar Chandra Vidyasagar, it aimed at providing legal safeguards against loss of property to those Hindu widows who desired remarriage.
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child marriage and perpetual widowhood. Age seems to be no barrier for a man.\textsuperscript{11} If he is wealthy he is in a doubly advantaged situation. Also some people give away their daughters as second wives. “But there is no weapon that pierces a woman as painfully as the thorn of being given as a second wife.” Yet again this can only happen with men. The very thought of women taking a second husband would raise the eyebrows of our societal policemen. What a hypocritical facade is this?

The vocabulary of advanced reformist circle in Bengal soon coined a new term; the “bhadramahila” that was a juxtaposition of the Brahmanical avatar of pativrata and the Victorian imagery of an educated and enlightened companion to men in their own separate sphere of the home. Such a woman could be an asset in running the new and more expensive types of households that many middle class men were seeking to establish for themselves. Gradually the conceptualization of this bhadramahila spread to other parts of the country.

Citing examples from mythology Tarabai has argued that women from time immemorial have been depicted as epitomes of selfless devotion just as Mandodari who for her husband Ravana’s happiness went to persuade Sita to be his wife; of immeasurable self control as seen in the historical figure of Gandari; of sacrifice found in the story of Tara, wife of Vali and the countless stories of sages. These depictions suggest that the husband is happy because his wife carried out her duties of seeing to his pleasures and the wife is happy to confirm to what is expected out of her. Such a notion of pativrata, Tarabai rightly has argued has greatly led to the deplorable condition of women. It is ironical that despite being such almighty heroes, they have been unable to pull poor widows out of this pit of shame. She questions “why can’t you break caste rules, put the Kumkum back on their foreheads and let them enjoy the happiness of marriage again?”

Like “caste”, the practice of purdah has been a striking feature of “traditional India”. However its pervasiveness became rampant with the ushering of the 19th century. It was in the same period that it came to acquire a more Hindu rather than a Muslim form. As H.Papanek argues that for Hindus purdah was not just an alien measure that was adopted at the time of Muslim invasions: for Hindus on the contrary it has been an elaborate means of signaling female modesty and obedience. This was reflected in the dressing of Maratha women of Maharashtra, who used the purdah to veil their face. In Tarabai’s own district of Berar, it was reported that Marathas observe the purdah system. The argument put forth in the defense of purdah was that the modesty and pativrata traits are the most priced ornaments for women, purdah was an instrument for its protection. In conformity to our commonsense for anyone with the bare minimum of rationality this argument would not be hard to refute. How can purdah ensure austerity? What about women who do not wear purdah? Are they immoral?

Tarabai extends the notion of pativrata which is found running through much of the newly celebrated Marathi print culture. This in the long run had significant repercussions on the manner in which women were talked about and represented in the 19th century society. Tarabai’s text is illuminating in this context for it brings to light a woman’s perspective on the new vernacular print genres and her consequent disenchantment with it. These writings drew heavily from a wide myriad of sources like the Arabian Nights for its adventurous quotient; the mildly pornographic tradition of Sanskrit stories; the tales of valor and courage from contemporary Victorian literature. The result thus was a highly ambiguous blend of fantasy, voyeurism and stern injunctions about the consequences of womanly weakness. Tarabai describes some of these stories and tales in detail. These include Muktamala published in 1861, Manjughosha in 1868, the play Manorama published in 1871 and Streecharitra from 1850

\textsuperscript{11} Behramji Merwanji Malabari is considered as a vociferous social reformed who ardently worked for the protection of the rights of women and for his activities against child marriage.
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O’Hanlon expands on Tarabai’s own comments on the representation of women in contemporary Marathi novels and seeks to provide insight into the growth of print culture in western India and its impact on the politics of gender. Tarabai demonstrates how the popular literature looked at women with disdain. They were represented as evil creatures. It is this that makes Tarabai to comment that “even men will feel sorrow on listening such description if women, it is any wonder that women will loathe them?” Respectable women, she further argues will throw up these books and throw them up into the fire. Their commercial success however could be attributed to the voracious consumers who had literacy, leisure and money to read. With its elaborate accounts of chastity, suffering and deference this new literature was a very attractive bend of racy details, moral earnestness and social conservatism. For Tarabai such a literature was propelled towards monopolization of power by men who employed it in a particularly damaging way against women.

Towards the end of her text, she makes puts forth certain crucial rejoinders. It becomes the prerogative of my paper herein to briefly enumerate them.

(i) If women are the storehouse of evil as postulated by the patriarchal conventions, then considering that men are stronger than her, can there be a single monstrous deed that men have not committed?

(ii) Even if we accept that women’s minds are full of whims, it is also true that these whims are restricted to their family lives. As far as men are concerned their whims are too elaborate and pervasive to be even seen through. Tarabai says that their minds are constantly churning towards cunning schemes.

(iii) If women are the very abode of debauchery, men are a thousand times more than them.

(iv) With regards to deceit, she believes there is absolutely no comparison to men. They can change themselves into fakirs, sadhus, brahmacharis, nanaks, jogis and the like to deceive the world.

(v) She points out towards the irony that says that despite being the fulcrum in every man’s life, women are treated labelled as being axes, vessels of all cunning, market places of wickedness, wreckers to the path to heaven.

Hanlon’s introductory essay provides an informed and thoughtful introduction not just to the tract itself but to current thinking about gender, colonial hegemony and power relations in modern India. O’Hanlon argues cogently for the nineteenth century as a period of “traditionalization”, rather than “modernization”, especially with respect to the status of women.

Purdh, she shows, was becoming increasingly widespread in Maharashtra, depriving women like Tarabai of the degree of social power and personal freedom once enjoyed by their grandmothers. She identifies a consensus shared between colonial and nationalist men about the idealized and emblematic status of women and the desirability of their exclusion from the arenas of public life and the domain of state authority. Tarabai’s own description of women contrasting strongly with the popular impoverished stereotypes of contemporary masculine discourse is the most striking aspect of her text. Her concern is not so much with abstract or ‘modern’ principles of equality. For her what seemed to have mattered, was not merely a religious milieu that upheld the ethos of equality for women but much more concrete changes in the domestic and social circumstances of women.

Having read the text one is forced to question is marriage not about a compassionate bond based on mutual respect and equality? Where does then these hierarchies stem from? Tarabai rightly has questioned if the husband is like a God should he not behave like one? And if wives are to worship them shouldn’t husbands have a tender love for them in return? However the entire notion of worshipping the man as your husband is hugely problematic.

Tarabai, for all her idiosyncrasies, thus becomes less a lone voice and more a representative figure. O’Hanlon’s eloquent source and her own regional expertise greatly help to enrich
our understanding of women and gender relations not merely in Maharashtra but across India as a whole. O’Hanlon expands on Tarabai’s own comments on the representation of women in contemporary Marathi novels and plays to provide insight into the growth of print culture in western India in the late nineteenth century and its impact on the politics of gender.

O’Hanlon’s in the last section of her introduction states that despite her young age, power of rhetoric and invective, Tarabai never wrote again. One of the reasons for this was the contempt that her book was subjected to. Moreover reading and writing on part of women it was argued leads to befalling of widowhood. This alternatively suggests that the acts of reading, writing and publishing had come to become a luxury for women in the 19th century colonial context. The enslavement was not restricted to the realm of politics alone but also to the dogmatic societal believes as well. The novelty of Tarabai’s therefore text lies not only in its ability to tell us about women and their deplorable plight but in that it sketches out explicitly the larger socio-political contours of the country.

From the vantage point of her ideology and on account of her all encompassing definition of emancipation that transcended the boundaries of politics to include within its ambit the social, it shall be no exaggeration to argue that within her restricted domain of operation, Tarabai most assuredly was a “beyond” thinker. She vociferously questions the artificial segregation of the inner from the outer. In her confrontationist approach she gives a blow to the authority of those who define what is inner and what is outer.

This becomes further nuanced when we compare her to a “nationalist leader” like Tilak. His idea of emancipation was limited to the realm of politics. History projects him as a nationalist leader, but for those lying on the disadvantaged side of the gender divide he can best be seen as a conservatist. His opposition to Girls High School, English education for women, the believe that teaching Hindu women to read and write would ruin his traditional values thereby making them immoral, his idea of curriculum for girls being limited to needle work, home science and Marathi speak for his anti progressive stand on the questions of women. Further his opposition to the Age of Consent Bill, to Rakhambai and his theory of differing psychology between English and Hindu girls on account of differing age of menstruation further elaborate the claim.

Meera Kosambi analyzes the debates over the Age of Consent Act of 1891 and argues that the significance of this controversy was that it introduced a new perspective on women, as "individuals entitled to the normal span of childhood protected against physical coercion" Tilak’s idea of denying equality and access to any meaningful education to women was shared by others like Syed Ahmad Khan and Theodore Morrison who argued that the informal literacy received by girls at home was suffice. It is such an anti-reformist propaganda that was the order of the day in 19th century India. In congruence to this it is no surprise that thinkers like Tilak were vehement opposers of educated and independent women like Rakmabai, Ramabai and Tarabai who refused to accept things as they were.

Yet another influential figure during the era was Pandita Ramabai who has been quite often been referred to in this paper. In the penultimate section, I wish to briefly draw parallels between the two ladies of unbound caliber and persona. Ramabai, an independent woman capable of understanding the scriptures and managing to carve out a niche for herself was an anathema for people like Tilak. She is hailed as a protestant who rejected a whole set of oppressive practices which she saw as integral to Hinduism and had thus rejected the dominant class of her time. Pandita Ramabai Saraswati’s status as a solitary women leader of the movement for women’s emancipation in nineteenth century Maharashtra and her

contribution to that cause were eclipsed by the storm over her conversion to Christianity and her consequent neglect by contemporary mainstream Hindu society.

In comparing the two women we see that Tarabai unlike Ramabai addresses her book to women of all classes in India and beyond India. As against this, Pandita Ramabai was addressing her books either to foreign audiences or only to high caste Brahman women. Ram Bapat has argued that Pandita Ramabai must be seen as a religious revolutionary but not as a social revolutionary and certainly not as a feminist.

Having read through the key themes raised by Tarabai Shinde in her book and its eloquent articulation found in Rosalind O’Hanlon’s translation and putting it in context of Maharashtrian literature, it appears that unlike other radical movements in Maharashtra which refused to treat tradition as a deadweight opposed to modernity and emancipation, the feminist movement in the state ignored its own tradition of succession of women saints and other women writers who had inverted, and occasionally even subverted, the classical ideals of womanhood embodied in the hegemonic texts.

In the last section I attempt at capturing the story as it unfolds today. In the post 1980’s world of feminism, a lot of discussion has centered on the question of is there a fundamental form of oppression? Who can speak for him? The anti sati campaign following Roop Kanwars death eroded the belief of all women being sisters. This opening up of differences along lines of caste, class, religion and region has permitted us to place women in a matrix of oppression and privilege where no one is a permanent occupant of either of the two positions. Yet it needs to be reiterated that despite a longstanding and vigorous women’s movement with many achievements patriarchy continues to be deeply entrenched in our society that otherwise harps on egalitarian ethos.

These find manifestation in the growing rate of female infanticide, dowry killings, rapes, sexual harassment at work place, khap panchayat killings, human trafficking, illegal trade in flesh amongst a host of other evils perpetrated against the womenfolk. These in the long run shape the socio-political institutions and therefore account for differing opportunities that are made available to men and women.

In retrospect it shall be no exaggeration to argue that the much celebrated notion of development will remain in namesake unless and until gender sensitivity and equality digs its roots in our society. Attitudinal change has no alternatives to this. Tarabai Shinde’s work most assuredly is a landmark in highlighting how patriarchy has been at task from time immemorial to subjugate the very psyche of women thus putting them through a process of internalization where women come to accept the status quo without resistance. As Tarabai has most aptly demonstrated, such a trend had reached its pinnacle in the 19th century colonial era.
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