

NARMAD'S *DĀNDIYO*: COMMUNITY AND CANON FORMATIONS

- Rakesh Desai

The periodicals which started during *Sudhārā Yug* (the age of reforms) in the nineteenth century Gujarat include, among others, *Buddhiprakāsh* (1854), edited by the poet Dalpatrām from 1855 onwards; *Satyaprakāsh* (1855), edited by the reformer Karsandās Mulji; *Gujarāt Shālā Patra* (1862), edited by the founder editor Mahipatrām Nilkanth, and later by the literary critic Navalrām from 1870 onwards; *Dāndiyo* (1864), edited by the poet and reformer Narmad and others; and *Gujarāti* (1880), edited by Ichhārām Suryarām Desāi. Narmad¹ (1833-1886) had modeled *Dāndiyo* (1864-69) on Joseph Addison's *The Spectator*, but the former turned out to be more radical than the latter in its range of subject matter. The periodicals published during *Sudhārā Yug* were characterized in general by a radical critique of contemporary society and culture. This paper engages in the historical context of the publication of *Dāndiyo*, its wide range of sociopolitical, literary, and cultural topics; its contribution to the formation of the community of scholars and litterateurs and literary canon, and its status in the context of a twentieth-century modern little magazine.

Narmad describes the process of starting *Dāndiyo*. When in Mumbai "the reformer friends were flying like the locusts of Marwar in the big field of share market," not attending the scholarly meetings, "lost in selfish motive, ready to harm even the near and dear ones," Narmad felt pity for them and found himself isolated (Shukla 3). He found a kindred soul, not interested in share market, Girdhārīlāl Dayāldās, and proposed "to arrange a meeting of three-odd friends once a week, and discuss varied matters related to education and reforms in the country over tea, coffee, bidi, hukkah, pan-beetle nuts," leading to "a literary club," "a table talk" (Shukla 3). Girdhārīlāl suggested "to publish something written, otherwise the idea would not work longer" (Shukla 3). This club was named as "*Sākshar mandal*," consisting of "Nagindās Tulsidās and Thākordās Ātmārām (the college students), Keshavrām Dhirajrām (a share broker) and Shridhar Nārāyan (a Gujarati teacher)," along with Narmad (Shukla 4). Then Narmad describes its process of naming:

¹ Narmadāshankar Lālshankar Dave (1833-1886), popularly known as Narmad, was a great social reformer and litterateur of the nineteenth-century renaissance Gujarat, and a pioneer in Gujarāti modern prose, modern poetry, lexicography, autobiography, literary criticism, historiography, and investigative journalism.

We got together and decided to meet every week, discuss and decide the write-ups we bring, and publish them as a periodical fortnightly. It would be fortnightly only so that we could get time to write substantial and also economize on it. People were not interested in reading prose, and they would not buy our paper without their flattery. Even if we had to spend our own money, we would publish it like *The Spectator*. When all in turn suggested the name for the paper, Nagindās suggested the name “Dāndiyo.” I said it was proper, because it was better to keep an inferior name and commit better deeds than keeping a superior name and commit inferior kind of deeds, and “Dāndiyo” also had two or three meanings, so I found it proper.²

(Shukla 4)

Dāndiyo was modeled on Joseph Addison’s eighteenth-century English periodical *The Spectator*, but it proved to be more radical than *The Spectator*. As Dr. Ratan Marshal informs:

Dāndiyo was published minimally in three series: 1. The first series includes thirty two issues from 1st September, 1864, to 15 December, 1865 2. The second series includes twenty seven issues from 15 March, 1866, to 15 April, 1867. 3. The third series includes fifty eight issues from 1st August, 1867 to 15 December, 1869.

(Marshal 184)

The issue of the first series had eight pages, and that of the second and the third series had twelve pages each. The name of *Dāndiyo* takes its metaphor from the drum beater at night in that age to alert people to thieves. The first issue of *Dāndiyo* (1st September, 1864) refers to its various meanings, and thus functions:

O people I am beating here the drum with a drumstick (*dāndi*): O poor people keep alert. ...I know the secrets and conspiracies of the rogue (*dāndiyo*), (though I have not committed roguery), so I will expose the matters of the rogues, and so they will call me a rogue, so I call myself a rogue beforehand. Keep alert. . . . O people, I have a cane (*dāndiyo*) to beat the native people for their wrong conduct, superstitions and ignorance. So I have the power to cane them. So take me for a cane (*dāndiyo*) only.

(8; 1st issue, 1st September, 1864)

² All the translations of the Gujarati quotations into English in this paper are mine.

Thus, “*Dāndiyo*” refers to the drum beater, alerting people to evils; one who is roguish enough to know other rogues, and a cane for punishing the evil. After its merger with *The Sunday Review*, *Dāndiyo* was also mentioned as “The Exposer” (Marshal 185).

Narmad uses the words “*chopāniyun*” (periodical) and also “*chhāpun*” (newspaper) for *Dāndiyo* (Shukla 5). This does not seem to be an informal, liberal semantic blend of both the words in view of his later remark about *Dāndiyo*: “there is only one periodical today, working both as a periodical and a news paper” (68; 8th issue, 15 December, 1864). It presents both investigative journalism, exposing social and political evils; and discussion of literary, cultural issues. Needless to say, the proposed reclamation of the sea bay between Kolaba and Valkeshwar in Mumbai floated the shares worth Rs. 10000/- each, with speculation that it would reach the value of half a lakh rupees each, tempting numberless people of Bombay to get rich overnight. *Dāndiyo* alerted them to the risks involved, leading one to heavy debts and liquidation, and it also proved true. References to the precarious speculative trading of shares could be traced maximally in the first series of *Dāndiyo*, from its 1st issue to the 26th issue, the 28th issue to the 30th issue; in its second series, from the 1st issue to the 8th issue, and the 10th issue; and the 2nd issue of its third series.

In addition to this, *Dāndiyo* covered many sociopolitical and literary, cultural topics. It recapitulates the broad areas dealt with so far in its journey of one and a quarter years, mentioning speculative trading, the government matters, the worldly matters (not much dealt with), the scriptural matters (not much dealt with), education, princely states, railway, “my community fellows” (255-56; 32nd issue, 15 December, 1865).

Dāndiyo, realizing its name, did offer a radical critique of contemporary society. Along with its critique of the speculative trading, ranging widely in its issues, it either exposes, advocates or discusses the lack of a proper burial place at the sea coast at Sonapor, not getting any donation from the rich merchants of Mumbai (18-19; 2nd issue, 15 September, 1864); the issue of widow remarriage through a letter from a widow to a widower merchant (26-27; 3rd issue, 1st October, 1864), the exorbitant house rents in Mumbai (64-65; 8th issue, 15 December, 1864); economic growth through better agricultural productivity (73; 9th issue, 1st January, 1865); the ostentatious and useless expenditure incurred by Gujarātis in a wedding ceremony, unlike the Parsee and the British (92; 11th issue, 1st February, 1865); the inefficiency of the Bombay police in preventing the crime of murder (192; 24th issue, 15 August, 1865); the legal court interpreters, weak at languages (197-98; 24th issue, 15 August, 1865); the disservice to the country by the superstitious and orthodox Brahmins (199-200; 25 issue, 1st September, 1865); the dirty politics of Nāgars in Kāthhiawād (251-53; 31st issue, 1st December, 1865); the corrupt clerks in the court and customs department of the government (203-204; 25th issue, 1st September, 1865); the dull and unintelligent teachers, deputy inspectors and inspectors in the Department of Education (224-225; 28th issue, 15 October, 1865); nepotism and

corruption in the examination of law and its serious social consequences (297-99; 5th issue, 15 May, 1866); women's sexual exploitation in the religious institutions (440-41; 9th issue, 1st December, 1867) and (448-49; 10th issue, 15 December 1867); the political condition of the princely states (540-42; 19th issue, 1st May, 1868), (564-65; 21st issue, 1st June, 1868), (575-76; 23rd issue, 1st June, 1868).

Despite the variety of subject matter treated by *Dāndiyo*, a few matters are notable for their consistent appearance—the moral critiques of the reformers like Durgārām Mehtā and Mahipatrām Nilkanth. Mahipatrām Nilkanth was sent to England for an exposure to training colleges in 1860, and consequently he had to suffer excommunication from his caste for many years. Durgārām Mehtā invited Mahipatrām Nilkanth and offered him a meal, and as the latter was excommunicated by his caste in view of the foreign travel, this was a bold gesture for Durgārām Mehtā. But Narmad would like Durgārām Mehtā to offer the latter meals frequently to prove Mehtā's steadfastness as a reformer, and doubted his compromises as Durgārām Mehtā's daughter had come of age, and the prospective groom and his family feared the authority of the caste (134; 16th issue, 15 April, 1865). In the next issue, Narmad taunts Mehtā for finally giving in to orthodoxy, and expiating by shaving off his moustache, and taking cow dung and urine, after keeping up the vow for one and a half years (140; 17th issue, 1st May, 1865). After one year Narmad ironically refers to Mehtā's futile complaint for libel against Shāstri Dinmanishankar, Shāstri Maninand and Pandyā Gangānand for their wrong *shāstrārtha* (an interpretation of the scriptures) regarding the ritual of expiation (292; 4th issue, 1st May, 1866), which would pave eventually, in the case of Mehtā's victory, as Narmad doubted, Mahipatrām's entry into the caste again.

Similarly, references to Mahipatrām Nilkanth describe his compromises with the pressures from the caste. Mahipatrām travelled to England in March, 1860, and came back to Mumbai in April 1861, facing excommunication by the Brahmins. Narmad remarks that since Mahipatrām wanted the caste sanction for the sacred thread ceremony of his son, he finally expiated by giving Rs. 1500 to the Brahmins, in addition to Rs. 200, shaving off his moustache and taking the cow dung and urine (391-93; 5th issue, 1st October, 1867). In the next issues again Narmad criticizes him for his compromise with the orthodoxy of the caste (399-401; 6th issue, 15 October, 1867), (419; 8th issue, 15 November, 1867).

In addition to these topics, *Dāndiyo* also offers writings on literary, abstract and scholarly topics like happiness (23-26; 3rd issue, 1st October, 1864), a literary dramatized presentation of the celebration of the full moonlit night (31-38; 4th issue, 14-15 September, 1864), and history, contextualizing the speculative share trading in Mumbai (127-28; 16th issue, 15 April, 1865).

Dāndiyo as a periodical defines and sustains a community of scholars and thinkers, a discourse of scholarship and cultural sensitivity. Though this kind of literary and progressive formations was a prominent feature of the nineteenth-century renaissance

period in India, it must have required a great deal of efforts to initiate and sustain this bond of knowledge in a superstitious, orthodox, politically subjugated society. The concerns in *Dāndiyo* with varied fields of culture and knowledge creates an interactive space of intellectual debates and identitarian reflections.

Sākshar mandal, the literary club, which contributed to, and published, *Dāndiyo*, itself exemplified this enlightened community. Further, varied intellectual topics and discussions in *Dāndiyo* create this ambience of a scholarly community: a warning given to the budding scholars against the way pride, egotism and selfishness corrupt scholarship (48-49; 6th issue, 15 November, 1864); a satire aimed at the pretentious scholars (284-85; 3rd issue, 15 April, 1866). Certain issues comment on the cultural and educational institutions. It criticizes the inadequate scholarship and productivity of publications of Gujarat Vernacular Society despite having funds, and points out that the people associated with it lack university education and international exposure, and on the other hand, Dakshanā Prize Committee at Pune is more productive in its publications with originality (129-30; 16th issue, 15th April, 1865). In the same issue, it criticizes the selection of the members of the committee of Gujarāti Sabhā in Ahmedabad, which selected rich persons, neglecting the poor scholars, and that too from Ahmedabad only; it also gives a small list of genuine scholars (130-31; 16th issue, 15 April, 1865). Further, various issues of *Dāndiyo* refer to the university of Bombay, evaluating its function and productivity, six years after its establishment. What *Dāndiyo* criticizes is the tendency of the rich Gujarati merchants, as revealed by the governor at the convocation, of not sending their children for higher education lest they should sit with the poor students (132-33; 16th issue, 15 April, 1865). After six months, a comment appears regarding the appointment of Sir A. Grant as the vice chancellor of the University of Bombay. It fears that government post of Sir A. Grant would overshadow the university, giving a very revealing remark—"Over there [England] a university directs the education department, here the education department directs a university" (230; 28th issue, 15 October, 1865). After almost two years, *Dāndiyo* discusses the Report of Department of Education for the year 1866-67, and points out the deteriorating standards of the university examination, and blames the British head masters, unlike Sir Grant, who blamed the native teachers (367-68; 3rd issue, 1 September, 1867). After four months, its issue publishes the details of the convocation address given by the governor at the convocation ceremony of the University of Bombay. The governor feels satisfied with the rigorous standards of the matriculation examination, and also takes pride of the fact that unlike other universities, the University of Bombay conducts examination at Mumbai only, and the candidates have to face viva voce also in addition to the written examination (463-65; 12th issue, 1st January, 1868).

Another important recurring topic appears to be Taylor's grammar. *Dāndiyo* comments that the grammar of Gujarati, written by Reverend Taylor, a Christian priest, is

getting undue favour from the Department of Education, and that shows the soft corner of the British rulers for the Christian priests; and Taylor hardly knows adequate Gujarati to write its grammar. It also alleges that the contributions by Jervis and Hope to Gujarati language and literature were actually written by the native scholars (176-79; 22nd issue, 15 July, 1865). Further, it exposes the misuse of funds meant for the library at Nadiad spent for a member's own house (459-60; 12th issue, 1st January, 1868). After two months, *Dāndiyo* regrets the lack of an archival collection of Gujarati books in Gujarat, and suggests to make an archive for the Gujarati books out of the funds collected by Gujarāti Sabhā in Mumbai under the directions of Mr. Forbes (491-93; 15th issue, 1st March, 1868). Further, it pays tribute to the English scholar Alexander Forbes at his demise, praises him as a rare English scholar in India, and as a founder of Gujarāt Vernacular Society, and the Gujarāti Society (for the growth of Gujarati books), and a contributor of his articles to *Mumbai Quarterly Review*, and *Rāsmālā* in English (209-210; 26th issue, 15 September, 1865).

Dāndiyo also interacts with its contemporary periodicals, and criticizes them too. It regrets the linguistic incompetence of the editor of *Buddhivardhak*, and finds him unable to compete even with “the fifth or sixth-standard students of a Gujarati school” in the matter of linguistic competence (293; 4th issue, 1st May, 1866). Its criticism of *Buddhiprakāsh* is frequent—*Buddhiprakāsh* favours reforms in a sober way, it leaves many things to destiny, finding man incapable to do anything for himself (499-500; 15th issue, 1st March, 1868), *Buddhiprakāsh* wrongly writes that the presence of Sanskrit words makes the Gujarati language complete, because it, on the contrary, suggests its limitation (508-509; 16th issue, 15th March 1868). *Buddhiprakāsh* wrongly praises Taylor's Gujarati grammar (553-55; 20th issue, 15th May, 1868). It also disagrees with the report regarding Mahipatrām in *The Times of India* of 23 September, 1867. The latter incorrectly describes him as a graduate of the University of Bombay, and that Vadnāgarā Brahmins are the best, and a few officers in Surat had helped Mahipatrām (405; 6th issue, 15th October, 1867).

With its literary responses to the contemporary issues, and its deliberations on literary issues, *Dāndiyo* helped the process of the formation of literary canons. The foremost contribution of *Dāndiyo* was to make Narmad, the father of modern Gujarati prose, write again prose, and that too of a different kind. Ramesh M. Shukla informs:

The greatest gain from *Dāndiyo* was that Narmad started writing prose again because of it. He had stopped writing prose from 1860. He began writing prose for the sake of *Dāndiyo* on 1-9-1864. His essays, which revealed in the decade of 1851-1860 the manly brilliance of comprehensive, all encompassing reformative zeal, now reinvented themselves with the prominence of humour and irony. (Shukla 12)

Though the authorship of the contributors to *Dāndiyo* were kept secret, as the writings carried for authors' names the letters of Gujarati alphabet only, but the scholars like Vijayrāi Vaidya and Ramesh Shukla could find out their authorship with the help of various kinds of evidences. As Ramesh Shukla points out in the lists given as appendices, the first list of Narmad's prose lists 50 writings, from the period of 1 September, 1864 to 15 July, 1865, edited in *Narmagadhya* (1865, 1912). The second list consists of his 42 writings, published in *Dāndiyo* after 15 July, 1865, and unpublished in a book. The third list of 122 writings, published in *Dāndiyo*, must have been authored by Narmad with reference to subject matter, language, context, and internal and external evidences (Shukla 593-603). Thus, Narmad has authored 92 writings, and most probably 122 writings additionally in *Dāndiyo*, dealing with a wide range of topics—social, economic, cultural, philosophical, literary. Many of the writings are characterized with humour, irony and satire, a kind of prose which evolved as a canon of an important category of modern Gujarati prose.

"*Avakāsh tarang*" is a kind of prose expressing leisurely talks with friends. Narmad writes about its origin:

Since 1860, many people began to visit my house, and so I began to meet several scholars and researchers. Varied matters came to be discussed during those meetings. From 1865, such rare interactions came to take place, that if they were published, they would give pure joy and refined knowledge to people. . . . I name that subject *avakash tarang*—the ideas which came across mind in leisure or the whims like the wind blowing in the mind's sky.

(323; 8th issue, 1st July, 1866)

Avakāsh tarang, published in the 8th issue, 1st July, 1866, of *Dāndiyo*, is a religious discussion in the form of a dialogue between four people, named as the letters of Gujarati alphabet, *ka*, *kha*, *ga*, and *gha* (Shukla 323). The next issue, the 9th issue, 15 July, 1866, presents such a dialogue about widowhood, the reasons for the conventional reluctance to a widow's remarriage, taking place between three people, mentioned as *ka*, *kha* and *gha* (333-34; 9th issue, 15 July, 1866).

In a way, dialogue, or a dramatized version of the discussion of a topic is a frequent feature of writings in *Dāndiyo*. The periodicals *Chandrodaya* and *Dāndiyo* are personified, and a dialogue takes place at the former's expense (446-48; 10th issue, 15th December, 1867). Further, the conduct and manners of the meeting of the Nāgar Brahmin community are revealed in a dialogue between the Brahmins about the issue of the expiation of Mahipatrām (559-61; 20th issue, 15 May, 1868). Further, a dialogue between *Lakshmi* (wealth) and *Udyam* (work) presents a moral allegory (79-81; 10th issue, 15 January, 1865). Further, the issue of the maladministration of a *panjarapole* presents an animal fable, a

satirical dialogue between the victims (hens, goats, all animals) and *Dāndiyo* (534-35; 18th issue, 15 April, 1868).

Dāndiyo also contributes to the historiography of Gujarati literature by canonizing the Gujarati poets. It offers the list of the eight living Gujarati poets, and also that of the famous male and female singers (of Mumbai) (52-54; 6th issue, 15th November, 1864). Further, Narmad lists the earlier major Gujarati poets, a kind of literary tradition, referring to the English poets also of the same historical period (59-60; 7th issue, 1st December, 1864). Further, he regrets the cultural backwardness of Gujarat, and also the lack of scholarly studies in Gujarati in his writing on Gujarati poetry (69-70; 8th issue, 15 December, 1864).

It is also notable that *Dāndiyo* also discusses the quality of the translation of Kālidās's *Shākuntalm* into Gujarati by Zaverilāl and Dalpatrām, attempting theorization of the process of translation (503-508; 16th issue, 15 March, 1868). Its later issue presents also critical comments on the text of *Shākutalam* (535-38; 18th issue, 15 April, 1868). Further, book reviews like that of *Pramānshāstra* in the legal area also found space in *Dāndiyo* (512; 16th issue, 15th March, 1868).

Dāndiyo had its own identity and space among its contemporary periodicals. Ramesh M. Shukla comments on the relative merits of the periodical of that time:

Narmad, one of the founders of *Dāndiyo*, did not have a good opinion of Mahipatrām Nilkanth, the then editor of *Shālāpatra*, and Dalpatrām, the then editor of *Budhhiprakāsh*. He was one of the founders of *Buddhivardhak*, but had broken away from the institution and the periodical due to some differences related to policy. These three periodicals were meant for a certain class. Their readership was limited. *Dāndiyo* was not a periodical of a limited class, but a fortnightly of a wider society. Its level was certainly higher than that of *Satyaprakāsh*, *Rāstagoftār* or *Chandrodaya* of the same class. . . . It can be said historically that the work done by *Dāndiyo* in its lifespan of five years was far superior to that of *Rāstagoftār*, *Satyaprakāsh*, *Chābuk* or *Chandrodaya* and was not inferior to that of these three [*Budhhiprakāsh*, *Buddhivardhak* and *Shālāpatra*].

(Shukla 11-12)

Further, a strong point of *Dāndiyo* was its communication with common readership, which anticipates the later periodicals like *Sāhitya* (1913), edited by Matubhāi Kāntāwālā (Vyas 98), and *Visami Sadi* (1916), edited by Hāji Muhammad (Vyas 58). Further, one of the preoccupations with Gujarati identity in *Dāndiyo* echoes in a later periodical like *Gujarāt* (1922), edited by K. M. Munshi, and assisted by Vijayrāi Vaidya (Vyas 138).

With its immense possibilities for development for varied kinds of periodicals, *Dāndiyo* was a potential model for many later periodicals. Foucault comments on the kind of authors having immense potential for development and influence in the future at the level of discourse:

It is easy to see that in the sphere of discourse one can be the author of much more than a book—one can be the author of a theory, tradition, or discipline in which other books and authors will in their turn find a place. These authors are in a position which we shall call ‘transdiscursive.’ This is a recurring phenomenon—certainly as old as our civilization. Homer, Aristotle, and the Church Fathers, as well as the first mathematicians and the originators of the Hippocratic tradition, all played this role.

(Foucault 206)

Dāndiyo is a ‘transdiscursive’ periodical in Foucault’s sense.

Further, it is interesting to assess *Dāndiyo* in terms of a twentieth-century modern little magazine. The editors Frederick J. Hoffman et al in their preface to *The Little Magazine: A History and a Bibliography* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1946), an important and earlier study of little magazines in the west, point out the heterogeneous, experimental and adversary mode of a little magazine:

These magazines have usually been the sponsors of innovation, the gathering places for the “irreconcilables” of our literary tradition. They have been broadly and amply tolerant of literary experiment; in many cases, they have raised defiantly the red flag of protest against tradition and convention.

(Quoted in Sherbo 486)

Similarly, Eric Bentley emphasizes the opportunity it provides to a new idea, and space for contradiction and contestation:

The purpose of a Little Magazine is to nourish our minds with fresh ideas and fresh works of art. To the rejoinder that this is the purpose also of serious book publishing one can only reply that the *periodical* appearance of new writing is especially conducive to the exchange of ideas.

(Bentley 285)

Further, Trilling comments on the gradual marginalization of the discipline of literature as an origin of the rise of little magazines to defend it: “To the general lowering of the status of

literature and of the interest in it, the innumerable “little magazines” have been a natural and heroic response” (Trilling 93).

The marginalized status and the experimental strategy of a little magazine certainly lead to its “heroic” efforts contesting the status quo and the established ideological network of power. Suzanne W. Churchill and Adam McKible succinctly formulates the core features of a little magazine: “Whatever the format, scope, or preferred topics of conversation, little magazines tend to share two features: a vexed relationship to a larger, “mainstream” public and an equally vexed relationship to money” (Churchill and McKible 3)

Dāndiyo certainly had “a vexed” relationship to the dominant ideology and institutions of its time and also “a vexed” profile of financial resources. It exposed the corrupt practices of government departments, social institutions, and the Jain and Vaishnava religious establishments. Though Narmad himself had an ambiguous attitude to colonial rule, *Dāndiyo* does evidence occasionally anti-colonial voices. It blames Jervis and Hope for managing ghostwriters for their books (176-79; 22nd issue, 15 July, 1865). Later, Narmad himself points out that “the princely states would not mend their ways and the British were simply interested in letting them ruin themselves” (564-65; 21st issue, 1st June, 1868).

The members of *Sākshar mandal* were well aware about the financially unstable future of *Dāndiyo*. Though the first two issues were distributed free of charge, its first issue does request for sending either writings or money, and as *Dāndiyo* has to shout 300 times a night while performing his duty, expecting at least one *ānnā* each for them (14; 1st issue, 1st September, 1864). It stopped publishing after the issue of 15 December, 1865. After two and a half months, it was revived on 15th March, 1866, and in that issue an advertisement appears, to attract subscribers, that “humourous matters will be included more than earlier” (271; 1st issue, 15 March, 1866). After publishing it for one and a quarter years, the editors could make out the loss of Rupees 400 (296; 4th issue, 1st May, 1866). It again stopped publishing for three months (May, June, July, 1867) (Shukla 16-17). With the third series, the subscription increased from Rupees 2 to Rupees 3 (Shukla 16). Finally it merged with the paper *Sunday Review*, most probably after 15 December, 1869. Vijayrāi Vaidya could find an issue of *Sunday Review* of 16 January, 1880, at K. R. Kama Oriental Institute at Mumbai, with the title “The Sunday Review & Dāndyo or The Exposer” (Marshal 184). It is ironical that *Dāndiyo* had criticized *Sunday Review* earlier: “The paper *Sunday Review* asks for honour itself and maneuvers to earn money” (554; 20th issue, 15 May, 1868).

Thus, with respect to its uneasy relationship with the mainstream class and ideology, and its shaky financial resources, *Dāndiyo* appears to be a little magazine in the twentieth-century sense. But the formation of community by *Dāndiyo* is different from what it means for a modern little magazine. The formation of community is “a strategy designed to combat writers’ sense of alienation from an audience and from themselves” in

the case of the twentieth century little magazines (Golding 698). For *Sākshar mandal*, it would be a serious gap of communication between society and themselves, and not alienation. Further, the formation of canon for *Dāndiyo* was more its primary, inaugural creation in historical terms, and less an experimental, radical, alternative canonization of a typical twentieth-century little magazine. Moreover, being in a different historical period, with different extent and nature of public and private spaces, *Dāndiyo* had privileges which were hardly enjoyed by the little magazines in the twentieth century. *Dāndiyo* in the 19th century was privileged to contribute to an inaugural, formative phase of modern Gujarati language and literature, allowing historical justification and missionary zeal, which contrasts with a little magazine struggling defensively against the gradual marginalization of the literary discipline. For the nineteenth-century *Dāndiyo* survival would be heroic, for a twentieth-century little magazine survival would be biological. Further, the littleness of a little magazine refers mainly to its small readership. Though in its cultural and economic contexts, *Dāndiyo* had limited copies in circulation, it had probably a greater readership, and hence a stronger impact. The 18th issue of 15 May, 1865, notes:

The name *Dāndiyo* reverberates everywhere in Mumbai, Gujarat, Kāthhiawād and Kuchha! Though its only 300 copies are printed, it is read by 3000 people!
(143; 18th issue, 15 May, 1865)

Further, with its wide range of social, economic, political and cultural subject matter on its agenda, *Dāndiyo* claimed to a large public space despite itself being a private and radical adventure. As the implied reader of *Dāndiyo* was a pan Gujarati reader, *Dāndiyo* is a little “big” magazine of the nineteenth- century Gujarat.

Works Cited

Bentley, Eric. “Editors in Person: Little Magazine.” *The Kenyon Review*, Vol.9, No.2 (Spring, 1947), 279-286. Web.
www.jstor.org/stable/4332847?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents, 2 March , 2015

Churchill, Suzanne W. and McKible, Adam. “Little Magazines and Modernism: An Introduction.” *American Periodicals: A Journal of History, Criticism, and Bibliography*. Vol.15, No.1, 2005. 1-5. Web.
http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/american_periodicals/v015/15.1churchill01.pdf, March 2, 2015

Foucault, Michel. “What is an author?” Trans. Joseph V. Harari. *Modern Criticism and Theory: A Reader*. Ed. David Lodge. London and New York: Longman, 1988. 197-210.

Golding, Alan. "Little Magazines and Alternative Canons: The Example of Origin." *American Literary History*, Vol. 2, No. 4 (Winter, 1990), 691-725. Web.
www.jstor.org/stable/489925?seq=25#page_scan_tab_contents, 2 March, 2015

Marshal, Dr. Ratan Rustamji. "Dāndiyo." *Gujarati Patrakartva no Itihas*. 2nd ed. Surat: Sahitya Sangam, 2005. 181-190.

Sherbo, Arthur. "Delta: An almost forgotten 'Little Magazine'". *Notes and Queries*. December, 2008. 486-489. Web.
<http://nq.oxfordjournals.org/> at South Gujarat University, March 2, 2015.

Shukla, Ramesh M. (ed.) *Dāndiyo: Navjāgran nā Mukhpatra nā kul 63 Anko nun Akbandh Sankalan. Kavi Narmadāshankar and Sāksharmandal*. Surat: Kavi Narmad Yugavarta Trust, 1996.

(Page numbers in parenthesis refer to this edition. The quotations cited from *Dāndiyo* in this paper are from this text, carrying the details of issue number for the reader's convenience.)

Shukla, Ramesh M. "Dāndiyo: Navjāgaran nun ākhābolun Khabardār Akhabār." *Dāndiyo: Navjāgran nā Mukhpatra nā kul 63 Anko nun Akbandh Sankalan. Kavi Narmadāshankar and Sāksharmandal*. Ed. Ramesh Shukla. Surat: Kavi Narmad Yugavarta Trust, 1996. 7-43.

Trilling, Lionel. "The Function of the Little Magazine." *The Liberal Imagination: Essays on Literature and Society*. New York: Anchor, 1953. 89-99.

Vyas, Kishor. *Sāhityik Patrakāratva: Vismi Sadi Purvārdh nān Sāhitya-Sāmayiko no Abhyās*. 2000. 2nd ed. Ahmedabad: Parshva Prakashan, 2009.