ASIAN AND AFRICAN STUDIES, *7*, 1998, 1, 52–68

METAMORPHOSES OF FAMILY-RELATED MOTIFS IN HINDI SHORT STORY

Dagmar MARKOVÁ
Oriental Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Pod vodárenskou věží 4, 182 00 Prague 8, Czech Republic

All that is stated here is based on reading and on confrontation of the reading (1) with the results of sociological research and (2) with the empirical knowledge of Indian reality. No statistical methods were used. In Hindi short stories, we find a number of recurrent family motifs through the whole 20th century, modified according to the time and view-point of the respective writer. Hindi short story is reflective of social realities but it can be regarded as a document of its time only up to some extent. The natural fascination of the writers by the novelty of certain problems is rather misleading.

Apart from a few indefinite pieces of prose – something between novel and short story – from the 19th century, the line of the modern short story in Hindi was started by Premcand (1880 – 1936). The modern form came from the West and through Bengali in the early 20th century. An essential feature of its modernity and the main difference as against the prose of earlier centuries was its secularity, its concern with earthly life without a garb of religion. The short story soon became a very popular form of literature. The short form enables the writer to react promptly to contemporary events and to new ideas and, last but not least, to earn some money quickly. A number of Hindi writers started writing just to earn their livelihood and probably for none of them the financial aspect of their creative activities was irrelevant. For the readers who, as a rule, were neither highly educated nor well-off, it was much easier to read short stories in journals or in cheap paper backs than to labour through a novel. And, once again last but not least, there is a long tradition of fables, fairy tales and other short forms in India. The periods of the bloom of the short story more or less coincided with the periods of stormy developments and changes in the society. Its origin coincided with the first great wave of the national movement, another great bloom followed in the stormy 1930s.

In the social reality, the highest concern of life for an average Indian are the affairs of his family. Accordingly, a typical topic of modern Hindi literature since its beginnings has been the family with its traditional hierarchy of relations. We cannot go into details of defining different forms of the traditional Indian family the definitions of which, after all, vary. While mentioning the tradi-

tional family we mean a familial group larger than the nuclear family (consisting of husband, wife and minor children), a group which, among other things, functions to arrange marriages of the young generation by securing a suitable match through negotiations. In most cases appearing in modern Hindi short stories, it is either the unit called joint family, i.e., consisting of two parallel or one parallel and one elder generation of people, or the unit called small joint family (or extended family), consisting of husband, wife and their unmarried children living with one or more kin of an elder generation.[1]

In Hindi short stories, we find a number of recurrent family motifs through the whole 20th century, modified according to the time and view-point of the respective writer. The above-mentioned pieces of prose of the 19th century were rather didactic pictures of family life.[2] Two strong trends of the early modern Hindi prose – the realistic one and the romantic one – were represented by Premcand and Jayśaṅkar Prasād (1889 – 1937).

As to the attitude towards the family, it is striking that Prasād's characters are, in a way, depicted as isolated from their extended families and relatives which was not in accordance with the current social reality.[3] This trait of his writing is sometimes explained as inherent to the short form, sometimes as a consequence of the usual way of romanticists to create independent lonely heroes struggling against their circumstances.[4] The latter explanation appears more plausible, if we take into account the settings of short stories written by non-romantic writers. It may be worth mentioning that Prasād as a romantic prose writer remained rather an isolated phenomenon in Hindi literature while Premcand not only was an extraordinarily prolific writer but he also found many continuers and followers.

In Premcand's short stories, in particular in his early ones, woman, especially a chaste and brave woman devoted to her husband, is depicted as a pillar holding up everything and holding the family together.[5] The tenor of Premcand's younger contemporaries was similar.[6] There are numbers of characters of such women who remained chaste and, in a way, devoted to their husbands even if deserted by them. They were depicted as morally superior to any other human being in the world.[7]

---

[1] Cf. Raghuvir Sinha, *Dynamics of Change in the Modern Hindu Family*. New Delhi 1993.

[2] Śrilāl, *Dharmsinh kī kahānī*, 1851; Gaurīdatt, *Devrānī jeṭhānī kī kahānī*, 1870. Nothing is known about the authors.

[3] E.g., almost all short stories in the collection *Indrajāl* (1936).

[4] Peter Gaeffke, *Grundbegriffe moderner indischer Erzählkunst aufgezeigt am Werke Jayśaṅkara Prasādas (1889-1937)*. Leiden 1970, pp. 216-217.

[5] E.g., Sair-e-darvīś. In: *Soz-e-vatan*. Kānpur 1908; Baṛe ghar kī beṭī. *Zamānā* (Kānpur), December 1910; Svarg kī devī. In: *Mānasarovar, vol. 3*, 4th ed. Banāras 1954; Do sakhiyā̃. In: *Mānasarovar, vol*. 4, 8th ed. Banāras 1958; Abhilāṣā. In: *Ibid*; Śikār. In: *Mānasarovar, vol. 1*, 8th ed. Banāras 1958; Mis Padmā. In: *Mānasarovar, vol. 2*, 7th ed. Banāras 1957, etc., etc.

[7] E.g., Premcand, Agni samādhi. In: *Mānasarovar, vol. 5*, 5th ed. Banāras 1958; Unmād. In: *Mānasarovar, vol. 2*; Saut. In: *Mānasarovar, vol. 8*, 2nd ed. Banāras 1956; etc., Badrināth Bhaṭṭ Sudarśan, Serdce ženščiny (Russian translation). In: *Serdce ženščiny*. Moskva 1959, etc.

Mother was as highly valued in accordance with the Indian tradition: "Mother's heart is the fountain of life."[8] Motherhood, however, need not be physical. It is through self-sacrifice and through motherly feelings that a woman morally raises herself above a man. Of course, Premcand and his contemporaries depicted numerous unhappy wives, too.[9] In many cases, the family circumstances were truly depicted as beyond the moral ability of the wife to adapt herself and to feel contented. All these characters were then depicted as mute sufferers, some of them even ending their days with a suicide. An extreme case is Viṣṇu Prabhākar's Nalinī who dies as a victim of her husband's foolish scientific experiment.[10] A very frequent literary character of Premcand's days was that of a widow[11] in more or less unhappy circumstances. A mother as a sole breadwinner was usually a widow.[12] Widow remarriage was quite a frequent motif – Premcand was openly in favour of it but he did not conceal that a widow's remarriage was a big problem. Those short stories where a widow remarriage was realized, however, had, as a rule, optimistic endings.[13] On the other hand, a love marriage, if intended, was, as a rule, not realized,[14] or, if realized, its consequences were depicted as bad,[15] though the writers seem not to have condemned it as such. There are few short stories in which forestalling a love marriage brought tragic results.[16] Exceptionally the motif of a marriage of one's own free will appeared, motivated by consideration of character qualities of the future spouse and, in the case of a widow remarriage, by a conscious effort for social reform at the grass-root level. In the short story *Gaurī* by Subhadrākumārī Cauhān (1905 – 1949) the girl's choice was motivated by sympathy and admiration for a widower, imprisoned for his activities in the anticolonial struggle.[17] At the same time, writers warned against ill-considered choice of the spouse.[18] In a number of short stories, the problem of dowry as a sort of bridegroom price and the problem of the high cost of the traditional Hindu

---

[8] E.g., Premcand, Mātā kā hr̥day. In: *Mānasarovar, vol. 3*, p. 104.

[9] E.g., Śānti. In: *Nārī jīvan kī kahāniyā̃.* Banāras n.d.; Lā̃chan, Nairāśya, Narak kā mārg, Strī aur puruṣ. In: *Mānasarovar, vol. 5*; 5th ed. Banāras 1958; Śūdrā. In: *Mānasarovar, vol.2*; Subhadrākumārī Cauhān, Grāmīṇā. In: *Galp-dhārā.* Dillī n.d.; Ilācandra Jośī, Tārā. In *Rasskazy indijskich pisatelej I*, Moskva 1959; I. Jośī, Rukmā. In: *Sovremennyj indijskij rasskaz*. Tashkent 1958.

[10] Viṣṇu Prabhākar, Vaijńānik kī patnī. In: *Galp-bhāratī.* Kāśī 1954.

[11] E.g., Premcand, Dhikkār, Udhār, Ādhār. In: *Mānasarovar, vol. 3*; Mandir. In: *Mānasarovar*, *vol. 5*; Beṭõvālī vidhvā. In: *Nārī jīvan kī kahāniyā̃*; etc.

[12] E.g., Premcand, Mandir, Śānti.

[13] E.g., Premcand, Nāg-pūjā. In: *Mānasarovar, vol. 7*, 3rd ed. Banāras 1957.

[14] E.g., Premcand, Actress. In: *Mānasarovar, vol. 5*; Vidrohī. In: *Mānasarovar, vol. 2*; Āgā pīchā. In: *Mānasarovar, vol. 4*, 8th ed. Banāras 1958.

[15] Premcand, Unmād; Do qabrẽ. In: *Mānasarovar, vol. 4*; Sudarśan, Kavi kī strī. In: *Tīrthyātrā.* Prayāg 1927.

[16] Gaurī. In: *Kahānī: naī aur purānī.* Dillī n.d.

[17] Ibid.

[18] E.g., Premcand, Mr̥tak bhoj. In: *Mānasarovar, vol. 4.*; Subhadrākumārī Cauhān, Grāmīṇā.

marriage appeared.[19] A recurrent motif was childlessness[20] and the misery of those women who gave birth only to daughters,[21] but hardly any complaint appeared of too many children in a family and of resulting problems. Some of the characters of the short stories of the 1920 – 1930s have generational problems or problems arising in households where grown-up brothers stay together. In Premcand's stories,[22] these problems usually did not result in conflicts, and if they did, then the conflict was smoothed over in some way. The writer did not take the side of either generation. Occasionally, the conflict was smoothed over by returning to the old tradidional ways.[23] On the contrary, Premcand's younger contemporary Becan Śarmā Ugr (1901 – 1967) depicted a generational onflict where the older generation (an uneducated landlord) was portrayed as greedy, cruel and narrow-minded whereas the younger generation (his educated son) was just the opposite, trying to take the side of the poor down-trodden tenants. However, the older generation wins and the short story has a heart-rending end.[24]

Some of younger contemporaries of Premcand followed a different path and concentrated more on the individual psychology of their characters than on issues of wider effect. Their creative activities bloomed, in particular, in the 1930 – 1940s. In their short stories, too, a set of family-related motifs appeared. It was, however, rather narrowed down. Jainendrakumār (1905 – 1988) who can be regarded as the founder of the genre of psychological short story in Hindi called one of his short stories very simply *The Wife*.[25] The same type of dissatisfied and unhappy wife appeared in short stories by other writers of the psychologizing trend again and again.[26] They were depicted as merely suffering without being to blame for anything, unable to seek a way out, let alone to find any.[27] It goes without saying that their marriages were arranged marriages. That, however, does not yet mean a disapproval of arranged marriages, as it ensues from Jainendrakumār's short story *The Logic of Love*[28] where the writer pronounced against the very idea of a love marriage in an original and rather shocking way.

---

[19] E.g., Premcand, Kusum. In: *Mānasarovar, vol. 2*; Subhadrākumārī Cauhān, Gaurī; Sudarśan, Tīrth-yātrā.

[20] E.g., Premcand, Saut; Sudarśan, Pāp-pariṇām. In: *Tīrth-yātrā.*

[21] E.g., Premcand, Nairāśya.

[22] E.g., Premcand, Baṛe ghar kī beṭī, Algyojhā. In: *Mānasarovar, vol. 1*; Gṛh-nīti. In: *Mānasarovar, vol. 2*; Būṛhī kākī. In: *Mānasarovar, vol. 8.*

[23] E.g., Premcand, Ghar jamāī. In: *Mānasarovar, vol. 1.*

[24] Becan Śarmā Ugr, Abhāgā kisān. In: *Galp-dhārā.*

[25] Patnī. In: *Kahānī aur kahānī* (ed. I. Madān), Dillī 1966.

[26] E.g., H.S.V. Ajńey, Gangrene. In: *Jaydol*. Kāśī 1951; Ilācandra Jośi, Tārā; Rāmkumār Varmā, Kanikuly. In: *Rasskazy indijskich pisatelej I.*; I. Jośī, Rukmā; Jainendrakumār, Rukiyā buṛhiyā. In: *Jainendra kī kahaniyā̃, vol. 7*. Dillī 1959.

[27] Later on, in the 1950s, Jainendrakumār in his novelettes changed over to another type of heroines who, in fact, are to blame for their difficult situations.

[28] Pyār kā tark. In: *Jainendrakumār kī kahāniyā̃, vol. 7.*

After the foundation of the Progressive Writers Association (1936), the trend of Progressivism (*pragativād*) came to the fore, started to dominate the Hindi literary scene and culminated in the 1940s and early 1950s. The progressivists, too, learned from Premcand but they laid much more stress on the social aspect of any issue than on the psychological one. What cannot be denied is their sincerity and enthusiasm in their struggle against what they called outlived traditions, against "the ideas of reaction and revivalism in relation to family..."[29] Accordingly, various inequalities within the family – between brothers and sisters, husband and wife, the old and the young were ardently pointed out, usually referring to wider social inequalities.[30] In the early 1950s, the problem of too many children in a family was presented as a problem of the current social order which did not allow a man having six or more children to bring them up in full dignity.[31] Even later, home was not usually depicted as a place of contentment. A frequent character was an ill-paid clerk with an ailing wife, too many children or ever-quarrelling female members of the family. He came home, tired and all the time angry, to find not a little bit of peace. Still, the sufferer was his wife.[32] There were problems with the dowry for daughters.[33] The younger generation was depicted as suffering under the rule of the older generation and as entitled to revolt.[34] Not only was the institution of arranged marriage disapproved, but the motif of love marriage appeared,[35] and was whole-heartedly approved of. We meet down-trodden deserted women in *pragativād*, too,[36] but there are no placatory endings. These women are usually portrayed as capable of a little revolt which usually proved to be futile and the authors articulated quite clearly that all this must be changed. Family relations were frequently depicted as generally bad and the extended family as condemned to break up.[37] The problem of the breaking of the traditional family appeared in Hindi literature of the 1950s, so to say, more frequently than in the social reality.

The span between the progressivists and the psychologizing trend proved to be very fruitful – the next generation of writers found a lot to draw upon and

---

[29] Manifesto of the Progressive Writers' Association. In: Walter Ruben, *Indische Romane I*. Berlin 1964, p. 269.

[30] E.g., Yaśpāl, Parlok. In: *Pinjre kī uṛān*. Lakhnaū 1939.

[31] E.g., Amṛt Rāy, Bāl baccedar kabūtar. In: *Lāl dhartī*. Ilāhābād n.d.

[32] E.g., Amṛt Rāy, Sāvnī samā̃, ākmunśī kī ek śām. In: *Kaṭhghare*. Ilāhābād 1956.

[33] E.g., Upendranāth Aśk, Mā̃. In: *Pinjrā*. Prayāg 1945.

[34] E.g., Yaśpāl, Prāyaścitt. In: *Pinjre kī uṛān*; Yaśpāl, Ābrū. In: *Tumne kyõ kahā thā maĩ sundar hū̃?* Lakhnaū 1954; Amṛt Rāy, Bhor se pahle. In: *Bhor se pahle*. Ilāhābād 1956.

[35] E.g., Amṛt Rāy, Āhvan. In: *Tiraṅge kafan*. Ilāhābād n.d.

[36] E.g., Yaśpāl, Mṛtyunjay, Prem kā sār. In: *Pinjre kī uṛān*; Ek sigreṭ. In: *Citr kā śīrṣak*. Lakhnaū 1951; Pahāṛ kī smṛti. In: *Pinjre kī uṛān*; Upendranāth Aśk, Dulo, Sabhya-asabhya, Marusthal. In: *Pinjrā*; Sprout (English translation), written in 1938. *Manushi* (New Delhi), No. 47, 1988.

[37] U. Aśk, Jīvan. In: *Pinjrā*.

they also learned what to avoid – from both trends. Thus, another bloom of short story was quite characteristic for the period of significant changes after Independence. During the first decade of independent India, a number of young writers who were just starting their literary careers appeared. Their first short stories were written round 1950. Their writings had many traits in common and began to be called the New Short Story.[38] At a literary conference at Prayag in December 1957, the designation New Short Story was already an established term.[39] It did not arise from any concept set before (like *pragativād*), but it developed as a designation for something already basically existing and further developing. The intention of the New Short Story writers was an appeal that the human being should be the centre of everything. The main trait of the New Short Story was anti-traditionalism. A recurrent motif of the New Short Story was arranged marriage with all its consequences – sometimes tragic ones, sometimes only killing by inches.[40] In fact, arranged marriages were depicted as worse than they usually are. The writers' attitude towards the traditional family was unambiguously rejective.[41] In the 1950s and early 1960s, the traditional family was depicted as desintegrating. The writers, as a rule, tore to pieces any picture of idyllic life in such a family.[42] Love marriage, however, was not a very frequent motif. Rather it was pointed out that on paper nothing stood in the way of new forms of life and thinking – including love marriage, but in real life they met with suspicion and they broke down sometimes even purely by unlucky chance.[43] More frequently than ever before, the following situation appeared: there had been a premarital love, however platonic it may have been, then an arranged marriage to another partner followed, but the former lovers never forgot each other and kept in touch through correspondence or sporadic formal visits at least.[44] A recurrent motif was the situation of a young boy or a girl, usually a student, who had come in touch with new ideas and into conflict with the patriarchal world of their home.[45] This motif was not new in Hindi literature, but in the New Short Story it was more thoroughly elaborated. In some stories, the revolt was presented as successful, in some others it failed. The writers unambiguously took the side of the younger generation, of the new. However, the

---

[38] *Kahānī* (Ilāhābād), Special Number 1956.

[39] Hariśaṅkar Parsāī, Nayī kahānī. In: *Nayī kahānī – sandarbh aur prakṛti*. Dillī 1966, p. 56; D. Avasthī, Hindī kī kathā-samīkṣā. *Ājkal* (Dillī) 2/1966, p. 20.

[40] E.g., Rājendra Yādav, Khel-khilaune. In: *Khel-khilaune*. Kāśī 1954; Kamleśvar, Ātmā kī āvāz. In: *Rājā Nirbansiyā*. Kāśī 1957; Mohan Rākeś, Ūrmil jīvan. In: *Insān ke khaṇḍahar*. Dillī 1950.

[41] E.g., Mannū Bhaṇḍārī, Nayā paudhā. Kahānī, September 1957.

[42] E.g., M. Bhaṇḍārī, Ekhāne ākāś nāi. In: *Mannū Bhaṇḍārī kī śreṣṭh kahāniyā̃*. Dillī n.d.; R.Yādav, Birādrī-bāhar. In: *Kināre se kināre tak*. Dillī 1963.

[43] E.g., Nirmal Varmā, Tīsrā gavāh. In: *Tīsrā gavāh*. Dillī 1960.

[44] E.g., Kamleśvar, Ātmā kī āvāz; Khoyī huī diśāẽ. In: *Khoyī huī diśāẽ*. Dillī 1963.

[45] E.g., R.Yādav, Ājkal ke laṛke, Aṅgārõ kā khel. In: *Khel-khilaune*.

representatives of the older generation were not all cut to the same pattern. In some cases[46] it can be felt that the writers had an understanding for them. But at the same time, the author's conviction is felt that ideals directed against the independence of the human personality cannot stand the test of time for long. The New Short Story writers had a special liking for depicting the contrast between women still living within their narrow horizons and those who crossed this horizon.[47] There are different sorts of unhappiness of discontented unhappy wives found: some do not know anything else but their "backwater", others secretly cherish sweet memories of their life before marriage.[48] Especially the plots of many short stories by Rājendra Yādav (b. 1929) could be called "a woman's lot." Female characters were depicted with sympathy but without idealization and without stock stressing of their selflessness if a woman's character was intended to be a positive one. Most successful were the New Short Story writers in those short stories where the heroine in her defence against traditions remained half way to modernity. These characters are most natural, for their creators saw the models of them all around. Uṣā Priyaṃvadā (b. 1931) introduced a new type into the short story: an unmarried educated woman supporting her parents and siblings as the sole earner or the main earner in the family.[49] The motif of childlessness appeared in a new context: as the desired temporary childlessness of a female intellectual, tolerated by her husband and absolutely beyond the comprehension of the older generation.[50] Many children in a family were occasionally depicted as a burden for their parents, and the parents' efforts to mould the life path of their children from the very beginning according to their wishes were depicted as hurting and burdensome for the children.[51] A mother as a sole earner may not necessarily be a widow or a deserted woman but also a woman who sent her husband away because he was just another burden for her.[52] She was depicted as suffering, but not as a silent passive sufferer. Characters of divorced parents and of their children between them began to appear.[53] The New Short Story was almost preoccupied with the feelings of loneliness of their characters in different situations and on different levels. The motif of the widow seems to be quite tempting for this purpose. However, the case was different – the motif of the widow disappeared from the limelight and appeared only occasionally, e.g., in the character of a calm widow as a contrast to her unbalanced daughter, dissatisfied with life,[54] or of a woman still striving for

[46] E.g., R.Yādav, Pās-fel. In: *Choṭe-choṭe Tājmahal*. Dillī n.d.

[47] E.g., M. Bhaṇḍārī, Ekhāne ākāś nāi.

[48] E.g., Kamleśvar, Ātmā kī āvāz.

[49] Uṣā Priyaṃvadā, Zindagī aur gulāb ke phūl. *Kahānī.* July 1958.

[50] E.g., M. Bhaṇḍārī, Ekhāne ākāś nāi.

[51] E.g., Kamleśvar, Dukhbharī duniyā. In: *Khoyī huī diśāẽ.*

[52] E.g., M. Bhaṇḍārī, Rānī mā̃ kā cabūtrā. In: *Mannū Bhaṇḍārī kī śreṣṭh kahāniyā̃.*

[53] E.g., Mohan Rākeś, Ek aur zindagī, In: *Ek aur zindagī.* Dillī 1961.

[54] E.g., R.Yādav, Khule paṅkh, ṭūṭe ḍaine. In: *Abhimanyu kī ātmahatyā.* Āgrā 1959.

a bit of happiness.[55] Some characters of the older generation feel lonely because they were not able to keep up with their times and to change their way of thinking at least a little.[56] Another sort of character feeling lonely is the young person living in a permanent conflict situation because, on the contrary, he/she outpaced his/her times.[57] Finally there are people who got away from their former background, but were not able to find their place anywhere else.[58] Nirmal Varmā succeeded in depicting the characters of all these categories next to each other, representing the regularity of these phenomena in a very natural way.[59] In the 1950s, the New Short Story writers believed in a speedy process of change, in the human ability to find a place in the mosaic of the traditional hierarchy of relations. Their attitude was as unequivocal as that of the *pragativād* – but for the difference that New Short Story was much more concerned with the individual.

It is striking that in the early 1960s, those themes and motifs which survived from the 1950s declined, while those which had not been so frequent before, appeared again and again. In the 1960s, the attitude towards the traditional extended family became irresolute. The authors sympathizing with the younger generation and with the new, in some cases depicted the traditional family as a fusty and backward, yet self-contented and successful entity.[60] In many stories, the younger generation goes its own way even at the cost of a break with the parents,[61] but the tenor of such stories is usually gloomy, they are full of suggestive depictions of feelings of fear, frequent in the 1960s generally. More and more short stories depict a breakdown of marriage for various reasons,[62] explained or unexplained. While in the 1950s, female characters were usually the centre of attention of such short stories,[63] now the attention was divided more equally. Male characters of such short stories are usually groping frustrated heroes – a very frequent type in the New Short Story of the 1960s – often more helpless and more disoriented than their female counterparts. In the words of a Hindi researcher in Hindi literature, "a third person makes himself unwantedly and unknowingly indispensable and penetrates into relations"[64] – which means pictures

---

[55] E.g., Kamleśvar, Talāś. In: *Mẽs kā dariyā*. Dillī n.d.

[56] E.g., R.Yādav, Pās-fel.

[57] E.g., Mohan Rākeś, Sīmāẽ. In: *Insān ke khaṇḍahar*.

[58] E.g., Uṣā Priyaṃvadā, Chuṭṭī kā din. *Kahānī*, July 1957.

[59] Nirmal Varmā, Māyā-darpaṇ. *Kahānī*, January 1959.

[60] E.g., Mannū Bhaṇḍārī, Chat banānevāle. In: *Ek pleṭ sailāb*. Ilāhābād 1968.

[61] E.g., Mohan Rākeś, Jaṅglā. In: *Faulād kā ākāś*. Dillī 1966; Kamleśvar, Ūpar uṭhtā huā makān. In: *Mẽs kā daryā*.

[62] E.g., R.Yādav, Ṭūṭnā. In: *Ṭūṭnā*. Dillī n.d.; R.Yādav, Bhaviṣya ke ās-pās maṇḍrāta huā atīt. In: *Apne pār*. Dillī 1968; Kamleśvar, Dukhõ ke rāste, Jo likhā nahĩ jātā. In: *Mẽs kā daryā*.

[63] E.g., Mannū Bhaṇḍārī, Tīn nigāhõ kī ek tasvīr. *Kahānī*, November 1958; etc.

[64] Rām Sanehī Lāl Śarmā Yāyāvar, Prem saṃbandhõ ke bīc tīsrā. *Rāṣṭrvāṇī* (Pūṇe), September 1995, p. 36.

of adultery appearing in the short story from the 1960s onwards.[65] A child from a broken or breaking marriage appears again and again.[66] The characters of these innocent "heroes" are depicted in a touching way but without sentimentality. The stress is laid rather on their lack of mental balance and their mental distortions as results of a permanent conflict situation. The characters of discontented children began to appear who are pushed to call their divorced fathers' new wives "mummy".[67]

Some of the writers of the short-lived, yet quite expressive trend of the Anti-Story (*akahānī*) of the 1960s, too, touched upon the theme of the traditional family and the young people's revolt against it.[68] However, a distinct feature of the trend was its spontaneous surrender to the mood of the moment, usually gloomy, so that little space was left to be concerned with real human relations, with the family.

The gloomy picture was somewhat compensated by the trend of the *sacetan kahānī*.[69] Here, again, the theme of basic transformation and even the disintegration of the traditional family was elaborated.[70] Sporadically, a family of a new type was depicted where there was no sharp conflict of generations.[71] Unlike the Anti-Story, the *sacetan* short story "declared that the basic urge of man is to live and exist."[72] In this respect, it was an opposite of the Anti-Story which never set goals and never tried to reach any clear definition of itself.

Basically the same family-related motifs appeared during the 1970s in the literary trend Parallel (*samāntar*) but also elsewhere: desintegrating family,[73] silently suffering deserted woman,[74] problems of arranging marriages,[75] too many children,[76] too many daughters.[77] However, they were, as a rule, overshadowed

---

[65] E.g., Uṣā Priyaṃvadā, Trip, Svīkṛti. In: *Kitnā baṛā jhūṭh*. Dillī 1972; Mannū Bhaṇḍārī, ũcāī, Bāhõ kā gherā. In: *Ek pleṭ sailāb*; etc.

[66] E.g., Rājendra Yādav, Apne pār. In: *Apne pār*; Mannū Bhaṇḍārī, Band darāzõ kā sāth. *Sārikā* (Bambaī), March 1967; Mohan Rākeś, Pahcān. In: *Mile-jule cehre*. Dillī 1969; etc.

[67] E.g., R.Yādav, Apne pār.

[68] E.g., Rameś Upādhyay, Ġalat! Ġalat! In: *Akahānī*. Lakhnaū 1967; Sudhā Aroṛā, Avivāhit pṛṣṭh. In: *Baġair tarāśe hue*. Ilāhābād 1968.

[69] The term may be translated as "rational short story" or "sensible short story" or "story of the conscious".

[70] E.g., Jńānrańjan, Pitā. In: *Fens ke idhar aur udhar*. Dillī 1968; S. R.Yātrī, Ajnabī log. *Naī kahāniyā̃* (Naī Dillī), October 1965; Mehrunnisā Parvez, Akelā gulmohar. *Naī kahāniyā̃*, October 1968.

[71] Jńānrańjan, Fens ke idhar aur udhar. In: *Fens ke idhar aur udhar*.

[72] Rajeev Saksena, A Year of Hindi Writing. *The Century Special* (New Delhi), January 1965, p. 51.

[73] E.g., Rameś Upādhyāy, Samtal. In: *Samāntar I*, ed. Kamleśvar, Bambaī 1972.

[74] E.g., S.R.Yātrī, Darazõ ke bīc. In: *Śreṣṭh samāntar kahāniyā̃*, ed. H. Jośī, Dillī 1976.

[75] E.g., Prabhu Jośī, Yah sab anthīn. In: *Ibid.*

[76] E.g., Sudīp. Kitnā pānī. In: *Ibid.*; Narendra Kohlī, Ek nayī śuruāt. *Sārikā*, May 1970; Sūryabālā, Gumnām dāyre. *Sārikā*, July 1974.

by the social motif in the narrowest sense of the word: the problems of poverty, unemployment, tension between the rich and the poor which were depicted as distorting family relations. In the short story *Useless is my Life*[78] by Sunītā Jain (b. 1940) the motif of family planning appears, but in a surprising light: its practice turns against the newly wed wife. Even the plight of a young woman who had become a widow as a child was depicted as caused not by traditions and by her relatives, but by poverty and even by arbitrary rule of the police.[79] In all short stories of the representative anthology *People of the Seventies*,[80] the social tenor in the narrowest sense dominates, and such is more or less the case in both representative anthologies of the literary group Parallel.[81] As it was put in the above-mentioned anthology *People of the Seventies*, "this leftist inclination appears in most short stories of this decade. At the time of the New Short Story, this progressivity had come forward with a romantic attitude towards emotional life situations of the human being. This time, it has come in the form of a human socio-economic struggle for existence."[82] We can add that this is nothing new – more or less the same was the tenor of *pragativād*.

The 1960s–1970s were still a time of literary groupings and of sharp polemics between them. Individualization on a large scale was yet to come in the 1980s when most authors avoided starting from a given postulate and thus putting a limit to their creative work. In spite of that, the short story of the 1980s and 1990s displays a particular set of recurrent motifs again.

In the 1980s and in the early 1990s, Hindi publishing houses manifested a certain liking for publishing anthologies of stories by different writers concerning certain common topics. Their titles are quite telling by themselves. What concerns us here, are, in particular, the anthologies *Stories of Failed Marriages,*[83] *Stories of Breaking Families,*[84] *Stories of Working Women,*[85] *Stories of Childhood,*[86] *Best Short Stories by Hindi Woman Writers,*[87] *Short Stories of Old Age.*[88]

It is not only that the writers find and portray a family and society different than their predecessors did. The authors' approach, too, has undergone changes.

---

[77] E.g., Sudhā Aroṛā, Damancakr. In: *Śreṣṭh samāntar kahāniyā̃.*

[78] Sunītā Jain, Birathā janm hamārā. In: *Ham mohre din rāt ke*. Dillī 1971.

[79] E.g., Himānśu Jośī, Manuṣya-cihn. In: *Śreṣṭh samāntar kahāniyā̃.*

[80] *Āṭhvẽ daśak ke log*. Ed. Balrām – Manīṣrāj. Dillī 1985.

[81] *Samāntar, Śreṣṭh samāntar kahāniyā̃.*

[82] Vinay Das, Hindī kahānī kā āṭhvā̃ daśak. In: *Āṭhvẽ daśak ke log*, p. 197.

[83] *Asaphal dāmpatya kī kahāniyā̃.* Dillī 1988.

[84] *Ṭūṭte parivārõ kī kahāniyā̃.* Dillī 1988.

[85] *Kāmkājī mahilāõ kī kahāniyā̃.* Dillī 1991.

[86] *Bacpan kī kahāniyā̃.* Dillī 1986.

[87] *Hindī lekhikāõ kī śreṣṭh kahāniyā̃.* Dillī 1991.

[88] *Vṛddhāvasthā kī kahāniyā̃.* Dillī 1986.

Most of the characters of the short stories of the 1980s and 1990s live amidst generational problems. However, a typical traditional family, ruled by the mother-in-law with a hierarchy of daughters-in-law ceased to be the centre of the writers' attention. That corresponds with the contemporary reality in which the joint family is usually transformed in different ways and in many cases it survives only in the minds of people. In the Hindi short stories of the 1980s and the 1990s, we rather come across elderly or old people who live alone because the young generation has left for the city or for abroad.[89] The grown-up children of these characters are depicted neither as a rebelling younger generation nor as scoundrels who left their parents alone, but simply as people living their own lives, nothing better and nothing worse. They meet, however, with difficulties of a new type: entirely left to themselves and thrown upon their own resources, they miss the support of their elders, especially their help in bringing up the children. The necessity to rely upon strange people rather than on one's own relatives is relatively new in the Indian social reality. Since family relationships are traditionally very close and firm, their violation of this sort is usually felt and depicted as painful.[90] Old people appear, who stay with their own families, but feel alone.[91] In many cases, such a character is not a pitied old widow, but an old man, be he a widower or not, whose expectations are not fulfilled because he is by far not in the position of a ruling patriarch.[92] Other relationships, too – such as the traditionally warm relationship between an uncle and his nephews and nieces who are his sister's children – appears depicted as deteriorating.[93] The existence of the two above-mentioned anthologies about failed marriages shows the interest given to failures of marriages. However, the woman in a not-so-happy marriage is not necessarily depicted as struggling for equal rights and for the development of her own personality[94] as was usual before. Surprisingly enough, there are only a few stories concerned with the problem of dowry[95] which is quite acute in the Indian reality. The – almost complete – absence of the burning issue of "dowry death" (which appears as a headline in the newspapers quite often) as a motif in literature is surprising. The question of ar-

---

[89] E.g., Mṛṇāl Pāṇḍe, Dūriyā̃. In: *Ek strī kā vidāgīt*. Dillī 1985; Rāmdhārī Sinh Divākar, Dharātal. In: *Mahānagar kī kahāniyā̃.* Dillī 1986; R.S. Divākar, Sarhad ke par. In: *1983-84 kī śreṣṭh hindī kahāniyā̃.* Dillī 1986; Himānśu Jośī, Ā̃khẽ. In: *Indraprastha kī kahāniyā̃.* Dillī 1990; Sūryabālā, Sā̃jhvātī. In: *1993-94 kī śreṣṭh hindī kahāniyā̃, vol.I*, Dillī 1995; Kusum Ansal, Yādõ ke sahyātrī. In: *Ibid.*; Simmī Harṣitā, Ātmakathā kā manobhāv. In: *Dhārāśayī.* Dillī 1980; many short stories of the anthology *Vṛddhāvasthā kī kahāniyā̃.*

[90] E.g., Sudhā Aroṛā, Mahānagar kī Maithilī. In: *Mahānagar kī kahāniyā̃.*

[91] Mṛṇāl Pāṇḍe, Ek strī kā vidāgīt. In: *Ek strī kā vidāgīt*; many characters in the anthology *Vṛddhāvasthā kī kahāniyā̃.*

[92] E.g., Mṛdulā Garg, Udhār kī havā. In: *Urf Sam*. Dillī 1986.

[93] E.g., Śekhar Jośī, Ziddī. In: *Bacpan kī kahāniyā̃.*

[94] E.g., Mṛdulā Garg, Cakkarghinnī. In: *Kāmkājī mahilāõ kī kahāniyā̃.*

[95] E.g., Vīrendra Saksenā, Dikhāne ke dā̃t. In: *Ibid*; Kauśalyā Aśk, Sanśay. In: *Ibid*.

ranged marriage and love marriage is not much discussed, although love marriage is by no means presented as a path leading straight to happiness.[96] The relation between generations as depicted in the 1980s–1990s has undergone great changes in comparison with its presentation even in the 1960s. In many respects, the generational conflict is tending to disappear, the younger generation live their own lives – but for one thing: to talk with one's parents about one's own marriage, or, as the case may be, about one's decision not to get married is depicted as by no means easier than before.[97] The type of a neglected unhappy wife has not disappeared but more frequently than a neglected wife we find a couple where both are too busy and both lose mutual interest in each other.[98] After all, a down-trodden wife is not a new phenomenon and, thus, not interesting enough for the writers. In the short story *The Wife*[99] Dhīrendra Asthānā appears to have reacted, in a way, to the short story of the same title by Jainendrakumār, mentioned before. Active female characters, stronger than their male counterparts or superior to them in one way or another, increased in number on the pages of short stories in the 1980s, and have become their permanent inhabitants in the 1990s. The forms of their superiority vary from one case to another.[100] Economic independence and freedom, however, is not presented as the solution to all problems.[101] The shift of woman writers from female characters to male ones, manifested in the 1980s, continues in the 1990s. However, it does not contradict the interest of the woman writers in the female characters. In some cases, the male character in an unbalanced married life is even at the verge of the comical.[102] A new motif is a married working woman who does not wish to have a child at all or who is not happy to have born it, as she considers it an obstacle in her career, or for other reasons, even non-economic.[103] In the 1980s, a deluge of short stories appeared concerning broken marriages and divorces with all consequences. Children are not depicted as a bond in a faltering marriage or in marriage generally, though childlessness is presented as a serious

---

[96] E.g., Dhīrendra Asthānā, Patnī. In: *Asaphal dāmpatya kī kahāniyā̃*; Anītā Manocā, Gavāh. In: *Bacpan kī kahāniyā̃*; etc.

[97] E.g., Surendra Tivārī, Aniket. In: *Mahānagar kī kahāniyā̃*; Citrā Mudgal, Śūnya. In: *Asaphal dāmpatya kī kahāniyā̃.*

[98] E.g., Mṛdulā Garg, Vitṛṣṇā. In: *Urf Sam*; Mahīp Sinh, Dhūp kī ũgliyõ ke niśān. In: *1983-84 kī śreṣṭh hindī ḳahāniyā̃*; Surendra Aroṛā, Āg kā jaṅgal. In: *Ṭūṭte parivārõ kī kahāniyā̃*; Mannū Bhaṇḍārī, Śāyad. In: *Asaphal dāmpatya kī kahāniyā̃.*

[99] Patnī. In: *Ibid*.

[100] E.g., Kusum Ansal, Mere āśiq kā nām. In: *1993-94 kī śreṣṭh hindī kahāniyā̃, vol. II*, ed. Mahīp Sinh, Dillī 1996; Vibhānśu Divyāl, Anubhav. In: *Ibid.*

[101] Mīrā Sīkṛī, Pahcān. In: *Ibid., vol. I*; Rabin Śā Puṣp, Sirf caukhaṭā. In: *Ibid., vol. II.*

[102] E.g., Sudhā Aroṛā, Are you listening? (English translation) *Manushi*, January-February 1995.

[103] E.g., Indirā Mithal, Please hamẽ bebī cāhie. In: *Hindī lekhikāõ kī śreṣṭh kahāniyā̃*; Rājī Seṭh, Ġalat hotā pancatantra. In: *Bacpan kī kahāniyā̃*; Simmī Harṣitā, Kājū. In: *1993-94 kī śreṣṭh hindī kahāniyā̃, vol. II.*

problem.[104] Also there are few characters of unhappy deserted women. In the 1980s, characters get properly divorced according to the law and their lives go on.[105] Very different pictures of mutual relations between divorced husbands and wives have started appearing, reaching from quite friendly relations to a cruel struggle between the two when both want to keep the child. Rather rarely we come across a remarriage of a divorcee and it is presented as full of problems.[106] Divorcees as sole earners in the family are depicted at least as frequently as widows. Widows are not altogether an object of particular pity or concern. They are presented just as working women and mothers coping with some additional problems.[107]

In the 1980s and 1990s, most short story writers carefully try to keep distance between their characters' emotional disposition and their own. They try to be above all it, they neither fight passionately for anything nor against anything.

We can, of course, regard fiction in general and the short story in particular as a sort of document of its time. Surely, it reflects the stir and change of its time.

The time of Premcand and his contemporaries was more or less the time of discussions of widow remarriage – if yes or not, though it had been legally permitted since 1856. To get one's daughter remarried or to marry a widow was still a matter of civic courage. Premcand himself married a widow as his second wife. Premcand's time was also the time of Gandhi who strongly opposed child marriages and advocated widow remarriage.[108] He opposed the dowry system[109] and other forms of the social degradation of women. In general, however, he was full of admiration for the ability of Indian women to suffer quietly and in his view, the woman served humanity best by giving the nation healthy and morally upright children.[110] Accordingly, these aspects of family life stood in the centre of attention of the writers. At the same time, urbanization and industrialization of India was under way, though still moderately, accompanied by social mobility of the people who individually started seeking new existence separatedly from the traditional family. The problem of upholding the traditional family or of letting it disintegrate arose. Writers noticed the changes and react-

---

[104] E.g., Citrā Mudgal, Śūnya.

[105] E.g., Mahīp Sinh, Dhūp kī ũgliyõ ke niśān; Nirmal Varmā, Ek din kā mehmān. In: *Kavve aur kālā pānī.* Dillī 3rd ed. 1989; Citrā Mudgal, Śūnya; Rameś Bakhśī, Jinke ghar ḍhahte haĩ. In: *Asaphal dāmpatya kī kahāniyā̃*; Sureś Seṭh, Flag Station. In: *Ibid*.

[106] E.g., Citrā Mudgal, Śūnya; Citrā Mudgal, Tāśmahal. In: *Kāmkājī mahilāõ kī kahāniyā̃*; Gulzār, Mard. In: *1993-94 kī śreṣṭh hindī kahāniyā̃, vol. I*; Rājī Seṭh, Andhe moṛ se āge. In: *Andhe moṛ se āge*. Dillī 1983.

[107] E.g., Manikā Mohinī, Rākh ke nīce. In: *Bacpan kī kahāniyā̃*; Mṛdulā Garg, Aglī subah. In: *Urf Sam*; etc.

[108] E.g., *Young India*, October 16, 1926; September 23, 1926; etc.

[109] E.g., *To the Women*. Karachi, 2nd ed. 1943, p. 120.

[110] K.K. Gandhi, *Women and Social Injustice*. Ahmedabad 1958, pp. 179-180.

ed to them in different ways: they welcomed them or they warned against them, they tried to point out how the problems could or should be solved, what should or should not be allowed to happen. The traditional institution of the hierarchical family started cracking but it still seemed that it was possible and even necessary to prevent this disintegration.

The 1940s and early 1950s were the time of turbulent changes. The freedom struggle culminated and Independence was attained. Freedom became so to say the slogan of the day. The Progressivists were enthusiastic for modernization of family relations and strongly against subordination of women and of the younger generation. In their fervour they usually wanted to point out a way out and when they did not find any, they sometimes resorted to slogans instead of the truth of life. The then dominating Progressivism was closely linked with the leftist movements. The decline of the Progressivist movement in the 1950s was connected with the enormous sectarianism within the Communist Party of India.

The 1950s were also marked by rapid urbanization and industrialization which, again, brought about disintegration of families in the sense that individuals moved to the cities or to other places to seek a livelihood. The disintegration of family seemed to be in full swing and attracted the attention of many writers as a new phenomenon. The first wave of the New Short Story tried to encourage it in the spirit: "The sooner the better," though further developments proved something else.

Approximately the same period was also the time of lively discussion of the future Uniform Civil Code (which has not come into being till this day) and of the reform of the Hindu Code which was put through in 1955. One of the most important points of the reform was that divorce with the right to remarry was made possible for any couple married according to Brahmanical rites or following any other form of customary Hindu marriage. Now divorce ceased to be an almost exotic phenomenon – this explains the emergence of the motif of divorce in the New Short Story of the 1960s. The problem of widow remarriage ceased to be a recurrent motif. In the social reality, widow remarriage is still widely rather looked down upon as a betrayal, but: many of those who oppose it feel that women are handicapped rather than benefitted by a second marriage.[111] In a sample from Delhi in the late 1970s it was found that most of the widows were not interested in remarriage out of concern about the well-being of their children.[112] With the rising marriageable age of girls, the phenomenon of the child widow is disappearing. Apart from that, being a wife is not the only possible way of existence for a woman now.

The first wave of the New Short Story culminated in the atmosphere of a certain civic enthusiasm of the years 1954–1960, when Nehru's government was able to raise hopes for a favourable development of the country. Writers

---

[111] Girija Khanna – Mariamma Varghese, *Indian Women Today*. New Delhi 1978, p. 162.

[112] *Social Welfare* (New Delhi), January 1979, pp. 33-35.

were critical of many inconsequencies and unfulfilled promises but they were also convinced that their dissatisfied and rebelling heroes would find a way out. The New Short Story of the 1950s left an encouraging impression not by proclaiming optimistic conclusions but by the fact that it did not hesitate to point at the black spots and thus to show the very first steps for their removal.

In the 1960s, an intricate situation began to develop. Economic difficulties and political disillusionment must have led to a horrified astonishment that not as much could be achieved by mere moral pressure on the social conscience as the writers wished. Among other things, the attitude towards the traditional family became irresolute. The comparison between by Indian standards liberated woman and the traditional dependent woman devoted to her husband also ended up irresolutely, often rather in favouring the latter. Rigid adherence to traditions makes people suffer, but being non-conformist also makes the individual suffer – what is to be done then? Life according to patriarchal traditions may then appear to many people as life in a cosy corner. This was not necessarily the viewpoint of the writers – they were only looking round themselves. For example, as to the attitude towards marriage, in a study of the attitude of educated women in 1959, 20% of them preferred a job to marriage, in 1969 it was only 5%. In 1959, 63% of the educated working women preferred love marriages, in 1969 it was 48%.[113] To cut a long story short, tradition in family relations lives on and has its own dynamics, supported by the socio-economic situation.

The increased concern with breaking or broken marriage in the 1980s and 1990s reflects a topical problem: in the first decade after the reform of the Special Marriage Act in 1976, for example in Bombay divorce cases more than doubled, in Delhi, 1986, nearly 25 divorce petitions were filed every day, etc. "Marriage is no longer a sacred word and divorce no longer a dirty one,"[114] was said in a special feature in a popular magazine by the end of 1986. New phenomena are found worthy of writing, and so is divorce as well as lonely old people which are a relatively rare phenomenon in Indian social reality. Further, both phenomena are reminiscent of foreign ways and may therefore be attractive for readers.

In the 1980s and 1990s, the short story appears to be a reflection of doubt upon everything in public life, which becomes manifest, for example when going through newspapers and periodicals. "Need to review...," "Time to re-define...," "Rethinking of..." are very frequent beginnings of the headlines. Contemporary writers manifest their uncertainty, or at least, they usually do not take up unequivocal attitudes towards any phenomenon that attracts their attention by its novelty.

Everything we find in Hindi short story we find in the social reality, too. Anybody who comes in touch, in particular, with the urban middle and "lower

---

[113] Promilla Kapur, *The Changing Status of the Working Women in India*. Delhi 1974, pp. 9-11.

[114] *India Today* (New Delhi), December 31, 1986, p. 44.

middle" class may have a feeling of having met the characters of a particular short story several times at several places. But: if as many young people had left their traditional families and taken an independent life path of their own, as it was depicted in the short story of the 1950s, then the extended family consisting of at least two generations or of relatives of different types from one generation would have vanished. Yet we know that it is not the case and that where nuclear families have been formed they frequently grow again into an extended/small joint family,[115] flexible enough to become an acceptable means of existence for emotional as well as economic reasons. If nothing else, then its solidarity is such that it observes traditional rules despite being physically separated due to different reasons. As it was put in a popular magazine, members of "today's 'I want my space' generation" exist "in their private cocoons even while leading a collective life of the extended family".[116] That may be an explanation of the decline of depictions of generational tension in short stories.

If arranged marriages and their after-effects had been as disastrous and unbearable as was frequently depicted, then love marriage would have become the common pattern. Yet it is known that the conventional marriage by negotiation and mutual settlement prevails.[117]

The impression of the above-mentioned anthologies of Hindi short stories of the 1980s and 1990s or even that of reading Hindi short stories in a greater number at random could be that divorce has become such a matter-of-course as it is in Europe. Yet it is a fact that divorce still affects the social prestige of the couple and people are not prepared to endanger their position in society and in kinship groups, therefore divorce is still avoided as far as possible.[118]

In this way, we could continue going through different motifs. An increasing phenomenon attracts the attention of the writers, which leads to a disproportionality in which the high frequency of certain motifs in literature exceeds the frequency of the respective phenomenon in social reality. Even detailed narrations, common in Hindi short stories, indicate that the authors highly appreciate the fact of having the chance to write about recent phenomena.

On the other hand, the striking scarcity, e.g., of "dowry death" and dowry problems in general in the Hindi short story of the 1980s and 1990s in contrast to the press which is full of them may perhaps be explained by the desire to remain neutral. It is hardly possible to remain neutral toward a case of death because of an insufficient dowry, whatever the circumstances may be, and it is next to impossible to be above such a horror and to doubt whether or not it had to happen. The absence of this burning issue bears another evidence of the fact that belle-lettres cannot be regarded as a thorough document of a time, however

---

[115] Cf., e.g., Raghuvir Sinha, *Dynamics of the Change in the Modern Hindu Family*, pp. 46, 272, etc.

[116] *India Today*, July 15, 1994, p. 87.

[117] Cf., e.g., Sinha, op.cit., p. 63, etc.

[118] Cf. Sinha, op. cit., p. 121.

true the individual pictures of life they present. However, there may be another explanation of the almost complete absence of that horrific motif, an explanation which concerns Hindi short story as a whole. Most short stories of the 1980s – 1990s are glimpses of the life the writers live themselves and see round themselves. There is, indeed, no scarcity of shocking news of "dowry deaths" in the newspapers, but in a "normal" average family they do not occur. The writers put their fingers on the charms of ordinary life – or on its "charms", i.e., on what is devoid of charm in ordinary life, not on criminal cases.

The motif of love marriage, too, appears relatively rarely, but this scarcity corresponds to the social reality where, according to an opinion poll conducted in five metropolitan cities in 1994, 74% of interviewed adults believed that arranged marriages are more likely to succeed than love marriages.[119] There is no space to analyse this question here and now, but love marriage or "self-arranged marriage", as it is called sometimes[120] is too remote from Indian tradition to become a frequent motif even of modern literature. If we accept the standpoint of some researchers that the traditional attitude towards marriage is likely to survive even the change from the extended to the nuclear type of family,[121] then the Hindi short story reflects this situation adequately.

To sum up, the Hindi short story is reflective of social realities but it can be regarded as a document of its time only to some extent. The natural fascination of the writers with the novelty of certain problems is rather misleading. After all, the same may apply to the literature of all countries and periods. It can only be added that, as to family-related motifs in India, the writers never felt restricted by fear of possible repressions by the ruling authority. If they avoided a certain question, it was not due to censorship, but, at most, due to a certain self-censorship because a particular point was a taboo or it was not found interesting enough, or it was found embarrassing in one way or another.

---

[119] *Sunday Magazine* (New Delhi), 9-15 January 1994.

[120] *Manushi*, January-February 1994, p. 13.

[121] T.N. Madan, The Hindu Family and Development. In: *Family, Kinship and Marriage in India*. Ed. Patricia Uberoi. Delhi 1994, p. 438.