

Raja Rammohun Roy and the Status of Women in Bengal in the Nineteenth Century

Most historians of feminist movements and feminist thought have ignored India. Miriam Schneir's work, perhaps, is a good example of the present-day feminist view of India:

No feminist works emerged from behind the Hindu purdah or out of Moslem harems; centuries of slavery do not provide a fertile soil for intellectual development or expression. The insights that such writings from outside our own historical cultural field might have offered can only be guessed at.¹

Historians of modern India will find the above statement rather odd. For not only did India produce the most formidable woman politician in the twentieth century (whether we agree with her or not Mrs Gandhi must be the most formidable woman politician of our time), but also it had developed a long tradition of women activists in the nationalist and the revolutionary movements (at least from the turn of this century). All students of Indian history know that most social reformers (of urban middle class origin) spent much of their energy and time in organising movements, such as those related to the abolition of *sati*, widow-remarriage, anti-polygamy, Age of Consent Bill, and female education, which were concerned with the position of women. As early as 1835 women started expressing their own views on the status of women.² No doubt much of this literature on women or even by women cannot be considered feminist, not even by pre-1929 standards.³ In fact most male Indian reformers were not concerned with widening the legal rights of women in political and economic spheres. They concentrated on what might be called the domestic sphere. They aimed at obtaining female companions who should combine within themselves the virtues of both

¹ Miriam Schneir, *Feminism: The Essential Historical Writings*, New York, 1972.

² B. N. Banerjee (ed.), *Sangbadpare Sekaler Katha, 1818-1840*, Calcutta, 1950, vol. 2, pp. 246-7, 256-7.

³ Schneir, *op. cit.*, p. xviii.

Indian and English housewives.⁴ There are, however, two exceptions to this general rule: one was a Bengali brahmin reformer, Raja Rammohun Roy (c.1772-1833), and the other was a Bengali Muslim lady from behind the purdah, Begam Rokea Sakhwat Hoshen (1879-1932). The primary purpose of this essay is to analyse the views on women as expressed by Rammohun Roy against the social and political background of his time. I feel that there is enough evidence to establish Rammohun Roy as one of the male feminist thinkers of the nineteenth century. For not only was he a passionate advocate of equality of the sexes, but also a significant liberal thinker who made some original contribution to the history of liberal feminist thought.

It might be considered strange that a social historian should be interested in what might be considered a biographical study or at best an essay on intellectual history. But ideas play an important role in social history, if only to set in motion people who bring about social change. In England, Puritanism, as Tawney observed, 'helped to mould the social order, but it was also itself increasingly moulded by it'.⁵ Thus a study of Puritanism helps us to understand the direction of the social change that took place in the seventeenth-century England and also the social structure that gave birth to Puritanism. Similarly, Rammohun's views on women were shaped by the relationship between the sexes that existed at that time and these views helped to change the position of women in Bengal in the nineteenth century. Also such an analysis of Rammohun's views is relevant to us if only to understand the limitations of the liberal reformist views on female emancipation.

It is particularly difficult for historians of modern India to make a close study of an individual for records are not well preserved. Personal details of even such famous persons as Rammohun Roy are missing. To make a comprehensive study of his views on women we should know a great deal about his relationships with the women with whom he came into contact. Such details are missing or had been suppressed by Rammohun Roy's friends and admirers in India and abroad, for they wanted to preserve the image of a puritanical Brahma hero. What follows is an attempt to signpost influences that shaped Roy's views on women and an analysis of these views against the social background.

⁴ Meredith Borthwick, 'Bengali Middle Class women in the nineteenth century', Ph.D. thesis, Australian National University, 1981. The thesis was subsequently published as *The Changing Role of Women in Bengal 1849-1905*, Princeton, 1984.

⁵ R. H. Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*, London, 1948, p. xiii.

Status of Women

Rammohun Roy was born into a radi brahmin family engaged in the administration of land revenue, under the Mughuls and later under the East India Company and the Maharaja of Burdwan. This was a very religious family (influenced by both *sakta* and *vaisnava* thoughts), a cultured family deeply involved in worldly affairs, money-making, and acquiring property. To use a Bengali word the Roys were a *visayi* (materialist) brahmin family.

Burdwan, the district where Rammohun Roy was born, was predominantly Hindu. According to a census taken in the year 1815-16, there were about one and a half million people in Burdwan, of whom 200,000 were Muslims. Among the Hindus, brahmin (260,000), sadgopa (161,784), bagdi (147,168), and agrahari (107,656) were the four largest caste groups in the district, but none of them were dominant.⁶ There were, however, areas where sadgopas and bagdis played an important role in politics and society in the seventeenth century.⁷ Brahminism was not the dominant religious force in Burdwan, nor was the district famous for Sanskrit scholarship (except for the Bhursut area). In fact there were many centres of unorthodox cults in Burdwan.⁸ The demographic evidence shows that there was a high ratio of male to female among the lower castes. The situation was the reverse among higher castes.⁹ It is also interesting to note that Burdwan had a long tradition of *sati*. There are *sati* memorials among the archaeological remains, probably older than the East India Company.¹⁰ Except for Hugly, amongst all British districts in India Burdwan had the highest instance of *satis* recorded.¹¹

The most influential and rich family in the district was the Burdwan Raj family. They were migrants from Panjab and were khetri by caste. They came to Burdwan in the seventeenth century as junior Mughal administrators. From 1760 they worked under the British. The family, at least since Kritichandra Roy, patronised brahmins, poets and pandits.¹² However, they could not establish themselves as the head of

⁶ B. N. Banerjee, *op. cit.*, vol. 1, pp. 359-60.

⁷ H R. Sanyal, 'Continuities of social mobility in traditional and modern society in India: two case studies of caste and mobility in Bengal', *Journal of Asian Studies*, 30, 2, pp. 315-41. Cf. B. De, 'A Biographical Perspective of the Political and Economic Ideas of Rammohun Roy' in V.C. Joshi (ed.), *Rammohun Roy and the Process of Modernisation in India*, Delhi, 1975.

⁸ B. Ghosh, *Paschim-Banger-Samskriti*, Calcutta, 1957, pp. 3, 7 and 32.

⁹ B. N. Banerjee, *op. cit.*, vol. 2, p. 306.

¹⁰ B. Ghosh, *op. cit.*, pp. 202-3.

¹¹ A. Mukherjee, 'Sati as a social institution in Bengal', in *Bengal Past and Present*.

¹² S. N. Mukherjee, *Sir William Jones*, Cambridge, 1968, p. 107.

the Hindu Society (*samajpati*). In other words, quite unlike other chieftains of Bengal the Rajas of Burdwan were not part of the Bengali caste structure and kinship system.¹³ In fact the evidence shows that the khetri Rajas were often at odds with local notable radi brahmin families like those of Bharat Chandra Roy and Rammohun Roy.¹⁴ Thus Rammohun Roy grew up in a district which was under British control, and where the local chieftain came from a migrant group. The district was not famous for Sanskrit learning and Brahmanic culture, but unorthodox cults and non-brahmin low castes played a significant role in local culture and society.

Rammohun Roy was born into a radi brahmin family as previously stated. In Bengal in the nineteenth century radi brahmins played an important role in the movements for social reform and nationalism. Social reformers like Rammohun Roy and Iswarchandra Vidyasagar, religious reformers like Ramkrishna, authors like Rangalal Banerjee, Bhudev Mukherjee and Bankim Chandra Chatterjee, educators like Rev. Krishna Mohun Banerjee, nationalists like Sir Surendranath Banerjee and W. C. Bonnerjee, lawyers like Justice Gurudas Banerjee, all came from this caste.

It can be argued that most of these famous men from the radi brahmin caste came from West Bengal. Their families lived in and around Calcutta and had been engaged in administration and/or higher learning for generations. Some of them were from families who had controlled landed property for a long period of time. In traditional Bengal the brahmins exercised considerable influence by combining their high ritual status with political and economic power. But they shared their high position in society and politics with two other castes — baidyas and kayasthas. It would seem that the brahmin, baidya and kayastha together formed a sub-elite group in the power structure of the traditional society; all rulers of Bengal — the Palas, Senas, Pathans and Mughals — had to rely on their support. They had the inclination and the skill required for the type of administrative posts open to the Indian, and for the areas of economic activity which received a new impetus under the British. Hence the brahmins, baidyas and kayasthas continued to play an important role in Bengal in the nineteenth century.¹⁵ What we

¹³ *Idem.*, *Calcutta Myths and History*, Calcutta, 1977, pp. 65-6.

¹⁴ Bharat Chandra Ray, *Bharat Chandra Granthavali*, Calcutta, 1962, pp. 24-32. Cf. M. Goswami, *Bharat Chandra*, New Delhi, 1962, pp. 4-6 and B. N. Banerjee, *Rammohan Raya*, Calcutta, 1960, pp. 19-22.

¹⁵ S. N. Mukherjee, 'Class, caste and politics in Calcutta, 1815-1838', in E. R. Leach and S. N. Mukherjee (eds), *Elites in South Asia*, Cambridge, 1970.

Status of Women

still need to explain is the fact that radi brahmins took a particular interest in the status of women, in *sati*, widow-remarriage, polygamy and female education. It is interesting to note that five outstanding Bengalis (two of whom were social reformers) — Rammohun Roy, Iswarchandra Vidyasagar, Rangalal Banerjee, and Sir Surendranath Banerjee — were descendants of three branches of the same Bandoghati Kula.¹⁶

I believe that we can find an explanation of this interest in the status of women in the strict marriage laws of the radi brahmin caste which left large numbers of women childless and a good number of men unmarried. Marriage in most societies, particularly in Bengal in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, was important to men not only for procreation but also for gaining or losing high rank.

In 1831 *The Friend of India* observed that in Bengal every caste was subdivided into numerous classes each given a certain rank or status by tradition:

Hence the station of every individual in Bengal is settled with nearly as much precision as that of the nobility of Europe...No family is lost in the crowd; there are always some beneath it, who view its right and dignity with feelings of respect; every individual therefore possesses an acknowledged and defined rank in this mighty aristocracy. These family distinctions may be tarnished by ignoble alliances, but they may be regained by a series of advantageous marriages.¹⁷

Marriage laws amongst the upper castes were restrictive and aimed at maintaining the purity of the higher ranks within the caste groups. The marriage laws of the radi brahmins were particularly difficult and complicated because of kulinism.

It is not clear when kulinism was first introduced in Bengal, but it is most likely that it was a protective device to maintain the purity of the high castes during the Muslim invasions. It may be because radi brahmins were in close contact with Muslims that they strictly observed kulinism. According to tradition Ballal Sen introduced kulinism amongst Hindus in Bengal but it was during the reign of Lakshmana Sen (thirteenth century A.D.) that radi brahmins were divided into two

¹⁶ N. N. Vasu, *Banger Jatiya Itihas: Brahman Kanda*, Calcutta, 1914, p. 256. Cf Pandit Lalmohun Vidyaniidhi, *Sambandha Nirnaya*, Calcutta, 1994, Appendix.

¹⁷ *The Friend of India*, vol. 1, p. 84.

groups: kulins (families of high lineage) and *strotriya* (families of regular scholars of the *Vedas*, who had lost rank by intermarrying 'with families of inferior birth').¹⁸ *Strotriya* was further subdivided into two groups, *suddha* or *siddha* (pure) and *sadya* or *kasta* (impure).

Radi brahmins followed a rule of hypergamy. The rule was that kulin women could only marry kulin men but kulin men could marry both kulin and *suddha* or *siddha* women. Women from the *kasta* group could only marry men of that group. Unequal and irregular marriages involved loss of reputation and rank. There arose a new class of brahmins known as *bansajas*. The *bansajas* were those kulins who had lost their rank on account of misconduct — want of charity, discipline and more importantly, no due observance of marriage laws.¹⁹

In the fourteenth century Devivara, a *ghatak* (genealogist and match-maker) from Jessore district, introduced reforms amongst the kulins. This had further complicated the marriage laws. Kulins were divided into three grades, *swabhava*, *bhagna* and *bansajas*. *Swabhava* kulins were further divided into thirty-six *mels* or endogamous groups. The principle of marriage amongst the kulins was known as *palti-prakriti* (preservation of the type),

by which families of equal rank were formed into triple groups as it were, for matrimonial purposes and bound to observe a sort of reciprocity. Thus Mukhuti families were bound to marry their sons to the daughters of the Chatterji and Banerji families and vice versa. All kinds of complications are said to have arisen from this understanding. If, for example, the Mukhuti had only one marriageable son and the Chatterji or Banerji, ten daughters approaching puberty the former must marry all ten or all must remain spinsters.²⁰

What is important for us to recognise is the fact that the reputation of a family depended on the character of marriages made by its female members. A kulin family could lose its rank by wrong marriage of their daughter, whereas a non-kulin girl could bring honour to her family by marrying into a good kulin house. The result was polygamy and as

¹⁸ H. H. Risley, *Tribes and Castes of Bengal*, Calcutta, 1892, vol. 1, p. 146. Cf J. N. Bhattacharya, *Hindu castes and sects*, Calcutta, 1896, (Editions India reprint 1968), pp. 28-9.

¹⁹ Risley, *op. cit.*, p. 146.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 148.

Risley observed, 'this singular and artificial organisation deranged the natural balance of the sexes, and set up a rigorous competition for husbands amongst women of the higher groups'.²¹

There was a strong demand for kulin bridegrooms from all classes of Brahmin families. Such families were willing to obtain a kulin bridegroom, even for a premium, so that they could gain honour and rank. In the early nineteenth century some *swabhava* kulin males made as much as two thousand rupees by marrying lower class Brahmin girls. Most girls stayed back at their parental homes and the marriages were generally not consummated. In parts of Bengal kulin boys of ten started their careers as professional bridegrooms and before they turned twenty they might be married to many wives of ages from five to fifty.²² Matrimony became a sort of profession among kulins. The outcome of this system was that it left a large number of women unhappy and barren. They were barren because they were widows or married to husbands with whom they did not generally cohabit, or not married at all. There were kulin families who could not afford a kulin bridegroom, who often married the effigies (*kusa-kanya*) of their daughters to kulin males.

The system also adversely affected *strotriya*, *bhagna* and *bansaja* brahmin males. A large number of them could not find suitable brides, as most families wanted to marry their daughters into high class kulin families; so there was a large number of unmarried men. This meant a very low birthrate amongst the radi brahmins. It was widely believed that some reform in the marriage laws of the brahmins was necessary so that they would not become extinct as a class.

In the 1830s there was a strong debate on kulinism and polygamy in the columns of Bengali newspapers. Most of the people who participated in this debate were missionaries, members of the Young Bengal group and followers of Rammohun Roy. There were also some women and some low rank brahmin men who wrote letters to the newspapers. The arguments put forward by the last two groups were very earthy, not clouded by Christian puritanical ethics. A *strotriya* brahmin for instance, wrote

Our creator, God has created the same number of male and female but since one kulin married one hundred females

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 146.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 146. Cf. B. N. Banerjee (ed.), *op. cit.*, vol. 2, p. 258.

according to his *mel* he leaves 99 other males childless. And owing to the system of *mel* many kulin daughters stayed unmarried for life. All good intelligent people will recognise that this system does not help to increase progeny....One man can never satisfy many women.²³

He further argued that kulinism was not sanctioned by the *shastras* but was introduced by the state and could also be abolished by the state. The writer urged the Governor-General to intervene and abolish kulinism for 'kulinism is the sure step for the extinction of families' (*vamsaloper sopan*). A woman of sixty wrote to say how she was married off at the age of ten to an elderly kulin whom she had not seen since the wedding night. Another woman urged for the abolition of polygamy and for widow-remarriage. She complained bitterly, 'were the *Shastras*, *Puranas* and *Tantras* created only to deny women of worldly pleasures?'.²⁴

It was widely believed that to prevent the 'extinction of families' some reform should be introduced among the radi brahmins. So it is to be expected that low-rank brahmins would advocate for widow-remarriage and female education, the abolition of *sati*, polygamy and kulinism. It is important to note that both Rammohun Roy and Vidyasagar came from surai *mel*. According to Risley, surai was a *bansaja mel*.²⁵ Bhattacharya confirms this: 'Rammohun Roy and Iswarchandra Vidyasagar were Brahmins of a better class, but even they did not hold a very high position in their class.'²⁶

Rammohun Roy like most boys of his generation and class received a very traditional education. He learnt Bengali and basic mathematics and then Persian perhaps at home with a munshi. It is not clear where and when he learnt Sanskrit and Arabic. It seems most likely that he learnt Sanskrit from Hariharananda Tirthasvami. A friend and a *tantrik* Sadhu, Hariharananda profoundly influenced Rammohun's view of God and interpretations of the *Upanishadas*. It is possible that he learnt Arabic first in Patna and later in Calcutta. His faith in one Creator was confirmed by Islamic theology. The first published work of Rammohun Roy was in Persian, *Tuhfat-ul Muwahhidin* (1803-4). This rationalistic-theistic defence of monotheism showed a remarkable influence of Islam on him. The civil society of Rammohun Roy, like the Islamic *umma*,

²³ B. N. Banerjee (ed.), vol. 2, p. 249.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 247.

²⁵ Risley, *op. cit.*, vol. 2, Appendix 17.

²⁶ Bhattacharya, *op. cit.*, pp. 30-1.

consisted of free individuals united in worship of one true God. Faith in God also helped to establish equality among all human beings including women. Women are also blessed with an innate quality to make 'boundless improvements in moral and intellectual fields'.²⁷ European thought and Christian religion shaped Rammohun's political, social and religious views. But he came into contact with them when he was already an adult and had established himself in business and public affairs. He started learning English in 1797 and had mastered the language by 1800, and it was during his long association with John Digby, his employer and friend, that Rammohun Roy began to read books on English literature, Christian theology, European philosophy, Sociology, History and English law. From the controversial pamphlets which he started publishing from 1815 onwards, it is clear that he was well acquainted with Bacon, Locke, Blackstone, Bentham, Montesquieu and Adam Smith, not to mention many minor English historians and theologians of the eighteenth century. In Calcutta he was in close contact with William Adam, Stanford Arnott, James Silk Buckingham and David Hare. They were either Unitarians or Freetraders and radicals. No doubt his views on women were shaped by his readings of Western philosophy and his association with European friends in Calcutta. But as we shall see, his original contributions to feminist thought were made before 1830, before the works of the radical Unitarians and John Stuart Mill were published. Hence European influence on Rammohun Roy was one of the many factors which shaped his views on women, but not the most important one.

If there was one single intellectual tradition which influenced Rammohun Roy most, it was the Bengali *Dayabhaga* system of law. His individualism, his faith in women's right to inherit property and the individual's right to property without restrictions, stems from the *Dayabhaga* system.

In India there were two legal schools, the *Mitaksara* and the *Dayabhaga* which determined the laws of partition and inheritance among the Hindus. The latter school was predominant in Bengal while the former prevailed in the whole of India except Bengal. The *Dayabhaga* school strongly favoured the individual's right to inherit and dispose of ancestral property without restrictions from the joint family. The two schools differed in four main areas of inheritance and partition of property.

²⁷ *Supra*, p. 24.

1. The *Mitaksara* school believed in the doctrine *janmasvatvavada* (right of property at birth), whereas the *Dayabhaga* school believed in *uparamasvatvavada* (ownership arising on death). According to the Bengal school all *daya* (property) is *sapratibandha*, ownership arises only on the death of the previous owner or on the assertion of the latter's ownership owing to his being *patita* (outcaste) or *sanyasi* (ascetic). Unlike the *Mitaksara*, the *Dayabhaga* did not recognise that the son, grandson or great-grandson acquires by birth any right to ancestral property.

2. The *Dayabhaga* lays stress on the text, the *shastras*, whereas the *Mitaksara* on the worldly usages. *Svatva* (rights) are determined by the *shastras* — no right can be established unless it is mentioned in the *shastras*.

3. Unlike the *Mitaksara* system the *Dayabhaga* holds that the members of a joint family such as brothers or cousins hold their shares in quasi-severalty and can dispose of them even when there is no partition of joint property.

4. The *Dayabhaga* holds that even in an undivided family the widow succeeds to her husband's share on his death provided he leaves no male issue. The *Mitaksara* denies her such right.

It is not quite clear why in Bengal the law of property should be so individualistic, recognising individual ownership without restriction on alienation, and female rights to own property. It was suggested that the spirit of commerce and Buddhism affected the Bengal school. There is, however, no hard evidence to support such a view.²⁸

In Bengal it was and still is the custom to break up joint families soon after the father's death. The breaking up of a joint family need not lead to the more traumatic and symbolic division of hearth especially if the mother is still alive.²⁹ According to the *Dayabhaga* system the sons, on the father's death, constitute co-parcenary, but the ownership of the family property does not belong to the sons as a group, so sons can be full owners individually of their own share of the ancestral property. There were families who divided the property at the will of the father, during his lifetime, but continued to share the same house and hearth

²⁸ P. N. Kane, *History of Dharmasastra*, Puna, 1946, vol. III, pp. 544-66.

²⁹ P. Kolenda, 'Regional differences in Indian family structure', in R. I. Crane (ed.), *Regions and Regionalism in Southern Asia*, Durham, 1967, pp. 197-226.

even after his death. Rammohun's family followed this highly individualistic tradition of property ownership.

From the records and documents left in the High Court, Calcutta, it appears that Ramkanta Roy, father of Rammohun, lived in the same house with his brothers, but their property was divided during the lifetime of Rammohun's grandfather. They, however, 'did not constitute an undivided Hindoo family'.³⁰ On 1 December 1796 Ramkanta Roy divided the property among his sons. Ramlochan Roy, stepbrother of Jagamohun and Rammohun, stayed on with his mother in the ancestral home at Radhnagar, whereas the rest of the family moved to a new house in another village. The family continued to live together till 1817, even after the death of the father in 1803 and the elder brother in 1812. One of the witnesses at a court case in 1817 said that the Roy family 'was undivided as to food but property always continued distinct [sic] which he this deponent knows from being now in the service of Govinda Prasad Roy [Rammohun Roy's nephew] and from having seen his books'.³¹

In fact the partition of property helped Rammohun Roy; while his father and his brother were ruined by bad debts, he continued to flourish. It is to be expected that Rammohun should oppose any change in the legal system of inheritance and proprietorship in Bengal. He felt that the *Dayabhaga* system helped the individuals in Bengal to enrich themselves and their families and this he said 'benefits the Country'.³²

No doubt the social background — the district he was born in, his caste, his family, the intellectual tradition at home, his education and his readings of Western philosophy influenced Rammohun's world view. Like many male feminists Roy's social ideas were also shaped by female friends and relations. John Stuart Mill was influenced by Harriet Taylor and by a group of radical Unitarian Feminists,³³ and Auguste Comte was influenced by his wife (although he was no feminist, he had unusual views on women). As we have already noticed our knowledge of Rammohun's personal life is rather sketchy. However, what we can gather regarding his family life and female friends is significant.

³⁰ R. Chandra and J. K. Majumdar (eds), *Selections from official letters and documents relating to the life of Raja Rammohun Roy*, Calcutta, 1938, p. 157.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 75.

³² Raja Rammohun Roy, *Essay on the rights of Hindoos over ancestral property, according to the law of Bengal*, Calcutta, 1830. As reprinted in *The English Works of Raja Rammohun Roy*, Calcutta, 1959, p. 19.

³³ Alice S. Rossi, *Essays on sex equality: John Stuart Mill and Harriet Taylor Mill*, Chicago, 1970, pp. 19-31.

Some years ago Shils pointed out that the Indian intellectual is 'quite firmly rooted in India.... By rooted I mean possessing within themselves, and accepting, important elements of its traditions and its present life'.³⁴ If we are to believe the autobiographies of some of the outstanding *bhadralok* of the nineteenth century then the traditional values were generally implanted in the boys by women — mothers, wives, grandmothers, aunts, sisters, sisters-in-law and servants.³⁵ When their English counterparts were toughing it out in segregated boarding schools, boys from the upper strata in Bengal spent most of their youth within the family household and most of their time in the company of women. Women in Bengal had more influence on their men than their English sisters had on the English ruling class. K. M. Banerjee, a member of the Young Bengal group, when thrown out of his home for his 'outrageous' anti-Hindu behaviour, complained bitterly in the pages of the newspapers:

We left the home where we passed our infant days, we left our mother that nourished us in our childhood; we left our brother with whom we associated in our earliest days; we left our sisters with whom we sympathised since they were born.³⁶

One element which is very important in the Bengali culture of kinship is the bond between mother and son.³⁷ Many popular novels were written on this theme and the devotional literature, both *sakta* and *vaisnava*, praised the close ties between Kali, the mother goddess, and her devotee and between Josodha and Krishna. The nature of Kali underwent a profound change in Bengal; in spite of her fickleness and unpredictability Kali was 'Mother' — a source of comfort and peace to her suffering child.³⁸ All male-female relationships were influenced by this attitude towards Kali and by the *vaisnava* view of the Josodha-Krishna bond.

Rammohun was also brought up among women — his mother, two stepmothers, his sister, sisters-in-law and wives. Tarini Debi, his mother, came from a *bhagna* brahmin family. Her family was devout

³⁴ Edward Shils, *The Intellectual Between Tradition and Modernity: The Indian Situation*, The Hague, 1961, pp. 61-3.

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ *Enquirer*, 1831.

³⁷ M. Roy, *Bengali Women*, Chicago, 1970, pp. 120-1.

³⁸ David Kinsley, *The Sword and the Flute*, Delhi, 1976. pp. 114-25.

sakta. She, however, became a devotee of Radha-Govinda, the family idol of her *vaisnava* husband. The relationship between mother and son was probably very close when Rammohun was young. But with his growing dissatisfaction with idol worship and disputes over the family property there was a coolness between the two. It must have been soon after 1803, after the death of his father and the publication of his first book, that a strong hostility developed between them, which reached crisis point in 1817. In that year Rammohun moved his wives and children from the family home in Langulpara, where his mother was the head of the household, to a newly built house in another village. His mother encouraged Rammohun's nephew Govinda Prasad to sue his uncle for property. Rammohun came out of this triumphant but at a heavy cost. What was an ordinary litigation, nothing more than a family dispute over ownership and inheritance of property, turned out to be a public trial of Rammohun for his religious beliefs. Among the records that have survived there is a document of 'the cross interrogations' with which Rammohun fully intended to confront his mother if she was produced as a witness.³⁹ In this remarkable document Rammohun wanted to prove to the court and public opinion in Bengal that his mother was inspired by a deep enmity towards him, that she desired his worldly ruin. Indeed 'she would have welcomed his death and looked upon his murder as a highly meritorious act'. As one biographer suggested there is hardly an instance in modern history where a public figure had so openly charged his mother with 'homicidal mania and vindictiveness'.⁴⁰ It is interesting to note that in his attacks on idol worship, Rammohun singled out Krishna and the *vaisnava* literature as objects of ridicule. Soon after the court case Tarini Debi left for Puri where she spent the rest of her life serving another *vaisnava* deity, Jagannath. She died in 1822 almost unnoticed.⁴¹ Despite this feeling of strong hostility Rammohun admired his mother for her strong 'independence of character', a phrase which was often used by him in his works. He saw her as a model of independent womanhood.

According to most of his biographers Rammohun Roy was married off to three child-brides. The first wife died soon after he was nine, when his father married him in less than one year to two different wives. However, we now have evidence that he married his third wife in

³⁹ Chandra and Majumdar, *op. cit.*, document 117, pp. 193-4.

⁴⁰ I. Singh, *Rammohun Roy: A Biographical enquiry into the making of Modern India*, Bombay, 1958, pp. 180-3.

⁴¹ B. N. Banerjee, *Rammohan Ray*, Calcutta, p. 48.

1799 when he was no longer a child.⁴² All male members of the Roy family had more than one wife despite their *bansaja* status. Rammohun was, however, never very close to his wives, who lived with his parents and from 1803 with his mother, while he was living in Bhagalpur, in Calcutta, Benaras, Rangpur and in other administrative and business centres. One died in 1826 and the other survived him. In all his correspondence from Europe he never mentioned them. It is widely believed in Calcutta that, because of his religious beliefs, he and his wives were strangers. They were not intellectual companions. It is possible that his third, and supposedly adopted, son Rajaram, who accompanied him to Europe, was Rammohun's natural son by a Muslim woman. He could have married this woman according to the Saiva system of marriage. It was so rumoured in Calcutta, and in one of his pamphlets Rammohun defended such marriages between Hindu males and Yavanis (Muslim women).⁴³ It is possible that this Muslim woman was a better companion for him than his wives had been.

It was, however, European women whom he admired and whom he considered his friends. He had already met some of them in Calcutta, and in London he came into close contact with some of the radical Unitarians such as Harriet Martineau (1802-1876). Rammohun was closely associated with the Unitarians in Calcutta, and no doubt shared their enthusiasm for female emancipation. It would, however, be wrong to say he was influenced by them, for all his important works on women were written before 1822 and the Calcutta Unitarian society was formed in 1821. It would be right to say that Rammohun was aware of the strong feminist tradition and the Unitarians in England knew him well for his publications were reviewed in their journal *Monthly Repository* and reports on this brahmin reformer reached them through other sources. It is not very important to find out who influenced whom, but it is important for us to note that Rammohun moved into this English circle of feminists with ease and gained immense popularity.

There is no doubt that he was something of an oddity in London; Fanny Kemble, the actress, noted, 'his appearance is very striking; his picturesque dress and colour make him of course, a remarkable object in a London ballroom'.⁴⁴ Harriet Martineau found him irresistible:

⁴² S. D. Collet, *Life and Letters of Raja Rammohun Roy* (2nd edition), D. Biswas and D. Ganguly (eds), Calcutta, 1962, p. 6.

⁴³ *Rammohan Granthavali (Bengal and Sanskrit works)*, Calcutta, 1944, pp. 19-20.

⁴⁴ Frances Ann Kemble's *Autobiography*. As quoted in S. N. Ray, *Rammohun Roy and the English Intellectuals*, Calcutta, 1973, pp. 16-17.

[He] always leads the conversation, and expects others to follow; and he talks to people in their own way or what he thinks such, with exquisite politeness, and a knowledge which appears almost miraculous. With all this cultivation, the most remarkable thing about him, his first characteristic, is his intensity of feeling.⁴⁵

It was this intensity of feeling which made him a passionate advocate for the equality of the sexes.

Rammohun Roy was not a political philosopher. He was at best a social engineer who intended to reconstruct the society. Undoubtedly his pamphlets were written in response to certain specific problems such as *sati*, freedom of the press, monotheism and the administration of justice in Bengal. But when we consider them all together they fall into a *definite* pattern — a schematised and idealised social system was implied in his arguments. He wanted to establish a social order which would enable individuals to maximise their abilities and bring prosperity to the whole community. Rammohun assumed that a man is human only so long as he is independent of the will of another. An individual is independent if he is 'rational' and the owner of his 'person' and 'capacities'. His faith in individualism was inspired by the *Dayabhaga* school of law and by Western political philosophy and more particularly by the works of Locke and Bentham. Individualism, however, was also part and parcel of the social, religious and economic aspirations of the Bengali middle class.

Elsewhere I have shown that all reform movements inaugurated by Rammohun Roy aimed at freeing individuals from 'restraints' imposed upon them by tradition and religion.⁴⁶ His God, not unlike Bacon's God, was beyond human perception (*atindriya*) and boundless (*apparimita*); no image by man can describe him. He separated God from 'habit and training' and from organised religions and put Him beyond human reason and imagination. By putting God beyond human reason Roy allowed 'reason' to rule supreme in worldly affairs and opened up the possibilities of 'boundless improvements' for individuals in social, political, moral and economic fields. Rammohun Roy's civil society consisted of free rational individuals united in the worship of one true God. Freedom was guaranteed by rationality and ownership of

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

⁴⁶ *Supra*, p. 25.

property; thus his civil society implied a class society, and excluded the vast majority of the people, poor and ignorant. I think that we should consider Roy's views on women as part and parcel of his scheme for social change.

The status of women in Bengal in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was rather low, lower than that of their sisters in Europe and America. Almost all women above the age of ten were either married or widowed and the majority of the women were illiterate and worked in the fields. Women from the upper classes and high castes lived most of their lives in segregated *antapurs* (inner-houses). They received no formal education. With few exceptions women played no part in public life. (There were one or two outstanding female *zamindars* and one female Sanskrit scholar who ran a college.) In urban areas poor women worked as domestics or as prostitutes, more fortunate ones worked as dancing girls or singers.⁴⁷

Rammohun Roy was not the first to notice the low status of women in Bengal nor was he alone in his protest. The missionaries started a debate on the status of women during the second decade of the nineteenth century. They also took the initiative in promoting female education. In 1819 the Juvenile Society for the Establishment of Female Schools was established by the missionaries with the support of a group of *bhadralok*. By 1824 they had some fifty female schools in and around Calcutta. Although the attendance was irregular, the standard of education low, and the *abhijat bhadralok* did not send their daughters to these schools, a section of the leading members of the *bhadralok* group was convinced that female education was essential for the welfare of the Bengali community.

Radhakanta Deb, the leader of the 'orthodox' faction of the *bhadralok* community, took an active part in the movement for female education. He admitted to Bishop Heber that women in ancient India, like the European women in Calcutta, were 'allowed into society... but before we could give them the same liberty as the European they must be better educated'.⁴⁸ He set about providing education for women. Although he was opposed to the idea of women attending public schools, he opened his house to the Juvenile Female School's prizegiving ceremonies and encouraged young girls of the *bhadralok* families to receive education in

⁴⁷ U. Chakrabarty, *Condition of Bengali women, around the second half of the nineteenth century*, Calcutta, 1963.

⁴⁸ M. A. Laird (ed.), *Bishop Heber in North India, Selections from Heber's Journal*, Cambridge, 1971, p. 68.

Status of Women

the *zenanas*. He helped Gourmohun Vidyalkar to write *Stri Siksha Vidayak* (a book on female education, published in 1821, which went through three editions by 1824). The aim of the early movement for female education was limited — women were given instructions so that they could become good mothers and good wives.⁴⁹

There were also protests against *sati*, polygamy and kulinism. Most of them, before 1820, were by missionaries or European civilians; but there was one important exception and that was Mritunjaya Vidyalkar. He was a Pandit at the Supreme Court, Calcutta. He had by 1817 entered into a pamphlet war with Rammohun Roy, defending the Hindu mode of worship. In 1817 he researched on *sati* and came out against the practice. He told the judges of the Supreme Court that he regarded 'a woman's burning herself an unworthy act, and a life of abstinence and chastity as highly excellent'.⁵⁰

Rammohun Roy was interested in four important issues concerning women: *sati*, female rights to property, polygamy and, indirectly, female education. The tone and the nature of his arguments on women's issues were radically different from those of his contemporaries in Bengal.

He passionately argued for the oppressed sex and his argument touched on the basic tenets of liberal feminist thought which are still relevant to us.

He expressed his views on women in five pamphlets, two petitions and a number of personal letters. Three of these pamphlets were originally written in Bengali, and later translated into English. The first four were published in Calcutta and only one was published in London. However, they all appeared in another edition together with many other works in one volume, in London in 1832. Four of these were primarily concerned with *sati* and on female rights to property. They all touched on the problems of polygamy and female education.

Roy's personal experiences in the Burdwan district, his Tantric friends, his knowledge of Islam and Christianity, must have been responsible for his antipathy towards *sati*. There was an anti-*sati* tradition among the Tantrics.⁵¹ It was, however, not until he settled in Calcutta that he started to write against *sati*. Rammohun did not aim to persuade the British government to legislate against *sati*. He aimed at creating a strong public opinion in Bengal against the burning of

⁴⁹ J. C. Bagal, *Radhakanta Dev*, Calcutta, 1961, p. 30.

⁵⁰ *Friend of India*, October, 1819.

⁵¹ A. L. Basham, *The Wonder that was India*, London, 1956, p. 188.

widows. He wrote the tracts in Bengali so that his views would be known widely. He translated them into English so that the Europeans in India and the British public, could be made aware of the strong arguments in the *Shastras* against such practice. The English translation of the Second Tract was dedicated to the Marchioness of Hastings, the wife of the Governor-General: 'I take the liberty to dedicate to your Ladyship; for to whose protection can any attempt to promote a benevolent purpose be with so much propriety committed?'

The first two pamphlets were written in the form of a dialogue between an advocate and an opponent of *sati*. True to his *Dayabhaga* legal training Roy argued from the original texts. He searched through the Sanskrit literature, particularly Manu, to select large quotations to prove his case that the *shastras*, although they sanctioned *sati*, preferred chastity among the widows: 'Manu directs, that after the death of her husband, the widow should pass her whole life as an ascetic. Therefore, the laws given by Angira and others whom you have quoted, being contrary to the law of Manu cannot be accepted.'⁵² Even if it was a widely practised custom, *sati* performed by force amounted to female murder. *Shastric* view must always override custom:

If, according to your argument, custom ought to set aside the precepts of the *shastras*, the inhabitants of the forests and mountains who have been in the habits of plunder, must be considered as guiltless of sin, and it would be improper to endeavour to restrain their habits. The *shastras* and reasonings connected with them, enable us to discriminate right and wrong.⁵³

He relied on the *shastras* and reason; failing that he appealed to the advocates of *sati* on humanitarian grounds. He attacked them for their insensibility:

But by witnessing from your youth the voluntary burning of women amongst your elder relatives, your neighbours and the inhabitants of the surrounding villages, and by observing the indifference at the time when the women are writhing under the

⁵² *Translation of a conference between an advocate for and an opponent of the practice of burning widows alive; from the original Bungla, Calcutta, 1818, as reprinted in The English Works, p. 91.*

⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 95-6.

torture of the flames, habits of insensibility are produced.⁵⁴

In the second tract, *A Second Conference between an advocate for, and an opponent of, the practice of Burning widows alive*, Roy moved the debate from the *shastric* sanctions of *sati* to the more general problems of the oppression of women and the male fear of female sexuality. His arguments are relevant to us now. He put in the mouth of the advocate the strong fears of female sexuality. Since widows were impure and without the authority of a husband, they were feared most. Consider the following argument.

Rammohun presented his arguments through the opponent in the pamphlet. I quote the whole text for it is worth our notice. The tone of his arguments were like those of Mary Wollstonecraft, John Stuart Mill and many minor feminist writers in America and England. Except for Wollstonecraft, Rammohun predates the others. The three main points that emerge from this quotation are central to the English and American feminist movement in the nineteenth century. Firstly, women are subjugated by the male by force. The male controlled society, law, public opinion and knowledge. Secondly, men subjugated women because they have irrational fear of their sexual independence; and thirdly, women are capable of excellent achievements, in all fields of life, if they are given the opportunity. They may even exceed the male in some areas.

Women are in general inferior to men in bodily strength and energy; consequently the male part of the community, taking advantage of their corporeal weakness, have denied to them those excellent merits that they are entitled to by nature, and afterwards they are apt to say that women are naturally incapable of acquiring those merits. But if we give the subject consideration we may easily ascertain whether or not your accusation against them is consistent with justice. As to their inferiority in point of understanding, when did you ever afford them a fair opportunity of exhibiting their natural capacity? How then can you accuse them of want of understanding? If, after instruction in knowledge and wisdom, a person cannot comprehend or retain what has been taught him, we may consider him as deficient; but as you keep women generally void of education and acquirements, you cannot,

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 96-7.

therefore, in justice pronounce on their inferiority. On the contrary, Lilavati, Bhanumati, the wife of the prince of Karnat, and that of Kalidasa, are celebrated for their thorough knowledge of all the Sastras: moreover in the *Vrihadaranyaka Upanishad* of the *Yajur Veda* it is clearly stated that Yajnavalkya imparted divine knowledge of the most difficult nature to his wife Maitreyi, who was able to follow and completely attain it!⁵⁵

Secondly. You charge them with want of resolution, at which I feel exceedingly surprised: for we constantly perceive, in a country where the name of death makes the male shudder, that the female, from her firmness of mind, offers to burn with the corpse of her deceased husband; and yet you accuse those women of deficiency in point of resolution.

Thirdly. With regard to their trustworthiness, let us look minutely into the conduct of both sexes, and we may be enabled to ascertain which of them is most frequently guilty of betraying friends. If we enumerate such women in each village or town as have been deceived by men, and such men as have been betrayed by women, I presume that the number of the deceived women would be found ten times greater than that of the betrayed men. Men are, in general, able to read and write, and manage public affairs, by which means they easily promulgate such faults as women occasionally commit, but never consider as criminal the misconduct of men towards women. One fault they have, it must be acknowledged; which is, by considering others equally void of duplicity as themselves, to give their confidence too readily, from which they suffer much misery, even so far that some of them are misled to suffer themselves to be burnt to death.

In the fourth place, with respect to their subjection to the passions, this may be judged of by the custom of marriage as to the respective sexes; for one man may marry two or three, sometimes even ten wives and upwards; while a woman, who marries but one husband, desires at his death to follow him, forsaking all worldly enjoyments, or to remain leading the austere life of an ascetic.

Fifthly. The accusation of the want of virtuous knowledge is an injustice. Observe what pain, what slighting, what contempt, and what afflictions their virtue enables them to support! How many

⁵⁵ *A Second Conference between an advocate for and an opponent of the practice of burning widows alive*, Calcutta, 1820, as reprinted in *The English Works*, p. 124.

Status of Women

kulin brahmins are there who marry ten or fifteen wives for the sake of money, that never see the greater number of them after the day of marriage, and visit others only three or four times in the course of their life. Still amongst those women, most, even without seeing or receiving any support from their husbands, living dependent on their fathers or brothers, and suffering much distress, continue to preserve their virtue; and when brahmins, or those of other tribes, bring their wives to live with them, what misery do the women not suffer? At marriage the wife is recognised as half of her husband, but in after-conduct they are treated worse than inferior animals. For the woman is employed to do the work of a slave in the house, such as, in her turn, to clean the place very early in the morning, whether cold or wet, to scour the dishes, to wash the floor, to cook night and day, to prepare and serve food for her husband, father, mother-in-law, sisters-in-law, brothers-in-law, and friends and connections! (for amongst Hindus more than in other tribes relations long reside together, and on this account quarrels are more common amongst brothers respecting their worldly affairs). If in the preparation of serving up the victuals they commit the smallest fault, what insult do they not receive from their husband, their mother-in-law, and the younger brothers of their husband? After all the male part of the family have satisfied themselves, the women content themselves with what may be left, whether sufficient in quantity or not. Where brahmin or kayasthas are not wealthy, their women are obliged to attend to their cows, and to prepare the cow-dung for firing. In the afternoon they fetch water from the river or tank, and at night perform the office of menial servants in making the beds. In case of any fault or omission in the performance of those labours they receive injurious treatment. Should the husband acquire wealth, he indulges in criminal amours to her perfect knowledge and almost under her eyes, and does not see her perhaps once a month. As long as the husband is poor, she suffers every kind of trouble, and when he becomes rich, she is altogether heart-broken. All this pain and affliction their virtue alone enables them to support. Where a husband takes two or three wives to live with him, they are subjected to mental miseries and constant quarrels. Even this distressed situation they virtuously endure. Sometimes it happens that the husband, from a preference for one of his wives, behaves cruelly to another.

Amongst the lower classes, and those even of the better class who have not associated with good company, the wife, on the slightest fault, or even on bare suspicion of her misconduct, is chastised as a thief. Respect to virtue and their reputation generally makes them forgive even this treatment. If unable to bear such cruel usage, a wife leaves her husband's house to live separately from him, then the influence of the husband with the magisterial authority is generally sufficient to place her again in his hands; when, in revenge for her quitting him, he seizes every pretext to torment her in various ways, and sometimes even puts her privately to death. These are facts occurring every day, and not to be denied. What I lament is, that, seeing the women thus dependent and exposed to every misery, you feel for them no compassion, that might exempt them from being tied down and burnt to death.⁵⁶

Although at the beginning Roy was not in favour of legislating against *sati*, in 1829 when Bentick banned the practice Roy welcomed it. He composed and signed the petition supporting Bentick and wrote to a friend in Europe, saying that the abolition of *sati* had 'removed the odium from our character as a people... we now deserve every improvement, temporal and spiritual'.⁵⁷

His attacks on polygamy were based on the *shastras*. The *shastras* allowed polygamy with many restrictions, but the practice in Bengal was contrary to the *Shastric* laws.⁵⁸ He suggested the true law of marriage be implemented by the government:

Had a magistrate or other public officer been authorised by the rulers of the empire to receive applications for his sanction to a second marriage during the life of a first wife, and to grant his consent only on such accusations as the foregoing being substantiated; [as in the *shastras*] the above Law might have been rendered effectual, and the distress of the female sex in Bengal,

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 125-7.

⁵⁷ B. Ghosh, *Report on Regional Records Survey Committee of West Bengal*, Calcutta, 1959.

⁵⁸ *Brief Remarks regarding modern encroachments on the ancient rights of Females, according to the Hindoo law of inheritance*, Calcutta, 1822, as reprinted in *The English Works*, p. 5.

and the number of suicides would have been much reduced.⁵⁹

The most important contribution that Roy made to feminist thought was his emphasis on the connection between independence and property ownership.

In the ideal society, which according to Rammohun existed in ancient India, there was good government (upholding the principles of separation of powers and the least intervention) and good laws. All men and women were equal, united in worship of one true God. Their happiness and their freedom were guaranteed by their right to enjoy property without restrictions. The system allowed individuals to maximise their abilities. Roy claimed that the *Dayabhaga* system as it operated in Bengal in his time helped men to enjoy the full benefits of property rights while women suffered. He wanted to restore 'the ancient rights of females'.

In Bengal under the *Dayabhaga* system, which appeared to be more liberal than the *Mitaksara* school, widows, whose husbands had no male sons or grandsons, had a right to inherit property, but widows with sons and grandsons had no such right. In 1831, in his pamphlet on *sati* published in England, Roy claimed that

according to their law of inheritance (the *Dayabhaga*), a widow is entitled to inherit the property of her deceased husband, without regard to his condition in life, and therefore is a complete bar to the claims of the father, mother, brothers, sisters and daughters of the deceased, who have all consequently a direct interest in the destruction of the widow. But in the Upper Provinces where the *Mitaksara* is respected as the law of inheritance, according to which the rights of the surviving wife are more circumscribed, the relatives of the husband are not much interested in her death; and in these Provinces it is found that the *Suttees* are comparatively very rare.⁶⁰

Clearly the law had to be changed. In 1822, Roy wrote a pamphlet called *Brief Remarks Regarding Modern Encroachments on the Ancient*

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

⁶⁰ *Some Remarks in vindication of the Resolution passed by the government of Bengal in 1829 abolishing the practice of Female Sacrifice in India*, London, 1831, as quoted in J. K. Majumdar (ed.), *Raja Rammohun Roy and Progressive Movements in India: A Selection from Records (1775-1845)*, Calcutta, 1941, pp. 182-7.

Rights of Females According to the Hindu Law of Inheritance. This was published by the Unitarian Press, Calcutta. The tract was republished in London in 1832 together with many other works and was almost ignored by the reviewers. In 1856 Ramaprasad Roy, Rammohun's son, published another edition, but advertised it as a pamphlet against kulin polygamy.

In the pamphlet Roy went back to the ancient lawgivers of India to show that the *shastras* approved of women's right to inherit property. All widows, whether they had sons or not, were allowed to have a share of the deceased husband's estate. All daughters also had a right to inherit their father's property and wives had to be provided with maintenance. He took this opportunity to attack 'this horrible polygamy among Brahmans'. Roy argued that under the circumstances prevalent in Bengal at that time, high caste and upper class widows had three choices:

First. To live a miserable life as entire slaves to others, without indulging any hope of support from another husband. Secondly. To walk in the paths of unrighteousness for their maintenance and independence. Thirdly. To die on the funeral pile of their husbands, loaded with the applause and honour of their neighbour.⁶¹

Independence was linked with the ability to earn an income and own property. Independent means to support oneself was an essential qualification. It is better to own property, but failing that a profession will provide independence. Even a prostitute, who is able to maintain herself, Roy believed, had more freedom than a virtuous widow 'who is slave to others'.

As we have already seen,⁶² Rammohun's concept of individual freedom implied a class society, consisting of the enlightened free owners and the superstitious dependent multitude. But gender must not be a barrier for 'boundless improvement' in intellectual, moral and social fields, for God had endowed them all, men and women, with the quality that was necessary for such improvement. When we compare Rammohun's arguments for individualism with his views on women's rights, we can see the contradiction. This contradiction is, however,

⁶¹ R. Roy, 1822, p. 5.

⁶² *Supra*, pp. 26-7.

Status of Women

inherent in liberal philosophy. Liberalism is based on the principle of possessive individualism (man is human only when he is the complete owner of himself) and market economy. Under its system women can and should be free but their 'selfhood' is also tied to market economy and class society.

Rammohun had not a great deal to say on the situation of married women, nor did he put sufficient emphasis on *stri-dhan* (female wealth) — property belonging to women by inheritance or gift. He did not look into the fundamental problems of marriage and divorce as some of his European contemporaries did. He does, however, deserve a place in the history of feminist thought. Like his European and American contemporaries he was concerned with oppression of women, their economic dependence and their struggle for selfhood.⁶³

⁶³ Schnier, *op. cit.*, pp. xv-xvi.