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Abstract: The hegemony of English has been explored in several studies since the wake of the twentieth century. Drawing on works of leading linguists, we have drawn our attention to the status of English as a dominating world language that exerts its influence on peripheral literatures of the world. This paper seeks to examine the hegemony of the English language in literary studies, more significantly, in the circulation of world literary pieces. The article discusses how English, at the centre of literary production and circulation, distorts the real essence and concept of ‘borderless world literature.’ The author begins with a brief discussion about the Gramscian concept of hegemony and its implications and consequences on the world circulation of literary pieces. It proceeds to interrogate the existing model of translation flow in the international book market and proposes an alternative approach to resist English hegemony, followed by the conclusion.

Keywords: hegemony, linguistic imperialism, translation, world literature, circulation

1. Introduction

Etymologically, hegemony means leadership. As conceptualised by Antonio Gramsci in 1971, the term hegemony is defined as “the ruling class’s exercise of social control and leadership over the subordinate class through a combination of force and consent” (Gramsci 1971:152). The consent is obtained through the interpellation of the subordinate class. Thus, hegemony is a geopolitical method that refers to indirect
imperial dominance exerted not by force or active persuasion but by a subtle and inclusive power over the economy, education, and media. The ruling class's power to influence the thoughts, behaviour, and perceptions of a particular segment of society through the direction of standard ideas, conventions, and beliefs eventually forms a dominant worldview.

Hegemony, as a concept, accommodates the discussion of the authoritative status of English across the globe. The Gramscian concept of hegemony provides a philosophical framework to explore further the disparity between the hegemon and the subordinate. In the article, The Hegemony of English and Strategies for Linguistic Pluralism: Proposing the Ecology of Language Paradigm, Tsuda expressed his concern about how English is taken for granted in the international system, creating an alarming situation for the other world languages and pinpointed the anxiety and insecurity. His argument relates to the usage of English as a source of personal identity and reflection of culture as English occupies the central position and controls the human consciousness. English, acting as a hegemon, has tactfully gained supremacy through political and economic power.

World literature theorists and critics perceived hegemony in the concept of world literature. Thus, translation practice, western academia, and the translation network appear to reinforce monolingualism by imposing it as a universal criterion on all others. Katherine Shields asserted a perceptible shift in translation modes from a mediating force to a pyramidal model in her article titled Challenges and Possibilities for World Literature, Global Literature, and Translation (2013). She unmistakably observed a shift away from literary translations as a means of establishing connections between literatures toward an unmediated supraliterature, in which the dominant forms were "literature translated into English, literature written in English, or literature written to be translated into English" (Shields 2013:2). Bellos's analysis of the UNESCO translation records confirmed that the translation flow elevates English to the top of the pyramid and establishes it as the base language for all translations. Isn't this an indication that the pyramidal structure compels literary works to be translated into the base language, namely English, to achieve global reception or circulation? Is it guiding the literary world toward a pre-defined structure in which the sole purpose of literary production will be to get translated into English? The English translation overshadows the original, tacitly pushing national and regional literature behind the time. This scenario mentioned above relates to Owen's remark:
"As in any cross-cultural exchange that goes in only one direction, the culture that receives influence will always find itself in the secondary position. It will appear slightly behind the times" (Owen 30).

That was, most emphatically, not Goethe's conception of Weltliterature. With his cosmopolitan humanism, Goethe anticipated that WL would open new avenues for national literature. His view of world literature as a literary space will liberate peripheral literature from all constraints or hegemony. However, the contemporary literary world has established a hegemonic model of cultural dominance. The literary market is commodified by the global influence of a few world capitals. In other words, global texts produced or mediated by the global language, English, have spread across the globe, gradually establishing a foothold in the literary market. This Anglo-globalism is encroaching on indigenous cultural dialects. Eric Auerbach accurately predicted such a standardized world that would foster the development of a single literary language, effectively eradicating the concept of Weltliteratur (1952: 66).

In the current study, the concept of hegemony is used to analyze the domineering status of English in the circulation of literary texts in the world. The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 briefly discusses the leap of English from a regional language to a lingua franca. The historical evidence supporting a political and economic powerplay would assist in developing a concrete understanding of the gradual move of English from ‘an imposed language’ to ‘the language of opportunity.’ Subsequently, Section 3 elaborates the model of literary circulation to critically analyze the dominating role of English as an international gatekeeper of the world literature trajectory. The following section proposes a counter-strategy to resist the English hegemony in the concerned field of study, followed by a conclusion.

2. The Rise of English from a regional language to lingua franca

The seminal rise of the English language from a provincial setup to a hegemonic state has passed through five distinct eras of development:

- British colonialism
- Linguistic expansionism through language policy
- The advent of America as an economic power in the post-World War II era
- The industrial revolution
The tremendous acceleration of globalization worldwide

The linguistic, cultural and religious imposition served as the wheels of colonialism in the ex-colonies of Britain. It relates well to the observation of David Crystal in his book *English as a Global Language*, which interrogated the dramatic linguistic leap of English from an international language to global stature. He argued that the success of a language is directly proportional to the speaker’s success on an international level as no language can flourish of its own. The success story of a language does not rely on its intrinsic structural properties or solid literary background. Instead, the user’s political, economic and military power determines the success rate of the language (Crystal 1997:9).

The increasing domination of the English language in the international market did not generate from the vacuum. Scholars interested in discovering the underlying factors studied the leap of English from a provincial language to hegemonic status. They explored its growing impact on every sphere of life, such as politics, economy, business, travel, communication, international relations, education, banking and many more. Crystal’s estimate projected that 99% of the international organisations, such as the World Health Organization (WHO), World Bank, World Trade Organisation (WTO), use English as the official language. In contrast, French and German language use has come to 63% and 40%, respectively (Crystal, 1997). David Graddol, in his book *The Future of English* (1997), noted instances of language shift in the publishing industry and international organisations. He cited the example of ‘The International Association of Linguistics’ that lists French as a working language but uses English exclusively in its publication and meetings. The publishing industry was also not an exception in this fast-changing world and equally joined hands in this transition phase. Prof. Eugene Garfield, the founder of SCI (Science Citation Index), declared that 95% of 9,25,000 scientific research papers are written in English (Xue and Zuo, 2013; 2263). Another notable instance is a Mexican medical journal titled Archivos de Investigacion Medica, which provided the entire article in English translation. Later, the journal hired an American editor and started accepting articles only in English and further changed the title into Archives of Medical Research (Gibbs, 1995). Similar was the fate of a Journal from Germany titled Zeitschrift fur Tierpsychologie that accepted submissions in Germany till 1950, but fell prey to the language shift and accepted submissions only in English since 1984 and renamed the journal as Ethology in 1986 (Graddol, 1997: 9). It is worth mentioning that English is also coming up as the preferred
medium for intranational communications (professional and higher studies) in some ex-colonies of Britain (Graddol 1997:11), resulting in language shifts within a nation. The book publishing market has similar statistics that depicted English as the most preferred language for publication across the globe. Irrespective of genre, the publishing houses preferred the English language for global marketing, sale and profit. This undisputed international status of English in the publishing world is neither a spontaneous growth nor is a voluntarily imposed phenomenon, but the consequence of a tactfully gained supremacy through political and economic power.

The extensive literature further emphasises the negative impact of English hegemony on the other world languages. In his article The English Language and the Globalisation, Danilo Pasi discussed the importance of English as a tool for international communication and the exchange of ideas, thoughts, and culture. He asserted this as the consequence of globalization, further extended by Guo & Beckett. They considered English an instrument of social control and a hindrance in the learner’s psychological, social, cultural, linguistic development as it exposes them to an unfamiliar pedagogical and social culture (2007,117). With the advent of globalization and advanced technology, English reflects the prominence of a particular country in the political, cultural, and economic spheres of life. This prominence of English in international communication is further discussed in detail by Xue and Zuo. Their study extended the view and considered it a cultural and linguistic invasion in non-English speaking countries. The application of English in global affairs acknowledged the paradigm shift from the British Empire to the empire of English, as stated by Robert Phillipson (1992).

Critics in the present-day argue that English has turned into a neutral world language and is no more the language of the colonizers. The universalness in the global context portrays English as a natural, neutral, beneficial language free from any political or economic constraints. In this regard, Van Parij and Swaan (2001) adhered to the Rational Choice Theory. They emphasised individual choice of language, but they failed to relate the language used with the issue of identity and power. Both scholars detached language and its increasing domination from the power game and politics involved, perceiving it as a natural, inevitable consequence of a decentralised decision (Phillipson, 2008: 9). The positive estimation of English resulted from its extended stay in the colonies as a neutral lingua franca. The persistence of the linguistic dominance of English in the disguise of a willful submission by the other world languages is witnessed in the promotional activities carried out by
the international organisations and the publishing industry, which is the result of political and economic expansionism.

Alastair Pennycook discarded the neutrality of English as a global language and argued that it is a language laden with colonial implications in his book *English and the Discourses of Colonialism* (1998). The subjugation of the native by a severe attack on the culture, language, self-esteem of the colonised and replacing the same with the colonial set is not a new phenomenon for colonial countries. Pennycook (1994) refuted the idea of *English being a language of choice* and perceived the choice as problematic and restricted. Bamgbose (2003: 421) further questioned whether the choice of English is a ‘free choice’ or certain constraints make it inevitable? (Lin 2013:7). Pennycook convincingly disapproved of the neutral function of English in the globalised era (Lin 2013:11). The inescapable choice of English in literary production and circulation turns the idea of literary universalism into an unattainable reality. The scenario requires careful consideration for a counter-discourse, which we shall discuss later.

The literature review confirms that the concern for the linguistic hegemony flows from Africa to Brazil and Nigeria to China. Xue and Zuo apprehended a ‘culture invasion’ due to English expansion in China. Scholars mark the casual use of English abbreviations and growing familiarity with English buzzwords in the Chinese language. They seem confident regarding English as a tool to integrate into the world and prepared to absorb new English words, but reluctant to allow the mad dance of English hegemony to threaten the age-old cultural heritage in China (2013:2266). Another adverse effect of English hegemony is noticed in the indigenous languages of Nigeria. The speakers wish to adopt the English language to flow with the wave of globalisation and fit into the advancing era. The result is the extinction of the local languages and establishing a language policy in Nigeria that encourages multilingualism. Anyanwu (2011) studied remarkable changes brought by the intervention of English in the use of Nigerian indigenous languages. A close study of prevalent languages displays the rapid extinction of languages (Oyetade 2004, Blench 1998, Anyanwu 2011). The educated community report on the language extinction in Nigeria also shows the extinction of most indigenous languages.

The hegemonic grip of English over human consciousness has grown stronger due to power and necessity. The above literature review testified the hegemony of English in every sphere of human life in the current time. The following section will explore the hegemony of English
in the literary field, especially in the circulation of literary texts across the globe.

3. English hegemony and world literature

The reviewed literature asserts the existence of English hegemony in the international market, resulting in the formulation of concepts such as Neocolonialism, Linguistic Imperialism, and Cultural and Linguistic Hegemony. It testifies to the global dominance of English and its various applications in almost all sectors. The power of the English language is assessed by scholars (Chan 2016) based on the opportunities it offers to its users. Being positioned at the centre of several language networks, English enhances the global reception of literary and cultural assets (Ronenet.et al., 2014). The concept of world literature and its global connectivity with English has to be asserted from a closer perspective to connect the dots.

The active participation in the international publishing market determines the global status of a language and the literature it produces. Now, the question arises that as we cannot deny the inseparable connectivity between language, culture and literature, how can the trajectory of world literature remain free from the hegemonic impact of English when its rapid expansion covers every other sphere? As Damrosch stated, “World literature are those pieces that travel beyond their place of origin.” The question arises, in which language? The language that can provide a wide reception to any literary piece and further stimulate translations into other world languages is English. The neutrality of literature that gets circulated in a hegemonic language is always questionable. The willing submission of the regional literature to the hegemonic language changes the entire structure of the literary world, questioning the real essence of the word ‘world’ in the term ‘world literature.’ We shall come to this discussion later while elaborating on the existing model of world literary circulation. It is equally relevant to investigate the impact of English hegemony in literary translation.

Scholars have further examined the dominating role of English in translation studies. Traditionally, translation has been conceptualized as a bridge between the text producer and receiver. The prominence of English translation testifies to the idea and mediates between two discrete universes of the producer and receiver (Bennett & Barros 2017:363). Lefevere (1990) confirmed the significant role of translation in bringing literary works in minor languages into the ambit of world literature (S. Campbell, 2005:28). Translation in the postcolonial context acted as a powerful tool to assimilate foreign culture. It turned to a
prioritized medium of literary exchange, a symbol of empowerment and cultural enrichment (Sareen 2010:85). Translation of world literature revolves around the world language, English, which measures the position of other world languages as marginalized. The politics of the English language is demonstrated by Lawrence Venuti when he referred to the Argentine author Jorge L. Borges. The USA refused to translate his fiction till French translations appeared in 1950 by a distinguished press. Is it not an alarming situation where the hegemony of a few significant languages makes it critical for the other languages to make their space in the canon of world literature? It is further observed that authors adopted western ideologies and followed the norms of the west with an expectation to get international recognition. Spivak criticized this practice of world literature and opined that Anglo-American enterprise, dominating the market of world literature, ignores the power of a work in its language. This projection of world view was not probably the exact picture of Goethe’s Weltliteratur. He cherished each of the authors he read in their native language. This practice seems to have been distorted over time, mainly in the aftermath of globalization. The power of English in translation is further elucidated by Ramakrishna (1997, 445), who asserted that the translation endeavours in colonial India were directly proportionate to colonial dominance. The nineteenth-century Indian readers read the Sanskrit books in English (Trivedi 2007:124). Campbell further suggested that translation into and from English needs to emphasize the context of power relations among the language communities and the rapid global expansion of English (Campbell, 2005: 29). English as a source language represents the lion’s share of all the translations published (60-70% in Europe), i.e., twice as many as all the other source languages put together. This position implies that the literary world places English at the centre and presumes the English-reading world as the only world (Ostler, 2010).

The evolution of world literature is inseparably connected to the rise of English as a global literary vernacular (Mufti 2016:11). The language remained the indispensable key to the world market, as Ostler (2010) identified. The evidence is noted in the circulation of world literary pieces. It becomes the gateway to move beyond the place of origin (Damrosch, 2003). English as a cultural system and global postcolonial culture is well illustrated in Mufti’s interrogation of the existing prominence of the language in the world literary circulation. Mufti referred to the dramatic historical shifts in the patterns of literary circulation. In his words:

“A hundred years ago, at least some intelligentsias in the vast stretch of societies from the Eastern Balkans, through Anatolia and
Persia proper, including swathes of Central Asia and Afghanistan, and stretching across northern belt of the subcontinent, may have encountered each other’s textual creations in the original and directly – this is, in Persian, Arabic, or Ottoman Turkish. Today, readers in India, Pakistan, Iran or Turkey will typically encounter each other’s literature only in translation in English (or in further translation from English) thus only if the works have received that metropolitan authentication” (Mufti, 336) (WL in Theory).

The dominant status of English is reflected in India, a multilingual nation, where translation into English has also served as a medium to strengthen the pluralistic cultural heritage. Sujit Mukherjee depicts a similar scenario in his book *Translation as Discovery* (2006), where he raised his concern regarding the inter-language translation in India. In his words:

“English enjoys the uninterrupted status of ‘link language’... Indian literary compartments have windows open to the non-Indian literatures but doors closed to the works of neighbouring Indians...” (Mukherjee 2006: 15)

Nineteenth-century India witnessed the political and cultural hegemony of English in book publication and translation. The translation flow was from the centre to the periphery as English remained a donor language in India for a longer span. Nevertheless, Sanskrit also served as the most preferred Indian donor language, resulting in numerous English translations of Sanskrit texts. Whether these few English translations targeted European or Indian readers demands further investigation? (Sareen 2010:84). The rise of English as a supralanguage is demonstrated in David Ballos’ study of the UNESCO statistics for translating literary works in Swedish, Chinese, Hindi, Arabic, French, and German. He noticed that between 2000 and 2009, 80% of all translations were from English, whereas only 8% were into English (quoted in K. Shield, 2015:4).

The flow of world literary translation and circulation can be better understood with reference to the international book market, a superstructure built on a traditional centre-dominated model.

Figure-1 illustrates the production and circulation of text beyond its place of origin. The regional and the national literature remain at the periphery and aspire to get into the centre through translation. The literary piece needs to be a Nobel Prize winner and translated into English to become world literature. English emerges as a dominant
language in the process. It depicts the magnetic centre that attracts all the diverse literature from the periphery.
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*Figure 1: Circulation of the world literary texts*

The national and the regional literature surrender to the monopoly of the global language, i.e. English, with an expectation to receive wide circulation and recognition in the world. The so-called recognition is the willing acceptance of the subjugation and indirect assistance to the dominance of the hegemonic language, English. It remains at the centre of literary production that compels all other pieces of literature across the globe to the centre. However, the question emerges, how does it justify the term ‘world Literature’? Is it not promoting monolingualism in a structured form?

This centre-dominated approach gives a partial view of world literature. The word *world* in the term ‘world literature’ has lost its essence under the subjugation of the elite forces, as ideally identified by Martin Puchner. He considered the cosmopolitan centre as a magnet that attracts everything, and the world in the process of moving towards it gets filtered through the hegemonic culture (Puchner, 2013: 32). Figure I depicts the same. If a literary piece has to sacrifice its identity and erase its linguistic boundary to become world literature, then where is the linguistic freedom? Is it not ironic that technically world literature is practically provincial literature, meant only for the English-speaking section of the society? Is it not contradictory to the idea of *borderless*
global literature that promises to cross geographical boundaries but restricts linguistic boundaries? The pathos of the situation is that most works get translated into the globally dominating language, English, for better circulation and compromise with linguistic freedom. However, the colonized consciousness of the human mind is reluctant to perceive this reality. This scenario can be considered an example of the hegemony of English that targets human consciousness and projects the future of the literary piece through translation.

We could understand the function of the system better through the illustration below:
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*Figure-II: Centre-dominated model of world literary circulation*

Figure-II depicts the literary transactions between the Source Languages (SL) and the Target Language (TL) on the international book market. The model shows the literature in diverse world languages aiming to get placed in the world literary canon. Translation in a specific language with a universal acknowledgement (English) serves as a gatekeeper and thus, remains at the centre of the literary production. The magnetic attraction of the English language at the centre of the production and circulation of world literature stimulates the peripheral literatures to surrender to the hegemonic culture and get transformed. The SL surrenders to the monopoly of the English language and receives the world space and recognition as compensation. The literary pieces cross the nation's boundary but fail to cross the linguistic boundary that is structurally and tactfully imposed. The international market favours English, which is also a medium to make the literary piece marketable. However, when the linguistic identity of other world languages is at stake, it fails to do justice with the term world literature. This cultural and linguistic hegemony of English is referred to as *Linguistic Imperialism* by Alastair...

The world literary market strengthens the status of the hegemonic language as it remains at the centre and regulates the periphery. The universal acceptance of the Anglophonic literature as world literature serves as a designed strategy that acts as a weapon for the minor or local languages inflicting hardships for their survival. In the 7th annual session of the Institute of World Literature (IWL) held in Copenhagen in 2017, David Damrosch presented his concern for the universal approach of world literature. He stated, “World Literature is still not completely global.” Even though he referred to the western literary canon, the same can be stated for literary production and circulation across the globe. To probe deeper into the context, we will examine how the model will look if the world market has to perceive the concept of world literature without English? The idea is not to reject English but to question the hegemonic grip and reconstitute the model in more ethical and democratic terms. The following section elaborates on the proposed model.

4. The proposed model and world literature

The role of English as a world literary language demonstrates that world literature itself has always signified a system of unequal relations between a handful of western languages—above all English and other languages of the south (Mufti, 52). Securing linguistic and cultural pluralism seems necessary to maintain the essence of world literature. As mentioned earlier, WL emerged from the world market, and European colonialism underlay the world market. So, it is, therefore, an extension of colonialism (Puchner 2017). The colonialism that no more intends to conquer territories instead conquers human consciousness and injects the quotient of the necessity of the colonial language in the name of worldwide exposure. The hegemony of the English language in the name of exposure to the world market and huge circulation pushes behind the minority languages, establishing undisputed domination in the circulation of world literature. As a counter-attack to the centre-dominated model, we propose the possibility of a model that would focus on the margin. Figure-3 below illustrates the same:
Figure III illustrates the alternative perception of world literature, where the focus shifts from the centre to the margin. Unlike the earlier trend of translation flow that advocated the world literature canon in English, the proposed model argued for the possibility of a reverse mode of translation. The model rejected language centricity and promoted world literature in other world languages without being escorted by English. The margin-centric approach offered an alternative strategy to the English-centred world literature and established a realistic and structural pattern for peripheral languages to follow when translating world texts. As Ostler predicted, a world market without English would open space for other prominent and marginalized languages, a scope for those to survive without being lost or drowned in the cacophony of the world market. World literature without English, identically, would add a new dimension to the study of world literature. It would foster the perception of WL in Chinese (Shijie de Wenxue), WL in Spanish, WL in Japanese (SekaiBungaku), WL in Arabic, WL in Bangla (Viswa Sahitya), WL in Odia (Biswasahitya); that would justify the term world literature in a true sense. Based on an approach termed ‘margin-centricity,’ it would bring forth the translation activities in regional languages. Ostler’s perception relates to complete replacement, whereas we do not claim the same. World literature would not be complete even without English literature; we only expect to find a balanced proportion of language share in the production, translation, circulation and reception of world literary pieces.

4.1. Implementation of the proposed model: Biswa Sahitya series

Implementation of the margin-centric model is reflected in a literary venture made in a provincial Indian state, Odisha. In 1969, a renowned Indian publisher, Granthamandir, launched a world literature series titled Biswa Sahitya Granthamala that marked a significant
reception of world literature in the Odia language (the language of Odisha). The project published a collection of abridged Odia translations of literary classics from across the world. The series included works from across the world and various literary genres, including novels, fairy tales, drama, science fiction, adventure stories, and detective stories, thus justifying the title. The series consisted of one hundred and eighty-six books and over eight hundred short stories written by over fifty world authors. The cover page featured the story's title, the project's name (Biswa Sahitya Grathamala) in the book's top centre, and the publisher's name (Granthamandir) with a logo at the bottom.

The title Biswa Sahitya Grathamala, which means a collection of world literature, is a deliberate attempt to convey the project's objective. The blurb of books confirmed that the series introduces and popularises world literature in Odia. The sole purpose was not to create world literature experts or literary critics of translation; the objective was to instil a positive reading habit in the target readers by introducing world literature in the local language. The series portrayed renowned world authors like Homer, Jules Verne, Shakespeare, Kalidas, Anton Chekov, Emily Bronte, Jane Austen, Leo Tolstoy, Maupassant, Premchand, H. G. Wells, Robert Louis Stevenson, Arthur Conan Doyle and many others as storytellers that differ from the scholarly discipline of world literature. The world texts were received not in an academic context but as a literary piece that teaches through storytelling.

A significant cultural event in the history of Odia literature, the Biswa Sahitya Grathamala series showcased the reception of world literature and created an alternative approach to perceive world literature. The series used specific translation techniques and reception tools to introduce world texts to the non-English community in Odisha. A thorough study of the series (publishing objectives, selection of books, translation strategies and other resources) could reveal many interesting facts about the space created for world literature in the Odia language. However, the scope of the paper does not allow us to elaborate on the same. It is worth mentioning that the project was initiated in 1969 and flourished over the years. It continues to thrive to this day demonstrates that world literature emerges, grows, and survives successfully in a local language without the assistance of English. This reverse translation responds to English's predominance and preserves the essence of the cosmopolitan world.
5. Conclusion

As an international gatekeeper to the world forum, the unstoppable rise of English made its way to a dominating centre of world literary production and circulation. The claim that English is no longer the property of native speakers cannot deny the impact of the hegemonic grip of the English language in the world literary circulation. The original essence of world literature gets distorted as the Anglo-centric model promotes monolingualism and restricts the flow of world literature to a province. The practice of receiving world literature into English is self-contradictory as the literature circulated in one language cannot justify the term ‘world’ in ‘world literature.’ The practice relates to World literature in English and infers cosmopolitan provincialism. The English hegemony in the world literary circulation indicates the persisting colonialism in a modified noble form. The language has satisfied the colonizers’ commercial and legal interests and educational and linguistic needs. Mutual acceptance of the cultural and literary treasure from across the globe in diverse languages could compensate for this loss of linguistic identity. The proposed model revisited the trajectory of world literature and perceived the same in more democratic terms. It combated cosmopolitan provincialism and advocated for vernacular cosmopolitanism. Vernacular cosmopolitanism is a term that refers to the use of a vernacular language to express a cosmopolitan world and its literature. Without the assistance of English, world literature emerged and thrived in a local language.

World literature is a step towards the unification of the world. The experts, scholars, academicians, translators, and publishers need to comply with the demand of the changing time and visualize literature in English and several world languages to retain the real essence of world literature.
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विश्व साहित्य में अंग्रेजी का आधिपत्य: अनुवाद प्रवाह और साहित्यिक प्रसार का एक अध्ययन

बीसवीं शताब्दी के बाद से कई अध्ययनों में अंग्रेजी के आधिपत्य का आलोचना किया गया है। प्रमुख भाषाविदों के कार्यों पर ध्यान आकर्षित करते हुए, हमने अपना ध्यान एक प्रमुख विश्व भाषा के रूप में अंग्रेजी की स्थिति की ओर आकर्षित किया है जो दुनिया के परिधीय साहित्य पर अपना प्रभाव डालती है। यह लेख साहित्यिक अध्ययनों में, और अधिक महत्वपूर्ण रूप से, विश्व साहित्य के संचलन में अंग्रेजी भाषा के वर्चुव्व की जांच करने का प्रयास करता है। लेख में चर्चा की गई है कि कैसे अंग्रेजी, साहित्यिक उत्पादन और प्रसार के केंद्र में, 'सीमाहीन विश्व साहित्य' के वास्तविकताओं और अवधारणाओं को विकृत करती है। लेखक आधिपत्य की शामिलित अवधारणा और साहित्यिक कृतियों के विश्व प्रसार पर इसके प्रभाव और परिणामों के बारे में एक संक्षिप्त चर्चा के साथ आलोचना का प्रारम्भ करती है। यह लेख अंतरराष्ट्रीय पुस्तक बाजार में अनुवाद प्रवाह के मौजूदा मॉडल का अन्वेषण करने के लिए आगे बढ़ाता है और निष्कर्ष के बाद अंग्रेजी आधिपत्य का विरोध करने के लिए एक वैकल्पिक दृष्टिकोण का प्रस्ताव करता है।

मुख्य शब्द: नायकत्व, भाषाई साम्राज्यवाद, अनुवाद, विश्व साहित्य, प्रसार