Community Literature – Its Aesthetics and Need: An Indian Experience

Sahdev Luhar*

Abstract

This paper endeavours to (re)propose the idea of '*community literature*' at par with '*oral literature*' or '*tribal literature*.' Re-appropriating the concept of '*community literature*', encourages documentation, translation, and analysis. It delineates the aesthetic makeup of the '*community literature*', arguing that it has its aesthetic appeal and depth as a good literature. Finally, enumerating the need for '*community literature'*, it further advocates for translating '*community literature*' into different languages to preserve the linguistic culture of Indian pastoralists and peripatetic nomads, which otherwise, is on the verge of extinction.

Keywords: Community literature, aesthetics, nomads, pastoralists, peripatetic nomads

Introduction

Hierarchical categories operate among different types of literature; hence, some literature enjoys more prominence than others. Several factors have a role in deciding this prominence and are evident even through the idea of the literary canon. However, it is surprising to note that such hierarchical categories are also perceptible in the oral literature of different communities. The two key factors responsible for this are the dialects (or languages) in which oral literature is narrated and the number of speakers of these dialects or languages. The repository of academic literature from various regions of India suggests a current tendency toward reducing oral narratives from sedentary and tribal communities to oral narratives from nomadic ones. Scholarly works on itinerant communities' oral literature are scarce, and the unfamiliarity of their languages and dialects has prevented people from appreciating their aesthetic and literary merits. This paper argues that community literature has aesthetic value and explains why it should be preserved, perhaps through translation. This paper is divided into three parts: (i) Community Literature: A Conceptual Understanding, (ii) Aesthetics of Community Literature, and (iii) Need for Community Literature. The first part remaps the trajectory of '*Community Literature*' and redefines it. The second part shows the aesthetic richness of community literature, and the third part shows the need for community literature in contemporary times. At the outset, it is clarified that words like '*language'* and '*dialect'* are used interchangeably throughout this paper.

Community Literature: A Conceptual Understanding

Earlier, the author of this essay defined 'community literature' as a 'body of oral literature by the diverse ethnic groups of India that speak thousands of indigenous languages.'[1] (Luhar 120; Luhar and Nimavat 125). The phrase 'ethnic groups' used in this definition raises some technical queries. *Oxford Learner's Dictionaries defines* 'ethnic group' as "a group of people who have a shared sense of identity because they have their cultural background, traditions, history, language, etc."[2] All Indian communities are ethnic communities for the members of those communities share many cultural traits of a particular community. This clarification leads to two problems – Which communities do the '*community literature*' refer to exactly? If it includes all the indigenous communities, how is it different from the oral literature of tribal communities?

The submission to the first problem is that the idea of '*community literature*' refers to the oral literature of the *migrant* or *nomadic* communities that speak indigenous dialects or languages. Many communities in India still

* Assistant Professor, Department of Basic Science and Humanities, B. A. College of Agriculture, Anand Agricultural University, Anand – 388110. Can be reached at sahdevluhar@gmail.com

live nomadic and marginalised lives. In India, there are three nomadic groups – hunter-gatherers (foragers), pastoralists, and peripatetic (or non-food producing). Hunter-gatherers still live ancestrally derived lifestyles depending on local sources for food or foraging. Approximately 1.3 million hunter-gatherers are found in India, which is one-fourth of their global population.[3] In the Indian context, most of the hunter-gatherers are tribal communities. From pre-colonial times to the present day, much research has come out on the oral literature of tribal communities. Hence, the oral literature of these hunter-gatherers' communities is beyond the scope of "*community literature*." Pastoralists are involved in livestock rearing. Though the pastoralists are considered nomads, the mobility criterion is hardly applicable to them.[4] Excluding a few pastoralist communities, most of their oral literature has remained undocumented. Likewise, the peripatetic nomads are engaged in some trade or craft. They lead a mobile life and sell their crafts to the sedentary groups. They constitute the most ignored and discriminated group of people. Except for anthropological and sociological research, no evidence of literary or folkloristic research on such peripatetic nomads is available. Thus, the idea of "*community literature*" centres on the oral literature of pastoralists and peripatetic nomads. The concept of '*community literature*' is based on the categorical identification of pastoralists and peripatetic nomads and the mobility criterion. These communities may not necessarily appear in the list of nomadic and semi-nomadic tribes as declared by the Government of India. The concept of '*community literature*' does not consider those nomadic groups that have tribal backgrounds or can be identified as hunter-gatherers.

As pointed out earlier, the negligence of the oral literature of pastoralist and peripatetic nomads is due to their languages or dialects and the number of speakers of these languages. Their languages could be difficult to comprehend by outsiders, which results in a problem for the conservation of these languages for outsiders interested in studying such dialects or languages. With the spread of literacy and modern technological advancements, the speakers of such languages have switched over to other languages. Moreover, these communities keep migrating from one place to another selling their handicrafts. They try to adapt to the dominant language of the area they frequently visit. Such effects make their original language a complex mixture of languages that pose a challenge to outsiders. That's why most of such communities' oral literature has remained unexplored. Since the population of such communities is small, these have been marginalised. In a country like India, these communities even do not form a significant vote share; hence, they are insignificant to local political ideologies. Hence, the languages of pastoralist and peripatetic communities are not represented at the national level. The Indian government's campaign for the survival of endangered languages does not include many languages of pastoralists and peripatetic nomads because these languages are not recognised by the government. The celebrated *People's Linguistic Survey of India* (2010-2022) claims the documentation of most of the languages spoken by the various groups of the people of India. However, it has included only a few indigenous languages of the pastoralist and peripatetic nomads.[5] Hence, the idea of '*community literature*' centres on the oral literature of pastoralist and peripatetic nomads and advocates for their representation in literary and socio-cultural circles.

Moreover, the languages spoken by the pastoralists and peripatetic nomads don't have any script. Besides most nomads don't have access to learning and lack writing skills. For this reason, written literature of these communities has not emerged yet. Hence, the idea of '*community literature*' does not include the creative written literature by these communities and is limited to oral literature only. Further, it is essential to clarify here that since '*community literature*' is available in oral form, it requires a medium to reach the people and reveal its identity as one of the types of literature. The most handy and authentic medium for this purpose is writing. Hence, '*community literature*' requires scripting of orality into written form. The researcher of the '*community literature*' would need to transcribe the language of a specific nomadic community using a known language. In addition, due to the complexity involved in understanding such literature, it is important to translate it for the target audience. In a nutshell, the concept of '*community literature*' goes hand-in-hand with translation. Translation (as a process and product) may have its politics. However, it cannot be denied that translation reinvigorates the oral literature of such migrant communities. Thus, in the Indian context, the concept of '*community literature*' is a body of oral literature of pastoralist and peripatetic nomads in indigenous or in the transcribed-translated known language.

Aesthetics of Community Literature

The concept of '*aesthetics'* is inherently problematic and designates "a kind of object, a kind of judgment, a kind of attitude, a kind of experience, and a kind of value."[6] In Indian critical discourse, the thought of aesthetics suggests the philosophical and spiritual experience of art in the audience. The idea of aesthetics is also linked with the idea of art forms. The belief *Satyam Shivam Sundaram* is the touchstone of aesthetic appeal. Any piece of art has

an aesthetic appeal if it is truthful, good, and beautiful and it creates the same experience of truthfulness, goodness, and beautifulness in the audience through the aural, visual, and verbal mediums. The Indian theories of *Rasa, Alankara, Riti, Gunas-Dosas, Dhvani, Vakrokti,* and *Aucitya* have insightfully explored what constitutes aesthetic appeal. Similarly, the Western theories of aesthetics have delved into the pertinent queries linked with the concept of aesthetics as object, judgment, attitude, experience, and value from time to time. One may describe aesthetics as (i) the experience of beauty and art, (ii) having a proper form, style, and taste, (iii) something truthful, good, and beautiful, (iv) something that gives a sense of completeness and perfection, (v) noble, and (vi) something that, in words of WJ Long, has artistry, intellectual and spiritual value, permanence, and style.[7] More simply, anything that arises the feelings of nobility, inspiration, beauty, grandeur, immensity, supremacy, sublimity, purity, majesty, or pride, and has creative, moral, intellectual, and/or spiritual value is said to have aesthetic value.

In light of this argument, '*community literature*' justifies itself as an embodiment of splendour and art and has many characteristics that make aesthetic appeal and offer pleasure to listeners or readers. One will undoubtedly feel grandeur in it. However, this grandeur lies in its simplicity – modesty of thought and diction. Any genre of '*community literature*' employs language that a listener or reader may find difficult to comprehend initially, but it is a thrilling experience. When it is explained to him/her by using translation (or glossary of terms), the listener or reader would have an altogether different experience that is difficult to explain verbally. Understanding the language of the '*community literature*' is not a difficult task. The practice of listening carefully is sufficient to understand the language (though not entirely). Most pastoral and peripatetic nomads keep migrating to a particular geographical region; hence, their language matches the dominant language used in that region. For example, the Gādaliyā Luhārs of Gujarat are found roaming in different parts of Gujarat, and their language or dialect has many *Gujarati* words that do not need the help of a dictionary or interpreter. Thus, '*community literature*' employs exotic vocabulary but thrills the listeners or the readers. Let us illustrate this point with an instance of the oral tale of the Gādaliyā Luhār community, "લવાણો," which means "*Concern*" in English.

The Gādaliyā Luhār is a peripatetic migrant community of Gujarat, a state in the western part of India. The members of this community speak Luhāri dialect, a blend of both *Gujarati* and *Rajasthani* languages. Since the Gādaliyā Luhār has been a wandering community of Gujarat for many decades, their original *Rajasthani* language is affected by the *Gujarati* language and at present, it is perceptible that the Gādaliyā Luhār's language is more *Gujarati* than *Rajasthani*. The second column of Table 1 presents the Gujarati transcribed oral tales originally narrated in the Luhāri dialect spoken by the Gādaliyā Luhārs. The third column presents the translation of this tale. The narrative is transcribed in Gujarati because the Luhāri dialect closely matches the Gujarati language script. To any Gujarati speaker, this transcribed version would appear exotic while listening and reading. However, a small practice of listening to this tale would enable the listeners or the readers to comprehend it easily. Let us look at the bold words in the second column; these bold words have *Rajasthani* origin. On the other hand, the bold words in the third column are the English translations of the words in the second column and the same row. The total number of bold words point to the fact that the language of '*community literature*' has more influence of the regional languages than its original language. Knowledge of some basic linguistic features would also help the researcher; for example, most of the nouns spoken by the members of the Gādaliyā Luhār community commonly end with the 'Ŏ' sound. They commonly use 'સ' ('s') sound for most of 'ચ' ('ʧ'), 'હ' ('h'), and 'છ' ('chha') sound words and 'હ' ('h') sound for 'શ' ('ʃ') sound words would undoubtedly decrease the complexity involved in comprehending the language spoken by them. Here, the point of argument is that 'community literature' is the subject of discrimination not because of the complexity of its language but because it uses the language of those who live at the margins of society. It is not the case that '*community literature*' does not have any aesthetic appeal, but the reality is that no one has carefully tried to observe its aesthetics.

The analysis of the tale shows that *Gujarati* transcribed oral tale employs 34 sentences, whereas the English translation uses 38 sentences. The transcribed version uses 224 words, and its English translation uses 302 words. Counting sentences or words employed in the original and translated versions of the oral tale hints at the fact that the original language is more affluent, and brevity is one of the characteristics. The sentences and words used in the original tale are infused with simplicity. The language and style are not elevated and grand, but its diction's simplicity has a grandeur. Look at sentences no. 16 to 20 and 26 to 33. The two groups of sentences present two events in this tale. The first set of sentences shows a wife's reaction when she learns that her husband and father-in-law are no more. The second presents the reaction of a mother when she comes to know that her husband and son have passed away. These simple-looking sentences convey the bitter truth that human relationships are temporary and selfish. A person has importance so long

Table 1: "Concern" – An Oral Tale of Gādaliyā Luhār Community

No.	Transcribed Version	English Translation
1	બાપને દીકરો બે ઘઉંમેં પૉણી વારે.	Once a father and his grown-up son were giving water to the wheat crop.
2	ઈમ કરતાં કરતાં હાપ આયો ને સૉકરાકૈડ્યો.	A snake came and bit the son.
3	સૉકરો મરી ગ્યો.	The son died.
4	ડોકરીયાને કીધું, "હેં ભઈ, થારો સૉકરો અતો?"	"Hey man, is this your son?"
5	"હોવે"	"Yes."
6	"એને તો હાપ કૈડ્યો તો મરી ગ્યો."	"A snake has bitten him. He is no more now."
7	"એતો મરી ગ્યો તો હાવ પણ પૉણી તો બારે કોઈ નીકર્યુંની?"	"Okay. I hope the water has not gone outside the farm."
8	"ના"	"No, it hasn't."
9	આતો ડોકરીયો ગ્યો તે સૉકરાને પૉણીરી પાળ આગે આડે મોન્ડતો માથે કાદવ થેથડ્યો.	The old man went to his son's body. He put his body as a barrage into the watercourse and dabbed his body with the muddy soil.
10	અવે, કૃષ્ણ ભગવૉન અને અરજાણજી બે વેતા વેતા જોવે.	Shri Krishna and Arjun looked at him surprisingly.
11	"મારું બેટું , આ હદ કેવાય હે!"	They thought, "This is a limit."
12	આ બે ઉવા તે આગે.	They went ahead.
13	એક બાઈ ભાતું લઈને આવે આ બેઓને દેવા.	A woman was going to the farm with a tiffin for the father and son.
14	"હેં બાઈ, ક્યોં જાય હે?"	"Sister, where are you going?"
15	"હે ભગવોન, મારા ઘરો ધણી અને મારો હૉહરો પૉણી વારે હે. ઈયોને ભાતું દેવા જાવ હું."	"O God, I am going to give this tiffin to my husband and my father-in-law on the farm."
16	"થારા ઘરરો ધણી તો હાપ કૈડ્યો તો મારી ગ્યો."	"A snake bit your husband and he has passed away."
17	"હે?"	"Really?"
18	એણે તો ભાતું હેઠે ઉતારી.	She put the tiffin down.
19	હાથરી બંગડીયૉરો ઢગલો કર્યો.	She removed her bangles and put them aside.
20	ને એરા ધણીરા ભાગરુ ખાઈ ગઈ.	And she ate up the food made for her husband.
21	અરજાણજી પૂસે હે કે "હે ભગવોન એને હું કેવાય?"	Arjun, "Oh God, what is she doing?"
22	ઉમેથી આગા નીકર્યા કૃષ્ણજી અને અરજાણજી ગ્યા તે ફળીયામેં.	They went ahead and entered into a street.
23	ડોકેડી, સૉકરારી માં, વાહીન્દો કાઢે ને સૉકરી સોખાં ભેળા કરીને ભાત મેલે.	An old woman, the son's mother, was cleaning the courtyard and her daughter was preparing a rice dish for dinner.
24	"એ બાઈ હું કરે હે"	They asked, "O sister, what are you doing?"
25	"સોખાં રોંધુ હું."	"I am preparing rice dish."
26	"ઉમે ખેતરમેં પૉણી વારતો તો એ સૉકરો અને ડોકર્યો એ કુણ હે"	"Who is the boy who was working with an old man on the farm?"
27	"મારો ભાઈ ને બાપ ઓવે"	"He is my brother and the old man is my father," she replied.
28	ડોકેડી એ કીધું "મારો સૉકરો ઓવે"	"He is my son," the old woman said.
29	"એ સૉકરાને તો હાપ કૈડ્યો તે મારી ગ્યો.	"A snake has bitten your son. He is no more now!
30	એરા ભાગરાય સોખાં રોન્ધે હે?"	Are you preparing food for him as well?"
31	"ઓવે"	"Yes."
32	"એ બાઈ એરા ભાગરા કાઢી નોંખ," ડોકેડી બોલી.	"Don't boil the rice for him now," the mother said.
33	અને એરા ભાગરા સોખાં કાઢી નાખ્યાં.	The daughter removed the rice that her brother would have eaten.
34	જરે કોઈ લવણો રયો?	Is there any concern for a relationship now?

as he or she can serve specific purposes. It conveys a message that all the relationships are based on selfish motives. The relationship remains intact even among the kith and kin until it offers some rewards. These two sets of sentences portray a situation that answers the question raised in sentence no. 34 – "Is there any concern for a relationship now?" The acknowledged pieces of literature with remarkable aesthetic value have noble themes that present pertinent questions about human life. This oral tale presents such an important question that is valid and shall remain valid in years to come. Thus, the brevity of the sentences, the melody of language, the shades of meaning, and the rhythm while speaking – all these together make this oral tale a piece of aesthetic beauty, creating an aesthetics of simplicity.

It is essential to note here another critical point – any genre of '*community literature*,' whether it is oral tale, song, riddle, or anything else, regardless of the community to which it belongs, is infused with aesthetic appeal. The simple but noble diction creates sublimity and grandeur. The messages they convey are universal and prominent. They have a didactic purpose to serve. Thus, they have moral and socio-cultural values. The oral tale taken up here is a mere example of these facts. If one records and assesses any oral tale of Snake charmers (*Vadee*), Bhavai players (*Nayak*), Chamatha, Vanzaras, Turi, Kothada, or any other migrating community, he/she would notice that it has significant aesthetic value.

Need for Community Literature

As outlined in the first part of the paper, there is a need for a distinct category called '*community literature*' to accommodate the oral literature of pastoralist and peripatetic nomads, which has otherwise remained unnoticed and unexplored. The communities that the idea of '*community literature*' refers to are the communities that are skilled in certain professions. Most of these communities depend on nature and natural resources for their survival. All these communities possess sound knowledge about human life and behaviour, animals, birds, reptiles, trees, and nature. Their oral literature is infused with the knowledge these communities have acquired after a hundred years of struggle. Their language is mature and presents a great variety of linguistic diversity. Sometimes, they surpass even modern sciences in specific fields. Moreover, the '*community literature*' of these communities is a valuable site for the intangible cultural heritage. However, due to the lack of attempts to preserve them, the precious knowledge and cultural sites will vanish in the short future.

The Indian government has declared an innovative project, "Indian Knowledge System (IKS)," under the Ministry of Education, which intends to spread "the rich heritage of our country and traditional knowledge in the field of Arts and literature, Agriculture, Basic Sciences, Engineering & Technology, Architecture, Management, Economics, etc." and "to promote interdisciplinary research on all aspects of IKS, preserve and disseminate IKS for further research and societal applications."[8] However, the traditional knowledge that these migrating communities possess shall only be noticed if their indigenous knowledge and cultural heritage are discussed and understood appropriately. For example, the story, "*Concern*," as shown in Table 1, is not merely a story of family relationships. At the metaphysical level, it echoes the bitter truth of human life – all relationships are based on selfish motives. People remain in relationships as long as their self-interests are fulfilled; as soon as their self-interests are fulfilled; as soon as their needs are no longer met, the bond weakens and, in many cases, disintegrates. Hence, the idea of '*community literature*' aims at documenting, analysing, and making available for societal applications the indigenous knowledge contained in the orality of the migrating communities of India. There is a need for a separate category called '*community literature*' because under the umbrella of '*Oral Literature*', the oral literature of specific prominent communities is highlighted. The communities standing on the margins of marginality have remained unexplored.

The oral literature of the Gādaliyā Luhār community embodies the knowledge system of the Gādaliyā Luhārs. After leaving Rajasthan, this community started migrating to different parts of India. The Gādaliyā Luhārs communities in Gujarat state are engaged in the profession of blacksmithy, bullock-selling and rearing goats. They are the experts in understanding the behaviour of bullocks and goats. They can train calves for agricultural purposes and cut or trim the hoofs of cattle. They are good at traditional weapons and agricultural tool-making. Since they keep migrating and catering to the needs of farming communities, they are good at understanding the behavioural practices of people. Comprehending their oral literature can be a good study of human relationships and behaviour. It is packed with wisdom and inspirational elements. Other similar migrating communities are Rabaries or Maldharies, who are engaged in a cattle-rearing profession. They are found in many villages of Gujarat and Rajasthan states migrating for water and grass for their cattle. This community follows certain indigenous health practices. They use plants as herbs and treat their non-serious health-related issues. For example, in the case of severe headaches, the Rabaris would heat the leaves of the *akada* (*Calotropis gigantea*) plant, extract juice from these leaves, and apply it on the head. This juice is believed to give relief during

headaches. Seeing the flowering on the neem trees or holy basil plants they can predict the arrival of rain. If they see red-colour flowering on the neem trees, they would know that the rainy season is approaching fast. The coming out of ants from their colonies or certain signs of goats-sheep -- like not sitting on the earth or remaining standing -- give them clues that the rainy season is looming. This community has a unique reverence for animals. They see godly characteristics in animals. They believe that black cattle are the form of Goddess Kali. So, they would never beat the black cattle. They can identify their cow or buffalo from even a herd of hundred or more cattle. They are purely vegetarian and are found talking to their cattle and can understand their cattle's gestures. They see the Goddess Limboj, their family goddess, in neem trees. So, they would never cut the neem trees. They also worship the *khejadi* tree (*Prosopis cineraria*). To know their indigenous knowledge practices, it is important to understand their oral literature or folklore. However, no one has yet recorded the folkloristic practices of this community.

Similarly, Bahurupi is a community of wandering folk performers. They disguise themselves in the forms of mythological or popular gods and characters and entertain people to earn their livelihood. Vadee or snake charmers are used to entertain people with different shows on snake handling. They can easily identify different types of snakes and can handle and catch snakes. In some cases, they are also found treating snake bites. Though many Indian communities that were engaged in trapping birds and animals for their livelihood have stopped trapping birds and animals due to the Indian Wildlife (Protection) Act 1972, as per the records of the Anthropological Survey of India, once there were as many as 196 communities in India who were actively engaged in trapping birds and animals for their livelihood.[9] To stress again, the idea of '*community literature*' intends to document both the language and knowledge practices of these migrating communities. Along with modern sciences, the indigenous knowledge practices confined to the oral traditions of the hundreds of Indian nomadic groups can enrich our understanding of different

Table 2: Some areas in which intangible cultural heritage can assist in achieving sustainable development goals (A) and the potential of the '*community literature*' (B)

A	B
Traditional practices concerning water management can contribute to equitable access to clean water and sustainable water use.	The Maldhari and other nomadic communities of the drought-prone Kutch region of Gujarat have a good practice of water harvesting for themselves and their herds.
Intangible cultural heritage provides living examples of educational content and methods.	The indigenous knowledge practices of all the nomadic communities have the potential to form educational content. The woollen art of the Bhotias of Uttarakhand, the embroidery of the Banjara community, the ethnomedical knowledge of the Gaddi Shepherds of Jammu and Kashmir, and hundreds of other nomadic communities can serve as valuable case studies for educational purposes.
Intangible cultural heritage can help strengthen social cohesion and inclusion.	Targala or Nayaks of Gujarat and other street performers can bring social cohesion and inclusivity through their performances.
Intangible cultural heritage is decisive in creating and transmitting gender roles and identities and therefore critical for gender equality.	Certain socio-cultural practices of nomadic communities like the Gādaliyā Luhārs stress the importance of gender equality. The barter system in marriage has helped in maintaining a balanced gender ratio in their community.
Intangible cultural heritage can help protect biodiversity.	Most of the nomadic communities possess good knowledge about life, animals, birds, reptiles, trees, and nature that can help preserve biodiversity
Intangible cultural heritage can contribute to environmental sustainability.	Certain communities like Maldharis and Rabaris follow some religious beliefs that indirectly protect the environment.
Intangible cultural heritage is often essential to sustaining the livelihoods of groups and communities.	Most of the nomadic communities are engaged in traditional professions that are being disrupted by modern technological advancements, however, they provide a good model for sustainable livelihood
Many intangible cultural heritage practices have the promotion of peace at their very core.	Case studies on nomadic communities can provide insights into how they promote peace in society through mutual integration among the dominant cultural groups.

phenomena. At the international level, the '*community literature*' can play a vital role in achieving sustainable development goals. A UNESCO report, "*Intangible Cultural Heritage and Sustainable Development*," claims that "*Intangible cultural heritage can effectively contribute to sustainable development ..., as well as to the requirement of peace and security as fundamental prerequisites for sustainable development*."[10] The idea of '*community literature*' can prove helpful in attaining sustainable development. This idea is based on the need to recognise their socio-cultural identity and infuse a sense of pride among the migrating communities. The UNESCO report identifies the following areas, as listed in column 'A' of Table 2, in which intangible cultural heritage can assist in achieving sustainable development goals.[11] The column 'B' of Table 2 indicates how the '*community literature*' can be useful in achieving these goals.

To conclude, '*community literature*' advocates for documentation, translation, and analysis of the oral literature and folklore of Indian pastoralists and peripatetic nomads. The oral literature and folklore of these communities have remained unexplored, and the indigenous knowledge in these can be helpful for different societal applications and intangible cultural heritage management. These oral narratives are aesthetically rich and employ rich and mature vocabulary. The translation of the oral narratives can help in preserving their local languages and dialects and expanding their reach. If analysed and understood carefully, the indigenous knowledge in '*community literature*' can prove at par with some fields of contemporary sciences.

Notes and References

1. Sahdev, L. (2019). Reinvigorating Community Literature through Translating Orality and Culture. *Translation Today*; 13(1):120.
2. Sahdev, L. and Dushyant, N. (2020). Translating the Oral Tradition of Community Literature: A Case Study. *Translating and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts*; 6(3):253.
3. "Ethnic Group." *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*, Oxford University Press, https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/ethnic-group. Accessed 2 Sept. 2023.
4. Cited in Peter, M. G. (2013). Understanding Anomalous Distribution of Hunter-Gatherers: The Indian Case. *Current Anthropology*; 54(4):10–13.
5. Sharma, V. P. *et al*. (2003). *Pastoralism in India: A Scoping Study* (Ahmedabad: Indian Institute of Management & Germany: The League for Pastoral Peoples: 63.
6. Volume 9, Part 2 of the *People's Linguistic Survey of India* is entitled "The Languages of Gujarat, Diu and Daman and Dadra and Nagar Haveli" (Hyderabad: Orient BlackSwan, 2022). In the section IV of this book, "The Languages of Denotified, Nomadic, and Coastal Communities," only Bahurupi, Bhantu, Chamthi, Dafer, Madari, Nayaki, Vadee, and Vanjari languages are discussed (and not oral literature in these languages).
7. James, S. (2022). The Concept of the Aesthetic. *The Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*, edited by Edward N. Zalta (Stanford: Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University. https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2022/entries/aesthetic-concept/.
8. William J. Long, *English Literature: Its History and its Significance for the Life of the English-Speaking World - A Text-Book for Schools* (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1909). *Internet Archive*, http://archive.org/details/englishliteratur00longrich.
9. Ministry of Education, "Welcome to Indian Knowledge System." *Indian Knowledge Systems*, 20 Aug. 2023, https://iksindia.org/index.php.
10. Bahar D. (2004). *Biodiversity, Livelihoods, and the Law: The Case of the "Jogi-Nath" Snake Charmers of India*. New Delhi: Wildlife Trust of India.
11. UNESCO, *Intangible Cultural Heritage and Suitable Development* (Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 2015), p. 16, https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/34299-EN.pdf.
12. Ibid. pp. 4–16