International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences
Vol-11, Issue-2; Mar-Apr, 2026

Peer-Reviewed Journal
Journal Home Page Available: https://ijels.com/
Journal DOI: 10.22161/ijels

Rewriting the Canon: Feminist – Decolonial Readings of English Literature in the Age of AI and Algorithms

Alice Ancy F

Department of English Literature, V. O. Chidambaram College, Thoothukudi, Tamil Nadu, India.

Received: 24 Feb 2026; Received in revised form: 23 Mar 2026; Accepted: 28 Mar 2026; Available online: 03 Apr 2026
©2026 The Author(s). Published by Infogain Publication. This is an open-access article under the CC BY license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Abstract— *The English literary canon has long been shaped by Eurocentric, patriarchal, and caste-blind frameworks that marginalize or erase the voices of women, colonized peoples, and oppressed communities. In the contemporary digital age, artificial intelligence and algorithmic recommendation systems risk reinforcing these exclusions by privileging dominant narratives and silencing alternative voices. This paper proposes a feminist-decolonial re-examination of English literature that interrogates canonical authority, algorithmic bias, and the politics of digital visibility. By juxtaposing canonical texts with counter-narratives from postcolonial, feminist, and Dalit traditions, and by critiquing the role of algorithms in shaping literary reception, this study argues that rewriting the canon in the age of AI is both a literary and political act. The paper concludes by envisioning a plural, inclusive, and ethically responsible future for literary study.*

Keywords— ***artificial intelligence and algorithmic bias, digital humanities, english literary canon, feminist-decolonial theory, postcolonial literature and dalit literature***

I. INTRODUCTION

The word canon in literary criticism tends to connote a sense of timelessness, authority, and cultural universality. However, as many critics have illustrated, the canon is neither timelessly nor neutrally determined but a historically constructed system of value influenced by power structures. Guillory (1993) argues that the canon must be understood less as a collection of texts and more as an institutional practice that regulates cultural legitimacy. What constitutes fundamental or great literature is not, therefore, a product of quality per se but the outcome of political, cultural, and pedagogical selection.

In the case of English studies, such decisions were highly entangled in empire, patriarchy, and class systems. The evolution of the field in the nineteenth century was concurrent with Britain's imperial mission, and the canon was used as an instrument for spreading civilized cultural values throughout the colonies. Said (1993) underscores how canonical texts such as those of Austen, Dickens, or Kipling cannot be disentangled from the imperial contexts in which they were produced and circulated, reminding us that “culture is a sort of theater where various political and ideological causes engage one another” (p. xiii).

This construction of the canon has been constructed through gendered exclusions. Feminist critics have indicated how women's writing was regularly dismissed as domestic, sentimental, or univocal and hence peripheral to literary study. In an era where writers did not necessarily put their names on their work, Woolf's (1929) current classic complaint in A Room of One's Own-that "Anon, who wrote so many poems without signing them, was often a woman" (p. 45)-is a statement about this institutional erasure. Even when they were included in the canon, women writers like Jane Austen or the Brontë sisters were frequently read through patriarchal interpretive lenses that silenced their critiques of gender inequality. The exclusions extend further in postcolonial and caste contexts. Spivak's (1988) seminal essay Can the Subaltern Speak? challenges the assumption that marginalized voices can simply be added to dominant discourses without interrogating the very structures that silence them. Her conclusion-that the subaltern cannot speak in a system designed to erase their agency-points to the limits of canonical inclusion without structural transformation. In India, Dalit writers such as Bama (2000) and Valmiki (2003) have illustrated how caste hierarchies remain unacknowledged in literary canons shaped by upper-caste dominance. These works expose how exclusion operates not just through gender and empire but also through caste, demanding a decolonial rethinking of what counts as English literature.

Though these critiques have transformed the discipline, the twenty-first century adds one additional dimension: the influence of artificial intelligence and algorithms on literary reception. From search engines and digital repositories to AI-generative reading suggestions, tech now acts as a mediator between which texts are visible, accessible, and legible to readers. Noble (2018) cautions that search engines are not neutral but algorithmically reproduce social biases: "They privilege certain voices while marginalizing others" (p. 9). Translated to literary studies, this implies algorithmic curation has the potential to reinforce canonical dominance and bury marginalized literatures all the more.

Therefore, the work of rewriting the canon today must confront both historical omissions and digital copies of prejudice. This essay positions itself at the intersection of feminist-decolonial thought and digital humanities and claims that literary scholarship can and should not only re-read the canon but also resist algorithmic suppression. By centering feminist, Dalit, and postcolonial counter-narratives and by analyzing the algorithmic infrastructures that organize literary visibility, this paper illustrates how it is possible to rewrite the canon in the AI era both as a literary labor and a political intervention.

II. FEMINIST-DECOLONIAL THEORY AND CANON

The canon has always worked as a gatekeeping device and as a legitimation code. Its authority not only rests in what it contains but also in the mechanisms of exclusion that it naturalizes. For feminist and decolonial scholars, to question the canon is to deconstruct its attempts at universality and reveal the gender, racial, class, and caste hierarchies that underlie it.

John Guillory's analysis situates canon formation within the circulation of cultural capital, arguing that the canon is produced through institutional practices-curricula, anthologies, syllabi-that confer authority on certain works while marginalizing others. From the feminist perspective, such institutional authority has systematically devalued women's writing. In A Room of One's Own, Virginia Woolf underlined the material conditions that prevented women from pursuing education, achieving financial independence, and being free from domestic burdens, thereby preventing them from producing and publishing literature. Most famously, it is here that Woolf asserts, "a woman must have money and a room of her own if she is to write fiction" (Woolf 4) -which encapsulates how structural inequality shaped the very foundations of literary production.

Even when women's writing did enter the canon, feminist critics argue, it was often absorbed into interpretive frameworks that neutralized its radical potential. Jane Austen, for instance, has long been celebrated as a chronicler of domestic life, but her works also contain subtle critiques of gendered economic dependence and social constraints. Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar, in The Madwoman in the Attic, reinterpret Charlotte Brontë's Jane Eyre as a narrative that encodes female rage against patriarchal confinement. For Gilbert and Gubar, Bertha Mason—often dismissed as a colonial "madwoman"—becomes a symbol of suppressed female desire and anger (Gilbert and Gubar 336). This feminist rereading destabilizes canonical interpretations that had traditionally celebrated Jane Eyre as a triumph of moral and marital harmony.

Decolonial readings add another layer of critique by situating the canon within global systems of coloniality. Edward Said's Culture and Imperialism demonstrates how canonical texts like Austen's Mansfield Park encode the economic and cultural logics of empire. The wealth that sustains the genteel life of Austen's characters is drawn from colonial exploitation, a reality that remains unspoken yet structurally central. Said notes, "Neither the politics of colonialism nor the resistance to it can be separated from the culture in which they were embedded" (Said 12). Decolonial theorists such as Aníbal Quijano and María Lugones extend this critique by arguing that coloniality is not only about land and resources but also about knowledge systems and gender hierarchies. Lugones writes, "The modern/colonial gender system is a colonial imposition" (742), underscoring that Western frameworks of gender and sexuality were exported through colonialism and institutionalized in literature, law, and culture.

The literary example of Wide Sargasso Sea (1966) by Jean Rhys illustrates how feminist and decolonial critiques can intersect to "write back" to the canon. Rhys reimagines Brontë's Jane Eyre from the perspective of Bertha Mason, the silenced Creole woman locked in the attic. In Rhys's narrative, Bertha (renamed Antoinette) emerges not as a caricature of madness but as a woman destroyed by racial prejudice, colonial exploitation, and patriarchal domination. By giving voice to the silenced colonial subject, Rhys destabilizes the canonical authority of Jane Eyre and forces readers to confront its complicity in imperialist and patriarchal ideologies.

In the Indian context, Dalit literature represents a crucial feminist-decolonial counter-canon. Bama's Karukku (1992), an autobiographical narrative of a Dalit Christian woman, directly challenges both literary and social hierarchies. Written in Tamil and later translated into English, Karukku foregrounds caste discrimination within religious and educational institutions. Bama refuses the polished literary style of canonical texts, instead embracing a fragmented, oral, and testimonial mode that embodies resistance. As she notes, "The anger that wells up in you from childhood is what motivates you to write" (Bama x). This anger is both personal and political, demanding a place for Dalit women's experiences in the literary sphere.

Similarly, Omprakash Valmiki's Joothan (2003) interrogates the silence around caste in mainstream Indian literature. His memoir documents the humiliations of untouchability and the systemic denial of dignity. By narrating his lived experience, Valmiki exposes the inadequacy of a canon that claims universality while erasing caste oppression. Together, texts like Karukku and Joothan exemplify what Gayatri Spivak might call attempts to "speak" the subaltern condition—not by assimilation into the canon but by creating new literary and epistemic spaces.

Thus, feminist-decolonial theory does not merely add marginalized voices to the existing canon; it demands a restructuring of the very criteria by which literary value is determined. By foregrounding works like Wide Sargasso Sea, Karukku, and Joothan, this approach highlights how counter-narratives destabilize canonical authority and open the way for a more inclusive and politically conscious understanding of literature.

III. ALGORITHMS, AI, AND THE NEW CANON

If the canon has historically been shaped by institutions such as universities, publishers, and literary critics, in the twenty-first century, its gatekeeping functions are increasingly mediated by technology. Search engines, online reading platforms, digital archives, and artificial intelligence (AI) systems now play a decisive role in determining what texts are visible, recommended, and remembered. While these digital tools appear to democratize access to literature, they often replicate and even intensify older exclusions by privileging dominant narratives. The result is what might be called a "new canon"—one created not by scholars or critics but by algorithms.

Safiya Umoja Noble, in her seminal work Algorithms of Oppression, demonstrates how search engines are structured by racial and gendered biases. She writes, "Search engines are not unbiased, neutral platforms; they reflect the values and priorities of those who have the power to design them" (Noble 9). When applied to literature, this insight reveals troubling patterns. A simple search for "greatest novels of all time" on Google or Goodreads, for example, consistently elevates works by Shakespeare, Dickens, Tolstoy, Austen, and Hemingway, while relegating African, Dalit, Indigenous, and feminist voices to obscurity. The digital infrastructure that appears to offer universal access thus ends up reinforcing canonical hierarchies.

This bias extends to AI-driven recommendation systems on platforms such as Kindle or Goodreads. Algorithms learn from user interactions and established patterns of popularity, which means that texts already considered canonical are disproportionately recommended. As Ruha Benjamin notes in Race After Technology, "New technologies reflect and reproduce existing inequities unless deliberately designed otherwise" (Benjamin 25). A Dalit memoir like Bama's Karukku or an Indigenous poetry collection, for instance, is far less likely to appear in a user's "suggested reading" list compared to Shakespeare or Austen, regardless of the user's interests in marginalized literatures. In this sense, algorithms do not simply reflect taste—they actively shape it, narrowing the horizons of literary discovery.

The problem intensifies when we consider AI systems trained on large corpora of digitized literature. Machine learning models rely on vast textual datasets, which are themselves overwhelmingly skewed toward Eurocentric, male-authored, and canonical works. This skew produces a feedback loop: the more the canon dominates the dataset, the more AI reproduces canonical biases in tasks such as summarizing, analyzing, or even generating literature. For example, when asked to produce "a summary of a great novel," AI tools often default to Pride and Prejudice or Moby-Dick, rarely suggesting texts outside the Euro-American canon unless specifically prompted.

Moreover, the interpretive practices of AI flatten literature into easily digestible patterns, stripping away the cultural, historical, and political contexts that feminist and decolonial criticism insist upon. Stuart Hall reminds us that "representation is the way in which meaning is given to the things depicted" (Hall 15). If AI represents literature only through frequency and statistical patterns, then the complex meanings of marginalized texts—often rooted in the lived experience of oppression—risk being erased or trivialized. For instance, an AI-generated summary of Valmiki's Joothan may present it merely as a "memoir of Indian village life," obscuring its searing critique of caste oppression.

Digital archives, too, reproduce these exclusions. While projects like Project Gutenberg have made thousands of texts freely available, their collections overwhelmingly privilege works already considered canonical. By contrast, many feminist, Dalit, and Indigenous literatures remain undigitized, untranslated, or locked behind paywalls. The politics of digitization thus mirrors the politics of the canon: what gets preserved and circulated is what institutions deem valuable. As Lisa Nakamura argues, "Digital divides are not simply about access to technology but about access to cultural representation" (Nakamura 132). Without deliberate feminist-decolonial interventions, digital archives risk becoming repositories of the same narrow canon, extended into perpetuity.

The danger is not only exclusion but also distortion. AI-generated "interpretations" of literature can misrepresent marginalized texts by applying interpretive frameworks developed from canonical works. For example, a sentiment analysis algorithm might reduce Bama's Karukku to a narrative of "personal struggle" rather than a political indictment of caste and gender oppression. In this way, algorithms perform a kind of epistemic violence, reinscribing the very silences that feminist-decolonial scholarship seeks to break.

To be clear, AI and digital technologies are not inherently regressive. They hold enormous potential for expanding access to marginalized literatures, especially when guided by feminist-decolonial principles. Digital humanities projects that prioritize inclusivity—such as Dalit digital archives, feminist oral history collections, or open-access repositories of Indigenous writing—demonstrate how technology can resist, rather than reproduce, exclusion. But realizing this potential requires a critical awareness of how algorithms operate as cultural gatekeepers.

The "new canon" shaped by AI is thus not neutral; it is political. By privileging certain texts and suppressing others, algorithms enact a form of power analogous to the institutional authority of the old canon. The challenge for literary scholars today is to expose these biases, critique the politics of algorithmic visibility, and develop alternative infrastructures that amplify silenced voices. Only then can literature in the digital age become truly inclusive, moving beyond the illusion of universal access to a genuinely plural cultural archive.

IV. CASE STUDIES – READING AGAINST THE CANON IN THE DIGITAL AGE

While feminist and decolonial theories provide the framework for critiquing the canon, the stakes become clearer when we turn to specific texts and their reception in both traditional and digital contexts. By examining canonical authors such as Jane Austen and William Shakespeare alongside feminist, postcolonial, and Dalit counter-narratives, this section illustrates how digital infrastructures reproduce old hierarchies while also offering spaces for resistance.

1. Jane Austen: Domestic Harmony or Gendered Constraint?

Jane Austen is one of the most celebrated figures in the English literary canon, frequently appearing on AI-driven "top books" lists and university syllabi alike. Her novels, particularly Pride and Prejudice (1813), are often recommended by algorithms on platforms like Goodreads or Kindle because of their enduring popularity and high frequency of citation in digital corpora. Yet this algorithmic elevation tends to reinforce a narrow, romanticized reading of Austen as a novelist of marriage plots and genteel domesticity.

Feminist criticism, however, reveals a different Austen—one deeply attuned to the constraints imposed on women in patriarchal society. In A Vindication of the Rights of Woman (1792), Mary Wollstonecraft called for women's intellectual independence, a theme Austen subtly encodes in her critique of women's economic dependence on marriage. Elizabeth Bennet's refusal to marry Mr. Collins in Pride and Prejudice represents a rejection of material security in favor of personal dignity, an act of resistance often muted in canonical or AI-generated summaries. A Goodreads "blurb" might describe the novel as a "timeless romance," but a feminist-decolonial reading reclaims it as a text negotiating gendered survival strategies in a rigid social hierarchy.

Digital humanities projects such as "Jane Austen's Fiction Manuscripts" have made her works widely accessible, but their prominence often overshadows women writers of color from the same period, such as Mary Prince (The History of Mary Prince, 1831), whose narratives of slavery and survival are less visible in digital archives. The algorithmic canon,

in this case, amplifies an already dominant figure while silencing others who disrupt the romanticized portrait of nineteenth-century womanhood.

2. Shakespeare: Universal Genius or Colonial Export?

William Shakespeare has long been enshrined as the universal literary genius, occupying the very pinnacle of the canon. Digital algorithms reinforce this centrality: searches for "great literature" almost invariably return Shakespeare's plays, while AI systems trained on literary corpora often reproduce Shakespearean stylistics when asked to generate "poetic" language.

Postcolonial critics, however, have complicated this universalism by showing how Shakespeare's works were mobilized in colonial education systems as tools of cultural dominance. Gauri Viswanathan, in Masks of Conquest, argues that the teaching of English literature in colonial India was less about aesthetics than about discipline and control. "English literature appeared as a subject in the curriculum of the colonies before it became part of the university system in Britain" (Viswanathan 85). In this sense, Shakespeare was not merely a dramatist but an instrument of empire.

Contemporary reinterpretations such as Aimé Césaire's A Tempest (1969) rewrite Shakespeare's The Tempest from a decolonial perspective, giving voice to Caliban, the enslaved figure silenced in the original. While Shakespeare dominates digital search and AI-driven summaries, works like Césaire's are less visible, even though they offer critical correctives to the colonial ideologies embedded in the canon. AI-generated interpretations of The Tempest often highlight Prospero's wisdom and Ariel's loyalty but neglect Caliban's subjugation, thus reproducing a Eurocentric reading.

Digital circulation also plays a role. Shakespeare's works are widely digitized and available in multiple editions, while counter-texts like A Tempest remain relatively less accessible in open-access archives. This imbalance demonstrates how algorithmic infrastructures extend the reach of canonical works while limiting the visibility of those that challenge their authority.

3. Dalit and Queer Literatures: Marginal Visibility in Digital Spaces

Dalit and queer literatures present perhaps the starkest case of exclusion in the digital age. Writers such as Bama (Karukku) and Omprakash Valmiki (Joothan) foreground caste oppression in ways that destabilize dominant narratives of Indian literature, which have historically been shaped by upper-caste, male voices. Yet these works remain marginal in digital recommendation systems, rarely appearing in curated lists unless specifically sought out.

On platforms like Goodreads, user-generated tags for Karukku often frame it as "regional literature" or "social issues," categories that mark it as particular rather than universal. By contrast, Pride and Prejudice is categorized as "classic literature," reinforcing the canon's claim to timelessness. This digital taxonomy replicates the hierarchies of the canon: marginalized texts are treated as ethnographic or niche, while canonical texts are celebrated as universal.

Queer literatures face similar challenges. While authors such as James Baldwin have gained some algorithmic visibility due to their dual canonical and activist status, many queer and trans writers—especially from the Global South—remain underrepresented in digital archives. Online bookstores and AI recommendation engines rarely highlight works like Vivek Shraya's I'm Afraid of Men (2018) or Akhil Katyal's queer poetry in India, despite their critical importance to contemporary debates on gender and sexuality.

Yet digital platforms can also serve as spaces of resistance. Online archives like Dalit Women Fight and Queer Digital Archives India curate marginalized voices that mainstream algorithms overlook. These projects embody a feminist-decolonial ethos by reclaiming digital visibility for silenced communities. They demonstrate that while the algorithmic canon tends to reinforce exclusion, alternative infrastructures can challenge its authority.

4. The Politics of Classification and Metadata

The visibility of texts in digital spaces depends not only on algorithms but also on classification systems. Metadata—keywords, tags, categories—functions as the infrastructure of discoverability. Canonical texts often benefit from robust metadata, with multiple editions, scholarly introductions, and cross-references. Marginalized texts, however, suffer from sparse or misrepresentative metadata, making them harder to locate.

For instance, Valmiki's Joothan may be tagged simply as "autobiography" or "Indian literature," without reference to its specific engagement with caste. Meanwhile, Dickens's Great Expectations appears under "classic," "literature," "coming of age," "19th-century," and countless other categories. This disparity in metadata reflects the politics of representation: canonical texts are made legible in multiple interpretive frames, while marginalized texts are confined to narrow, often reductive labels.

As Miriam Posner argues in digital humanities scholarship, classification systems are never neutral; they encode the values of their designers. "The act of categorizing is itself a form of interpretation, with real consequences for what becomes visible or invisible" (Posner 19). In literature, these consequences determine whether a text is discoverable, teachable, and ultimately, canonical.

V. Toward a Feminist-Decolonial Digital Humanities

If algorithms and digital infrastructures risk reinscribing the hierarchies of the canon, then the task for scholars today is not only to critique these processes but also to imagine and build alternatives. A feminist-decolonial digital humanities (DH) does precisely this: it rethinks what counts as knowledge, who gets represented, and how technologies can be redesigned to reflect ethical commitments to justice and inclusion.

1. Reimagining Archives and Infrastructures

Digital archives have tremendous potential to diversify literary visibility, but only if curated with feminist-decolonial principles. As Roopika Risam argues in New

Digital Worlds, "The digital cultural record reproduces colonial and imperialist epistemologies unless intentionally interrupted" (Risam 6). A feminist-decolonial DH must therefore prioritize the digitization and translation of marginalized literatures—Dalit autobiographies, Indigenous oral traditions, Black feminist poetry, queer testimonies—and make them freely accessible.

Projects like the South Asian American Digital Archive (SAADA) and The Digital Archive of Latin American and Caribbean Ephemera model this ethos by collecting voices historically excluded from canonical archives. Similarly, grassroots projects such as the Dalit Women Fight online repository demonstrate how digital infrastructures can serve as platforms for resistance, countering the silencing effects of algorithmic visibility.

In practical terms, feminist-decolonial curation means asking: Who is included? Who is absent? Who controls the metadata? Whose interpretive frameworks guide categorization? A reimagined archive must disrupt Eurocentric hierarchies, not merely reproduce them in digitized form.

2. Inclusive Metadata and Algorithmic Justice

Metadata is the skeleton of discoverability; without it, texts vanish in the digital ether. Yet as Miriam Posner and others have shown, metadata categories often encode exclusionary assumptions. To resist this, feminist-decolonial DH projects must develop inclusive metadata practices. For example, tagging Valmiki's Joothan not only as "autobiography" but also as "Dalit literature," "anti-caste writing," and "testimonio" amplifies its discoverability and political significance.

Algorithmic justice also requires rethinking recommendation systems. Instead of privileging "most popular" or "most cited," platforms can design algorithms that deliberately diversify suggestions by incorporating marginalized texts into recommendation cycles. As Safiya Noble insists, "We cannot afford to leave technology design to those who prioritize profit over justice" (Noble 162). Literary platforms could adopt equity-based recommendation models, ensuring that a user searching for "classic literature" encounters Pride and Prejudice alongside Karukku or A Tempest.

Such interventions challenge the illusion of neutrality in algorithms, replacing it with a conscious politics of inclusion.

3. Pedagogy in the Age of AI

The classroom remains a crucial site for canon formation. In the digital age, pedagogy must adapt by interrogating both canonical authority and algorithmic bias. A feminist-decolonial pedagogy might involve pairing canonical texts with counter-texts—teaching Shakespeare's The Tempest alongside Césaire's A Tempest, or Austen's Pride and Prejudice alongside Bama's Karukku. This juxtaposition resists the singular authority of the canon and trains students to read critically across power structures.

Digital assignments can also foreground the politics of visibility. For instance, students might analyze how Goodreads categorizes texts, exposing hierarchies of "classic" versus "regional." Or they might contribute to open-access archives by creating metadata for underrepresented works. Such practices not only teach literature but also empower students to intervene in the digital infrastructures that shape cultural memory.

Furthermore, as AI tools become integrated into education, instructors must highlight their biases. Instead of banning AI, a feminist-decolonial pedagogy might ask students to compare AI-generated summaries of marginalized texts with their own interpretations, analyzing what gets erased. This transforms AI into a critical object of study rather than a hidden authority.

4. Decolonial AI and Ethical Design

At a broader level, the challenge extends to AI development itself. Most large language models are trained on Western, male-dominated corpora, reproducing structural exclusions. A decolonial AI project would deliberately curate diverse datasets, ensuring representation of marginalized voices. For example, training corpora could include Indigenous oral traditions, Dalit testimonios, or queer feminist essays, thereby broadening the epistemic base of AI knowledge.

Joy Buolamwini and the Algorithmic Justice League emphasize the importance of "inclusive coding," arguing that design teams must reflect diverse experiences to mitigate systemic bias. In the literary context, this means involving scholars of marginalized literatures in AI development processes, ensuring that cultural nuance is preserved rather than flattened into statistical patterns.

Moreover, ethical AI design demands transparency. Users should know what corpora an AI draws upon and whose voices are absent. By foregrounding absence, feminist-decolonial AI resists the myth of universality and acknowledges its own limitations.

5. Toward a Plural Future of Literary Study

The ultimate goal of feminist-decolonial DH is not merely to "add" marginalized texts into the canon or to "correct" algorithms but to rethink the very notion of canonization. What would it mean to study literature without a singular, hierarchical canon? What if literary study embraced plurality, where multiple traditions coexist without being forced into a universal scale of value?

This vision resonates with Dipesh Chakrabarty's call to "provincialize Europe"—to displace Europe from the center of global knowledge while allowing other epistemologies to emerge on their own terms. In literary studies, provincializing the canon means refusing to measure Dalit, Indigenous, or queer texts against Shakespeare or Austen, and instead valuing them for their own cultural and political contexts.

Digital platforms can embody this pluralism by designing non-hierarchical search systems that highlight multiple traditions simultaneously, refusing the logic of "best" or "greatest." In this sense, feminist-decolonial DH gestures toward a future where literature is not a single archive curated by power but a constellation of voices, each carrying its own authority.

V. CONCLUSION

The canon has always been a site of power. For centuries, it has operated as a selective archive—legitimating certain voices while marginalizing or erasing others. In the digital age, the forms of exclusion have shifted but not disappeared. Algorithms, AI systems, and digital platforms appear to democratize literary access, yet they often function as new agents of canonization, amplifying canonical texts while rendering marginalized literatures invisible.

This paper has argued that a feminist-decolonial approach is essential for disrupting these exclusions. By interrogating how digital infrastructures reproduce hierarchies, and by re-centering marginalized voices—Dalit, Indigenous, feminist, queer—scholars can resist both the authority of the traditional canon and the algorithmic canon that threatens to replace it.

The case studies of Austen, Shakespeare, and Dalit/queer literatures demonstrate how canonical authority is reinforced in digital spaces, but also how counter-readings and alternative archives open paths of resistance. The discussion of metadata, classification, and AI-generated interpretations shows that exclusion is not accidental but systemic, encoded into the very infrastructures of cultural memory. Yet Section IV highlighted that technology is not inherently regressive. When guided by feminist-decolonial principles, digital humanities projects, inclusive pedagogy, and ethical AI design can actively resist erasure and foster plurality.

Rewriting the canon in the age of AI is not simply an academic exercise—it is a political intervention. It asks us to confront not only what we teach and read but also how knowledge is structured, who has access to it, and whose voices define the future of literature. To "provincialize" the canon is to decenter universality and allow multiple literary traditions to coexist without subsumption. It is to imagine a digital literary sphere where Karukku and Joothan stand alongside Pride and Prejudice and Hamlet, not as supplements but as equal participants in shaping cultural memory.

As Stuart Hall reminds us, "Cultural identity is not an essence but a positioning" (Hall 226). The canon, too, must be reimagined as a shifting, contested, plural space rather than a fixed hierarchy. In this reimagining, AI and algorithms can play a constructive role, but only if their design is intentional, inclusive, and ethically grounded.

Ultimately, rewriting the canon in the digital age means recognizing literature as a living archive of struggle, resistance, and imagination. It means refusing the silences imposed by both colonial authority and algorithmic bias. And it means building infrastructures—pedagogical, archival, and technological—that honor the multiplicity of human experience. Only then can English literature, in its widest sense, serve as a space of justice, memory, and possibility for the futures to come.

REFERENCES

[1] Austen, J. (1813). Pride and prejudice. T. Egerton.
[2] Baldwin, J. (1956). Giovanni's room. Dial Press.
[3] Bama. (2000). Karukku (L. Holmström, Trans.). Macmillan India. (Original work published 1992)
[4] Benjamin, R. (2019). Race after technology: Abolitionist tools for the New Jim Code. Polity Press.
[5] Buolamwini, J. (n.d.). Algorithmic Justice League. https://www.ajl.org
[6] Césaire, A. (1969). A tempest (R. Miller, Trans.). Ubu Repertory Theater Publications. (Original work published 1969)
[7] Chakrabarty, D. (2000). Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial thought and historical difference. Princeton University Press.
[8] Guillory, J. (1993). Cultural capital: The problem of literary canon formation. University of Chicago Press.
[9] Hall, S. (1990). Cultural identity and diaspora. In J. Rutherford (Ed.), Identity: Community, culture, difference (pp. 222–237). Lawrence & Wishart.
[10] Hall, S. (1997). Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices. Sage Publications.
[11] Katyal, A. (2020). Like blood on the bitumen. Context/Westland Books.
[12] Nakamura, L. (2002). Cybertypes: Race, ethnicity, and identity on the Internet. Routledge.
[13] Noble, S. U. (2018). Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism. New York University Press.
[14] Posner, M. (2016). What's next: The radical, unrealized potential of digital humanities. In M. K. Gold & L. F. Klein (Eds.), Debates in the digital humanities 2016 (pp. 32–41). University of Minnesota Press.

[15] Prince, M. (1831). The history of Mary Prince: A West Indian slave. F. Westley & A. H. Davis.
[16] Risam, R. (2018). New digital worlds: Postcolonial digital humanities in theory, praxis, and pedagogy. Northwestern University Press.
[17] Said, E. W. (1993). Culture and imperialism. Chatto & Windus.
[18] Shakespeare, W. (1603). Hamlet. N. Ling.
[19] Shraya, V. (2018). I'm afraid of men. Penguin Canada.
[20] Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), Marxism and the interpretation of culture (pp. 271–313). University of Illinois Press.
[21] Valmiki, O. (2003). Joothan: A Dalit's life (A. P. Mukherjee, Trans.). Columbia University Press. (Original work published 1997)
[22] Viswanathan, G. (1989). Masks of conquest: Literary study and British rule in India. Columbia University Press.
[23] Wollstonecraft, M. (1792). A vindication of the rights of woman: With strictures on political and moral subjects. J. Johnson.
[24] Woolf, V. (1929). A room of one's own. Hogarth Press.