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ABSTRACT

Being the Masters of India as successors of the Muslims, British views on India, especially, Muslim India has been considered as most authentic and valuable contribution to the understanding of Indo-Muslim civilization. Muslim India has been seen through the British eyes. It is British Historiography of Muslim India 1800-1857 which forms the crest of the understanding of British attitude towards the Indo-Muslims, Euro-British tradition of Indo-Muslim historiography and in the understanding of now current identities and conflicts in South Asia. It also depicts a vast arena of concepts, modules, premises, problems, technicalities, theories, issues, perceptions and misperceptions related to the area.

Although Muslim historical literature with a moral purposive background provided the antecedents to the British, yet British historiography during the period was largely influenced by the Euro-British intellectual tradition; historical, passing through Renaissance, Reformation, Scientific Revolution, Enlightenment; and the early nineteenth century trends in the European thought such as liberalism, historicism, orientalism, colonialism, industrial revolution and nationalism. Orientalism forms the key to Indian studies and colonialism the purpose of historiography. The India seen through a Western, British superior ruling “self”, as an Eastern, Indian, inferior ruled “other”. It appears to be an administrative dialectics or discourse, to influence the Indian policy or influenced by the Indian affairs. Although covering a variety of issues and problems, its central theme seems to be the understanding of Indian identities, and a policy demonstration in this perspective. In spite of the fact that the British analysts see the British Indian historians as “individual guerrillas”, the British historical writings seem closely associated with or rather representing the western intellectual tradition. Four major streams of thought become identical in the British historiography of Muslim India on the bases of their views on Muslim India and their basic criterions to understand the history: Oriental Romanticists, Ethno-Regional Romanticists, Utilitarians and Missionaries. A clear-cut demarcation among the schools is not possible. All seem concerned with the question of Indian identity, considering Hindus as natives and
Muslims as foreigners, imperial, despotic, religiously bigoted community of fighters. They aim at strengthening the British Imperial rule in India and want to change the Indian society in European sense: westernisation, Anglicisation and Christianisation. However the four schools show their distinction from each other with an overlapping of views in coordination or in contest. Yet the treatment of Muslim India makes them clearly distinct from each other and each school represents an evolutionary change, not only within itself, but also with mutual influences to each other.

The Oriental Romanticists’ criterion for the understanding of history appears to be antiquity, literature and diversity. In this perspective the ancient India forms their central theme of studies. Sir William Jones’ identification of ancient Indian civilization and subsequent rise of Indian romance and ‘Indology’, led to an early nineteenth century romanticists’ defence of Indian civilization. They laid the blame of the degeneration of Hindu Society on the Muslim rule. The marked conflict between oriental romanticists’ concept of nation based on antiquity and geography, and the state of contemporary Hindu society as highlighted by the utilitarians and missionaries, seems to be synthesised by Malcolm and Elphinstone in the form of merger of Muslims in the Indian Nation and elevation of “a whole Indian Nation”. The romanticists were of the view that Indians were a civilized society and they should be treated with civility and a cautious policy should be adopted for social change in India. However by the middle of the nineteenth century an extreme romanticism in favour of the Hindus and against the Muslims became visible.

The Ethno-Regional Romanticists identified layer of “nations” in the depth of Indian civilization on the model of oriental romanticists and advocated a treatment, having identity for a Multi-national and Multi-cultural society.

Contrary to the romanticists, utilitarians focused on the contemporary history and attached it with the Muslim period of Indian history as seen in the Gladwin’s works. Mill refused to accept the civilized status of the Hindu Society, criticizing its barbarian nature. He highlighted a positive contribution on the part of Muslims in bringing a change in the Indian society. Thornton replied blame of degeneration of Hindu society as an impact of Muslim rule and pointed out degeneration among the Muslims as an impact of the Hinduism. However the utilitarians insisted on the westernisation or Anglicisation of
India through a policy of radical social change. However, Erskine tried to resolve the conflict by advising a paternalistic attitude on the Mughul model.

Utilitarians used the missionaries' arguments and missionaries used utilitarian evidences. Missionaries saw the westernisation in the form of Christianisation. They insisted on an effective role of the East India Company for the conversion of the Indian Heathens.

In this way British historiography appear to be an administrative discourse. Muslims are treated as foreigners from a distance and seem not to form the central themes of the British historians. Their "self " and "other" approach failed to identify "others" and place Muslims in "others", accepting Muslim identity as a nation. None of the schools accepted the civilized status of Muslims and even placed them inferior to western civilization in their self generated criterions. Therefore it rather appears a sort of colonial apology than attempts to understand the Indian situation. On the one hand it seems to be creating a romance of Hindu nationalism and on the other hand it seems to be creating a sort of reactionary resistance among the Indian Muslims against the British.
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Chapter One:

INTRODUCTION

1. Introduction.

The Study *British Historiography of Muslim India* (1800-1857) has a two-dimensional framework. It deals with: (1) The study of Indian Muslim history and British attitudes towards it and (2) The European and British Intellectual tradition and its response to the Indian situation.

What is happening and how? These are the questions that have ever created a sense of curiosity among men. The impulse to understand the diversity of nature is natural to man. Man wants to be taught and to teach others, “to be educated and to educate others”.¹ But how to understand the diversity of nature and how to be educated and how to educate others are the questions which have been very crucial for the human mind. Sources of knowledge may be placed in three categories, according to the nature of sources, viz., revelation, reason and tradition. Since all three categories have always been used, therefore, their relative importance is a debatable issue.²

History is the work of men behind the events, making a sense of evolution. It has been an accepted source of knowledge ever since the dawn of history, not only for philosophers and kings, but also for religions. In this way, writing history (i.e. historiography) is a work of vital importance. History and historiography emerged as sound disciplines out of Ibn Khaldun's *Muqaddima* on philosophical and technical grounds. Ibn Khaldun analysed the historiography of his predecessors and developed the use of history for the formulation of social philosophy. The outcome was a "Philosophy of History", the foundation of modern historiography.³ In Europe, the sense

---


² For a debate on the nature of sources of knowledge see Muhammad Iqbal, *Reconstruction Of Religious Thought In Islam*, Lahore, 1989.

of history or philosophy of history seems to be emerging in the nineteenth century Historicism. Therefore historiography has emerged as an important field of study in the twentieth century.

Although the importance of historical knowledge has been accepted in virtually all societies, and some, like the Muslims and the post-Reformation Christians of Europe, have given it a place of honour in their structure of knowledge. The validity of any given historical account has always been questioned. Since historical knowledge is passed down through time by individuals, there is always room for doubts regarding authenticity and reliability. Historiography as a discipline attempts to resolve these doubts. However the difference of opinion among historians stressed the need to evolve a method to analyses historiography. A number of historians contributed to the evolution of new methodologies for history and principles of historiography.

In this perspective, historiography as a discipline focuses mainly on three aspects: to analyses the written history, to analyse the historians' "contemporary" sense of history and how to write history. Therefore historiography focuses mainly on the technicalities of concepts, problems, premises and theories related to the human past and in this regard it serves as a motivating force for the writing of new histories; for keeping in mind the flaws of earlier historiography or determining the concepts of historiography. However the study of historiography as a sort of historians' contemporary history is the most remarkable development that the discipline has made during the recent past. In the modern times, historiography is studied by literary critics as well as by the students of

---

4 Three distinct functions of historiography are quoted by Perry Anderson in *Arguments Within English Marxism*, London, 1980, from Thompson's *Poverty of Theory*. These functions can be formulated as: "(1) what is the particular nature and place of evidence in any historical inquiry? (2) What are the appropriate concepts for the understanding of historical processes? (3) What is the distinctive object of historical knowledge"? The first two functions are related to the methodology for writing history, and the third can be taken as dealing with the result of the historical knowledge. In this regard writing history and its analyses seems to be the basic concept of Historiography.

5 Ibn Khaldun, *op. cit.*, Introduction.

6 G. R. Elton, *The Practice of History*, London, 1967, quoted by Grewal, *Muslim*. In the 'Foreword' the authors stress that study of historiography is not a second order history. They considered it as a sort of history equally important like a document-based history.


philosophy. Although political history is still the dominant trend, yet the historians have diverted their attention towards, social, economic, constitutional, intellectual, literary and other aspects of a society for historiography. In this way, social history, literary history, history of philosophy, intellectual history and economic history are the types that emerged out of this new tradition and the concept of “philosophy of history” has provided historiographical studies a prominent place in the histories of philosophy.\footnote{See Albury Casteel, *An Introduction To Modern Philosophy*, London, 1963, pp.432-499.}

In this perspective, the study of historiography has become a vast discipline. Even the study of only one historian or history of the period can take years of research. Therefore, the varieties of histories and historians extend the need of the specification of a historiographic model for the current study. So this dissertation will focus on the analyses of general content, premises, themes and theories on Muslim India from some selected Indian histories written by British historians during the first half of the nineteenth century. The individual histories of histories are supposed to form content of some future plan based on this research.

1.1. Contemporary Scene.

The first half of the nineteenth century was a period of great upheavals in India as well as in Europe. After a long span of active rule Muslim political power was at the verge of its decline. The petty powers of India, Sikhs, Jats, Marathas, Rajputs, along with Muslim nobility had declared their independence and the vacuum of central authority was being filled by the British. British had become a paramount power in India after the fall of Seringapatam in 1799 and establishing a military protectorate for the Mughul emperor at Delhi in 1803. From that time onward the British East India Company seems to be struggling to establish their direct and effective rule in India or to strengthen their rule. By 1857 the British had established their direct rule over India. Their focus was on two fronts: conquests and administration. On the first front, the British remained busy in wars with Nepal, Marathas, Sikhs, and Muslim states to make their authority paramount. On

\footnote{R. A. Skotheim’s *American Intellectual Histories*, New Jersey, 1960, can be taken as a best Example of such a type of History.}
the other front they introduced crucial social, political, cultural and educational changes on western model to strengthen their rule. The interaction between the British and Indians had began to formulate premises and understandings in the minds about each other which had began to influence their reactions.

A similar state of affairs prevailed in Europe. Since the French Revolution 1789, there was a permanent conflict between the forces of liberalism and conservatism and revolution and reaction. Simultaneously the concept of nationalism and democracy were gaining ground challenging the traditional political hierarchy and monarchies. The industrial revolution had begun to bring a change in the social structure and ideologies based on the philosophical foundations of enlightenment. Most of all, there was a struggle for mastery not only in Europe but in the colonies also. India had been a scene of war between Britain and France and during the period under discussion British supremacy seems to have been threatened by the expansionist plans of Russia. The Anglo-French rivalry seems to have been converted into Anglo-Russian conflict by the Russian expansion to territories of the fast-declining Ottoman Empire. To check the threats of imperial powers, small European states tried to promote the alliance system and congress system to maintain peace and the balance of power. In this perspective India had gained a very important position for the British due to its economic resources.

India had gained an important place not only in this wider European context but also in the internal British affairs. England had gained a place of prominence and British society a standard refinement in their living standard. The colonies were considered the foundation of these developments. In this way, the internal state of affairs in Britain was being seen in the colonial perspective. The political reforms, educational system, women’s rights and revenue system were the burning issues of the time. However to keep the working of internal affairs smooth, British government was willing to establish a check on the colonies, controlled by the administration of the trading companies. Simultaneously, common British people became worried about the method of government applied in the colonies. Britain had been considered the champion of human rights, liberalism, democracy, constitutionalism and other concepts, which were the
subject matter of the domestic debate. All this was being seen in the context of British
relation with India.

1.2. Importance and Significance of The Study.

The study recognizes the need to analyse the British historiography of Muslim India
during the final phase of Muslim political power in India. It attempts to bring to light the
elements, motives and purposes working behind the British historiographical efforts in
the field of Indian Muslims’ history and the compulsion of non-indigenous, method and
thought applied to the understanding of Indian history. Focusing on the British
intellectual framework, in which, Muslim history is analysed, it also evaluates the
importance of Muslim history as a past experience of Indian administration for the British
Indian government. In this way, the study covers a neglected period of Indian Muslims’
history and opens a debate for new areas of research. In doing so, it incidentally also
highlights the background of the War of independence and the renaissance of Indian
Muslims, compelled by the attacks of British intellectuals attacks on the social, political
and cultural life and heritage of the Indian Muslims. It is hoped that it will provide some
important clues to the British perception of Indian Muslims’ culture and civilization and
highlight the scene of change taking place during the late eighteenth century and in the
first half of the nineteenth century. As a contemporary history, the study provides
glimpses of the foundation of British attitude towards Indian Muslims after the
Company’s rule in the crown era. The study provides glimpses of the British intellectual
framework and justification, they advocated for the permanence of British rule in India
and, to solve the internal and external problems of Indian administration. In this regard, it
also provides an insight into the roots of British attitude towards Indian Muslims in order
to understand the influence of the British historians on the policies of the British
government, especially towards the Indian Muslims. Above all the study hopes to provide
an insight for contemporary South Asian problems linked with historical past or its
interpretations such as identity, nationalism, civilization, culture, empire and community,
which are the burning issues of modern times.
2. India and Muslim India.

2.1. India: A Complex Term.

"India" has been a complex term both in history and geography. Henry Yule and A. C. Burnell are of the opinion that the word originated from Sanskrit word “Sindhu” meaning “the sea” used for river Indus. The word was adopted by the Persians as Hindu and “Hind” was used by the authors of Arabic historiography (as, for example, Al-Baruni’s “Kitab-ul-Hind”). The word seems to be adopted by Romans and Greeks as India. Initially the word “India” was used either for the river Indus or the areas between Indus and Ganges. The same word in the form of “Indies” was applied to the areas of southern and eastern Asia and even to America. In the medieval Persian chronicles (of the Sultanate period of Indian history) the word “Hindostan” is used for the areas that mark the later Mughul period state of Oudh. However during the second half of the eighteenth century the word was used for the areas comprising the Mughul Empire. In the romanticists’ version the area designate as India seems to stretch from Cabul to Indonesia, by the mid-nineteenth century India had become synonym for Hindustan. The most generally accepted terminology, during the rule of British East India Company, India was marked as a great geographical unit, stretching from the Indus on the west to the delta of Ganges in the East. The Arabian Sea and Indian Ocean formed the natural frontiers in the south of India and vast semi-circle of mountain ranges, (Hindu Kish, Karakoram and Himalaya etc.) marked a natural wall from the Indus to the Bay of Bengal in the northern side. In modern times the term South Asia is being used for the same

14 See for example map attached to Mill’s History.
16 The best example of this sort of understanding of cultural geography of India is John Crawford’s History Of The Indian Archipelago, Three Volumes, London, 1820.
area. In spite of these natural frontiers of mountains and sea the difference of opinion regarding India’s geographical definition shows the geographical importance of India.\textsuperscript{19} Thus this area has been treated as “continent” and “subcontinent”. In the present study, the British concept of the Indian boundaries, as perceived by various authors from time to time, has been accepted for the purpose of analysis.

### 2.2. Periodization of Indian History.

The periodization of Indian history is a varied concept. Generally, Indian history is divided into three distinct periods, on the model of European history, in continuation of the efforts to create harmonization between colonial masters and colonized people and to develop a concept of the unity of Europe and Asia as “Eurasia”. In this connection attempts are made to divide the Indian history as well as European history on the same model from the pre-historic periods to the latest.\textsuperscript{20} Since the enlightenment and especially from the rise of history as a discipline in the nineteenth century, the progressive theory of history had become popular among the historians. For the history of the eighteenth century onward, European authors have used the term modern history, for the near past (2\textsuperscript{nd} to 15\textsuperscript{th} century with the interregnum of Renaissance and Reformation in Europe), they used the term medieval, and for the remote past, ancient. In this way, they advocated the concept of evolution of human civilization and unity of history. The same terms were applied to the Indian history: ancient India, medieval India and modern India.\textsuperscript{21} Some historians have divided the India history on the indigenous model as Vedic, Aryan, Muslim and European period. Simultaneously Vedic or ancient period has been

---

\textsuperscript{19} See for a detailed discussion on the subject Mathew H. Edney, Mapping an Empire: The Geographical Construction of India, 1765-1843, Chicago, 1997 and Ian J. Barrow, op. cit., 37-49.


aken as classical age, Muslim period as Middle Age and European period as modern Age.22

Some historians of civilizations disagreed with this application of European historical concepts to Indian history. Looking at India as a land, which had been invaded many times, they saw its history in the light of three different civilizations. The romanticists pronounced the unity and perfection of Hindu civilization,23 the Enlightened and utilitarian school accepted the role of Muslim civilization in the world history and argued to propagate the superiority of the European civilization,24 represented by the British in India. The historians of political history followed the same pattern. They identified the era of political hegemony and divided Indian history into Hindu, Muslim and British eras of political dominance.25 The British period has also been taken as “Christian” period.26 Some of the historians have also divided Indian history in pre-colonial, colonial and post-colonial periods.27 However the periodization differs in interpretation. For some historians Vedic periods come to seventh century A.C., and some begin modern period or colonial period from the invasion of Alexander the Great. Simultaneously some historians mark the beginning of modern history of India by the accession of Akbar the Great. Most of the variations in nomenclature noted above, however, broadly coincide with the periodization of ancient, medieval and modern in term of the time sequence (up to 800 A.D., up to 1800 and since then).

---

23 This concept of Hindu civilization is a common feature among the romantic historians of India. See for example Sir William Jones, Works, London, Thirteen Volumes, 1807; H. T. Colebrooke, Miscellaneous Essays, ed. by T.F. Colebrooke, London, 1873 and John Crawford, op. cit.
24 See for example Edward Gibbon, The History Of The Decline And Fall Of The Roman Empire, ed. J. B. Bury, Seven Volumes, London, 1776-1788; and Mill, India
25 See for example Mill, India.
27 Tanvir Anjum has applied the terms in the post independence sense. However the term has been applied in the early nineteenth century with the exemption of post-colonial.
2.3. Muslim India.

In the British historiography of India, the term "Muslim India" acquired special significance. It marked an era of political dominance or a civilization of its own, that established an identity for the Muslim community in India.

India has been a centre of civilization from the early days of history. The people living in the territory classified as India by the British, produced the Harappan and Gandhara civilizations, and established Mauryan, Kushan and Harsha Empires and the religious codes of Buddhism, Jainism and Hinduism. Due to its importance and prosperity, a lot of exotic elements entered the region from time to time and merged into the indigenous socio-religious tradition. But it was the Muslims, who not only established their rule in the Indian subcontinent for several centuries, but also preserved their separate identity in the sphere of social, cultural, religious and intellectual activities. Before the Muslims, India was divided into a large number of states. There had been no unified state encompassing the areas North of Vindhiyas for a long time. The Muslims not only introduced a new religion and culture but also established the concept of the political unity in various parts of India at different times. The permanent contacts and relations with the Middle East and the Central Asian Muslim world contributed a lot in the development of Indo-Muslim civilization. This civilization, while preserving its individuality, also provided ground for the intermixture of Islamic civilization with that of local Indian traditions. During the period of British Rule and the Muslim struggle for freedom, the term “Muslim India” became synonymous both for the Muslim community of the subcontinent and for the civilization which the Muslim community had developed, particularly from the 13th to eighteenth century A. D. In this study the term is applied to the Muslim community of India, collectively, irrespective of the areas or period of their dominance in power or population. A number of writers have used the term to denote the areas that have been under the Muslim rule and the areas in which the Muslim form the majority of the population.

3. British Historiography of Muslim India.

The British historiography of Muslim India seems to be connected, on the one hand, with pre-British tradition of historiography in India and on the other hand, with the British perception of history in general and Indian history in particular. We will, therefore, briefly state some of the salient features of these two aspects, before coming to the British tradition of historiography of the Muslims of India. However we will deal with them under the heads of: (1) the pre-colonial Indian tradition as an antecedent and (2) the pre-colonial British tradition of historiography as precedent.

3.1. Antecedents.

Pre-British tradition of Indian historiography is synonymous with medieval Muslim historiography of India. The ancient Indian society did not have a very strong sense of historiography as a result there is a dearth of historical literature before the advent of Islam in India. Hindu tradition of history was based on mythological and legendary compilations such as Vedas, Shastaras, Mahabharta, and Ramayana or on numismatical and archaeological evidences. Therefore the British historians either neglected the early history of India or tried to interpret it in literary and mythological terms. A strong tradition of historiography in India began with the establishment of Muslim rule in India. The Muslims imported strong and vibrant tradition of history to India, which seems to be a continuity of Muslim tradition of Historiography. The Muslim historical literature was in the form of biographies, chronicles, political history, contemporary history (ma'athir), or administrative rules or in the form of travelogues. Some of it was strictly official history and some of it was politically sponsored. There was, however, a corpus of

---

29 Grewal, Historian, p.32.
non-sponsored and unofficial historical literature as well. 33 This tradition has been divided into Sultanate and Mughul periods of Muslim rule.

History of Sultanate period or medieval India “meant for the historians of medieval India political history and only have meant political history”34 and seem to have administrative purposes. Naturally they focused on the contemporary history in terms of dynasties, individual rulers, distinguished nobles, Sufis35 and officials.36 Although their subject matter remained confined to the activities of ruling elite, matters related to wars and conquests37 and to the suggestions and admonitions for the rulers and ruling elite,38 yet all histories begin with a firm declaration, on the part of rulers and writers, of belief in Islam39 and have contents related to cultural history.40 However a number of poetic source, religious and mystical literature and travelogues too have been considered as great contribution to medieval historical literature41 Most of these sources are in Persian, the cultural language of Muslim political elite who were a minority religious and ethnic ruling community in India.

The historians of Medieval Sultanate period “critically evaluated the activities of the rulers in the light of the dictates of religion as endorsed by the ‘ulama’42 and the ‘best practices’ they themselves acknowledged”.43 However “not criticizing individuals and personalities directly” but “critically evaluating actions” along with the identification of

---

33 Peter Hardy, op. cit., passim.
34 Ibid., pp. 6-7.
35 A mystic belonging to a brotherhood based on a methodological understanding of the way to approach union with God.
37 P. Hardy, op. cit., p. 3.
40 P. Hardy, op. cit., pp. iv, 4
41 For example see the works of Amir Khusrav.
42 Scholar, especially in religious field.
43 Khurram Qadir, op. cit., p. 25.
personal belief of the people under evaluation seem to be their guiding principle. In this perspective Medieval historiography had a purposive outlook to strengthen the Muslim empire in India. It was a means “to inform the sultan, the Ulama’ and the Umra’ of the action of the past rulers and their consequences so that they could plan their actions and role in that light” and to make the public aware of the achievements and failures of the rulers. This purpose attached the Muslim historians with what P. Hardy called “general history of the Muslim world” and led to draw inferences and principles from history, which is called “philosophy of history”. This attitude was largely influenced by the religious and mystical belief system of Islam.

The later historians, whether Mughul or British, adopted this “ready made” tradition of medieval Muslim historiography for historical premises, techniques or evidences. It had politico-administrative leaning, with a focus on contemporary history, with the same purpose of guidance and information for rulers and the public in the exotic Persian language of minority ruling community. Yet the Mughuls brought about a big change in this tradition as a result of two centuries of freedom from external invasions and an enduring peace within the empire that provided a requisite environment for the socio-cultural advancement, economic prosperity and all round development. The Mughul rulers were fond of literary pleasures and this peace and tranquillity strengthened this

---

47 The same type of work on a higher scale and more systematic method was being done by Ibn Khaldun in North Africa about the same time. Ziya al-din Barani’s Fatawa –I- Jahandari has been considered as a complementary to his Trikh –I- Firoz Shahi same as Ibn Khaldun’s Prolegomena and Machiavelli’s Prince are complementary to their histories.
49 R. G. Collingwood, The Idea of History, Oxford, 1946, p. 234. According to this theory, the essential things in history are memory and authority. History is thus believing someone else when he says that he remembers something.
50 P. Hardy, op. cit., p. 7.
51 There are so many works written on the model of sultanate historiography such as Khond Mir’s Habibus Siyar, and Dastur al Wuzra, Abbas khan Sarwani’s Tarikh i Sher Shahi, Ahmad Yadgar’s Trikh i Shahi, Harawil’s Tarikh I Khan Jahan, Nirzamuddin’s Taqquat I Akbar, Abul Fazal’s Akbarnama, etc. For a view of the Persian language influence on Mughul historiography see Humaira Arif Dasti, “Persian Influence on the Historiography of Mughul India”, in Journal of Research (Humanities), Bahauddin Zakiriya University, Multan, Vol. 21(2003), pp. 59-68.
attitude. They strengthened the tradition of memoirs in autobiography and biography by the members of ruling dynasty, both male and female, and focused on the cultural aspects of the dynasty along with political aspects. However, Akbar’s reign provided stimuli to the innovative trends. On the one hand, he promoted the culture of translations. This tradition was adopted by the eighteenth century British. Simultaneously, a tradition of collection of records seems to be developing during the reign to systematize the administration. Khwand Amir had already written a treatise entitle Qamun-I-Humayuni. Abul Fazal edited Ain-I-Akbari and collected his official letters under the titles of Ruqat-I-Abul Fazal and Muktubat-I-Allami. The tradition seems to be followed by the modern historians. This was the beginning of a “rational secular” tradition of Indian Historiography which has been taken as a source of transformation of Mughul Empire into a nation state by a large number of modern historians, Western as well as Indian. From that time a sort of conflict in terms of dialectics between Islam and Hinduism, empire and regionalism, secularism and communalism and between orthodoxy and modernism, in the approaches to understand the Indian history, is clearly visible which seems to be inherited by the British. However a number of historians widened their scope to whole dynasties or tried to evaluate the process of history. Badauni’s Muntakhab-ut-Tawarikh was a comprehensive history of India from the time of Ghaznavids to the fortieth year of Akbar’s reign. A history of the Muslim world up to one thousand years of Hijra era was compiled by the orders of Akbar by Maulana Ahmad, Badauni and others. This trend of evaluation of a complete span of time culminated later in the history written by Muhammad Kais Freight. His Tarikh-I- Farishta became very popular among the generation coming after. The same tradition seems to prevail during

---

52 Tuzak-I-Babri, Humayun Nama and Tuzuk-I-Jahangiri can be taken as example of this tradition. See Annette Susannah Beveridge, tr., The Babarnama, London, 1922; The History of Humayun (Humayun Nama), Oriental Translation Series-1, 1901, Indian reprint, Delhi, 1972.

53 For example Badaoni translated Ramayana from ancient Sanskrit to Persian and translated one half of Mahabharata.

54 See for a discussion on the subject Abdur Rashid, op. cit. pp. 128-138.

55 History of Medieval India, p. 21.
the later Mughul period. The emphasis of historians was either on the contemporary political history or on the religious aspects.\textsuperscript{56}

3.2. Precedents.

The British historians of Muslim India were impressed by three-fold tradition of historiography: at home (in Europe and Britain), in colonies other than India and in India. British Indian historiography will be the subject matter of coming section. Here we will discuss the tradition "at home" in Europe and Britain and in other colonies and the historiography of India by European nations other than the British. The early tradition of English historiography, primarily, was based on folklore, cultural traditions, travelogues, biographical sketches, memoirs and official or personal records. It was dominated by a religious sense of understanding of history. But, since the 16th century, under the influence of the renaissance and the reformation, a sense of classical history (on the model of the art literature and civilization of Greece and Rome) had become the ideal of the European intellectuals. However enlightenment turned this antiquarian attitude back to contemporary political track.

The enlightenment introduced some powerful elements in the concept of historiography that continued to dominate the historians' mind, method and morality to date. It shifted the focus of historical narration from divine forces to the arena of human activity. Social and cultural aspects of history gradually gained popularity. History became the tool for the consolidation of human thought rather than just an element of amusement for people.\textsuperscript{57} It secularised every department of human life and thought and in this way emerged as a “crusade against Christianity” in the writings of Vico (1668-1744), Voltaire(1694-1778) and Hume( 1711-1776).\textsuperscript{58} In this sense Hume's History of England had become a symbolic expression of rational enlightened trends.\textsuperscript{59} It resembles the conflict, which had emerged during the reign of Akbar in the historiography of India. In

\textsuperscript{56} Mir Ghulam Hussain Tabatabai’s Sipor-ul-Mutakherin, tr. John Briggs, Calcutta, 1832; and Shah Waliullah’s writings on religious matters represent these two trends.
\textsuperscript{57} See Patrick Gardiner, ed., Theories of History, New York, 1959, passim.
\textsuperscript{58} R. G. Collingwood, op. cit., pp.76-78.
\textsuperscript{59} Hume, History of England, ————.
this way by the beginning of the nineteenth century history had acquired a philosophy (a philosophy of history) in Europe’s intellectual tradition. Montesquieu (1689-1755) saw the history in term of a natural process and Gibbon explained it in the form of historical laws of nature. However religious spirit with a shift to new symbols continued to work in the European mind. A trend of using history for the derivation of principles and patterns of behaviour became dominant. The philosophers, theorists and politicians all applied the historical evidences for the evaluation of their premises and policies.

However, French and German romanticists seem to be widening the scope of history. Rousseau (1712-1778) extended the understanding or role of man from men in power to common man and revived the culture of Renaissance and Middle Ages. However their focus was on the diversity of culture and civilizations in the world. Herder (1744-1803) saw human life closely related to natural world. It was Kant (1724-1804) who tried to combine enlightenment and romanticism through his An Idea for a Universal History from the Cosmopolitan Point of View published in 1784. His themes had become popular at the end of eighteenth century, which also promoted the themes of orientalism.

On this ground, the first half of the nineteenth century seems to be a period for the growth of divergent historical assumptions and premises with a widened spatial and temporal scope. German romanticists’ focus on ancient Greek and Roman culture, civilization and politics along with languages and religion, linked historical studies with the medieval times. The spirit of inquiry and method of criticism began to develop new social science, which seems to be greatly influencing the British Historiography of Muslim India.

---

60 R. G. Collingwood, op. cit., p.81.
63 Ibid., p.89.
64 Kant. I., An Idea for a Universal History from the Cosmopolitan Point of View, 1784.
The British historiographers during the first half of the nineteenth century seems to be following the same tradition. Politics, language, literature, laws, customs, ethics and human nature seem to be the dominant fields of interest in all schools of thought and had become burning issues. British historiography seems to be motivated by contemporary philosophical intellectual debate in Europe. Three main themes seem to be dominating the mind of British historians. First that was association of contemporary British society with the continuity of historical process as was presented par excellence by Hallam in his *Sketch of Europe in the Middle Ages*. Second was a tendency of writing biographical works to identify the role of man in history which seems to be done by a lot of historians and can best be seen in Carlyle's *On Heroes and Hero Worship*. And third was the presentation of religious history in a secular way as was best done by Macaulay as *History of England*. These trends seem to be determining the approaches of the British historians. However tradition of writing on the colonial subjects seems to be dominating during the period and *History of England* was being viewed in its relations with the British colonies. Here we will deal with the historiography of the colonies other than India which is the subject matter of coming section. In the tradition of historiography of colonies America and West Indies seem to be dominating the British interest. Three example of such interests were P. Colquhoun’s *A Treatise on the Wealth, Power and Resources of the British Empire in the every Quarter of the World, Including East Indies*, Bryan Edwards’ *The History, Civil and Commercial, of the British Colonies in the West Indies* and John McGregor’s *British America*. However Robertson’s *History...*

---

of America remained a classic on colonial history\textsuperscript{74} and after the independence of American colonies, India seems to be making the core of interest for colonial historiography.

In this tradition of European and particularly British historiography a particular vision of Muslims seems to have emerged. A criticism of Muslim State, society and religion was a fairly common practice. Under the influence of Muslim historiography, however, a sense of world history had been developed among the European historians since the fifteenth century. The understanding of the phenomena of decline and fall of empires, states, societies and civilizations had been the most popular form of narration of history.\textsuperscript{75} Liberalism,\textsuperscript{76} romanticism\textsuperscript{77}, humanitarianism and industrial revolution\textsuperscript{78} were the forces influencing the current stream of historical thought. In spite of all this, however, European expansionism and colonialism continued to dominate all these enlightened trends in thought and action.\textsuperscript{79}

3.3. British Tradition of Indian Historiography.

The Muslim rule in India lasted for several centuries. In the nineteenth century the British gained complete power in India. Aiming to preserve the British interest in Eastern trade through colonial expansion, the British East India Company began to expand its control over the Indian states from 1757 and occupied the entire Indian subcontinent within a century. In the second half of Eighteenth century, the British extended their influence to local politics. The nineteenth century brought the supremacy of British power in India into sharp focus.\textsuperscript{80} A long period of contact with India from the beginning of the eighteenth century developed the interest of British writers in the subject of

\textsuperscript{74} William Robertson, History of America, Edinburgh, 1771.
\textsuperscript{75} One popular example of this trend is Edward Gibbon's The History Of The Decline And Fall Of The Roman Empire. It was published in seven volumes. First volume appeared in 1776 and last in 1788. It has been reprinted for several times.
\textsuperscript{76} For details see D.Forbes' The Liberal Anglican Idea of History, Cambridge, 1952.
\textsuperscript{77} See chapter three.
\textsuperscript{79} see chapter second.
Indology\textsuperscript{31} and especially in Indian history, which was considered a part of the discipline of Indology.

The British also inherited the tradition of historiography along with government and politics from the Indian Muslims.\textsuperscript{32} Their understanding of Indian history was confined either to contemporary political and cultural history or to "ready made history" in the form of translation of works on Muslim period. Fraser’s The History of Nadir Shah published in 1742 was an embodiment of British interest in the contemporary Indian history.\textsuperscript{33} Francois Bernier’s The History of the Late Revolution of the Empire of Great Mogol\textsuperscript{34} and Francois Catrou’s The General History of the Mogol Empire\textsuperscript{35} had already been translated into English in 1671 and 1695. However by the late eighteenth century they began to add to the Muslim tradition and combined it with European traditions, methods, techniques, premises, ideas and problems which were being applied or discussed in the current European intellectual community. Robert Crane is of the opinion that:

Of the published volumes on Indian history, probably, the largest part has been contributed by English historians.... the great English Orientalists of the Nineteenth century who recovered much of the basic material of India’s past... Certain biases...tended to characterize...part of the product of English scholarship on India.... [Partly] from the importation of European attitude...[and partly due to] a tendency to put too much reliance - especially for the period of British Indian history-upon [the] official viewpoint, and an emphasis on purely political or quasi-dynastic history. Some of the best known volumes [stress] what the rulers were doing.... In practice, it has meant that British histories of India have tended to underemphasize Indian social history, or Indian economic history.

Being the rulers of India for a long time, the information given by the British was considered reliable and authentic. Without the images projected by them, European and American intellectuals would know very little of the history of India today. Even though, initially, other European nations such as Portuguese, Dutch, Germans and French,

\textsuperscript{31} The British interest in India was so high that they began to consider Indian state, society, religions, politics, culture, manners, customs, arts, sciences, natural resources, soil and produce a specified field of study. It was termed as Indology. Sir William Jones is taken as the initiator of Indology. For details see S.N. Mukherjee’s Sir William Jones. Cambridge, 1968, pp. 73-121.
\textsuperscript{32} Michael Bentley, op. cit., p.680.
\textsuperscript{33} Fraser, The History of Nadir Shah, London, 1742.
\textsuperscript{34} Francois Bernier, The History of the Late Revolution of the Empire of Great Mogol, London, 1671.
\textsuperscript{35} Francois Catrou’s The General History of the Mogol Empire, London, 1695.
contributed a great deal to the knowledge in this field. Yet the attitude of the English-speaking people towards India was affected largely by the British historiography.  

What Edward W. Said has written about the nature of Orientalism, may equally be applied to the nature of British historiography of India and Muslim India. The British, he felt, saw the history of India through folk tradition, observations, journey, and through fable. There were biases and interests working behind their premises. "Under the general heading of the knowledge of the Orient, and within the umbrella of Western hegemony" a complex concept of the Orient emerged which was "suitable for study in academy, for display in the museum, for reconstruction on the colonial office...for instances of economic and sociological theories of development....". Even more relevant are his comments in his concluding chapter:

Now, one of the important development in nineteenth-century Orientalism was the distillation of essential ideas about the Orient — its sensuality, its tendency to despotism, its aberrant mentality, its habits of inaccuracy, its backwardness, into a separate and unchallenged coherence; thus for a writer to use the word Oriental was a reference for the readers sufficient to identify a specific body of information about the Orient.

British study of Indian history and the resultant tradition of historiography were primarily a political need, which later adopted the form of social and cultural history. Mill and Elphinstone made it into a comparative study of three civilizations. It was an active response to the problems of Indian administration. Initially it aimed to satisfy British self-interest and curiosity about India. In the nineteenth century, it became a tool to influence the government policies related to India in Britain and in the Sub-continent. In this way, primary importance in British tradition of Indian historiography was given to British Indian Empire. Its focus was then contemporary discussion in administration, in

---

88 Ibid, p.205.
89 And early British works on Indian history were aiming at an understanding of Indian system of state, society and religion. So it were primarily translations from the histories written by the Indian Muslims. For example Alexander Dow's The History of Hindostan (London, 1968-72) published in three volumes was based primarily on Muhammad Qasim Farishta, Tarikh-I-Farishta. Elliot & Dowson's History of India as Told By Its Own Historians, London, 1969 is the sole example of this trend of translating Indian history written by indigenous writers for political needs.
religion, in politics and in philosophy and there was no great interest in understanding the Indians and Muslims.

The Muslims, for their part were neglectful of learning English even after 1857. The first institution under the British auspices for the promotion of English language among the local people was established in 1834 at Bombay. About the same time Persian language was removed from the offices of the Company’s government. We may deduce that British historiography of India was in fact responsible for moulding British opinion in matters relating to British Indian policies. There was a very small class of locals in India (at this time) who could read and understand the English language. But there was a large British community with definite opinions on matters in India. It, therefore, makes sense that British historiography, at the beginning of the nineteenth century should be considered with reference to home consumption. We could say that it was a statement by the British administration and for the British readers. What Robert Crane writes about the post War of Independence British historiography is equally applicable to the period prior to the War of Independence. He writes:

...there was a tendency among the English writers, many of whom had been officials, to act as apologists for the government of India. As Indian nationalism developed and the nationalist attacks on the administration increased in vigor [vigour] and frequency, there was almost perceptible movement by the beleaguered British to close ranks and defend the record.

Perhaps, it would be too harsh to say that British historiographers were apologists for the government of India. However, their works provided a justification of British expansionism and for the satisfaction of European readers and intellectuals. All four schools agreed on the colonial agenda. However their differences were visible on the issue of identity of Indian communities, nature of administration and British relations with, and treatment of the subject people. To argue and decide on these matters European themes of thought were forming the central structure of their works. C.H. Philips in the

94 A number of British writer seem to be focusing the interest of the British readership in Indian affairs as a motivating force working behind their literary skill. For example see Ms. Meer Hasan Ali. Observations On The Mussulmans of India, London, 1832.
95 Robert I. Crane, op. cit., pp.6-7.
introduction of his famous edited book *Historians of India, Pakistan and Ceylon* writes that in the British historiography:

...Indian past, for instance, was assumed to be much the same like the European present and European categories of thought, not only in the field of history, were automatically applied. Moreover as the idea of progress became identified with the extension of European influence, throughout the world, this Europocentric [Europe Centric] view became characteristic also of Western historians, generally, whatsoever their field of inquiry...\(^96\)

This led to the establishment of new socio-political and philosophical schools, which not only influenced the British Indian policy but also influenced European intellectual tradition as well. This historiographical activity was influenced by a number of intellectual traditions: enlightenment\(^97\), romanticism,\(^98\) liberalism,\(^99\) utilitarianism,\(^100\) evangelicalism, etc. By the beginning of nineteenth century, four trends were under sharp focus: oriental romance, ethno-regional romance, utilitarianism and missionaries. Liberalism and paternalism were influencing all the four trends and traditions.

Oriental romanticists had accepted the civilized status of Indian society and in this way were anxious to preserve it. They were the great arbitrators for the policy of non-interference and non-intervention in Indian society. In this regard, they were called champions of local cause.

The ethno-regional romanticists had focused on the diversity of Indian cultures and in this way were identifying India as a continent or subcontinent inhabited by a number of nations having a common civilization.

The Utilitarian was the new socio-political reformist school, analysing the socio-political institutions through the concept of "utility" of the institutions for the society on the "principle of happiness". They claimed the superiority of European civilization over Indian civilization. So they were the champions of the cause of importing western

\(^97\) For a detailed study of the trends developing during the enlightenment see Harold Nicolson's *The Age of Reason 1700-1789*, London, 1968.
\(^98\) See chapter three and four.
\(^100\) See for details Eric Stokes' *The English Utilitarians and India*, Delhi, 1982.
civilization to India. They accepted the challenge of "white men's burden to make the world civilized". For that, they were the advocates of radical social change in India.

The Missionary school saw the superiority of Christian religion in the form of European imperialism. They presented the European expansionism as a divine proof of the righteousness of Christian religion. So they were the propagator of Christian creed in India and wanted to Christianise Indian society.\footnote{For a detail of the common feature of the schools see chapter second.}

### 3.4. British Tradition of Indian Muslims' Historiography.

Muslim India was particularly significant in the British concept of Historiography. In the nineteenth century the British perceived Muslim India on the basis of general concept of the history of India. In this concept India was a land of the Hindus and the Muslims were considered as foreigners and imperial.\footnote{See supra, chapter three, four, five and six.} Prior to the nineteenth century the British viewed Indian history merely as history of Muslim India.\footnote{The early British works on the Indian history were greatly concerned with the history of India during the period of Muslim rule in India or during the period of European contacts with and expansionism in India. The contemporary state of Indian society was also a concern of British administrator historians.} Their understanding of Indian history was confined to the works on contemporary history which was of the Muslim rule in India, such as translations of Bernier and Catrou's works and Frazer's History or observations, letters, travelogues, memoirs or biographies of the British. In the Modern Universal History published between 1736 to 1765. Indian History was considered almost synonymous with the Mughuls, also quoting some pre-Mughul events. Robert Orme extended the scope of Indian history from the Mughul to the pre-Mughul period, although not very clearly identified.\footnote{Robert Orme, \textit{op. cit.}} Simultaneously the ‘ready made’ history of India by Muhammad Qasim Farishta was thrice translated to English, focus of which was on the Muslim period. In 1768 Alexandre Dow translated it under the title of History of Hindostan and extended it to the contemporary events of Mughul history to 1772. However, in the late eighteenth century, the trend began to change under the influence of new European thoughts\footnote{See Muhammad Shafique Bhatti, \textit{op. cit.} passim.} and by the nineteenth century, the sense of a non-Muslim
component of Indian history resulted in the development of a "general Indian history" and a consciousness of a history of Muslim India within its overall framework.

The British were closely connected with Muslim India, politically and historically. The Muslim rule in Indian lasted for several centuries and the British contacts with India began at the time when the Muslim rule was at its peak under the Mughul sovereignty. It left an indelible impression on the contemporary British mind. To the early British historians (contemporary with the Mughul Empire), Indian history was synonymous with that of the Mughuls. In the late eighteenth century, its scope was extended to pre-Mughul Muslim rule. It was the romanticists who discovered the extent of Indian history to the Hindu times.

It is apparent from this sequence that in the British mind the concept of Muslim India preceded that of Hindu India just as the awareness of Mughul India preceded that of the pre-Mughul period. This, perhaps, determined forever the order of precedence in British historiographical scholarship, although for some, the pre-Mughul history of India became far more important.

The British established the Indian Empire on the ruins of the Muslim Empire. To preserve the British interests in eastern trade British East India Company's interest had been attached to the contemporary Mughul State and society. During the eighteenth century the British expansionism against the Muslim states seems to be in full swing. The historiography during the period became an important tool for intellectual supremacy. Dr Aslam Syed is of the opinion that "Europeans explained the political changes not only by pointing to their superiority, but also by arguing that Christianity, unlike Islam, was based on reason and truth and had, therefore, ultimately prevailed over Islam...". The British had inherited the tradition of political history and historiography from the Muslims, and

106 To study the nature of early British perception of India, see Hawkins' and Sir Thomas Roe.
107 Grewal, Historian, p.32. To J.S.Grewal the credit of this extension of the scope of the study of Indian history goes to Sir William Jones. To him it was a shift from the study of Muslim Indian History to the Study of Hindu history. He writes: "Before Indian history had been almost synonymous with Indo-Muslim history, after Jones, it became almost synonymous with Hindu history.
108 Muhammad Aslam Syed, Muslim Response To the West: British Historiography Of Muslim India, Islamabad. 1988, pp.1-2.
so they had to carry it on. Being the immediate successors of the Muslim scholars patronized by the State, they recovered much of the basic material on Muslim India.\textsuperscript{109} Even today the image of Muslim India seems to be reflecting a new version of nineteenth century British opinion.\textsuperscript{110} In this perspective, a number of questions may be raised about the nature and purpose of British Historiography of Muslim India. Whether it was objective one or purposive? What was the purpose of British historiography of Muslim India? Was it a continuation of the main stream of European intellectual and historical thought or it was an abstract tradition? What are the difference of opinion on Muslim history and why? What was the use of Muslim history in contemporary discourses on religion and politics? Such questions are the main focus of the study of British historiography of Muslim India.

4. Review of Literature.

4.1. British Historiography.

Although some work has been done on British historiography, in general, the analytical study of British historiography of Muslim India is a neglected field. The number of works concerning historians and histories written during the period (1800-1857) is very low and focus is on individual historians and histories rather than on the collective thought, they present. In Barens' \textit{A History of Historical Writings}\textsuperscript{111} not even one of the historical writings on India is mentioned. J. R. Hale has also neglected the historiography of India and Muslim India in his book \textit{The Evolution of British Historiography}.\textsuperscript{112} As the title suggests, the work deals with the leading aspects of British historiography through a selection of excerpts from the writings of some major British

\textsuperscript{109} Till the end of the nineteenth century a number of sources on Muslim India were not only recovered but also translated into English or other European Languages. See for example Elliot and Dowson's \textit{History of India as told by Its Own Historians}, indicate the success of the efforts made on the part of Europeans to recover the basic source material on the Indo-Muslim history.

\textsuperscript{110} Modern European historians seems to be still following the views of Dow, Jones, Mill, Grant, Elphinstone and Erskine. Moorland, Smith, Lase Pole and other can be seen as successors of the early British writers.

\textsuperscript{111} Barens, \textit{A History of Historical Writings} New York, 1963.

historians. Similarly, A.J. Arbery's *British Orientalists* also neglects the role of British Historians in Indian history even though its main focus is the role of Arbery's compatriots in the promotion of Oriental Studies. Although among the historians of India some have discussed the thought of James Mill as a philosopher in detail, they have not commented upon his contribution as an historian. It is G.P. Gouch who has contributed a valuable paragraph on James Mill's History of India, in his book *History and Historians of the Nineteenth Century*. Historians are neglected as contributors to romantic thought, though they were very active participants in the movement of romantic revival and very strongly advocated romantic thought through history.

Some writings in the second half of the twentieth century on the historiography of the Muslims of India have opened the way for the study of British historiography of Muslim India in the recent past. Among them P. Hardy's *Historians of Medieval India* deals with Muslim historians of medieval India. Muhib-ul Hassan, in his book *Historians of Medieval India* has also focussed on the history and historians of medieval India. Harbans Mukhia's *Historian and Historiography During the Reign of Akbar* deals with 16th century India.

On the one hand works on the European and British historiography of India include Ganda Singh's *Early European Accounts of the Sikhs* and Dobson's edited version of some accounts of the European travellers *India Seen Through European Eyes*. On the other hand Shafa'at Ahmad Khan dealt specifically with the British historiography. His *Sources of the History of British India* is a list of sources of eighteenth century Indian History. However, in two lectures, published in 1938 under the title of *History and Historians of British India* delivered at Broda State University, even he has neglected

117 Harbans Mukhia, *Historian and Historiography During the Reign of Akbar*
119 Dobson, *India Seen Through European Eyes*, Bombay, 1933.
120 Shafa'at Ahmad Khan, *Sources of the History of British India*, Calcutta, 1926.
121 Shafa'at Ahmad Khan, *History and Historians of British India*, London, 1938.
the British Historiography of Muslim India. His emphasis remained primarily on eighteenth century British India. Chatterjee and Burnes' book deals almost exclusively with the efforts made by the British for the promotion of Indigenous Indian sciences, especially, Indian history, it seems, rather a tribute to British under the title of British Contribution to Indian Studies.\textsuperscript{122}

Robert Crane, in his concise pamphlet History of India: its Study and Interpretation\textsuperscript{123} has analysed some important aspects of British historiography of India. He is of the opinion that the British historians are a bridge between India and the other world. He also points out some biases in the British framework, for criticism of Indian history including Muslim India. He generalizes that to the British the Indian past is like the European present, so the British Historians have applied the European categories of thought to the historiography of India and Muslim India. In the same way Wink's Historiography focuses the imperial period as well as motives in the British historiography.\textsuperscript{124} Winks highlights the imperial motives in the writing of colonial history. Robert E. Frykenberg's "India to 1858" follows the same theme. Frykenberg sees the British historiography in terms of a "long-lasting tension" over policy position in the name of 'principle' and indigenous sources.\textsuperscript{125}

However, a number of sources have dealt with the British historiography in core. A large part of C.H.Philips' edited work Historians of India, Pakistan and Ceylon\textsuperscript{126} is reserved for British historians, but it focuses on the Post-War of Independence. Only Charles Grant, James Mill and Elphinstone are dealt with as representatives of the missionary, utilitarian and romantic, schools respectively. On the one hand C.H. Philips saw the British Historians like "individual Guerrillas in a jungle, lacking discipline and awareness of their part", on the other hand, he compares Mill and Elphinstone as two representatives of "group and rational prejudices and of psychological, philosophical and

\textsuperscript{122} Chatterjee and Burnes, British Contribution to Indian Studies, Calcutta, 1943.
\textsuperscript{123} Robert Crane, History of India: its Study and Interpretation, Washington, 1958.
\textsuperscript{125} Robert E. Frykenberg, "India to 1858", in Robin W. Winks, op. cit., pp. 194-213.
cosmological differences". A number of historians seem to trying to understand the common themes, trends and schools of historiography. These commentators have approached British historiography in an introductory way, just to indicate some central views and biases. Analytical approach is neglected.

Some latest reviews of literature and historiographical studied analyse a number of common themes and theories. It is a common view that British historians have potentially contributed to the construction and invention of India, historically and culturally. And Edward W. Said, Ashish Nandy and Gyan Parkash are of the opinion that even the post orientalist and postcolonial construction of Indian historical conscious was based on the writings of British Orientalists. For Daud Ali, this understanding was based on "rhetorical strategy" for imperialism on European model. Edward Said sees this rhetoric between orient and occident and Ashish Nandi between “historical and ahistorical” society. This understanding has commonly been represented as “self” and “other” of Europe or West against India or East in modern studies as power, morality and civilization against deficiency, immorality and barbarity.

On this basis, they see a uni-linear approach to the understanding of Indian History on the Western Model. Pro-British nationalist historians of India owe the debt of the

---

130 Daud Ali, “Recognizing Europe in India: Colonial Master Narratives and the Writing of Indian History”, in Jeffrey Cox and Shelton Stromquists, op. cit., p. 96.
131 By "historical" society, Ashish Nandy means a society having and consciousness of history and its use and by "ahistorical" means a society that has a history but having no sense of its understanding. See Ashish Nandy, op. cit., pp. 45-47.
emergence of Indian nationalism to this approach. However, Gyan Prakash and Frykenberg see the evidence of this approach in the emergence of religious identity. For Gyan Parakash the religion was considered a potent force working behind Indian history as a symbol of vices and immorality of Indians and for Geoffery A. Oddie and Frykenberg religion was raised as a unifying force for Indians, in both cases emergence of a common Indian identity on the religious foundations. P. J. Marshal edited the British writings in the same context. This understanding of Indian past on the part of British seems to be determining the nature of British Historiography of Muslim India.

Understanding of India as an "other" of British resulted in the quest how India should be identified. For that British historians are seen to be applying western concepts of nation, civilization, culture, state, society, government, politics, races, languages, literature, morality, philosophy and war and peace to the Indian history by the modern critics. The resultant construction of history, Edward W. Said, Ashish Nandy and Gyan Prakash see evident in the writings of modern historians. What a model of historical construction, the British had constructed is challenged by S. C. Mittal in his India Distorted A Study of British Historians on India. What the British had constructed during their colonial rule in India in the form of History, Mittal sees as distortion of the facts Indian.

132 S. N. Mukherjee, *op. cit.*
135 The issue of common identity of India on the cultural grounds has been discussed in modern context by Javeed Alam in his article "The Composite Culture and Its Historiography", in *South Asia*, Vol. XXII, Special Issue (1999), pp. 29-37.
4.2. Works on British Historiography of Muslim India.

The works discussed do not deal significantly with British historiography of Muslim India. However these works represent the basic assumptions of British historiography of India which are applicable to Hindu and Muslim period alike. Most important concerning our study, are two books by J.S.Grewal. In his book *Medieval India: History and Historians*\(^{138}\) he has contributed articles on some British historians, dealing with each one separately. In this work he has stated their views but he has not dealt with the evolutionary nature and working assumptions of British historiography.

The only work dealing exclusively with British historiography of Muslim India is Grewal's book *Muslim Rule in India: the Assessment of the British Historians*.\(^{139}\) It concentrates on the political aspect of Muslim history through the eyes of individual British historians who wanted to prove the British rule just and benevolent. Muslim society and religion is not his prime concern. Keeping in mind the remarks by Robert Crane quoted supra this is hardly surprising. It aims at highlighting the British Historians' attitude towards Muslim political history, which was directed by imperial, commercial and administrative interests.

Some recent works on the British attitude and policy toward India helped a lot to understand the general British assumptions of historiography. Erick Stock's *Utilitarians and India*\(^{140}\) is an analytical description of the utilitarian motives, attitude and policy toward India. In this regard, it highlights the liberal influence on utilitarian theory. In the same way Wishwanathan has commented the nature of British reform movements, educational policy and liberal attitude. He is of the opinion that these were *The Masks of Conquests*, to build an Indian Empire.\(^{141}\) F.G. Hutchins termed the British attitude towards India as *The Illusion of Permanence*\(^{142}\) and treated it as a form of Imperialism. Ralph J. Crane is of the opinion that the British looked at India through fiction and

---

\(^{138}\) Grewal, *Historian*.

\(^{139}\) Grewal, *Muslim*.

\(^{140}\) Erick Stock, *op. cit.*


literature. He concludes that the British have no serious intention to understand the realities of Indian past, politically or socially.

The trend of the study of historiography seems to be gaining popularity during the second half of the 20th century. During the first half of the twentieth century, there are very rare examples of the study of historiography of India, particularly Muslim India. The emphasis remained on the sources of history of British India, history and historians of British India, or on the Orientalists rather than any systematic study of historiography. The works of A.J. Arberry, C.A. Dobson, Chatterjee and Burn and Shafaat Ahmad Khan can be taken as examples.

During the second half of the 20th century there began a systematic study of historiography of India through seminars and symposiums. It was primarily a trend of the study of historians' craft. P. Hardy and C.H. Philips seem to be taking initiative for the study of Indian historiography. However, the emphasis remained on individual historians. C.H. Philips' edited the Historians of India, Pakistan, and Ceylon. State and politics have remained the central focus of the contributors, although some historians have contributed articles on the trends evident in the historiography of India. In general, in this trend "rational and group prejudices", and schools of thought are not given the proper weightage.

J.S.Grewal seems to be following the same trends for the study of medieval Muslim history. Although, he has analysed some general trends of the British historians of Muslim India, his emphasis remains on the individual historians. On the same lines, following the tradition of British historians of historiography, state and politics seem to be his basic criteria for the study of historiography. In this regard he seems to be neglecting the schools of thought working behind the British historiographical efforts.

The central themes of these studies revolve around some basic concepts such as Indian civilization, status of civilization, Indian nationalism, administrative problems and British imperialism at a level of conflict between western or British “self” and “single other”, the Hindu India at large. A neglect of a multi-civilization status of India appears to be the main theme of these studies and presentation of India as a religious,
geographical and cultural nation, seems to be a permanent problem focused in these studies. The formation of Western especially British mind in their own indigenous perspective is avoided; rather the development of British mind in historiography has been studied in terms of these exotic issues. Whether the western internal developments had a role in the British understanding of Indo-Muslim past or whether administrative problems and imperial motives were the sole focus in British historiography, is an important question to understand the nature of a system inherited from British by the people of South Asia.

4.3. Selection of the Historiographic Samples.

A lot of primary sources on the proposed period of study have been printed. H.K. Kaul’s *Early British Writings on India* is a bibliographical catalogue of more than three thousand books written by the British on India. The sources on Indian history are scattered in different forms, i.e., journals, observations, recollections, travelogues, surveys, memoirs, histories, monuments, etc. The availability and search of all the sources is a big problem. To deal with that problem, the sources chosen as the sample for the present study have been classified and selected on the basis of the schools of thought identified earlier. Every school of thought is sub-classified, keeping in mind the evolution of thought within the schools and various trends and attitudes working behind the thoughts from time to time. However the classification of schools is not exclusive but individuals are identified according to dominant trends of their thoughts.

The classification of British historiographical schools has been done on different grounds: according to purpose of the historian, nature of sources or system of thought. As thoughts are supposed to be basic source in the construction of historical model and premises, therefore we have classified the British historiography of Muslim India on this model. A number of classifications on this ground can be found operative in the academic and research circles, such as Orientalists, Anglicans, Evangelicals, Romanticists, Missionaries and Utilitarians. There are also sub-classifications of these

---

schools. Dr. Daud Ali had classified British historians into Orientalists, utilitarians and Evangelicals.\textsuperscript{144} Orientalist is a term applied to all those working on the orient. Therefore considering it as a basic assumption, British historiography is being classified within the oriental framework. This perspective marks a clear difference with Edward W. Said's thesis that finds unified themes and trends in orientalism, which Gyan Prakash identifies as 'simple minded gesture of solidarity'.\textsuperscript{145} Danis Vidal\textsuperscript{146} and Peter Heens\textsuperscript{147} are of the opinion that the colonial orientalism of the nineteenth century and the sort of orientalism highlighted by Said are "two entirely different things". Danis Vidal divides it into "scholastic" and "romantic" categories. In the same way David Ludden distinguishes between the "colonial knowledge" and "colonized people".\textsuperscript{148} The two distinctions also mark the difference between romanticists and utilitarians. In the same way, the term Anglicans is applicable to all English men working for the Anglicisation of one aspect of other of the orient according to the preferences of their schools. Simultaneously, Evangelical is a term that shows a limited scale for christianisation. Contrary to that, all missionary activity was aiming at the christianisation of world in one way or other. Therefore three main schools are considered worthwhile for the study of India Historiography: romanticists, utilitarians and missionaries. However, romanticists, due to worth of their thoughts are divided into two: oriental romanticists and ethno-regional romanticists. Although a clear line between these schools can never be marked and the schools overlap and coordinate with each other on the issue of harmony, however, the classification seems clear in respect of their treatment of Muslim India.

\textsuperscript{144} Daud Ali, "Recognizing Europe in India: Colonial Master Narratives and the Writing of Indian History", in Jeffrey Cox and Shelton Stromquist, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 98.
\textsuperscript{145} Gyan Prakash, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 383.
\textsuperscript{147} Peter Heens, "Shades of Orientalism: Paradoxes and Problems in Indian Historiography", in History and Theory, Vol. XVII, (Mé, 2003), pp. 169-195
It is a common understanding that the British attitude and policy toward India was distinct from that regarding Britain and Europe. We have noted the views of Crane, Erich Stock, Edward Said, and C. H. Philips that British and European thought were applied to the Indian Historiography, the current classification is developed on this basis. In this regard four major schools of thought have been determined: Oriental Romantic, Ethno-Regional Romantic, Utilitarian, and Missionary. When we analyse any specific work of the period under study, it is difficult to determine the school of thought, within which it should be classified. A number of influences of various schools due to the authors' personal dynamics and those of time and space affect the basic framework. Contemporary link-streams of thought influence the major trends, in this case, Free Trade, Liberalism, Anglicanism, and Evangelicalism. Enlightenment is taken as a challenge to the missionaries and source of motivating force working behind Romanticism and Utilitarianism. As a result, the present classification of authors under various heads is based on the dominant trend in the work that has been selected and the major thrust of the author's views at the time of their formulation. However order of narration within the schools has been set, not on the basis of the life span or active career of the historians, rather it is based on the period of their potent publications related to history. In this way an historian who had joined the East India Company Indian service earlier, is treated in the later period of historiographical evolution because his writings were published later. Or an author who lived long as compared to the one who is treated later is given priority in the historiographic evolution because his writings were published earlier. In this way period of contribution to historiography forms the basis of order and priority in the study of the internal evolution of the schools.

4.3.1. The Oriental Romanticists.

An appreciation of literature, arts, ancient history, mythology, customs, traditions, culture and ancient civilizations determine the identity of the romantic thought. The romanticists were the champions of a policy of non-interference in the structure and morals of Indian society. There is an underlying change of attitude visible in the romantic thought during the period under discussion. In the early phase of the development of the
doctrine, an appreciation of antiquity seems to be dominating the romantic thought. By the rise of utilitarianism this emphasis seems to be shifting from antiquity to the advocacy of a cautious policy of non-interference in the structure and morals of Indian society. But during the 1830s and 1840s, losing the influence in the formation of Indian policy, a tendency of developing compromise and harmony with the utilitarians, missionaries and liberals seems to be the central focus of romanticists. However, a tendency of reaction seems to be dominating during the later years of the period. In this perspective, the works of William Jones, Thomas Maurice, John Malcolm, Mountstuart Elphinstone, and Sleeman are selected for the analyses of these trends and thought.

In the last decades of eighteenth century and in the first two decades of nineteenth century, antiquity was the central focus of schools’ activities in India due to William Jones initiation of “Indology” in the oriental and romantic perspective. Among the exponents of the school in this early phase only Thomas Maurice has discussed the Indian Muslim State in the context of world history and civilizations. He wrote a lot in poetry, prose and history. In 1795, his History of Hindostan was published in which he discussed the concept of ancient history through the literature of ancient civilizations. His Modern History of Hindostan was published during 1802-10. It seems to be completing a general history of Hindostan till the time of the author. He was the first romanticist writing on the history of Muslim India. In 1806 he contributed a drama Fall of the Mughuls: A Tragedy. In his works he seems to be much impressed by the progress made by the ancient civilizations in the field of arts, literature and sciences. In this regard his writings are selected as representatives of antiquarian apologetic romantic thought. Second and third decades of nineteenth century are taken as the rise of utilitarianism and liberalism. The missionaries, liberals and utilitarian all favoured the doctrine of radical social change on western pattern in India. The romanticists opposed these arguments for the radical social change. During the decades, romantic thought can be seen as a response to the utilitarian, liberal and missionary logic. John Malcolm and Mountstuart Elphinstone’s works are selected as representative of this trend.

John Malcolm was an influential civil servant in the Company’s government. His History of the Sikhs was published in 1812. He raised his voice in favour of a policy of non-interference in Indian society and to preserve the social structure of Indian society during the third and fourth decades of the nineteenth century. In this way, his A Memoir of Central India, published in 1823 and A Political History of India, published in 1827 are very important pieces of contemporary historical discourses in politics, state, society and civil and military administration. In 1833, his The Government of India was
published in which he tried to utilize his conclusions drawn from the history of India for the formation of British Indian policy. In this regard his works are selected as main argument, for a cautious policy in India, and to preserve the Indian society.

Elphinstone's *History of India* (1841) and *History of the British Empire in India* (1841) are the only romantic example of a complete and comparative history of India, dividing it into the Hindu, the Muslim and the British periods. Elphinstone is taken as a main exponent of the trends of response to the utilitarians and liberals in India during the period of 1840s. Malcolm's concern remained primarily with the contemporary state, society and politics. He began to lose his influence in the 1830s. In this state, it was Elphinstone who tried to make the romantic thought and vision a dominant trend and tried to conclude the debate on India among the romanticists. He extended his frame of perception from contemporary state and society to the general history of India from ancient to modern times, in the form of the study of civilization. He extended the scope of his arguments from politics and administrative problems to religions, cultures and civilizations that flourished in India, in a comparative way, in the scope as well as models of historical studies. In this way, he saw the Indian history in its integrity and compared all three civilizations that flourished under the political hegemony of the Hindus, the Muslims and British. In this regard, selection of his works can be justified. However, it represents a sort of compromise with other schools on Indian policy.

At that time the oriental romanticists had begun to lose their influence in Indian policy. Therefore, along with Elphinstone, a reaction against the dominance of utilitarian views seems to be approaching romantic thought. Sleeman's *Rambles and Recollection* published in 1844, depicts an administrator's approach towards history, society an Islamic religion during a phase of romantic extremism, having sympathy with the Hindu against the Muslim rule and religion. He seems to be reacting against the missionary logic and utilitarian and liberal arguments. Sleeman supported the cause of indigenous culture and society, contrary to the missionary logic and western superiority. The difference between his early works, *Sleeman's Oudh* published in 1815 and *Rambles and Recollections* is very clear. It shows a very clear shift in the romantic thought which
the cause to select this work as a sample for historiographical study during the period of romantic compromise.

4.3.2. The Ethno-Regional Romanticists.

Whereas the ethno-regional romanticists provided the rationale of dividing the imperial entity into its component nations and cultures, the historians discussed in the previous section, saw the Indian history in a sub-continental perspective and a monolithic imperial unit. A number of historians have studied sections of the Empire with reference to the ethnic and regional groups as fragments within the Indian scene. At that time Hindu nationalism was emerging out of romantic thought. Marathas, Sikhs and Rajputs emerged as powerful elements during the period of British expansionism in India. In this way British works on the history of these groups seem to show an important variation, which, in a sense, highlighted the fragments of the British Empire in India as distinct ethnic and political entities.

Charles Stewart (1764-1837) published his History of Bengal in 1813. It seems to be a study of Bengal’s importance in Indian politics. It also presents an ethnic and political justification of the foreign rule in Bengal. He appreciates the role of foreign rule in the progress of Bengali nation from barbarism to civilization. In this regard, Stewart has been taken as a historiographer of a regional nation.

Mark Wilk’s History of the South of India was published in 1813. It seems to be an apology for the dethronement of Tipu Sultan. It highlights the British concept of state and government. It is selected because it shows the British perception of the then contemporary Muslim states and it justifies the imperial relations with these states. In this way, it is taken as a sample of ethno-regional historiography during the period of antiquarian romanticism.

James Grant Duff’s History of the Marathas was published in 1828. It is a history of the rise of Maratha power during the period of decline of Muslim State in India. In this way, on the one hand, it throws light on some of the most important elements working behind the decline of the Muslim State and society as a contemporary history. On the other hand, it is an example of ethno-political historiography during the period of active
romantic response to the theory of radical social change. Through elevating the Marathas as an ethnic-cultural community, Grant Duff seems to be promoting the concept that India is a land of different Nations and cultures. Therefore any attempt to impose any unified system of administration will be injurious to the British interests. Similarly, the concept of radical social change cannot be applied to the Indian environment due to the variety of cultures that exist in India.

James Tod’s *Annals and Antiquity of Rajasthan* is taken as examples of ethno-regional romantic Historiography with another perspective. He seems to be confirming and supporting the arguments of Grant Duff through a new set of facts, based on an ancient culture of Rajputs of Rajasthan, in a different historical form as “annals”. In this regard his annals present a set of arguments in favour of a cautious policy of non-interference in indigenous Indian society.

J.D.Cunningham’s *History of the Sikhs* was published in 1849. On the one hand, at that time, missionary influence in Indian politics seems to be in full swing. On the other hand about the same time the British had occupied the Sikh kingdom of Punjab. In this regard, it shows a romanticist’s perception of an Indian religion during a period of reaction against the missionaries and utilitarians. Due to this importance* History of the Sikhs* is taken as a sample for historiographical analysis.

These are selected as histories of four prominent groups, playing a crucial part in the change taking place in the contemporary India. The focus of analysis of these works will remain over the questions, what were the relations of these groups with the Muslim state and society and, what part they played in the decline of Muslim state and society in India. So dealing with them restates, how the Muslim state, society and religion were understood by the British.

**4.3.3. The Utilitarians.**

Utilitarians are dealt with as the direct heirs to the enlightenment. They accepted most of the trends of the enlightenment, on the principle of "utility" for society. Civilization, contemporary state and society, and, in this respect, history were their central focus. They gave importance to law and order and economic activity and criticized the romantic focus
on literature. They accepted the "utility" of Islam as compared to the ancient civilizations and religions. But, to them, the superiority of modern European civilization was unquestionable. In this regard, declaring Western institutions "useful" for India, they were the propagators of the importance of the introduction of European civilization and culture in India, radically. Utilitarian thought seems to be going through an evolutionary process during the period 1800-1857.

Utilitarianism emerged out of enlightened philosophy in the first two decades of the nineteenth century, focusing good government and administration as its main concerns. During the final decades of eighteenth century, romantic thought became a popular creed as a child of enlightenment. In this age of romanticism an optimistic view of the Indian past began to dominate the British mind. But, some writers continued to follow the main trends of enlightened thought. They propagated a progressive theory of history and appreciated the contribution of medieval and modern civilizations to the progress of humanity.

Francis Gladwin is taken as a representative of this phase of the development of Utilitarian thought. In an age of the rise of romanticism, he concentrated on the medieval Muslim State, society, religion and literature. Gladwin translated a number of medieval writings into English. In 1786, he wrote An Epitome of Mohammedan Law.\textsuperscript{149} His History of Hindostan during the Reigns of Jehangir, Shah Jehan and Aurangzeb\textsuperscript{150} was published in 1788. It was an attempt to understand the political problems of India as successors to the Great Mughul Empire. His translation of Ayeen Akbary\textsuperscript{151} into English published in 1800 was a devoted attempt to solve the problems of administration of revenue in India. This translation by itself seems to be a tribute to the medieval Mughul administration. He also appreciated the reformist nature of medieval Muslim literature by translating he Gulistan of Sady into English in 1806.\textsuperscript{152} Francis Gladwin’s works satisfy

\textsuperscript{149} Francis Gladwin, An Epitome of Mohammedan Law, Calcutta, 1786.
\textsuperscript{150} Francis Gladwin, The History of Hindostan during the Reigns of Jehangir, Shah Jehan and Aurangzeb, Calcutta, 1787.
\textsuperscript{151} Francis Gladwin, Ayeen Akbary or The Institutes of Emperor Akbaar, Two Volumes. 1800.
\textsuperscript{152} Francis Gladwin, Gulistan of Sady, Calcutta, 1806.
the curiosity to know about the early utilitarian trends and enlightened approach to solve the Indian problems.

The founder of utilitarianism was Bentham but in historical analysis, it was James Mill, who had the credit of making the creed popular. The emphasis of enlightened thought remained on the political and social problems of society. The romanticists found the solution of Indian problem in the policy of non-interference of government in the structure and morals of Indian society. James Mill’s *History of India* published in 1817 was a reaction to this sort of argument. Against the romantic emphasis on the traditions, customs, conventions, and culture, he seems to be highlighting the importance of socio-political institutions with respect to their utilization for society. Considering the state, most useful institution of human society, he demanded more and more authority for state. The state-authority is ever used by the government and administration. In this regard he seems to favour a free and authoritarian administration. He was a great proponent of a policy of radical social change in India. This change could be possible only through a free, active and authoritarian administration. In this way, James Mill used the term "utility" to establish the state authority. He proposed an initial form of democracy, as a check over administration to take it away from corruption. The French revolution had developed a consciousness of the role of people in the affairs of government and the process of the participation of people in the affairs of government and administration, at a minimal level, had begun in Europe with moves of constitutional checks on the authority of king. However, right to vote was limited to specific classes. Even Mill was not supporting the case of extension of franchise to women. In this way James Mill is treated as an Authoritarian Utilitarian. His *History of India* is selected as a true representative of authoritarian trend in utilitarian thought.

In the third and fourth decades of the nineteenth Century, liberalism became the central focus of the western mind. Liberals advocated the introduction of liberal European institutions, political as well as scientific, in India. It was the age of social and educational discourses with reference to the introduction of western sciences and English language in India. T.B.Macaulay was the representative of this trend. He supported the
theory of radical social change. But rather than supporting the concept of an authoritarian state to escalate the social change in India, he advocated the spread of western sciences through the introduction of English language in India. During 1820s his Essays on Pitt, Clive and Warren Hastings presented his ideas on Indian administration. He wrote an essay History in which he seems to be presenting a utilitarian and progressive concept of history. In 1833 his Minutes on the Education of Indians was published, proposing education as the best source of social change in India. The administration of justice was another source of social change in India. He published his views on the subject in 1839 in Legislative Minutes. In this regard his writings not only present a powerful and influential point of view, but also fulfil the demand for a contemporary social history. Edward Thornton wrote extensively on the then contemporary history. His thought was largely representative of the utilitarian views and extends the utilitarian concept of Indian history with contemporary evidences. In this regard he has been taken as representative of utilitarian defence against romantic political moves. Utilitarian emphasis remained on contemporary state, society and politics after James Mill. In the fifth and sixth decades of the nineteenth century, although getting success in Indian policy, utilitarianism seems to be on decline. It seems to be at a compromise with Liberalism, Missionaries and Paternalists. Erskine's History of India published in 1856, shows another angle of the paternalist utilitarianism in compromise with the romanticists and represents the influence of utilitarianism, which had begun to overwhelm romantic logic. It seems that he has accepted the theory of social change in India. But instead of supporting a complete change in Indian society, he seems to promote a concept of Anglo-Indian society. In this way, he seems to be presenting the trends of compromise in romantic thought from a different angle. The above-mentioned sources present an evolutionary view of the utilitarian thought. These sources are selected as the initiators of the change of attitude

and trends within the main stream of utilitarian thought, from time to time, during the period 1800-1857

4.3.4. The Missionaries.

The Missionaries had a sole aim and justification of their activity in India and that was the spread of Christian religion. In this way "Christianisation of India" was their sole mission. They tried their best to influence government's policies in a way useful to the missionary aims. There were a number of Christian sects working in India representing German, Polish, French and British communities. Among the British, Baptist Missionaries worked hard to influence the East India Company's Indian policy. The missionary works show an underlying change of thought during the period. The samples for historiographical studies are selected keeping in mind sense of evolution working behind the missionaries' thought.

The company's government had adopted a policy of non-interference in Indian society in the early eighteenth century, so the missionary activities were not given official support. In this regard, the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century missionary writings were "An Apology for Promoting Christianity in India".\textsuperscript{154} For that purpose they had launched a severe attack on Indian society and stressed the need for a radical social change, assuming Indian society highly immoral. This change could be initiated by the missionary activities in India. Charles Grant was the initiator of this trend of thought. His \textit{Observations on the State of Society Among The Asiatic Subjects of Great Britain, Particularly with Respect to Morals; and on the means of Improving it},\textsuperscript{155} written chiefly in 1792 and published with additions in 1813, influenced the British thought and Indian policy as well to a great extent. In this regard his Observations are selected as sample of apologetic trends in the missionary thought.

\textsuperscript{154} See for examples C. Buchanan, \textit{An Apology for Promoting Christianity in India}, London, 1813.
\textsuperscript{155} Charles Grant, \textit{Observations on the State of Society Among The Asiatic Subjects of Great Britain, Particularly with Respect to Morals; and on the means of Improving it}, London, 1813.
liam Tennant’s *India Recreation* appeared between 1804 to 1808. He was a chaplain in the East India Company’s Bengal army. In this regard, although he did not follow the missionary method in practice, however, he seems to be much more interested in demanding the Company’s support for Missionary works.

As the Company accepted the “apology for promoting Christianity”, the Missionaries attempted to affect the social change on the Christian model in India. In the twenties and the thirties of the nineteenth century, the utilitarians shared the same objective as the missionaries. However the missionaries condemned the authoritarian version of arguments for social change in India. They supported the liberal solution of the Indian problem and in this regard they stressed the introduction of western sciences and spread of Christian religion in India. They stressed upon the Company’s government to support the missionaries for the spread of Christian religion in India. The work of henry Martyn represents an under-lying support of the Company for the Missionary work.

Alexander Duff’s arrival in India proved to be much more helpful for the enhancement of missionary works. His approach for a radical social change through a medium of education and English language came into close contacts with the utilitarians. In this regard, Duff’s work represents a view of Indo-Islamic literature and languages. His works include a number of treatises on his contemporary social and literary Indian history.

The rise of polemics in India involved the British bureaucracy in religious controversies. Viewed in regard to these issues, the bigoted British administration seems to be very closely connected with missionary aims. They were very closely attached to the missionary zeal and rendered high standard intellectual services to the missionary cause in the polemic debate against the Muslims through their writings. The most daring examples of such activity are John Key and William Muir.

Marshman represents this school of missionary bureaucracy. Being the son of a missionary, Marshman joined the Company’s services and also joined the educational
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projects as well as the print activities initiated by Duff. His History of India depicts a visible conflict between a missionary and a servant of the company. He has been criticized for his missionary zeal by the British Indian administrators belonging to the romantic school.

The trends which were initiated in the early part of the nineteenth century, got a final shape in the 1857 crisis, after which the reins of the Indian government were handed over to the Crown and new phase was initiated. As a result the nature of British historical writings on Muslim India became clear in their purpose and outlook. Selecting the above-mentioned works for analysis as historiographical samples to be studied, the evolution of the thought of the schools and the forces working behind the change of ideas must be kept in mind.

5. Scope of the Study:

The field of historiographical studies has very wide implications. In this section, the reason why the period 1800-1857 is selected for historiographical studies and the justification of the issues, which have been selected for the analyses of British historiography of Muslim India, will be highlighted.

It has been mentioned that J.S. Grewal's Muslim Rule in India: The Assessment of the British Historians is the only work on the subject of British historiography of Muslim India. In this regard, his analysis seems to be of great importance. Some basic concepts of the British historiography as conceived by him are accepted as valid for our analysis. The political and imperial motives of British historical writings, "idiosyncrasies of Individual historians"; Indian administration as major problem for historical themes; historical writings as a part of contemporary discourse on social change in India, are some of his potent concepts found in the British historical writings on India. His observations and comments on individual historians, too, are valuable, and in this regard his generalization of British historians' concepts is remarkable.

\[13^7\] A post in the British army to perform everyday religious functions.
But there are a number of problems concerning Grewal's Schemes. He has not dealt with evolution in his treatment of British historiography of Muslim India. Although the general impression is that Jones and Gibbon influenced the British tradition of Indian historiography but the administrative and philosophical prejudices were more solid as compared to the individuals'. In this way, the theme that India was a distinct land to the British historians and individual treatment of the British historian does not seem to justify the nature of British historiography of Muslim India, fully. These historians, in one way or other, were connected with the main stream of European intellectual tradition and they applied the European schools of thought to Indian history, which is neglected in Grewal's Scheme.

The present study, primarily, rather than dealing with the individual historian in general imperial administrative perspective, focuses the school oriented understanding of British historiography of Muslim India with an emphasis on the central themes of British historians' concern in terms of evolution of thought within school and its relation with the other schools.

5.1. Rationale of the Selection of The Period
(1800 TO 1857)

The period under discussion has a very great significance in the study of history of British historical writings on Muslim India. Although, the British interest in Indian Muslims' history had begun to develop during the 17th century, yet it was confined to observations or translations from the Indian sources. However, by the nineteenth century British began to develop the understanding of Indian history on the model of western schools of thought. The process of the development of British self-understanding of India took almost half a century to be mature. In this regard, the period under study reflects the process of the formation of British attitude towards Indian history.

This process seems to be reflecting a big change in the British understanding of Indian history. Pre-nineteenth century British tradition of historiography of Muslim India had been highly impressed by the political success of the Muslims. Indian history was taken as synonymous with Muslim history in India. Its nature was purely political and the
emphasis remained over contemporary history. The concept of pre-Mughul Muslim history was confined to Farishta's history and its translation. It was purely on the basis of the British self-interest and did not involve any philosophical or disciplinary problem. The British historians, simply, succeeded the Muslim court historians, for the understanding of the rulers' relations with the people of India. During the period British historical interest was dominated by literary or administrative interest. No intellectual controversy seems to be important for pre-nineteenth century British historiographers of India.

In the nineteenth century, the Indian scene had become very complex. Administrative problems, faced by the British East India Company, had become very acute. The Indian policy of the Company was going to be subjected to heavy criticism at home (in Britain). Due to the company servants' corruption, a change of the form of imperialism was propagated in terms of the crown's rule in India. Complexity of the Indian problems had initiated some crucial philosophical questions for the justification of British interest in Indian soil. New philosophical, social and commercial schools, such as romanticist, utilitarian, missionary, free trader, liberal, evangelical and angelical were determining the flow of the main stream of the British intellectual activity. They all tried to prove their philosophical and theoretical assumptions through the Indian question, especially, in the light of Indian Muslims' history. They had also begun to apply their theories in Indian social and political soil on an experimental basis to evaluate their worth. The result was a dialogue and discourse among the different schools of British thought on the Indo-Muslims. Common among the issues discussed was the theory of radical social change. Similarly, the missionaries initiated a new activity of seeking Company's support for the Christianisation of Indian people by the dawn of the nineteenth century. In this perspective the period becomes more important for historiographical studies.

Although the British expansionism was at work since 1757 but it was not until the beginning of the nineteenth century, that the company gained ground in the Muslim heartlands, and achieved rapid expansion. In 1799, the British East India Company occupied the State of Mysore and a puppet Hindu government was established. In 1803,
Delhi was captured. From that time onward expansionism found the path into the heartlands of the Muslim majority areas. During the period, the British were taking over the authority from the Muslims to rule the Muslim majority areas, therefore, their policy and observations during the period seem significant for the understanding of the British attitude towards Muslims and the response of the Muslim subjects towards the British government. The study is complementary to a number of recent studies done on the issues in this perspective.\textsuperscript{158}

On the same line, British historical interest was shifting from its eighteenth century emphasis on Muslim India to the romance of Hindu India. There began a comparative approach towards Indian Hindu history and Muslim history. In this regard, its study not only highlights the British perception but also throws light on the relative importance of the two communities, Hindus and Muslims, in the British intellectual framework.

In the early nineteenth century, some of the writers on India assigned literary and academic purposes a secondary place and concerned themselves primarily with earnest attempts to influence the British policy towards India through their writings. They assumed a state of confrontation between the two civilizations, identifying Hindu India distinct from Muslim India. In this regard, the study of nineteenth Century British writings on Muslim India is more important than the pre-nineteenth Century writings.

In the history of Muslim India, the year 1857 marks the "War of Independence". This war seems to show a number of trends not only in Indian Muslims' behaviour but also in British attitude towards Indians, especially towards Muslims. Therefore, the study of historiography to that time is very important. It marks the end of a phase in Indian history: political, social, administrative and intellectual. Study of historiography from 1800-1857 seems to be harmonized with a socio-political tradition. It also shows a number of trends, which appear to be taking final shape. Instead of commercial interest, imperialism was declared superior, which resulted in the dissolution of the British East India Company's monopoly. The influence of British attitude on the Muslim society

\textsuperscript{158} Muhammad Aslam Syed, \textit{Muslim Response To the West: British Historiography Of Muslim India}, Islamabad, 1988.
became visible after the War of Independence. Muslim intellectual response to the British historiography can be observed in the thought of Syed Ahmad Khan and a number of other scholars. Muslims' resistance to the British cultural and intellectual encroachment became apparent in the form of Nadwa-tul-Ulama and Aligarh Movement. By that time the British attitude towards the Indian Muslim took its final shape and became clearly visible out of expediency. The year marks the completion of one phase of the process of formation of British attitude towards Indian Muslims.

5.2. Selection Of Issues:

British understanding of Indo-Muslim identity in the perspective of Muslim religion, state and society in India is taken as the main areas of interest in this study. These aspects, in one way or another, harmonize the human affairs in integrity. Religious concepts concern all aspects of life and in Islamic thought where state and society are integral parts of Religion. In the modern thought, the philosophers, the political scientists and the sociologists have a different set of standards to evaluate the nature of these three aspects, on the basis of the problems, which one has to face while studying the society with reference to any discipline.

Modern Europe, since the eighteenth century, has questioned the place of religion in society as a doctrine. The European philosophers have studied religion with reference to its relations with philosophy, science and theory of knowledge. They have also studied religion as a tool of imperialism, against nationalism and human liberties. They also questioned the view that the place of man in the universe is determined by religion, rather they subscribe to the view that evolution and progress depend on the nature of human affairs in the society.

British historiography has dealt with the relation of religion with politics, nature of the state, powers of the state, political aims, responsibilities of a state, state ideology and practice, state's relations with the subjects, character of the rulers and socio-economic
development. State’s relations with religion with reference to legislation form another set of questions and issues which determines the nature of state, both in relation to religion and society in the British historiography of Muslim India.

Social problems concern more with the individuals’ relations with individuals and with society and vice-versa. In this regard the mutual relations, standard of living, place of arts in the society, concept of freedom, property rights, culture and civilization and such other issues are concern of the historiography under review.

The European philosophers have applied their criteria, in spite of the exotic nature of their thought to Islam and Muslims. Such issues have become the criterion of the new regime of historians, which emerged during the first half of the nineteenth century. The historians of Muslim India have discussed such issues in one-way or other. But the difference between the Muslim and the European traditions has raised very interesting questions related to the succession to the Muslim government, role of aristocracy in the maintenance of law and order, and role of the Sufis in the harmonious growth of the society.

With regard to such problems and issues, European writers seem to apply the European standard to the Indian Muslims’ history and that is the problem mainly concerned in formulating this study. These problems are discussed here with reference to medieval, modern or contemporary history.

5.3. Scheme of Chapters.

The first two chapters deal with perspectives, the next four chapters deal with the major schools of British historiography of Muslim India, while the last chapter provides the conclusion of the analysis of these schools. Three distinct schools of British thought are marked for Indian Muslims’ historiography. The romanticists, the utilitarians and the missionaries form the central part of the study. Due to the variety in romantic thought the school is further classified on the bases of oriental and regional trend. Other schools seem to be following the main stream of thought. The influence and evolution of the schools during the period and their role in the Indian affairs has helped a lot to determine the place of the schools in the study and in the scheme of chapters. Evolution of Indian
problem within the schools, and the response of the schools to the problem seem to vary from time to time. But every school followed a main stream. Therefore, every school occupied a dominant place in the Indian affairs and, in this way, in the historiography of Muslim India.

**CHAP 1: INTRODUCTION.**

The first chapter deals with four issues, the subject of the study (India and Muslim India and periodization of the history of India); the inputs that determined the British historiography during the period under study; a review of literature; and the scope of the study.

**CHAP 2: HISTORICAL AND HISTORIOGRAPHICAL PERSPECTIVE.**

In the second chapter historical perspective of British historiography of Muslim India is discussed. The view is established that the trends, thought and attitude of British historians of Muslim India were determined by European and British tradition of enlightenment. The main themes of the schools of thought: romanticists, utilitarians and missionaries, are analysed along with liberalism. Historicism, orientalism, Colonialism, Industrial Revolution and Nationalism are discussed as the main forces influencing all three schools of thought. European, Indian and British political scenes are discussed as indicators of problem profile. Surveying the British historiography of Muslim India in the pre-nineteenth century, certain premises and hypothesis are stated regarding the trends that were emerging, sometimes in conflict, and sometimes in association with each other, as supplements, compliments, substitute or compromise. Whereas the schools are described below, the regional vs. sub-continental perspective, the occupational inclination of individual historians, their chronological and technical influence, etc., are also taken into account during the analysis of the trends of the schools and the historiography of the individuals.

**CHAP 3: THE ORIENTAL ROMANTICISTS.**

Romanticists are divided into two groups: Oriental Romanticists and Ethno-Regional Romanticists. The oriental romanticists saw the orient a land of wonders and presented
India as a unity of culture and civilization, distinct from that of Europe. In this way, it is discussed that first generation of romanticists saw India as the land of Hindu civilization. Thereafter the romanticists blamed Muslims for the destruction of the Hindu civilization. The school soon developed as the advocates of a theory of natural progress and change, advising a cautious policy for India against the evangelical and utilitarian advocacy of radical social change. In the last phase, facing loss of influence in India's affairs, the romanticist historians seem to argue in favour of the establishment of an Anglo-Indian society and seeking a compromise with the utilitarians and missionaries. It is concluded that in the early nineteenth century romanticism was at its height but, by the propagation of utilitarian theory, its influence began to decline and in the later period it was merely a defence against and compromise with the utilitarians and evangelicals. As a reaction there emerged an extreme romanticism.

**CHAP 4: THE ETHNO-REGIONAL ROMANTICISTS.**

The Ethno-regional romanticists advocated a variety of cultures, races and nations in India, especially emerging during Muslim rule such as Hindus, Marathas, Rajputs, and Sikhs, having indigenous character. The ethno-regional romanticists concluded that these groups presented anti-imperial forces, reacting against Muslim imperialism and they never accepted the dominance of any ruler in spite of all-powerful suppression.

**CHAP 5: THE UTILITARIANS.**

*The Utilitarians are taken as direct heirs to the enlightenment. They emphasised the institutions of state and society, along with humanitarianism. In the 1820s the concept of utility of social institutions and replacement of inactive institutions with new useful ones became the focus of this school of thought. Mill tried to establish an authoritarian state to act as the force working behind the radical social change. In the thirties, education and behavioural change became the focus, advocated by the liberal Macaulay. The later part of the period under review was occupied by paternalism, advocates a compromise with indigenous institutions, culture and customs. The utilitarian school dominated the intellectual scene of Britain and India for two decades (twenties and thirties of the nineteenth century).*
CHAP 6: THE MISSIONARIES.

It is argued that missionaries were aiming at the Christianisation of the Indians. In the early nineteenth century, they were apologetic for missionary activity, but in the twenties and thirties, they joined hands with the utilitarians and liberals for social change, and launched an attack against the Muslims in the forties and fifties. In the last decades of the period (1840 to 1857) the missionaries' activities dominated the Indian scene. In this phase even the British bureaucracy joined hands with the missionaries.

CHAP 7: CONCLUSION.

It is concluded that the British historiography of Muslim India during the period 1800-1857, was by and large subject to the European intellectual trends and schools of thought. On the Indian policy these schools seem to go through an underlying evolution of thoughts. In this evolution early nineteenth century was dominated by the romantic thought. During the 1820s and 1830s utilitarianism over shadowed the Indian scene. Two decades preceding the war of independence of 1857, show the rise of missionary thought. Romanticists and utilitarians seem to be at a stage of mutual compromise with the missionaries.

In this way the rise of missionary logic for Christianisation of the Indian Muslims was the out come of the long process of evolution of British historiography of Muslim India. William Muir, J.C. Marshman, John W. Kaye are the examples of this rise. The intellectual attacks on the Muslim history developed behaviour of resistance among the Muslims against the British political hegemony. The British tried to replace the Muslim socio-political influence by the western culture, civilization, and religion. The British historiography, following the path of the British policy, was a tool to degenerate the Muslim community, and to promote the cause of the West and Christianity. It was the attack and the attempt that created a sense of insecurity of religion and culture among the Indian Muslims, resulting in the rise of Muslim nationalism in India.
Chapter Two:

HISTORICAL AND HISTORIOGRAPHICAL PERSPECTIVE

The aim of this chapter is to trace the factors and force working behind the British historiography of Muslim India (1800-1857). It has two dimensions: historical and historiographical. In the historical perspective, the evolution of European thought resulting in the emergence of nineteenth century modern Europe and elements of this new modern Europe with special reference to Britain and British India will be analysed. The historiographical perspective will focus on the study of the central themes in European thought, related to history and historiography. Both are coherent aspects and can be studied simultaneously.

The dawn of the nineteenth century has been marked as the beginning of a new and modern Europe. This new Europe took about four hundred years for its transformation from medieval to a modern form, passing through the Renaissance, Reformation, Counter Reformation, Scientific Revolution and Enlightenment. The Enlightenment changed the European outlook towards God, Man and Universe in many ways and gave birth to a new form of thinking which became the foundation of Modern Europe. This new thinking was fundamentally guided by six elements at the end of the eighteenth century, emerging out of the historical patterns of European society: Liberalism, Historicism, and Orientalism as intellectual factors and Colonialism, the Industrial Revolution and Nationalism as practical forces. Britain was in the lead in all the six elements by the beginning of nineteenth century. British liberalism had inspired the European as well as American people and the American and French Revolutions had taken place by this time. British political, cultural and constitutional pragmatism, by the development of liberalism, had begun to form the basis of Historicism and by the mid-nineteenth century, under German interests, Historicism had become the philosophy of the day. British Orientalist researchers, such as Jones and Robertson, were elevating Orientalism to a level of a separate field of historical studies and making it a fashion of the day. British Industries were growing fast and Britain was taken as the archetype of modernization by the European nations for Industrial growth. British
overseas colonialism was reaching its zenith especially in India, over running the Muslim power in Asia.

In the historiographical perspective Europe had come out of the traditional Christian view of historiography. History was, now, no longer considered an "act of God". The focus had shifted from God to Man. In this perspective the six elements were active in the construction of new European historical premises as well as thoughts, such as Romanticism, Utilitarianism and Missionaries, which will be treated in the following chapters. The emergence of Historicism as a philosophy of the day and Orientalism as a fashion of the day had begun to contribute to the development of history as a discipline and in the elevation of historiography as a work of high calibre and creativity. All these trends represent the modern Europe and all the controversies of nineteenth century seem to be emerging out of, and within these trends.

1. Emergence of Modern Europe.

The nineteenth century marks the beginning of a new and modern Europe. The process of coming out of "stagnation and slumber", prevailing during the Middle Ages, had been completed.\(^\text{\ref{1}}\) An overview of the medieval world-view and the impact of revolutions seem necessary to understand the shift of European outlook from medieval to modern.

1.1. Medieval World View.

Medieval Europe presents a picture of "a divinely ordained disorder", divided into classes and without any central authority. The political power had been divided among clergy, nobility and the court, but the church had an overwhelming and dominant position, not only in the religious spheres, but also in the social and political spheres labelled as the "Christian Matrix".\(^\text{\ref{2}}\) The medieval Church had propagated a God-centred world-view. The universe was "a vision of God's creation on earth, God its source to God its goal"\(^\text{\ref{3}}\) and man had no vital role in this understanding. The Church was the representative of God on earth. Thus Theology was "the Queen of the sciences" and questioning was supposed to be a heresy or
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apostasy. In the tradition of Jewish-Christian version of "Ptolemaic geocentrism" the earth was thought to be a constant, static and stationary centre of universe as well as nature. Man was supposed to be born in sin and was seeking salvation in this world for life after death. However, neither perfection of the kingdom of heaven nor salvation exist on earth, because the human mind, as an organ of Adam's sin, could understand only things of the physical world. Only by divine illumination could man hope to get access to the divine or super natural. Prayers, not study, and love for God, not reason and logic, were the means to achieve divine illumination.

1.2. Making of New Europe.

By the tenth century, European society had begun to react against the medieval outlook, but the germs of change in the European world-view can clearly be marked by the beginning of Christian-Islamic interaction through the Crusades. This interaction resulted in the emergence of a "compound culture" introducing Islamic modes, methods and thought to the Crusaders. Under this influence there began a series of movements in European society which, by the end of eighteenth century, totally changed the European socio-political and religious thought and transformed it into a new world.

The crusaders' familiarity and awareness of a sound and sophisticated world outside the Christian lands of Europe became the first step towards the emergence of a new Europe that expanded the European outlook and kept this attitude flourishing throughout the centuries to come. There emerged an awareness among the European intellectuals that neither the Pre-Christian world nor the non-Christian world was totally wrong and there was good in the Pre-Christian and non-Christian people and civilizations also, from which Christian Europe could benefit. On this ground, a French intellectual Abelard (1079-1142) highlighted the merits of pre-Christian Greek-Roman civilization and marked a close relation between ancient paganism and Christianity. He presented a statement containing one hundred and fifty eight points to the church intellectuals to debate. Later the attitude was further strengthened by

---

9 However the awareness that the Christian people were kept ignorant and cheated by the church, led to a series of challenges to its authenticity and authority and to an open criticism. See for details European Renaissance.
Holbein (1101-1164), Dante (1265-1321) and Roger Bacon (1214-1294).\textsuperscript{10} Dante depicted the exotic influence on the Christian literature and criticized the contemporary church\textsuperscript{11} and Roger Bacon promoted a spirit of enquiry against church’s blind faith.

This was the spirit which gave birth to the Renaissance. However the Renaissance could never have been able to win a success without a commercial revolution, “the Free Cities Revolution” and the emergence of a new bourgeoisie class, which became the guardian of Renaissance activities.\textsuperscript{12}

The Renaissance was a movement of the revival of ancient Greek-Roman culture in the form of arts, architecture, sculpture, and literature. This movement for revival was primarily a cultural marriage between ancient pagan civilization and the then contemporary Christian civilization. The socio-political religious intellectuals and artists tried their level best to safeguard the Christian church in the name of the revival of ancient culture, logic, literature and arts against the movement of critical enquiry. However the Renaissance by itself became a source for the promotion of the spirit of critical enquiry and critical method. The commercial bourgeoisie promoted these trends in the free cities. Florence, Venice, Amsterdam and Paris began to appear as big centres of arts and literature. As a result the great works of great men such as Petrarch (1304-1374), Leonardo de Vinci (1452-1521), Machiavelli (1469-1527), Sir Thomas More (1478-1535), Erasmus (1466-1536), Michelangelo (1475-1564), and Shakespeare (1564-1616) began to appear in the Europe to promote the spirit of inquiry, invention and discovery.\textsuperscript{13}

In this perspective, the place of religion and role of clergy in European society was fast declining. The enlightened clergy was well aware of the fact that corrupt clergy was the primary cause for this decline. Therefore, a voice for Reformation began to appear, finding its triumph in the name of Protestantism. The Reformation failed to defend the place of clergy in Europe rather it provided new themes and thought for the development towards a new world. Its challenge to the socio-political and religious authority of the church ultimately led to the idea of Nation-State and National Kingdom and struck at the very root of political authority and unity of the Christian Europe. The idea of Divine Right of Kingship was

\textsuperscript{12} Norman, Zacour, \textit{An Introduction to Medieval Institutions}, London, 1976, passim.
\textsuperscript{13} See for details sources on the impact of renaissance on Europe.
harmonized with an ideal of National King. The Reformation made the question of relations between church and state a core issue of the contemporary scenario. The Reformation not only broke the authority of dogma but also generated many sects within the Christian fold. The endless debate on theology among the sects ultimately led to the recognition of reason as a touchstone to distinguish right from wrong, unless one of these sects were armed with irresistible physical forces. The dialectics of attack and defence resulted in the triumph of reason and weakness of dogma. It resulted in the division of Europe into Catholic and Protestant Christianity and to a Hundred Years War between sectarian European powers.\(^\text{14}\)

However, if the Scientific Revolution proved to be a Divine assistance to Reformation in this encounter on the one hand, the spirit of reasoning and logic promoted by the Reformation contributed a lot in the development and acceptance of the scientific revolution. Science was taken as the basis of reason through observation and experiment in nature. Its focus remained on four major areas of knowledge: Cosmology, Optics, Anatomy and Mechanics i.e. the science of motion. It expanded the canvass of human approach to nature and the scientists began to discover an inherent system of laws in nature.\(^\text{15}\)

In this understanding logic, mechanics and reason became the basic tools of knowledge. Logic and reason contributed for a new system of philosophy in the name of Enlightenment and mechanics led to a new Industrial Revolution. The new scientific discoveries and invention falsified the ecclesiastical world-view and began to format a new one.


\(^{15}\) Copernicus (1473-1543) in 1543 in his book *On the Revolution of Heavenly Spheres* rejected the concept of a motionless earth and he tried to prove logically that earth moves around the Sun and Sun is the centre of the Universe. *Burno* (1548-1600) elaborated the implications of Copernicus' theory. Tycho Brahe (1546-1601) defending the earth-centred theory against Copernicus' theory, gathered some data valuable for Astronomy and strengthened the view that the moon moves around the earth. Kepler (1564-1624) presented the elliptical view of motion of planets, rejecting the concept of circular motion. Galileo (1564-1642) argued for a scientific and mathematical religion on the basis of his discoveries of mathematical laws in nature. In the same way Rene Descartes (1596-1650) developed a system of analytical geometry based on analytical method and Pascal (1623-62) turned it into a theory of logical numbers. Newton (1642-1727) found the Law of Gravity in the Universe explained the gravitational relations between the planets mathematically. Such type of views and theories were very strongly resisted and suppressed by the church. However these theories were strongly supported by the new inventions and discoveries such as Microscope (1591), Thermometer (1597), Telescope (1608), Air Pump (1615), Logarithmic Table (1617), Barometer (1644) Pendulum Clock (1657). Scientific societies such as Royal Society, London; Academy of Science, Moscow; Scientific Books Royal Society for Improving Knowledge in England and Philosophical Society of Philadelphia spread these views and discoveries among the common people. See Burtt, E.A., *The Metaphysical Foundations of Modern Physical Sciences*, London, 1975, and Hall's *From Galileo to Newton 1630-1720*, London, 1970.
2. Enlightenment: the Foundation of New Europe.

What the scientific revolution had initiated in the field of natural, physical, mechanical and biological sciences, eighteenth century philosophers began to apply it to the social sciences. The scientific revolution had begun to replace the traditional structure of cosmological and biological sciences. It projected a system of natural, physical and mechanical laws working even in the microcosm. It promoted the trend of finding natural laws in human institutions e.g., social, political and religious. The eighteenth century seems to be strongly dominated by these trends. The basis of the findings during the century was critical and free evaluation of theories and themes in the light of reason. Therefore, it is called “The Age of Reason”\textsuperscript{16} and “Enlightenment”\textsuperscript{17}.

The Enlightenment was primarily based on scepticism\textsuperscript{18} generated by scientific revolution and its ideal was the derivation of social laws on the basis of scientific method. Therefore, the dissatisfaction over the existing state of knowledge was the pre-assumption of the philosophers of the age. For them, existing knowledge of man, nature and society in Europe was very limited, unauthenticated, irrational and unreliable. They felt the need of authentication and rationalization of existing knowledge. They wanted to evaluate its reliability and expand the frontiers of the existing state of knowledge. It could not be possible without redefining knowledge, its sources and its nature. But this question was not a problem for the philosophers. They projected the view that knowledge is all around in nature. Nature is a constant source of knowledge. It is unlimited but rational. Man is also a part of nature and knowledge is based on human experience in nature. In this way enlightenment focused on the knowledge based on human reason. However, all human knowledge was not reliable. Human knowledge aims at serving Man but first it has to be verified.\textsuperscript{19} This verification in fact resulted in the replacement of scholasticism\textsuperscript{20} with the principles of epistemology.\textsuperscript{21}

The Enlightenment concept of “knowledge” hit the church very hard. Scepticism challenged the basis of Christian church very strongly and criticism virtually demolished the

\textsuperscript{18} An attitude of questioning every thing.
\textsuperscript{19} Steven Kreis. “Ecrasez l’infame!: The Triumph of Science and the Heavenly City of the eighteenth Century Philosophe”, \textit{op. cit.}
\textsuperscript{20} The branch of science which deals with the application of reason for the understanding of things.
\textsuperscript{21} Branch of science dealing with the theory of knowledge.
Church's status as guardian of divine knowledge. Free scepticism posed serious questions regarding the nature of religion and religious beliefs and dogmas. Instead, it promoted new rational themes and theories concerning the nature of Man, God and the Universe. On the other hand criticism of the existing state of knowledge led to a spirit of free enquiry. This spirit of enquiry practically promoted the rational intellectual and material progress against authority and tradition in connection with politics and religion. In this new tradition there was not any practical limitation for enquiry and knowledge. Scripture was no more an authentic source of knowledge. This new tradition was more beyond the limited world-view of church on secular basis and it was based on rational philosophy. It insisted on the unity in diversity on individualism, on new enthusiastic themes, theories and thought, on new assumptions and theses and on the liberty of thought and thinking. The result was the lessening of peoples' interest in Christianity and the emergence of new beliefs based on atheism and deism, which were derived from pre Christian classical heritage, in which there was no God but man-like gods and goddesses.

As the new foundations of knowledge were based on human reason, therefore man became central in this new system of thought as classical symbol of gods, as philosopher, as reformer or as individual. There emerged a positive optimism about the abilities of man as a most perfect rational being. Now man's happiness became the aim of all human pursuits. This aim influenced the view of history a lot. Now man was not a sinful creature who could only be saved by self-denial while patiently awaiting death and ultimately salvation. It was a man, energetic, curious, and rational and explorer of the world who was the promoter of knowledge. Under the enlightenment, men began to look at life full of promise and hope to find a self in life. Now they were looking at this worldly life rather than life after death. Now people's rights, their well being, education, material prosperity and right to rule were the issues. Now man's moral and intellectual perfection was the goal to attain. In this way, it appeared in the form of humanitarianism.

The Enlightenment was not an abstract phenomenon, recognized by later philosophers or historians. It was a conscious tendency or a culture. The philosophers of the age were well aware of their objectives. They were making conscious efforts to make their world

22 The view that rejects the belief in God.
23 The doctrine that belief in God can commend itself to the human mind by its own reasonableness.
24 The doctrine that teaches a hopefulness.
enlightened. WHATSOEVER may be the result of these efforts, the phenomenon was widespread as well as powerful and it influenced the later developments of Europe. It spread very fast in the different parts of Europe and appeared in different names having the same meanings: in Italian “illuminati”; in French “lumiere”; in German “aufklarung” and in English “Enlightenment”\textsuperscript{25}. Philosophers from most of the Europe contributed to its development in criticism, in the development of new science of man, in the exploration of nature and natural laws, in human sciences and in the understanding of man’s new role in the world.

In this perspective John Locke (1632-1704) and Vico (1668-1744) were the first among those who applied scientific logic and reason to the humanitarian sciences. Locke tried to develop an epistemology to evaluate the nature and authenticity of human knowledge. His epistemology asserted the people right in the establishment of government and superiority of natural law over the religious dogmas. Vico focused on the study of human behaviour with reference to learning and human institutions. He proposed a system of learning based on historical contexts. Francois Voltaire (1694-1778) promoted a criticism of existing socio-political and religious system and set up the mind of the people for its overthrow. David Hume (1711-1776) also analysed the nature of human mind with reference to social relations on the scientific basis. Denis Diderot (1713-1784) tried to sum up all the human knowledge into one great Encyclopaedia. Montesquieu (1689-1755) presented a theory of separation of powers among the different organs of state to check the exploitations of people’s rights by the government. Rousseau (1712-1778) tried to awaken the people with his famous phrase “man was born free, but now is every where in chains”. Adam Smith (1723-1790) highlighted the role of wealth in the development of human morality i.e., social, political, cultural, economic or religious. Beccaria (1738-1794) criticized the existing judicial system and propounded the people’s right of demanding justice. Edmund Burk (1729-1797) fought a case of human liberties against the civil servants of the government. Herder (1744-1803) approached the understanding of human institutions and psychology in a cultural and physico-geographical environment.

In this way the philosophers of the enlightenment focused on the concept of God, Man, and Universe. By the end of the eighteenth century, the enlightenment had created a new

\textsuperscript{25} Steven Kreis, “Ecrasez l’infame!: The Triumph of Science and the Heavenly City of the eighteenth Century Philosophe”, op. cit.
world-view and, in this regard, a new Europe. It diverted the central focus of European society from blind faith to scepticism, from tradition to modernity, from revelation to reason, from God to man, from obedience to questioning, from life hereafter to life on earth, from aristocracy to democracy, from despotism to aestheticism and from an old system of thought to a new one. From this world view began to emerge a new European political, social and cultural system which has been taken as Modern Europe.

The developments very sharply influenced the modern European concept of historiography. Although Christian religion had to face a hard criticism during the last four centuries, however it survived as a fundamental institution even in the modern system of European state and society. Propagation of Christianity still formed the major part of most European intellectual efforts and achievements. European writers as well as historians seem to be promoting the cause of Christianity through the agenda of reforms or conquests either rationalists or others. The course of history as well as character of individuals was being discussed in terms of their role in the spread of Christianity. From Sir William Jones to Sir John Kaye all seem to be convinced of the superiority of Christianity over all the other religions as well as civilizations during the period under discussion.

However, renaissance seems to be influencing the core of historiographic structure. Renaissance elevated language, literature, mythology, philosophy and arts to a level of ideal symbols of the rise of civilizations. The romance created by the spirit of renaissance can be identified as the foundation of nineteenth century European “romanticism”. The romanticists seem to be adopting the ideals and the patterns same as those of renaissance, focusing on antiquity. On the other hand utilitarians focused on the contemporary issues in terms of philosophy and administration in the same backdrop. The romance of renaissance, as a reaction to the extreme rationalism of eighteenth century, also seems to be idealizing renaissance and spread of Christian religion in the nineteenth century. Both the aspects formed the central mechanism of nineteenth century missionaries’ activity. The standards of civilization, language, literature, arts and philosophy can best be placed as legacy of renaissance to the modern European world. In this perspective, if Sir William Jones was

26 Jacob S. Dharmaraj, Colonialism and Christian Mission, Delhi, 1993.
27 See Intra, chapter six.
28 See Intra, chapter III.
29 See Intra chapter V.
devoted to language and literature, William Robertson and Thomas Maurice’s ideal was antiquity. If Charles Grant focused the revival and spread of Christianity, Mill philosophised history. If utilitarians idealized a change or Westernisation, Europeanization, or Anglicisation and the missionaries idealized the Christianisation of the world, the romanticists idealized the cultural and civilizational diversities and natural growth of the societies and civilizations, all as a continuity of renaissance trends.

The influence of Reformation and Counter-Reformation confirmed the renaissance cause of revival and reform in Christianity through history and historiography. Sanctifying renaissance’s revival of painting and sculpture, it made the study of arts a permanent aspect of historical studies. Utilitarians’ distinction between religion, philosophy and superstitions seems to be founded on reformation theories. A tendency of a strong criticism of existing religion can be traced as a root cause for the growth of the study of political, social and cultural institutions through history in historiography. However, Scepticism seems to be the central force working behind the development of historiographical methods and Scientific Revolution seems to be providing the basic techniques for modern historiography. Therefore, new sciences evolved by the scientific revolution and their subject matter seem to be forming a dominant subject matter of nineteenth century history and historiography. However all these trends can be found explicit in enlightenment.

The enlightenment’s “intellectual chaos” and resultant multi-spheric historiography proved itself an immediate predecessor to the modern European trends of historical thought. Its emphasis on nature opened the ways for the study of human environment and ecology. All the contemporary histories seem to begin with an introduction to the geography, demography, ecology and natural resources of the area concerned. Focus on man diverted all the emphasis of historical writings from “history as an act of God”, to history as a philosophy taught by examples from human past experiences.\textsuperscript{30} The enlightenment opened the non-Western world to the Europeans and expanded the sphere of their observations. There began an attitude of tolerance to all form of knowledge and techniques. Romanticists seem to be influenced by the enlightened concept of “diversity in the Universe” in the form of races, cultures, species, nations, etc., and reacting against extreme rationalism and mechanization of

life in the form of analysis by emphasizing the abstract ideas such as human will, passions and pleasure in historiography. They seem to be borrowing the concept of ethnic, cultural, regional and social histories from the enlightenment. They seem to be convinced of enlightened view of unity of human nature and psychology in history from ancient to modern. On the other hand Utilitarians took the concept of natural laws and universal history from enlightenment. They seem to be tracing the means, ways and tools to bind the world in universal system by adopting extreme techniques of social mechanization, neglecting diversity in the Universe. Histories of law, institutions, education and histories of contemporary state and society was their close focus. The concept of superiority of Western or European world over, and westernisation or Europeanization of, the rest of the world, without doubt, can be taken as a legacy of enlightenment to the utilitarians. However the influence of enlightenment on the missionaries seems to be more interesting. Missionaries seem to be equally influenced by the enlightenment concept of diversity in the universe and superiority of the West, however missionaries envisioned the practice of both the concepts under a universal form of religion in the name of Christianity. This understanding can be found a constant element in the modern missionaries’ historiography. In this way, on the one hand, missionaries adopted a romanticists’ view regarding cultural, ethnic and geographic histories and on the other hand, a utilitarian view to make the world Christianised. Both the trends indicate a direct influence of enlightenment on missionaries. However the rise of missionaries’ activities was no doubt a reaction to enlightenment’ Deism.

3. The intellectual Elements of New Europe.

This transition of Europe from medieval to modern resulted in the development and growth of three new intellectual tendencies, which form the basis of modern Europe. The tendencies of renaissance, passing through scepticism, reformation and enlightenment, led to the rise of liberalism and a reactionary historicism. Contacts with new world and discovery of new trade routes with the east resulted in the renewal of occidental interest in the orient and emergence of Orientalism.
3.1. Liberalism.

Liberalism is a purely European term, founded on the basis of the concept of human “liberty” and “freedom”. A liberal has been taken as “a man who believes in liberty”\textsuperscript{33} and “freedom of the individual from any kind of restraints”\textsuperscript{32}. In this way it has emerged as a value, which covers the basic structure of society and focuses on the sharing of freedom and equality among the citizens to govern the society.\textsuperscript{33}

The concept of human liberties is as old as human society. It has been a central question to all socio-political philosophies from the Greeko-Roman to modern times. The philosophers take the preservation of human liberties as a primary cause for the establishment of all the human institutions. “Man was born free”\textsuperscript{34} in a “perfect state of freedom”.\textsuperscript{35} It is a natural right which should not be curbed by any authority, but now man is everywhere in chains. Liberalism has been presented as a force struggling for the liberation of man from these chains of authority. However this struggle seems to be in action in all the history of mankind and Croce takes “history as the story of liberty”\textsuperscript{36}.

The evolution of the concept has been traced back to the ancient times, and encompasses all areas of human life and thought. However its focus has changed in different times. During the ancient times Socrates and his follower sacrificed their lives for the cause of a system based on liberty of thought, derived on the basis of human wisdom. It can be taken as social liberalism. In the middle ages it was a struggle against church authority. In modern times, since the nineteenth century, it has taken the form of a movement for the preservation of human rights.

Modern liberalism emerged out of enlightenment ideals against authority, power, suppression and tyranny, ruling over humans, especially in Europe, \textit{in the name} of religion, divine rights, state, justice, peace and law. As struggle against these forces had become very systematic with the \textit{rise of Free Masons} and Carbonaries in the sixteenth and seventeenth

\textsuperscript{32} \textit{Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy}, see Classical Liberalism, www.stanfordencyclopediaofphilosophy.com
centuries, the enlightened ideals tied this sense of struggle into a new name of liberalism. Practical application of enlightened ideals about man appeared as its central goal. Liberalism’s assertion of the right of struggle against any illegitimate authority, revolutionary thoughts, industrial revolution, new classes of bourgeoisie and workers and changing social order became tools for its projection and popularity. However, the philosophers of different areas looked at liberalism in different ways. In England it has focused on religious tolerance, government by consent, personal and especially economic freedom. In France liberalism has been closely associated with secularism and democracy. In United States, liberalism has been devoted to the cause of personal liberties with an antipathy to capitalism while the liberals of Australia have been sympathetic to capitalism. In all its multiplicity the focus of nineteenth century liberalism remained on the political aspects and in this regard it is termed as Political Liberalism. However the term has been applied as classical liberalism, political liberalism, religious liberalism, liberal state, liberal economy, economic liberalism, commercial liberalism, liberal despotism, liberal church and in this way Christian liberalism, etc.

From the American War of Independence to the unification of Italy and Germany, European history can be generalised as a struggle of liberalism against autocracy or conservatism, for human rights and natural liberties, for constitutional frame works for the governments, for the limitations of government powers against individuals, for the non-interference of government in the individuals’ affairs, for the people’s right of property, for the freedom of expression and for the right to self-rule.

The French Revolution influenced the European world to the core and created a strong sense of enthusiasm for liberalism. Its slogans of “liberty, equality and fraternity”, its enthusiastic call for nationalism, its endless struggle against divine rights and class distinctions, its effort to make a public constitution and after all its “Declaration of Rights of
Man" became symbols of successful human struggle for human rights against authority and suppression. For the next seventy years, European people can be seen fighting for the practical achievement and implementation of these slogans. On the other hand a conservative hierarchy was struggling hard to crush and suppress liberalism, under the leadership of Russian Emperor and Austrian Chancellor. Vienna settlement (1815) was the triumph of conservatism against liberalism. However people's reaction against the settlement was very strong. Very soon, they began to react against this settlement. Revolutions broke out for liberal constitutions in Spain, Portugal, Netherlands, Balkan and Ottoman Europe. In 1830, French people again overthrew the conservative monarchy and established a new liberal constitutional monarchy, which was a common man's kingship. In 1848, again they overthrew the monarchy and established a republic. These revolutions influenced the whole Europe and national revolutions broke out in Germany, Italy, Austria, Hungry, Spain, Portugal and the Netherlands. The industrial working class promoted socialist liberalism under Saint Simon (1760-1825) and Karl Marx (1818-1883). These developments led to the rise of nationalism in the name of people's right to form a political and geographical unit.

In short individualism, constitutionalism, democracy and human rights seem to be the outcome of nineteenth century liberalism, which form the basic structure of modern European state and society. It was primarily a struggle against all institutions claiming any sort of authority other than that of the people: state, church and government. It promoted a number of philosophies in European society such as democracy, republicanism, individualism, nationalism, constitutionalism, and socialism. However all these aspects were primarily a focus on political affairs and nineteenth century Liberalism appeared as a Political liberalism. Due to its versatility and a close concern with people's daily life, it came out as a very powerful phenomenon in the nineteenth century Europe. It began to influence almost all the aspects of European life and all the intellectual theories and thought whether religious or secular. It almost took the form of a universal reform movement. All schools of philosophers, state, society and church seem to be reforming their view, ideas and rules concerning man and government, gradually and repeatedly. Modern Europe seems to be

emerging out of this process of gradual and repeated change and a dialectics between change and reversal.

The nineteenth century liberalism provided new ideals to look at history and society. Liberalism had emphasized on the human liberties especially in the political sense and reformation of social intolerance into a tolerant behaviour. Its impact on the historiography began to appear in the form of the adoption of new model for historical studies. The historians of the era can be seen analysing the remote history on the principles of modern liberal ideals. As it was also an era of colonialism, so the early application of new liberal ideals began to appear first in the ancient and medieval histories of the Europeans' colonies. The form of government, nature of government, its relations with the subjects, process of law making, nature of the implementation of laws, peoples' rights in the state law, state constitution, preservation of human rights, class system in society, relations among the different classes of society, place of religion in society, nature of social thinking, cultural aspects of society, ethnic formation and response of society, superstitions and means to eliminate these superstitions, family relations, social relations, social grouping, relations with other countries and civilizations and such other topics became the core issues and subject matter of historiography. The romanticists seem to be idealizing the system of ancient civilizations, state and society on these questions and trying to defend the ancient civilizations and indigenous culture and society by providing the glimpses of their liberality to the European intelligentsia, especially, in the colonies. On the same lines, utilitarians seem to be presenting liberalism as a purely western concept. The ancient as well as non-western modern societies were lacking this concept totally. So the promotion of liberal ideals through colonialism was their prime goal. The missionaries were attaching the development of liberal ideals to the attitude of Christianity towards politics. Tracing its origin from the Christian history, the missionaries were looking the spread of liberal ideals just through the Christianisation of the colonized societies. However liberal ideals were forming the core of nineteenth century Western historiography, especially that of the colonies.
3.2. Historicism.

"Historicism" is a term applied to the behaviour and method of solving the current problems and 'forecast the future on the basis of ... experience of past [history]'\textsuperscript{49}. Following the theme Karl Popper\textsuperscript{50} considers "historicism as a 'philosophy which claims to predict the course of human history on the basis of past behaviour'.\textsuperscript{51} Foucault sees the development of "historicism" on the concept of knowledge on the basis of history:

All knowledge is rooted in a life, a society, and a language that have a history; and it is in that very history that knowledge finds the elements enabling it to communicate with other forms of life, other types of society, other significations; that is why historicism always implies a certain philosophy, or at least a methodology, of living comprehension...of inter-human communication.\textsuperscript{52}

In this way historicism is a reflection of the modern episteme. 'Historicism concludes that all knowledge claims are subjective ... [and ] philosophy then seeks to understand and comprehend this underlying diversity'.\textsuperscript{53} It had five prominent aspects:

First, scope of history seems to be widening from what, when and where of simple information to how and why of analysis. Therefore, the questions of "being" and "becoming" of rational and religious philosophy becomes central to historical inquiry.\textsuperscript{54}

Second, historians and philosophers began to look at history as a thread fabricated by past, present and future; historical past providing experienced theory; present, always linked with past, a laboratory to re-evaluate and re-assess the theory; and future a time to come for the completion of historical process and fulfilment of historians predictions about the development of human state and society.

Third, on the foundations described above all the theorists, thinkers, philosophers and policy makers seem to be devising all their theories, thoughts, philosophies and policies in historical context and perspectives, on the basis of historical facts and issues. However, primarily it was a help, which these theorists, thinkers, philosophers and policy makers sought from history

\textsuperscript{50} Karl Popper, \textit{The Poverty of Historicism}, London, 1986, passim.
\textsuperscript{52} Foucault, \textit{Archaeology of Knowledge}, tr. A. M. Sheridan, New York, 1972, pp. 372-373.
\textsuperscript{54} Hans Meyerhoff, \textit{The Philosophy of History in our Time}. New York, 1957, p.65
Fourth, the German school of historians began to deal philosophical issues on the basis of pure historical facts and figures. It was the generalizations of history and derivation of laws through the understanding of historical process. It was the new philosophy derived through history, “philosophy of history”.

Fifth, by the moving of history to a central place in modern European thought, the questions of the nature and reliability of historical knowledge, facts, figures, subject matter and events became more important than ever as the foundation of history and historical knowledge. The most important aspect of the historicism was the understanding of history as a discipline. In this regard historicism seems to be determining the place of history as a source of knowledge, developing method of historical research, analysing the nature of facts and even human actions in their moral capacity. It was, in this way, a rather subjective and particular approach than objective and universal. However, the nature of historical reality or fact is always under question of the rationalists and religionists.

The evolution of historicism has been traced back to the advent of historical knowledge from the time of Herodotus. The European Renaissance had revived the concept and consciousness of history in European mind. However, by the beginning of the nineteenth century, the consciousness of history began to convert its substance into “historical consciousness”. The knowledge of theories and practices of human past was being deemed necessary for the understanding of all the aspects of “human existence” on earth. Pragmatism had always existed but now philosophy was being historicized. Philosophy was, now, no more considered philosophy but “history of philosophy”. “Philosophy of History” had begun to develop its status as the accepted and popular thought of the day. These philosophised trends and theories of history seem to be contributing at large in the development of modern Europe throughout the nineteenth century in the name of historicism.

Historicism was emerging out of a conflict and controversy inherited in the logic of development of modern European thought. The challenge of Cartisean Scepticism and extreme Rationalism had met with the elevation of history as a source of truth in a sense of

---

55 See for details G. P. Gooch, History and Historians in the Nineteenth century, Boston, 1968
56 See for details Paul Hamilton, op. cit., pp. 7-29.
57 See for a detailed discussion on the concept, Ashish Nandy, op. cit. passim
58 The method of enquiry developed by Descartes.
"historical idea". Cartesian scepticism had destroyed the established foundations of European society without an alternative, which had made European intellect and psyche lose the moorings. The problem developed a dialectics between suspicion and faith, reality, truth and fact. It was also a conflict between probability and certainty. Vico tried to solve the problem through his concept of history. He seems to be elevating history to the level of a new faith and reality for European society. On the question what is being and how is it becoming, Vico’s priority to the question of ‘becoming’ seems to be placing history at the central focus of philosophy. “History is not concerned with the past as past”. It concerns with the actual structure of society. In order to study the actual structure of the society, for Vico, we need not pose the question whether it really exists. He equates the questions of “becoming” with Historical process: a real problem for concern. It is historical process in which human beings build up systems of languages, laws, customs, state and government. Thus the plan of history appears wholly a human plan in Vico’s thought. However, under the influence of “the age of reason”, his focus seems to be on the mental and intellectual side of history. He attacks the Cartesian criterion of truth in the form of a clear and distinct idea, however, confirms the status of belief that depicts some ideas as fact or reality in our mind and history thus appears a work of human mind in Vico’s thought.

As the Cartesian scepticism was primarily based on a criticism of Divine Faith, and new world-view was based on Man, therefore the synthesis of the conflict came out in the form a theory of knowledge based on human reason and human experience. During the Age of Reason and Enlightenment a number of philosophers seem to focus history as a more reliable source of knowledge. However, three questions kept the status of history down to reasoning: First, history had been understood as “what happened” and “where”. “Why” and “how” had not yet taken the importance in the Western historiographic tradition. Second, there was no potent vision of future in the eighteenth century European historiography. There was no prediction on the basis of history or philosophy of history except that of religion or philosophy’s moral judgment. Third, history was being understood in terms of individual or collective human actions and efforts. Therefore it was taken as a field that had no concern with universal and moral values, which were the central theme of contemporary thoughts.

61 Ibid., pp. 63-71.
It was due to the problems emerging out of extreme rationalism of enlightenment and its focus on pure reasoning that increased the need of elevation of human experience to a level of philosophy in the European mind. The centre of enlightenment was philosophical metaphysics. The trends widened the gap between reason and experience, theory and practice, idea and action and between possibility and certainty.\textsuperscript{62} The gaps could be bridged only through history and attempts by the philosophers to bridge these gaps seem to be bringing history to a central focus of philosophy. Voltaire uplifted the status of history and laid the foundation of historicism by introducing the term of “Philosophy of History”\textsuperscript{63}. Edward Gibbon strengthened the trend by focusing the internal and natural process of rise and fall of states, societies and institutions\textsuperscript{64} like Ibn Khaldun\textsuperscript{65} and Burke by adopting a universal code of moral values from religion for history.\textsuperscript{66}

In this perspective, by the beginning of the nineteenth century, history, and historical experience had become a central force of thinking and thought. The intellectuals, as well as people, had begun to look at all the problems of human person and society in its historical context and formulate their vision of future on the basis of ‘historical consciousness’. Philosophy, metaphysics and even logic of the time began to use history as the most reliable source of information and knowledge. History began to emerge as a most potent theme of literature. Even religionists can be found using history as a source to strengthen their views and vision on religious belief. Now philosophy was being considered no more than history of philosophy. Religion was being taken as an evolutionary process and even the understanding of scripture had been considered as a product of time and space rather than a divine diffusion. History by itself was now not mere a record of past events, but a live force in human society as well as institutions and a source of prediction for future.

During the first quarter of the nineteenth century, historicism seems to be under the influence of reason, metaphysics or religion. The Christian religious philosophers began to propagate the fulfilment of biblical predictions not only in past, but also in present and

\textsuperscript{62} Ibid., 65.

\textsuperscript{63} Voltaire has been taken as an originator of modern term of “philosophy of history”.

\textsuperscript{64} See for details Edward Gibbon, op. cit.

\textsuperscript{65} The concept is the subject matter of Ibn Khaldun’s Prolegomena.

\textsuperscript{66} Baldacchino, Joseph. “The Value-Centered Historicism of Edmund Burke”

future.\textsuperscript{67} Philosophers like Hegel focused on metaphysics and divine reasoning or “Grand Idea” and on \textit{Philosophy of History}.\textsuperscript{68} However real historicism seems to be developed and promoted by the German philosophers in the second quarter of the nineteenth century.

As a whole during the period historicism seems to be flourishing very fast from a helping source of knowledge for moral and philosophical understandings to an independent and complete source of knowledge, a philosophy by itself. By the mid-nineteenth century, its status as a complete and independent source of knowledge had been determined.

The growth and development of historicism seems to be influencing the British historiography of Muslim India a lot. The early British historiography of Muslim India was primarily a product of British curiosity to know about India. However, by the beginning of nineteenth century, it seems to be influenced by the views based on historical contexts or historical perspective and this context can be found utilized to prove or negate some arguments or views. Romantic Antiquarianism and Enlightened Utilitarianism along with Orientalism seem to be promoting their cause through history. In the same way, for missionaries, history became the source to prove the truth of Christian religion. Romance, utility, derivation of lessons from the past, policy implications through history and generalization of historical events and processes appear to be some common features of all the British historiography since nineteenth century. Historians like Mill, Maurice and Elphinston seem to be looking at history in its compact sense of one central theme from past and present to future in which orient was subordinate and occident a leader. They also adopted a methodological scheme, closely examining the sources of information and validity of information given in these sources. However most of the contemporary histories of the first half of the nineteenth century were written without giving any priority to such methodological schemes and analytical examination, except to prove, defend or promote some administrative or intellectual view.

3.3. Orientalism.

Orientalism was another force in the formation of modern Europe in the late eighteenth and the early nineteenth century. It applies to a “discourse”\textsuperscript{69} among European intellectuals to


understand the orient in all its aspects, which “have been at work for hundreds of years”.  
Traditionally, orient and orientalism had been understood with reference to the Semitic races. With the rise of Islam and expansion of Muslim empire, the conflict between Islam and Christianity seems to have determined the length and width of the orient and orientalism. Later, European intellectuals increased the extent of their conception of the orient and orientalism from Semitic regions to Iran, China, Japan and the Far East.

The expansion of Oriental outlook can best be understood in the late eighteenth century world scenario. The European enlightenment had greatly stimulated the urge to bring order to the whole universe of knowledge, breaking the essentially pro-Christian and anti-Islamic paradigm of orientalism. Imperial and colonial expansion and exploration had opened up new areas, questions, peoples, problems, policies, systems and structures of society to European intellectuals and a “structural opposition” between East and West, already strongly presented by Muslim society, was creating a new set of questions for the Orientalists.

In this perspective, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, orientalism had emerged as a “concrete historical reality: as an ideology, a movement, and a set of social institutions”. It had become a fashion of the day, so popular that almost every writer had begun to refer to the orient or things oriental in his writings - philosophical or narrative. All sorts of the European people were rushing to the colonized orient: historians, philosophers, linguists, philologists, professionals, artisans, adventurers, travellers, diplomats, administrators, etc. Their sense of curiosity and adventure was conquering almost every field of inquiry about the orient and every geographical area of the orient from Morocco to Indonesia. The travellers narrated many romantic stories about the state, society and religion of the orient to the
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69 The word has gained popularity through Michel Foucault’s discourse theory of knowledge. Michel Foucault is of the opinion that a discourse is a self-explicating concept developing itself. In this way knowledge is primarily a discourse which is the prime source of human development. See for details Michel Foucault’s *The Order of Things*, New York, 1971 and *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, New York, 1971. Edward W. Said applies this word to Orientalism.

71 A field of knowledge that focuses the study of things, thoughts and theories related the Semitic people. Semites are the people supposed to be the descendants Sam, the son of Noah, including especially, Jews, Arabs, Assyrians, Babylonians, and Phoenicians.
73 Michael Dalby, op. cit., pp.485-490.
76 David Kopf, op. cit., p. 496.
European readers through their travelogues. Historians seem to be busy in digging out the ancient history of the Orient. In the same way the people belonging to the different disciplines were trying to systemize knowledge about the Orient, i.e., its religions, customs, traditions, festivals, institutions, superstitions, beliefs, ceremonial, state, politics, family structure, family relations, classes, soil, birds, animals, products, people, races, languages, dialects, myths, symbols, heroes, literature, sources of knowledge, social and political hierarchy, remains, buildings, gardens, rulers, administration, system of taxation, land revenue, seasons, diseases, plants, and all such fields.\footnote{Edward W. Said, \textit{op. cit.}, passim.}

A sense of exchange of information and collective analysis had resulted in the formation of oriental societies in different parts of Europe, America and European colonies abroad. Asiatic and Oriental societies were established at London, Paris, Vienna, Amsterdam, Florida, Bengal and other parts of Europe and Asia.\footnote{In this regard establishing the societies to organize the Oriental studies had become the fashion of the Orientalists of the day. In this regard, Belles Lettres Academy was working in France since 1718. In England had been founded Society of Antiquaries in 1751, Royal Academy in 1768 and Royal Society in 1780. The Dutch had established Batavian Society. Some of the prominent societies in India were Literary Society, Bombay. Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal. Bombay Geographical Society. A list of some valuable journals is: Asiatick Journal, Asiatick Researches, Asiatick Miscellany, Bombay Quarterly Review, Calcutta Monthly Review, Calcutta Review, Friend of India. Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bombay. Journal of Indian Archipelago and Eastern Asia. Journal of Royal Asiatic Society London. Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal. Modern Journal of Literature and Science. Quarterly Oriental Magazine. Kapp, Robert A., “Review Symposium: Edward Said’s Orientalism”, in \textit{Journal of Asian Studies}, vol.39, no. 3(May,1980).p.481.} These societies had begun to maintain and publish their proceedings, publish original sources on the Orient, discuss different aspects of the Orient and even establish some most valuable institutions for the promotion of “oriental sciences”. To keep the world aware of their findings, these societies and institutions had begun to launch their journals.\footnote{In this way orientalists were very closely connected with each other and were promoting the study of orientalism.} In this way orientalists were very closely connected with each other and were promoting the study of orientalism.

However, what was being done was subject to western themes, theories and thought on the Orient. It dealt with the issues central to the self-conception of those European people who “devoted themselves to the study of another culture”.\footnote{In this regard establishing the societies to organize the Oriental studies had become the fashion of the Orientalists of the day. In this regard, Belles Lettres Academy was working in France since 1718. In England had been founded Society of Antiquaries in 1751, Royal Academy in 1768 and Royal Society in 1780. The Dutch had established Batavian Society. Some of the prominent societies in India were Literary Society, Bombay. Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal. Bombay Geographical Society. A list of some valuable journals is: Asiatick Journal, Asiatick Researches, Asiatick Miscellany, Bombay Quarterly Review, Calcutta Monthly Review, Calcutta Review, Friend of India. Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bombay. Journal of Indian Archipelago and Eastern Asia. Journal of Royal Asiatic Society London. Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal. Modern Journal of Literature and Science. Quarterly Oriental Magazine. Kapp, Robert A., “Review Symposium: Edward Said’s Orientalism”, in \textit{Journal of Asian Studies}, vol.39, no. 3(May,1980).p.481.} The Orient presented by the orientalists and orientalism was created at large by the orientalists, on their own standards, under implication of their own thoughts. The orientalists were being patronized and orientalism was being promoted and preserved by the oriental masters (colonial powers) as a tool of colonialism and imperialism. It was dominated by a Euro-centric trend and greatly
constructed on the assumption of Western cultural and intellectual superiority over the world. The understanding of the orient was being exploited to make the people of the orient loyal subjects to their imperial masters and in practice orientalism was patronized as a tool for colonization and Europeanization or Westernisation of the orient and was contributing as a vital force in the formation and refinement of orientalists' assumptions, subject matter, language and conclusions.\(^81\) Its theme was essentially counter-Islamic and a sense of historical and civilizational confrontation with Islam remained central to the discourses of the late nineteenth century orientalism. The orientalists founded new areas of civilizations, symbolic parallels to Islam and Muslim empire, or even higher entities than Muslim civilization in their ancient and pre-Islamic periods.\(^82\) In this way, the emergent orientalism was based on a “selective ignorance or amnesia, cultural chauvinism, silk foolishness” or sum of such blends.\(^83\) Although the trends, modes, models, themes, patterns, tools, opinions, theories, thought and intellectual concerns of orientalism, were not based on a distinction between the orient and the occident, however, they promoted the process of discovery of the orient and oriental heritage.

Orientalism provided the vision of a new world to the Europeans, to observe the unity and diversity in the world and to compare European system with the rest of the world in historiography. Thus the romanticists, utilitarians and missionaries used different aspects of the findings of the orientalists to their own ends. The world depicted by the Orientalists was in fact a source of inspiration for the European romanticists. Practically, Orientalism and Romanticism appear to be mutually dependent thoughts in the nineteenth century. For Utilitarians, Orientalism provided a bulk of source material to compare the orient with the occident in the form of historiography, to prove the supremacy of the occident over the world through the history. It practically played the part of a “Laboratory of History” for the development of utilitarian ideals and their implementation. The view of oriental people’s customs, habits and behaviour, provided by orientalism, seems to be the prime concern of missionaries’ historiography. However missionaries also viewed the role of state and
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\(^81\) Ibid. quoted from Edward W. Said.


\(^83\) Michael Dalby, op. cit., p. 487
government in strengthening the state of religion in the orient through orientalism. Missionaries' plea in historiography for the role of government for the conversion of the orient to Christianity seems to be built through orientalism.

4. The Practical Forces of New Europe.

Simultaneous, with the intellectual development, the development of mechanics and mechanization of tools of production resulted in the emergence of a new practical force in the name of Industrial Revolution. Parallel to this force, the broadening of the European worldview and discovery of new world along with the needs of commercial activities generated by Industrial Revolution promoted the rise of colonialism and imperialism based on nationalism in Europe. These three forces, colonialism, industrial revolution, and nationalism became the foundation of modern Europe.

4.1. Colonialism.

The word "colonialism" is derived from the Latin word "colonia" meaning at farm, landed estate, cultivation and a settlement. However, in the ancient history, it had been taken as a proper term for a public settlement of Roman citizens in a hostile or newly conquered country who, retaining their Roman citizenship, received lands and acted as garrison. As a term the word "colonialism" has been interpreted in different ways. Colonialism has been considered as "immigration and permanent settlement of the immigrants on unoccupied land". For another view, it is a sort of understanding in which the people other than ruling country are taken as "violent, intractable, not amenable to the forms of civility and culture". K. N. Panikar explains it as a form of aggression against peaceful people of the world by the west. However, generally the word can be applied to a theory and practice for an alleged policy of acquiring colonies, keeping them dependant and to the policy of exploitation of colonized, backward or weak people by a superior power.

The concept of colonization has always existed in history, being associated with power, empire and weapons. However, modern European colonization began with the discovery of the New World. The early phase of European colonization consisted of factory settlements. It
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had been associated with commercial enterprises of western powers till the late eighteenth century. Spain and Portugal were the early colonial powers followed by Dutch, French and English. To the mercantilists colonialism was necessary:

1. To furnish the mother country with goods which could not be produced at home;
2. To trade with the mother country alone and not compete with her industries or enrich her commercial rivals or in other words to establish a monopoly over trade and commerce;
3. To help bear the burden of home government, and
4. To enable the mother country to build up a "favourable balance of trade" i.e. a flow of precious metal into the country.86

However, by the mid eighteenth century, economic and commercial interests attached to the colonies and a struggle for monopolization of trade and commerce between rival powers, had converted these factories into cantonments. The affairs of colonies became much relevant to the home scenario. The problem of colonies was being taken as concerned with the situation at home. Therefore at the end of eighteenth century and beginning of nineteenth century the need to theorize and organize the affairs of colonies was being felt very strongly. There was a desire among the European people and politicians to understand the question in its totality and deal with this problem on the basis of some theories and polices. Therefore, there began the formulation of theories as basis for the policies concerning the affairs of colony by all the European administrators and intellectuals. The practice can be found operative throughout the nineteenth century. Four factors seem to be working behind the growth and development of this colonialism.

A: Liberalism had begun to emerge as a growing socio-political force of the European state and society. Its focus was on the basic human right for all the people, criticism of exploits of governments and on constitutionalism. The liberals were closely watching the relations between the rulers and the ruled in the colonies. They were well aware of the economic exploits of the indigenous people by colonial powers and were also posing questions on the legitimacy of European colonial behaviour under humanitarianism. They were more critical about the way of government, connections of colonial administration with home governments

and impact of exploits and corruption in colonies at home administration, government and politics. There was a growing fear among the liberals that cruel means and methods used to deal with the people in colonies will ultimately be applied against the people at home. They were well aware that new elite emerging out of colonial exploits was corrupting the state and society at home and policies of suppression and exploitations applied to colonized people were being imposed on the most civilized people of the world.

B. Series of revolts in European colonies especially, American War of Independence and loss of American colonies in the late eighteenth century and early nineteenth century had created a fear of future revolts and break up of colonial empires. The loss was closely connected with socio-economic and political crises in Europe. Therefore, to avoid such revolts and keep the colonies dependant seems to be coming out as one of the top priority problem among the Europeans.

C. The struggle for colonies, resultant rivalry among the European powers and a struggle of seeking compensation for the loss of American colonies had increased the need and demand of more colonies. The need and demand had become a lust, which was being fostered by the Industrial Revolution during the nineteenth century, very acutely. The need of industrial raw material for home industry and search of new markets for industrial goods, now forming the back bone of the economy of European states, had not only increased the tension between the rival European powers but also had begun to create an awareness for a systematic and sound policy of colonization among the European powers to safeguard their commercial interest and sustain their economic growth.

D. The problems of colonies were leading to exploitation of indigenous people, mal-practices in administration, and a deterioration of relations of European people with local population, role of home government in the administration of colonies, etc. Vital questions for colonial administration, such as what should be the relations with the colonized people? What should be the method to rule them? How should the benefits be drawn from colonial resources? What weightage should be given to local system and what to Europeans in the colonies had to be addressed? The questions were being taken very seriously throughout the colonial era and to deal with these questions a sound and systematic policy was the demand of the contemporary industrial, commercial, political and intellectual elite.
The growing criticism of colonial affairs by the liberals and question of legitimisation of colonization led to the formulation of theories of colonialism during the nineteenth century, especially in the first half. These theories can be summarized into some basic assumptions or principles.

First: Europeans were supposed to be the only people on the earth promoting a modern progressive civilization based on liberal thoughts, modern institutions and advance mechanical technology. They were the most civilized, sophisticated, cultured, educated, mannered, intelligent, disciplined, organized and democratic people on the earth.

Second: the world other than Europeans is uncivilized, uncultured, savage, destitute of manners, ignorant, which has never produced any civilized institution. There is injustice, tyranny, despotism and lawlessness in the world other than Europe.

Third: it is white men’s burden to make the world civilized, educate them with new liberal thought and European institutions and provide them justice.

The theories proved to be a response to the liberal criticism, provided a justification for colonialism and facilitated the case of the colonialists for the need of more colonies. Therefore, the nineteenth century emerged as an era of colonialism. There began a mass scale colonization of the world by European powers. Russia, Britain, France and Holland began to emerge as great colonial powers as well as colonial rivals. All the colonialists found their ways in the Muslim heartlands. Russia began to encroach the Central Asia and Balkan Peninsula as well as Eastern Europe. Holland began to establish its colonial rule in the Far East. France began to find new colonies in North Africa. Britain focused on the areas like India, Egypt and South Africa. Throughout the period under discussion these powers continued to encroach on the European regions not colonized, so far by conquests and conspiracies.

Whatsoever the justification or interpretation of colonization, they were invariably linked with commercial interests which could not be attained without exploitation and aggression. Therefore, there began a policy of systematic exploitation of colonized people. On the one hand the colonialists tried to find new ways and means to exploit the colonized people, on the other hand they launched a policy of aggression through propaganda against the indigenous people, their history, culture, civilization, manners, habits, ways of living, state and society. Political aggression began to promote political disorder and chaos and annihilate indigenous
political order. Economic aggression seems to be destroying the social fabric and means of production, which is still considered the basic cause of poverty in the third world that was colonized in the nineteenth century. Social aggression began to change and disturb the minutely balanced order of society in such matters as relationship between sexes or between the different orders within the community. Intellectual aggression showed an open disregard for the ancient and indigenous wisdom, tried to impose western forms of thought, thinking, modes and models, establish western system of education, without any reference of indigenous psychology. In the same way religious aggression promoted the work of the Christian missionaries to convert the colonized people to Christianity by condemning religions of their forefathers.

However, a sort of resistance can be found emerging in the colonies as a result of such aggression and exploitations. First, this resistance began to appear in the form of revolts of peasants and workers and in due course of time it took the form of struggle for independence from colonialists rulers.

Colonialism developed a number of new perspectives for modern historiography. Colonial theories and practices were wetted through history. Means, sources, routs, tools and other aspects of strategic importance for colonization became the subject matter of historiography. Military histories became popular. Simultaneously, the issues of colonial administration and, government and the governed attracted the attention of the historians. The romanticists seem to be re-establishing the myth of warrior heroes through colonialism in historiography. They seem to be much impressed by the tendency of discovering new world through colonialism and in this regard developing new theories of history and constructing the histories of such discoveries also. The problem of administration looks to them an indigenous one. On the other hand utilitarians were not much impressed by the new discoveries or heroism. They were more interested in the history of growth and utilization of sources and means to establish an irresistible administration. The conflict of romanticists and utilitarians also raised the conflict of authority between the home government and government at colonies which became the subject matter of modern historiography. The missionaries focused new areas for the analysis of morals through colonialism. However colonialism seems to be developing a sense of Western superiority over the rest of the world in all European historiography.
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4.2. Industrial Revolution.

Industrial revolution applies to the development, growth and application of mechanical innovations to manufacturing, mining, transportation, communication and agriculture, and to the change in economic organizations that attended these innovations of methods, especially during the second half of eighteenth and first half of the nineteenth century. It was a change in the tools and means of production and mechanization of these tools.

Industrial Revolution came out of the roots of scientific and enlightened efforts made to implement the idea of man’s empowerment to subdue nature. Francis Bacon (1561-1626) was of the opinion that natural philosophy could be applied to the solution of practical problem. This was a progressive vision based on the view that history of human society was the history of human “progress forever forward forever upward”. The concept gave birth to the idea of modern technology. Natural philosophy and mechanics were applied to the manufacturing, which led to a series of invention of new machines, mechanism and engines. By the application of this mechanism, machines and engines to different sort of tools, inventors sought mastery of man over nature.

In spite of the abundance and variety of these innovations, Industrial Revolution may be subsumed under three principles. First among these principles is the substitution of rapid, regular, precise, tireless machines for human skill and effort. Second is the substitution of inanimate for animate sources of power, in particular, the introduction of engines for converting heat into power which opened up to man a new and almost unlimited supply of energy. Last is the use of new and far more abundant raw material, in particular, the substitution of mineral for vegetable or animal substance. For Landes, these improvements constitute the Industrial Revolution.

With the development of scientific method and man-centred worldview, Europe began to face an explosive increase in population, resulting in the growing pressure of demand for food and clothing. So, agriculture and textile became the early targets of changes for large-scale production through mechanization. This mechanization began to expand very fast to
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other areas of productive interest. Food demand resulted in the increase of attention to fertilizers, the adoption of new crops and farming technology.\textsuperscript{91}

However the real revolution broke out with the discovery of steam power and invention of steam engine. Till that time power often came from water wheels and windmills. Steam power proved to be more cheap and portable source. Watt’s invention of condenser in 17\textsuperscript{09} with some improvements by “a practical method of converting the reciprocating motion of the piston into rotatory motion” made the steam engine a practical prime mover for all kinds of machinery.\textsuperscript{92} Steam engines allowed deeper mine shafts to be sunk through powerful pumps and in this way greatly increased the coal available for mining. The metallurgy steam engines were soon applied to the blast furnaces, to operate automatic hammers and rollers for metals. Moreover the spread of the use of steam created a growing need to build and empower the new machines in the fields of textile, grain mills and sugar refineries.\textsuperscript{93} However the revolution proceeded at a variable pace in the communities of different areas. It proved to be linked with contemporary socio-political, cultural and economic pattern and systems in different places. For the spread of industry the change in the existing legal system, destruction of manorialism,\textsuperscript{94} abolition of guild system, availability of capital and a free-trade system were the pre-requisition. A parallel struggle for these changes by the liberal elements became the real strength for industrialization.\textsuperscript{95}

Industrial revolution established a momentum for change. New inventions, speedy improvements in existing machines, and a large-scale consumption of manpower in the newly established industries, began to change the social milieu very fast. A new factory system can be seen during the period under discussion. It promoted the concentration of workers around a steam engine, division of labour and centralized system of supervision in the name of administration. The increase in productivity led to the decrease in prices. It created opportunities for employment and led to a general economic prosperity in society. There began to emerge a new social stratification consisting of a new industrial-capitalist class replacing the traditional nobility, the middle class consisting of professionals and, a worker or lower class replacing the traditional peasants. New economic institutions, new

\textsuperscript{91} Henry W. Littlefield, op. cit., P.124.
\textsuperscript{92} Ibid.,
\textsuperscript{93} Peter N. Stearns, op. cit., P.78.
\textsuperscript{94} manorialism The concept of the use of police powers by an estate holder in his estate.
\textsuperscript{95} Ibid., P.79.
relations of workers, workers and industrialists, industrialists and capitalists, state and workers and state and industrialists, seem to be developing during the period. There began to develop industrial towns or a migration to cities and within fifty years from the second quarter of the nineteenth century, most of European population had been shifted to the cities.\textsuperscript{96}

However, these developments led to a new sort of problem. There was a concentration of wealth into the hands of a few industrialists and capitalists. The industry was based on just one principle, that of profit and the exploitation of workers and peasants became very common. As a result, there was conflict between factory owners and workers on the wages, working conditions, working hours and workers' facilities. Bad working conditions resulted in the deteriorations in the health conditions. Factory waste, air pollution and noise caused diseases and psychological problems among the workers. Periodic economic crises led to the spread of unemployment. Living conditions became insufficient for the numerous workers coming from the villages to towns in search of employment in factories. Without a collective system of subsistence there was always a food problem for these people. The migration from villages to towns began to destroy agriculture. The crisis in agriculture manifested itself in the shortage of food, hunger and devastation.\textsuperscript{97}

For the solution of these problems a new sort of socio-economic, cultural, administrative and political structure was necessary. The role of state for the resolution of conflict between different classes and groups i.e. workers, industrialists, capitalists, peasants and bureaucracy became vital. There began a new form of legislation concerning factories, workers, banking, trade unions etc. The role of state increased the role of these groups in the political process. To solve the problems of this new industrial phenomenon, new intellectual activities began to emerge having two distinct dimensions: socialists, focusing the cause of workers depicting industrialists as exploiters, and capitalists, arguing that the new capitalism was vital for the progress of humanity and was the pride and distinction of Europe all over rest of the world. The trade unions promoted the ideas of Saint Simon, Luis Blank and Karl Marx. However,

\textsuperscript{96} ibid., PP. 83-172
the capitalists had already found support among the economists, utilitarians and liberals projecting the idea of human progress.98

The phenomenon produced a totally new world-view. Now money and profit began to appear as the sole purpose of human life and effort. Material gains were the only criterion for success and failure.99 Love, passions and relations became meaningless. A new morality began to overpower the society. Profit mechanism became the spirit of European society.100 Man was no more treated as man but machine and commodity, which could be bought and sold in the open market. It was the legacy of industrial revolution. In Thomas Carlyle's words, it was "cash nexus" where the only connection between men is one of "money, profit and gain" and nothing else.101

This worldview influenced the non-European world very fast. The commercial relations between the east and the west had been established since the times of the discovery of the new world. Industrial revolution strengthened these relations in two ways. Firstly, to establish the market prices and earn more profit there was a need to find new markets for sale of European industrial goods. Secondly, to keep the European industry operative, the utilization of raw material produced by the rest of the world was necessary. To exploit the sources of the world, European powers began to overpower the East and this ground gave birth to modern colonialism.102 Colonial Europeans promoted the concept of the superiority of Europe over the world on the basis of industrialization. In hand-base industry, there was no "great disparity between the civilizations of East and West".103 It began to promote a Euro-centrism among the white men. Discovery of steamer and refinement in communication helped not only European economy to grow, but promoted the growth of European colonialism on the mother earth, supported by modern weapon-industry.

The Industrial Revolution seems to be creating some anti-mechanization and more humanistic trends in romantic historiography. Romanticists seem to be comparing the

99 See for details communist and capitalist philosophy, utilitarianism, liberalism and individualism.
100 Steven Kreis, "The Origin of industrial Revolution in England", op. cit.
delicacy of man-made and roughness of machine-made things. Arts and literature seem to be emerging as a reactionary romantic vision against the passionlessness of industrialization. It seems to create a sense of class struggle and exploitations of rights and resources in romantic historiography. However, utilitarians can be seen focusing the concept of development in human society through material and visible means and rejecting the invisible or passion-based concept of development, resulting in the writing up of histories of industries, technology and development. The missionaries seem to be combining both the views. The missionaries used the European industrial revolution and mechanical and technological superiority very passionately as a proof of righteousness of Christianity. They developed the tendency of looking at history in religious perspective and righteousness in material perspective. And all these trends in historiography were the outcome of a purely industrial consciousness.

4.3. Nationalism.

Nationalism was another force, which was increasing its role and importance in the emergence of modern Europe by the beginning of the nineteenth century. It emerged out of the concept of “nation” which applies to a “community of people, whose members are bound together”. Although the sense had always existed on racial or tribal bases, however by the reformation it had begun to emerge in its political sense. During the Middle Ages it had been aligned to a unity of religion, but because of the reformation, the concept of religious unity was shattered. To decrease the powers of Pope and to keep his political influence limited, the reformists supported the regional churches and rulers’ role in church administration, which contributed a lot to the development of nationalism.

The sense of “being one nation” seems to be supported by the theories developed and propagated by the enlightenment. Complete rejection of the old order by the enlightened intellectuals and the resultant intellectual chaos promoted the need of some new affiliations, creating a sense of unity among the people of different areas. In this perspective, the French Revolution’s slogans of “liberty, equality and fraternity” among French people, created an
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106 H. F. Gaizot, General History of Civilization in Europe, From the Fall of Roman Empire till the French Revolution, Edinburgh, 1848.
enthusiasm for a sense of unity among the other European people. French success in the anti-revolutionary wars proved the strength of sense and feelings of unity among the people and made it a great force. The French Revolution also created a sense that the right of government and administration belongs to nation rather than to the rulers. The practical success of the views made up the concept of nation and in this regard nationalism became a popular creed of the day applied to every sphere of political and administrative life of Europe.¹⁰⁸

The nineteenth century European intellectuals seem to be creating, developing and promoting a sense of unity among the people on the basis of common culture, common language, common history, common traditions, common geography or even on the basis of common interest.¹⁰⁹ In the pre-modern Europe there was no concept of nation state. Empires consisted of several nations¹¹⁰ or nations were divided among several empires or into several states.¹¹¹ However, nationalism emerges as a creed demanding self-rule, independence or political unity of people having a sense of unity. Wherever the sense of unity already existed due to some geographical or administrative reasons or due to the ruling dynasty, nationalism emerged as a creed propagating the superiority and seeking supremacy of that particular nation over its own territory. Therefore, if there was a “struggle for supremacy or mastery” in Europe between nineteenth century France, Britain and Russia on the one hand,¹¹² there was struggle for unity among the German states to become a big power under the leadership of a nationalist intellectual Stein and political leadership of King of Prussia.¹¹³ Simultaneously Mazzini (1805-1872) looking at every thing in national perspective was providing intellectual leadership¹¹⁴ and Charles Albert (), Victor Emmanuel (r. 1849-1878), Cavour (1810-1861) and Geribaldi (1807-1882), political leadership to the Italians for the unification.¹¹⁵ In the same way Greeks, Hungarians and Bulgarians can be found seeking independence either from Turkish Empire or form Austrian Empire. The Holy Roman

¹¹⁰ Hugh Seton-Watson, op. cit., p.143.
¹¹¹ Ibid. pp. 89-143
¹¹⁴ See for William Clarke, Essays Selected from the Writings, Literary, Political and Religious, of Joseph Mazzini, London, nd.
Empire was neither supported by the big European powers or states nor by the people infected by the nationalist feelings. In this regard, nationalism came into direct conflict with the traditional political system. It began to promote a concept of nation state. The Europe began to use the word nation or people instead of state or empire. The modern European geographical map and mutual relations seems to be drawn and developed at large by this concept.

Nationalism seems to be influencing the nineteenth century historiography a lot. Initially, it provided new dimension to the geographical unit of historical studies and, simultaneously, widened the scope of history from political and racial complexion to cultural, linguistic, historical and such other identities with the help of romanticism. Therefore, concepts of dynastic, political and religious history seem to be destroyed or replaced by the new cultural-geographical, lingual-geographical or historic-geographical identities for historical studies. The concept clearly demarked between “empire” and “nation” and posed a great challenge for the Western imperialism. Resultantly a sort of history in the form of apologies seems to be dominating the historiographic scene and a reinterpretation and defence of existing political identities began to dominate the historiography during the period under discussion.

The oriental romanticists were greatly influenced by the romance of nationalism in the form of historic-cultural geographical units for historical studies. They seem to be accepting the ancient historical and even mythological identities to apply the nineteenth century concept of nationalism. The romance of finding national identities led Ethno-Regional romanticists to the ethnic and regional linguistic, cultural and historical units of communities. However utilitarians applied the same concept to the administrative units. They stressed on the assertion of existing identities and on conscious efforts to make new identities. However missionaries were seeking support for their missions from their national churches. As a whole nationalism seems to be affecting the core of the nineteenth century system of thought.

5. Britain: The Leader of New Europe.

By the beginning of the nineteenth century, Britain was claiming the leadership of Europe: intellectually, politically, militarily and economically. All six intellectual and practical forces were the by-products of the Enlightenment, originating from Scotland. Although, in the late eighteenth century, French revolution had taken over the lead of liberal
elements, yet extreme responses of revolutionary government to the European situation provided Britain opportunity to remain the nucleus of liberal activities as the British had a history of Magna Charta, Glorious Revolution and constitutionalism.\textsuperscript{116} Simultaneously during the first half of the nineteenth century, Britain had blocked the road of Napoleon, Maternich and Czar’s expansionist policy and was continuously favouring the policy of non-interference in the internal affairs of any country.\textsuperscript{117} In the same way, although the German scholars initiated orientalism\textsuperscript{118} and historicism,\textsuperscript{119} by the beginning of the nineteenth century, British had dominated both fields. William Jones had turned the British mind on the oriental studies and opened the way for a new generation of orientalists dominated by the British race. Historicism was very closer to the pragmatism\textsuperscript{120}: an identical British behavioural attitude.

On the other hand, being distinct, separate and independent of European mainstream, the British had always claimed their separate identity, especially since the Glorious Revolution. The industrial revolution was primarily an English revolution and was exported to all over the Europe from England during the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{121} This sense of leadership was also dominating the colonial scene. By the beginning of the nineteenth century, British power in India had become paramount \textit{in India} against French and Dutch. British had begun to establish colonies in the Middle East and African continent. The loss of American colonies had been balanced through the Asian colonies. Simultaneously, British had checked the growth of Russian imperialism in Central Asia and Eastern Europe. However, the strength of British intellectual and practical leadership was based on the strength of British India.

\section*{6. British India.}

The foundation of the British political status and the strength of its economy were based on the Britain’s Indian Empire. India as a “continent” or “subcontinent” was under the Muslim rule since long. However by the beginning of the eighteenth century, the central authority of the Mughul emperors had been shifted to petty chiefs, nobles and nabobs,

\textsuperscript{118} See for details Wilhelm Halbfass, \textit{India And Europe}, Delhi, 1990.
\textsuperscript{120} A view that conception of effects is the conception of object.
\textsuperscript{121} See for details Arnold Toynbee, \textit{The Industrial Revolution}, London, 1884.
intriguing and fighting among themselves for political power and territorial aggrandizement. In this situation, the British East India Company had found the vacuum to assert its role, first as mediator and then as beneficiary in India. The company began to play its role as a power that could maintain balance in the politics of nabobs for commercial interests and by the time began to exploit its role. After the battle of Plassy in 1757, the British intervention in the local politic was clearly visible. They began to appoint and depose the nabobs in accordance with their commercial interests and to collect bribes. In this perspective, the problem of administrative morality became crucial in British intellectual and political circles. Simultaneously, the struggle for colonies among the European powers, initiated in America, had become crucial in India. To keep the commercial control of India firm in their hands, the British had begun to establish their authority on all Indian territories. With the fall of Seringapatam in 1799, the British political power in India had become paramount in India. The scope of French resistance was almost eliminated. As a result, in 1803, the Emperor of Delhi had come under the patronage of the East India Company.

From that time onward, to 1857, the company's policy seems to be based on some particular issues, dominated by administrative problems such as nature of administrative system, place of indigenous laws and local population in the administration, means, method and tools of collection of revenue and rulers and ruled relations. However, the emerging Russian threat, by the second quarter of the nineteenth century, seems to be stimulating the policy of aggrandizement toward northwestern frontiers of India. So the maintenance of political power for commercial interest was the central issue of the day. For that, the British were ready to face any challenge either internal or external.

The Muslim response to the rise of British power was identical. The Muslims had been the ruler of India since last eight hundred years. Their status was now converting to a subordinate. Therefore, Muslims were struggling to reassert their power in India. The revivalist movements had become active since the time of Shah Waliullah. The political and military struggle, which had begun in 1757, had terminated with the fall of Seringapatam. Since that time, Muslim bands of soldiery, deposed from the nabobs' armies or collected under the British, had continued revolts, rebellion or free-boater activities in the different.

123 Criticism of Lord Clive and trial of Warren Hastings clearly depict the nature of British exploits in India.
parts of India. For the Muslims the British or Europeans were heretic Christians and observers of social and moral vices and in this way other than British projected elite they were not ready to cooperate with them.\footnote{See for details Gulshan Khan, \textit{Indian Muslim Perceptions of the West During the Eighteenth Century}, Karachi, 1998.}

By the second quarter of the nineteenth century, a number of revivalist movements had come on the surface of Indo-Muslim scene, dominated by the Path of Mohammad (Tariqah-I-Muhammadiyah) and Jihad Movement of Syed Ahmed Shaheed, Farizy Movement of Haji Shariatullah and Muslim peasants movement of Nisar Khan alias Titu Mir, with their centres in Muslim majority areas. This was not only a political resistance but also resistance against foreign Christian culture.\footnote{See for a view in perspective of the Islamic world, Levitzon and Voll, \textit{Eighteenth century Renewal and Reform in Islam}, New York, 1987.} In the same way understanding the power of Muslim resistance the British administration had begun a harsh policy against the Muslims in which the Muslims were treated as foreigners and Hindus as indigenous people. In the same way, the missionaries had launched a campaign against the Muslims with the dual motives of highlighting the differences between the Christians and Muslims and to curb the strength of Muslim religion.\footnote{The discussion on the issues is wide spread in the pages of all British historical writing of the period included in the bibliography.}

7. Four Major Streams of Indo-British Thought.

The intellectual and practical historiographic perspective along with the Indian situation was the base of four major streams of Indo-British thought: Oriental Romanticists, Ethno-Regional Romanticists, Utilitarians and Missionaries. In the Indo-Muslim context, this division was within the orientalism and especially in its relation to the Indo-Muslims. Although these four schools were based on the western ideals, yet, India had been considered a laboratory to testify the practical utility of these ideals. However, all the schools seem to be defending imperialism and believing in the concept of superiority of West over rest of the world.

Oriental Romanticists were following a context of historicism and nationalism with an antithetic approach to industrialized society on a primary scale of civilizations in the form of cultures, languages and literature. Therefore, antiquity, myth and customs and traditions were...
their focused areas. Ethno-Regional Romanticists were applying the romance to the modern concept of nation. However, Utilitarians seem to be the main proponents of liberalism, colonialism, Industrial Revolution and Nationalism. For Missionaries all modern European developments were the source of the spread of Christianity as by-products of this divine religion. In this context these schools perceived the Indian situation and policies.

The four schools are initially introduced in the first chapter. However the core of this research is based on these schools. Every school is discussed and analysed in a separate chapter with a brief background of the school and a view of Indo-Muslims. In this perspective, chapter three to chapter six, presenting Oriental Romanticists, Ethno-regional Romanticists, Utilitarians and Missionaries, respectively, form the central part of arguments.
Chapter Three:

THE ORIENTAL ROMANTICISTS

Romanticism was a movement of varied scope and interest. Antiquity, art and literature can be taken as the core of romantic thoughts, all developing a sense of history. The same romantic trends seem to be dominating the Indian scene with an emphasis on the problems of Indian administration. Although romanticism was a movement of the late eighteenth century, however, the origin of Indian romance can be traced back to the evolutionary process, which began with the contact of Greeks with Indians since the time of Alexander the Great.¹ The European perception of India, primarily, was based on the early Greek and Roman narratives of India and was highly influenced by the European understanding of the Orient and Orientalism. Under the influence of enlightenment and as a reaction to pure reasoning, in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, Indian romanticism had become a mature philosophy. The romantics had a special concern with the historical development of the socio-political and cultural elements and with the administrative problems of the Indian society.

British romantic thought regarding India seems to be indicating a sign of underlying change during the first half of the nineteenth century. Sir William Jones, as a precursor to Indian romance and established “Indology”² as a separate field of study from “Orientalism”. In the early decades of nineteenth century antiquity seems to be the central focus of the romantics’ activity. The romantics emphasized the presentation of Hinduism as an ancient and potent civilization. They almost neglected the study of Muslim India, taking Muslims as foreigners and Muslim rule as imperialism, not connected with indigenous civilization. This approach was directly in conflict with the missionaries’ efforts to bring a religious change in India and with rationalists’ progressivism.³ In this background an apology for the contemporary Hindu society seems to emerge in the British historiography of India. The apologists laid all the blame of degeneration of the contemporary Hindu society upon Islam and Muslim rule in India. This led to a dialectics in the British historiography on the question, that whether ancient Hindu civilization was a potent civilization? And should India be administered according to Hindu institutions or not? In this dialectics, the romantics of

¹ Wilhelm Halbfass, India and Europe, Delhi, 1990, chapter one.
² “Indology” is a field of study that deals with all sciences and arts related to Indian soil and society.

The apologists laid all the blame of degeneration of the contemporary Hindu society upon Islam and Muslim rule in India. This led to a dialectics in the British historiography on the question, that whether ancient Hindu civilization was a potent civilization? And should India be administered according to Hindu institutions or not? In this dialectics, the romantics of
the decades of thirties and forties seem to be trying their best to provide safeguards to Indian culture and civilization. They advocated a cautious policy in Indian administration against the utilitarian theory of radical social change and the introduction of European institutions, culture and English language in India. As a result of this dialectics, in the later part of the first half of the nineteenth century, Euro-centralism along with missionary creed began to develop its hold on the British mind. Therefore, the romanticists seem to be seeking a compromise with both the utilitarians and the missionaries. When the War of Independence broke out, Europeanization and Christianisation of India had become almost a common goal of the British intelligentsia in India.

1. The Origin of Indian Romance.

A romantic vision of India has existed for centuries in the imagination of Europe. Three main factors seem to be contributing in the rise of Indian romance in the nineteenth century: (1) concept of India in the classical writings of Greece and Rome; (2) discovery of the Orient and rise of Orientalism; and (3) the enlightenment.

1.1. Classical Concept of India.

In the classical writings of Greece and Rome, India was described in a very romantic and ideal way. This description was in the form of travelogues, memoirs or in the form of geographical sketches. Alexander’s invasion of India marked the beginning of direct contacts between India and Europe. Under the auspices of Greek-Bactrian empire, Magasthenes’ Indica depicted a very powerful image of Indian state, society and government. It was a reflection of a well-organized administration, a disciplined and civilized society, a classical culture and literature and a rich soil and prosperous people. The vision established the concept of India as an ancient centre of civilization and created a romance of Indian antiquity. Therefore, later writers compared the antiquity of Indian civilization with that of ancient civilizations of Egypt and Babylonia. Trogus Pompeius, also known as Justin has
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3 Progressivism is a term applied to a behaviour of seeking an evolution in society and finding some sort of positive advancement and contribution by every posterior or modern development in human society.


5 Magasthenes, Historica Indica, London, nd. Megasthenes was an ambassador of Syria in the court of Chandragupta about 302 to 291 B.C. Indica was his observations on Indian state, society and religion that has been reprinted as Historica Indica.

6 Babylonia was the capital of ancient Chaldean empire that was established on the areas of modern Iraq.
presented India as a land of warlike people and revived the Greek-Roman concept of mythological warrier gods and heroes. On the same lines, Strabo and Arrian seem to be promoting the concept of India as an ancient geographical unit. In the third century A.D. the question of the origin of philosophy became the criterion of Greek philosophers to determine the place of a society among the civilized world. The Greek doxographer Diogenes Laertius, in his work published under the title of Lives And Opinions Of Eminent Philosophers, referred to the question of origin of philosophy and tried to determine, whether it was of Greek origin or of Oriental origin? Referring to Aristotle, he mentioned and refuted the view that philosophy had its origin among the barbarians. Diogenes traced the origin of philosophy from Greece and questioned the status of ancient Asian civilizations. His mention of Indian “gymnosophists” among the groups who were the initiators of philosophy along with Chaldeans, Egyptians and Persians, created a sense of curiosity, promoting a romantic vision of ancient Indian civilisation. This vision was also promoted in the works of other ancient writers such as Clement of Alexandria. This Indian Romance prevailed on the minds of European intellectuals throughout the middle ages. Revival of Greek-Roman arts and literature by European renaissance and rise of classicism seem to be bridging this classical romance of India with that of modern romantic thought.

1.2. Orientalism and India.

The middle ages were pre-dominantly Muslim centuries. The rise and expansion of Islam in the Orient led Christianity to the collision with Islam in the name of Crusades. This state of war, along with the depiction of orient as a world of heretics, prevented the European
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7 Maurice, Hindostan, preface to Vol. 1.
8 Strabo and Arrian were two famous geographer-historian of first century B.C. Roman empire who wrote Historical Geography of Roman Empire in Seventeen volumes.
10 Doxography is the hymns of praise. It is applied to the person who acknowledges and praises the origin of notions, ideas and philosophy and their authors. In other words Doxographer can be called a historian of Ideas.
11 He was a Greek historian of philosophy of the early third century A.D. He presented the philosophers as heroic figures so that they serve an admirable source of moral example.
12 Aristotle (384-322 B.C.) was a famous Greek philosopher and a disciple of Plato.
13 The ancient Indian Yugis or religious mendicants who were well versed in Vedas or Hindu scripture. In this regard they were not only masters of philosophy, but also of physical science, which are now termed as Marshal Arts.
14 Chaldea was the tribe that established the Babylonian Empire and developed one of the most prominent civilizations in the ancient times.
15 Wilhelm Halbfass, India And Europe, Delhi,1990. P.3.
16 See for detail S. Runciman’s History of the Crusades, Cambridge, 1952. Also see Lane Poole’s Saladin and the Fall of the Kingdom of Jerusalem, London, 1898.
intellectuals to inquire about the Orient. However, the development since the sixteenth century brought European powers and politics into close contacts with the Orient. The fall of Constantinople in 1453, led to a forced discovery of India by the Europeans\(^\text{17}\) and the rise of classicism gave the Indian romance a boost. During the later centuries, for the marketing and missionary interests, Europeans began to develop relations with the oriental nations. The Europeans observed in the orient a world very distinct from that of their own. India had a very prominent place in this world of diversity and distinction. Travellers, traders and missionaries rushed to India and wrote their experiences in and observations on India, for the Europeans in a very romantic way\(^\text{18}\). The strange culture and very strong traditions of Indian state, society and religions revived the ancient Greek-Roman romance of India. The rise of romanticism among the European intellectuals seems to be converting Indian romance into a socio-political theory.

1.3. Enlightenment and Indian Romance.

In the pre-eighteenth century, to inquire about the world of heretics (non-Christian world) had been considered as a revolt against religion. Romanticism was a movement of varied and paradoxical interests and scope. The romanticists were impressed by the spirit of Hindu society,\(^\text{19}\) which provided them “an escape from the spiritual narrowness of nineteenth century Europe”.\(^\text{20}\) Contrarily the enlightened philosophers compared contemporary Indian State, society and religion with that of the European state, society and religion, to reject the accepted norms of Christian religion and to strengthen the Deists’ stand points against Christianity.\(^\text{21}\) To meet with the challenges of industrialized materialism and mechanization of man, the romanticists tried to approach the question of relations between religion and


\(^{18}\) Among the writings of this period Bernier’s The Late Revolution Of The Empire Of The Great Mughuls, Catrou’s The General History Of The Mughal Empire, Manucci’s Memoirs and Memoirs of Sir Thomas Row’s Embassy to India, are very important.

\(^{19}\) S. N. Mukherjee, Sir William Jones: A Study In Eighteenth-Century British Attitude to India, Cambridge, 1968, p.6.

\(^{20}\) Aronson, Europe Looks At India, A Study in Cultural Relations, Bombay, 1946, p. 9. Also see Erick Stock, The English Utilitarians and India, Delhi, 1982.

\(^{21}\) Voltaire compared Ancient Indian chronology with that of the Bible and questioned the authenticity of the Bible. Rousseau’s Social Contract, Montesquieu’s theory of Law, Herder’s theory of Culture and prevalent Humanitarianism influenced the Romantic Movement a lot. One reaction to these trends was the rise of abstract passions and poetry in the form of literary movement, which became the foundation of romantic revival. See Rousseau, Social Contract, London, 1945; Montesquieu, The Spirit of Laws, London, 1978.
customs, unity and diversity in the system of universe, and law and liberty in the society. The outcome was a romantic philosophy.

In this way the nineteenth century Indian romanticism was based on classical view of Indian antiquity, pre-colonial missionaries and travellers’ vision of Indian society and pre-nineteenth century enlightened-romantic philosophy. This system of thought was developed and strengthened by Sir William Jones, who almost made romanticism a synonym for "Indology".

2. Sir William Jones: A Pre-Cursor to Modern Indian Romance.

The eighteenth century was dominated by a sense of understanding of contemporary history in term of society. Its focus was the foundation and construction of Indian existing system. However it was Jones who revived the historical romance of antiquity, culture and race and thus has been considered a pre-cursor to modern romance of Indian identity and nationalism.


Sir William Jones was a famous Orientalist. He left a marvellous impact on the European understanding of India in his short span of life, spent in India. He has been considered a “precursor to Romantic Movement”. Jones’ extensive writings show a vast area of his interest, from classical antiquity of Greece and Rome to Arabic, Persian and Indian studies. For a long time the orientalists and Indologists of repute not only accepted and followed Jones’ themes and theories but also elaborated his concepts on new models and evidences. In this regard Jones’ thought needs a detailed study. He has been taken as founder of Indian nationalism, based on the ancient origin of Indian races.

2.1.1. Setting of Jones’ Thought.

Born in a well-known Wales-origin family of London, in an age of enlightenment, William Jones was brought up by his mother. Her traditional approach to education at home inculcated a love for classics in Jones’ heart, which was nourished during his education at Harrow and Oxford from 1753 to 1769. His focus on classical and oriental languages
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irculated a romance of language, literature and diversity of the universe in Jones’ mind. He seems to be diverting his interest from the current themes of his contemporary society to the classical world and to the orientalism. The growth of European imperialism and colonialism towards the orient had revived the oriental learning, which became the focal point for Jones’ studies. Jones’ contemporary Orientalists were looking at the orient as a distant, primitive and irrational entity. Most of the Orientalists were propagating the concept of inferiority of the oriental civilizations as compared to the European civilizations, ancient or modern. There was developing an opinion that this primitive and irrational entity should be replaced with that of the modern and rational European civilization. Jones very soon became popular as linguist, both classical and oriental and was made tutorship of the children of a noble family. He became member of the learned society and was assigned a translation work from oriental history by the king of Denmark in 1772. This assignment confirmed his fate as an Orientalist.

Jones was a romanticist, showing his liking for geographical, linguistic and cultural diversities and promoting “universal humanitarian values”. For Jones, this diversity forms the basis for the development of human society. Jones was interested in the preservation of this diversity and in determining the place of oriental civilizations in the world history. Therefore, in all his works, he seems to be busy in analysing oriental and European civilizations under a romantic standard criterion for the study of civilizations.

Jones’ romantic standard seems to be emerging out of enlightened classicism. He was educated in classical languages, literature and history. Classical heritage of ancient Greek-Roman civilization, particularly, had impressed upon his mind greatly. He was inspired by the simplicity of logic working behind the laws, customs, traditions and system of administration of the classical age. The democratic nature of classical state, society and government seems to be inculcating in Jones’ thought a sense of individuals’ rights and a love for liberty. So, he devoted his energy to support the cause of English constitution, Whig
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23 S. N. Mukherjee, op. cit., p.42; Grewal, Historians, p.42.
24 A view that man is a basic source of unity in the universe and in this way man’s rights should always be protected and all the institutions should work for the welfare of man.
25 He was a founder member of a society in the name of “Grecian”. For details see S. N. Mukherjee, op. cit., pp.17-24.
philosophy and American war of independence as contemporary symbols of classical heritage.\(^{27}\)

However, after getting reserved his place as an orientalist, Jones’ financial problems turned his eyes to the East India Company’s administration as an orientalist. After a long struggle of ten years, he joined the East India Company’s Bengal services as a Judge of Supreme court. His Indian career turned him towards a focus area of oriental studies, which was “Indology”. He continued his classical, linguistic and oriental theme in the Indian studies. In this perspective, his historiographical perceptions seem to have multi-fold purpose. At times, he seems to be guiding the policy makers, apologizing his own conduct of the affairs of justice as a judge and trying to develop a harmony between the rulers and the ruled on the moral ground of classical relations between the Indians and the Europeans.

2.1.2. Jones’ Concept of History.

Jones was “charmed by old literature and inspired by ancient wisdom”.\(^{28}\) For this setting of thought, history was a key source. He tried to harmonize modern developments with that of the ancient history on the bases of nature and reason. On the model of Cicero\(^{29}\) and Milton,\(^{30}\) he wanted young men to be educated a combination of the education of a gentleman, a man of letters and wisdom of the ancients.\(^{31}\) In this way history was rather a philosophy teaching by “the accumulated experience and wisdom of all ages and all nations”, than merely a sort of knowledge to collect examples from the human past.\(^{32}\)

Jones sees history in the form of rise and fall of civilizations, embodied in arts, crafts, literature and institutions. However, he studied the development and progress of human civilization through the study of history of racial mythology. On this ground, he treats ancient Hebrew, Arabic, Greek, Roman, Italian, Indian, Chinese and Persian literature and mythology. As all ancient literature forms some sort of religious belief and moral system, so Jones had a strong belief in the wisdom and strength of the ancient religions and moral system, although a great believer in Christianity. All modern developments were an outcome of ancient wisdom for Jones and he was looking at the current human developments in

\(^{27}\) Jones’ letters to his friends quoted by S. N. Mukherjee, *op. cit.*, p.25.

\(^{28}\) Ibid., p. 20.

\(^{29}\) A classical Roman poet of ancient Roman Empire.

\(^{30}\) Milton (1625-1660) was a famous English poet of Reformation period and views.

\(^{31}\) S. N. Mukherjee, *op. cit.*, p.23.

continuity with the human history, visualizing continuity in human history and progress. This progress appears to be a result of the interchange of belief system, sources, institutions, mythology and literature among the civilizations. In this way religion becomes the core of his thought. He sees religion as a product of human aspirations, hopes and wishes, which form the basics of his mythological understanding of human past. On this understanding of relations between mythology, religion and rituals, religion and its observation becomes a customary law supported by history for Jones, which was his basic concern as a judge in India. This view reserves the voluntary obedience of common people to religious leadership. Thus, his ruler appears to be a leader in rituals of human people as well as in politics. His policies aim at the spiritual as well as temporal well being of his followers as an indigenous man or as a saviour of the common people.

2.1.3. Jones’ Unit of Historical Studies.

Determining “laws of society” as a “unit of historical studies”, Jones sets his criterion for the study of the advancement of human civilization in the form of the development of language and literature. Life was not worth living without some “tangible achievement” for him. However, he had no sympathy with the warriors and conquerors and love of wealth, power and territorial conquests, the true cause of misery in the world, were not tangible achievements for Jones. His great men were not the destroyers of mankind, but benefactors of mankind. In this way, the progress of arts, sciences and letters as well as virtue, wisdom and prosperity was a more fascinating subject for him than wars and conquests and his attitude towards Indo-Muslim history seems to be directed by this worldview.

In this perspective, his focus remains on the ancient history. Islam was a comparatively modern religion for Jones and its followers, the Muslims, were devoid of classical tradition: Again, focus of his official activities was India, which he linked with ancient Hindu mythology. Thus, Muslims did not form his central theme. His attitude towards Muslims was antithetic. Although, he was of the view that Muslims should be treated according to their own religious law, yet, he did treat Islam as a civilization. He considers Islam as an
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33 This thesis seems to be working behind all the works of Jones, especially in his A Grammar of Persian Language, London, 1771 and in The History of the Life of Nadir Shah, London, 1773.
34 S. N. Mukherjee, op. cit., p.21.
outcome of Arabic civilization. In this perspective, he assumes India a land of Hindus on the basis of mythological evidences and considers the Muslims of India as foreigners.

Jones as a classicist, romanticist and orientalist had a mental leaning towards the ancients, Hindus in India. As a judge in the company’s administration, Jones was interested in the administration of justice according to the local norms, customs and rituals, which was almost a settled principle of justice in Britain at that time. Jones was annoyed with the company’s administrators’ continuous interference in the affairs of justice and exploits of the local population through the interpretations of the indigenous issues in the western manners. For Jones, these tendencies were harmful to the British rule in India. By focusing the indigenous laws, Jones seems to be checking the growth of the involvement of the administrators of the company in the affairs of justice. The conflict between administration and judges had already been crucial since 1770. Jones seems to be separating historical and customary evidences for the freedom of justice from the pressure of administration, although aiming at strengthening the British Empire.

Jones’ Asian and Muslim studies can best be understood by dividing his career into two periods or categories: (a) His career from 1770 to 1783 has been termed as that of an orientalist. During this period his focus remained over the study of Arabic and Persian languages and literature. (b) During his career from 1784 to his death in 1794, he has been termed as an Indologist, when he was concentrating on the study of Indian civilization. During both the periods of the study of Asian civilizations, classical age and literature seem to be central to Jones’ thought and method.

2.2. Jones the ‘Orientalist’.

As an orientalist Jones focus remained on the Asiatic studies. On the one hand if he wrote on the Tartars, Turks, Chinese, Buddhists, Jains, Parsees and Hindus, on the other hand, his focus areas were Arabic and Persian languages and literature. However, after his arrival in India, “Indology” became his central interest. Therefore, in this section, his general views about the orient are being focused here, with special reference to Arabic and Persian civilizations and in the proceeding section his “Indology” will be the central focus. However, the division shows the dominant trends in Jones’ thought. Otherwise, his work on all oriental aspects continued throughout his life.
2.2.1. ‘Oriental Jones’.

Jones was a classicist and Greek-Roman antiquity and literature were the basis of modern Europe to him. However, to Jones, neither classical antiquity nor modern European achievements could be completely understood and sustained without a curious study of the orient. The historical writings of the Asians were indispensable for completing the universal history and “to complete the history of universal Philosophy”. He accepted the view that Asian nations possessed pure reason and an Aristotle or a Plato could be found in Asian Literature. He insisted that the conquest of Constantinople by the Muslims was the potential date for the beginning of renaissance in Europe and he hoped that spread of oriental learning would stimulate another renaissance in Europe. He seems to be in complete agreement with Alexander Dow on the view that there was a sort of religious prejudices, intellectual sloth, inability to learn oriental languages and ignorance of oriental literature and blindness to its merits on the part of the Europeans. On the other hand, absence of material incentives, lack of the orientalists of taste and scarcity of books on the orient had been responsible for “a curious kind of self conceit” for Europeans. He also highlighted the pragmatic value of oriental learning for imperialism. This frame-work seems to be determining Jones’ concept of oriental studies followed by most of the “orientalists of taste”.

Jones rejects the view that orient is an inferior entity. He promotes the view that orient has produced a number of potential civilizations. These civilizations were not only contemporary to the classical, but had a number of similarities with the Greek-Roman civilization. Defending the ancient oriental civilizations, Jones is of the opinion that the customs and traditions of oriental civilizations, criticized by the European authors, had social and legal justifications, which had been ignored or falsely interpreted by the latter ones. In this perspective, it becomes clear that Jones promoted his interest in the oriental studies owing to the similarities between the European classics and the ancient orient. He was seeking and determining the influence and extent of classical heritage in the orient. Under this concept of oriental studies, criticizing the Turks and Tatars, Jones’ studies made him

---

39 Quoted in Grewal, Historian, p. 39.
conscious of three areas of potential Muslim influence; Arabia, Persia and India. However, he seems to be ignoring the role of Tartars in modern history. It may be due to his emphasis on literature or due to a general prevalent behaviour about the oriental studies.

2.2.2. ‘Arabic Jones’.

Jones as an orientalist was well versed in Arabic language. He analysed the Arabic civilization on the basis of its relations with the classical civilization. He seems to be treating ancient Arabic civilization as an extension of Greek-Roman civilization as Edward Gibbon had treated the Islamic empire as an extension of the Roman Empire in his *History of the Decline and Fall of Roman Empire*.42 He was much impressed by the pre-Islamic simplicity, bravery and love for liberty of Arab society. He was inspired by the pre-Islamic Arabic literature, especially, by “Saba’ Mua’laqat”43 representing Arab nomadic life, violent love, thrilling adventure and dramatic pastoral poems44. For Jones, this Arab society was a “perfect society”45 having “exalted virtues”46. However, Islam seems to have failed to impress him because he found nothing to praise in Arabic literature, since the dawn of Islam. It is a question, whether or not he was projecting Islam as a religion less interested in literature or passion of arts but it is very clear in his writings that Islam preserved the chastity and simplicity of Arabic civilization. He found the simplicity of Arabic society the only example of its own kind in the contemporary world, since the Mughal conquest of Kashmir.47

Contrary to Gibbon’s view, Jones is reluctant in accepting the contribution of Islam to the contemporary world either in literature or in philosophy. The ideal of universal God of Islam comes directly into conflict with his Christian, classical and romantic concepts of metaphysics and mythology. A centralized system of government established by Islam to achieve the purpose of political unity among the Arabs appears in his mind as a check on the traditional Arab sense of liberty and natural way of life, especially when it is serving the cause of Islamic conquests. He seems rather critical of Islamic initiatives to reform the Arab state, society and religion and is not inclined to accept the contribution of Islam in the

43 These were seven Arabic poems universally accepted as the classics of Arabic literature and hanged in Ka’ba. The authors of these poems are called “Ashab al Mua’laqat” or authors of the poems hanged in Ka’ba. Among them are included Amraol Qais, Al-Zubiani, Abi-Sulma, Al-aashi qais, Al-Abasi, Al-Abd, and Ibn-Kalsum.
development of a universal religion. In this way, he condemns the destruction of traditional Arab “idolatry” and mythology by Islam and Islam appears in his mind as an anti-classic religion, establishing non-traditional trends in the state, society and belief.\textsuperscript{48}

Jones was well aware of the state of current affairs in the Muslim world. Muslim state and society were fast declining at that time and colonial imperialism was taking its place. However, he seems to be impressed by the enlightened approach of Muslim rulers towards their subjects. Although he condemns the cruel behaviour of some of the members of the ruling families, in general, yet, he appreciates the Muslim rulers’ efforts for the reformation of government administration, modernization of society and promotion of arts, sciences and literature.\textsuperscript{49}

2.2.3. ‘Persian Jones’.

Jones was also impressed by Persian language and literature. Persian relation with the classical antiquity had become a source of Jones’ interest in Persian history and literature. He was of the opinion that Persians had been great theists, possessed metaphysics, great architecture and probably, sciences and arts. They were one among the civilized nations of the world. All this had projected Persia as “the finest part of Asia”,\textsuperscript{50} in Jones’ understanding. Jones analyses the growth of Persian civilization in the light of the development of Persian language with the view that only enlightened people can develop a refined language.\textsuperscript{51} He measures the development of Persian civilization through his analysis of the gradual growth of Persian language from unpolished to polished and sophisticated. This evolution took place in four stages and Persian language reached its maturity and elegance in the Sassanid period. However, Jones rejects the view of the historicity of Zoroaster and existence of pre-Sasanide Persian literature, challenging his own ideas of the classical antiquity of the Persian language.\textsuperscript{52} Jones was a great admirer of Persian poetry. He translated a number of Persian poems into English. He compared Persian poetry with that of classical European poetry and, in this way, he tried to compare the civilizations of Asia and Europe. He draws parallels.

\textsuperscript{47} Ibid. Vol. X, p.10
\textsuperscript{48} This expression can be found in the works of Jones very commonly. It is just because of his love for antiques and classics determined by the romantic criterion.
\textsuperscript{49} Astatic Researches, Vol. II, p.81 quoted by S.N. Mukherjee, op. cit., p.75.
\textsuperscript{50} Jones, Works, Vol. XII, p.342.
\textsuperscript{51} In this regard he expressed his ideas in his A Grammar of Persian Language and History of the Persian Language. See Jones, Works, Vol. V.
between the oriental "masters" and European "classics." He translated *A Persian Song of Hafiz*. He seems to be deriving the concept of instructive features in history and poetry from Persian poems and felt himself "like a drop of water in the "Hikayat-I-Sadi". In his essay "On the Mystical Poetry of the Persians and Hindus", he showed his appreciation of mystical theosophy. He believes that Rumi in his "Masnavi" and Hafiz in his "Ghazals" had given an immortalized expression towards their beneficent Creator. All the writings of Jones are full of praise for Persian poets and Persian poetical expressions.

Dealing with the Arabic literature, Jones seems to be posing a negative underlying question about the promotion of literature under the auspices of Islam. It appears in his writings that Islam was responsible for blocking the way of literary and cultural progress in Arabia. However, his elevation of Persian literature seems to be providing a source of negation of his own assumptions against Islam. Although, Persian language attained its polished form during the Sasanid period but produced no literary classic during this reign. His Persian literary classics come from Hafiz, Firdusi, Rumi, Nizami and Sadi. All belong to Muslim mystico-poetical tradition and, their poetry has been taken as a source of Islamic teachings, reserving its place even in the traditional Islamic curriculum. Jones makes no mention of the fact that Islam has provided the instructive spirit to the Persian poetry.

Jones seems to be presenting his views about oriental and Asian politics in *his History of Nadir Shah*. He analyses the reign of Nadir Shah, keeping in view the orientalists' dialectics regarding the nature of the oriental state. In his discussion, he seems to be defending oriental despotism presenting its enlightened character. Jones apologizes for undertaking the writing of history of a despot, conqueror and scourge, but he argues that the character of a conqueror is same in history all over the world, whether in Europe or in Asia. He is of the opinion that Nadir’s system of state and society was similar to that of European

---

55 *Ibid.*, p.342. Muslihuj Din Sadi Sherazi (d. 1296) was a famous Persian poet. He is well known for his purposive and reformative poetry. His *Hikayat* or tales have been taken as a classic of Persian literature.
56 It is a term applied to the philosophy based on theological or religious precepts.
57 A term applied to long poems having a common subject.
58 A short lyric poem.
60 Nadir Shah was the king of Persia. He ruled over Persia. In 1739 Nadir Shah attacked India and played havoc. His massacre and plunder of Delhi are well known in Indian history.
feudalism. There were checks on the royal authority. The King was well aware of his duties towards his subjects.

Nadir shah appears in Jones’ mind not as a despot but as a hero. He compares Nadir Shah’s conquest of India with that of classical conquests of Alexander the Great. His mild treatment of Mughal emperors and princes of Sind and restoration of their throne become fascinating examples of oriental despotism for Jones. Jones seems to be ignoring cruelties of Nadir Shah due to his patronage of arts and culture. He believes that if he had lived in a better time, he would have been a greater patron of arts, sciences and learning. S.N. Mukherjee is of the opinion that in his presentation of Nadir Shah “Jones was only eager to make Asia appear more acceptable to Europe”. Therefore, he emphasized the similarities between two cultures of the patronage of arts and literature. It was just because of this reason that Nadir was no crueler than European conquerors.

2.3. Jones the ‘Indologist’.

2.3.1. ‘Indian Jones’: Father of Indology.

Before his arrival in India, Jones had a very vague idea of a dark period of pre-Muslim Indian. He had no idea of a politically united India and divided India into three parts and put Assam as a part of Malayan peninsula. For him, India’s ancient system was based on feudalism and contributed nothing important to human experience. His emphasis remained over Arabic and Persian cultures. After his arrival in India, within a short span of time, he came to the conclusion that European ideas about India were very vague. India had inherited a very rich ancient civilization. In this regard, there was an extreme desire to enhance the study of Indian sciences, arts, literature, state and society. It could be useful for the Europeans in bringing about both, another renaissance in Europe and a sound system of government to rule over India. At that time Anglo-Indian society was under the influence of a superiority complex. The indigenous population had been taken as inferior to the Europeans. All this was against Jones’ enlightened vision of society. For Jones this mistreatment of indigenous people and society was due to the ignorance of Europeans of the local culture and civilizations. This ignorance could be harmful for the stability of British government in India. So, to make the Europeans more aware of the Indian civilization, he established a new field of study called “Indology” or “Indian Studies”. For developing the Europeans’ interest in Indology, he seems to be highlighting those aspects of Indian history, culture and civilization.
which had close resemblance with the European culture, institutions and history. In this regard, his emphasis remains over ancient Indian history and culture. He has been taken as the founder of “Indology” as a field of study. A number of Indian historians owe the beginning of “Indian Renaissance”, “Bengali Renaissance” and “Indian Nationalism” to the beginning of Indological studies by Sir William Jones. J.S. Grewal is of the opinion that:

Before Jones, Indian history had been almost synonymous with Indo-Muslim history, after Jones, it became almost synonymous with Hindu history. The Muslims were moved from centre to the periphery of the history of the subcontinent.

In this way, Jones and his immediate followers seem to be highlighting Hindu history in their thrust for the Europeans’ self-understanding and self-education about India.

2.3.2. Jones’ Neglect of Muslim India.

After his arrival in India, Jones diverted all his attention towards Hindu history and had almost neglected the history of Muslim India. On his way to India, he had planned a schedule of study to execute in India. In this plan of study, a large share was granted to the natural features of India. However, Muslim law, Mughal constitution and contemporary India were also the dominant fields of study. What he did in India was almost entirely different from his scheduled plan. He not only neglected the history of Muslim India, but also neglected the contemporary India and diverted all his attention towards Hindu India. Although, he referred to the history of Muslim India in his writings, made translation of Al Sirajiyyah or Mohammedan law of inheritance and wrote a treaties on the Mohammedan Law of Succession to the property, but these works were mere translations to facilitate his work as a judge. In these works he does not accept the divine nature of Shariah laws but interprets these laws in terms of Arabic culture. On the history of Muslim India, he could still suggest publicly that a perfect history of Mughal India could be compiled from the Persian sources beginning with Ali Yazdi’s Zafarnama and ending with Ghulam Husain’s Siyar al-Muta’khirin. “Privately, he noted down history of India before the Mohammadan conquests as the chief desideratum”.

---

63 Grewal, Historian, p.32.
64 the laws of Islam.
66 Grewal, Historian, p.37.
Jones' neglect of the Muslim India can be due to the number of reasons. Jones was a romanticist and as a romanticist he had already neglected the role of Islam while dealing with Arabic and Persian civilizations. Hinduism was a more ancient system having a rich mythological literary heritage. He had also found some sort of similarities between the classical Greek-Roman civilization and Hinduism. As a romanticist he was much more interested in indigenous culture and Jones seems to be dealing with Muslims not as natives of India but as a foreign imperial power in India. They were there from Central Asia and Hinduism was so strong a culture that Islam had failed to dominate it. Hindu civilization could be more helpful in making Asia acceptable to, and in this way, beneficial to Europe due to its similarities with the classical European culture for him. However, his views about the Indian history can be derived from his works on Arabic and Persian civilizations and from his writings on contemporary administrative issues.

It is clearly evident from Jones' writings that he accepts nothing in Islam as a contribution to human civilization and deals with Arabic and Persian entities as cultural forces. He does the same for Indian Muslims. However, Indian Muslims appear in his understanding as a foreign imperial and cultural force invading and establishing their rule in India. Muslim rule in India was a sort of despotism for Jones, but he seems to find similarities between Asia and Europe even in despotism. He presents the benevolent and enlightened aspects of oriental despotism. He accepts the view that Muslim rulers in India patronized the arts, sciences and literature. They introduced the Persian language and literature in India but contributed nothing remarkable. He blames the Muslim rulers for introducing luxurious way of life and style of living in India. This style has replaced the pure feelings and simple living style of Indians. He is of the opinion that before Mughal conquests, Kashmir was one of the areas of the world, famous for its purity and simplicity. However, he accepts the view that Muslim rulers were benevolent and enlightened. They were well aware of their duties towards their subjects and equally responsible to God and bound by Shariah laws to run the government. Their system was based on feudalism and they were benevolent towards the local population.

---

Jones uses history of Muslim India to prove his theories and strengthen his stands on Indian administration. The British East India Company was facing a harsh criticism for mal-administration of the Indian affairs at that time. The Company's officials were going to be charged with corruption and lawlessness. The exploitation of indigenous population on the part of British "Nabobs" [lord] was the burning question of the times. In this situation, the administration of British India was the core issue for contemporary British public opinion, very sensitive about the influence of Indian situation on Britain.

Jones as a Whig had faith in the rule of law, the separation of power, the sanctity of private property and mild government. The central theme of his ideas was the protection of the individual, his person, property and freedom. All these rules were being violated by the Company's administration. He wanted twenty four million British Indian subjects to benefit from his ideas at least by giving them their own laws. But he was afraid that the people had never experienced the political freedom and if liberty could be forced upon them, it would make them as miserable as the cruelest despotism. In the situation, he argues a benevolent and enlightened despotism for India. He founds examples for this sort of despotism from Indian Muslim history.

He rejects Bernier, Montesquieu and Dow's theory of absolute despotism. He believes that Indians could not have flourished, if the despot had to be the owner of all property, and if people had no experience of private property. The Indian princes never had been above the law, nor they pretended to have unlimited legislative powers. They were always under the laws believed to be divine with which they never claimed any power of dispensing. His visit of the island of Johanna administered on Arab style developed his opinion that an enlightened despot free of the pressure of nobility, could administer the state well with the help of scholar-governors and ministers. He argues that during the Muslim rule the provinces were governed according to the Muslim laws. However, the Muslim rulers recognized the authority of the Hindu laws between the Hindu litigants. On the rights of property, he observes:

---

71 Jones, Sirajiyah, p. xiii.
73 Jones, Sirajiyah, p. xii.
74 Jones letter to Ashburton quoted by S. N. Mukherjee, op. cit., p.126.
by the Mughal constitution, the sovereign be not the sole proprietor of all the land in his empire, which he or his predecessors have not granted to a subject and his heirs; for nothing can be more certain than that land, rents and goods are in the language of Mohammadan lawyers, property alike alienable and inheritable...No Musalman prince in any age or country would have harboured a thought of controvert these authorities.  

He further writes:

Aurangzeb himself the bloodiest of assassins and most avaricious of men, could not have adopted and proclaimed such an opinion whatever his courtiers and slaves might have said in their zeal to aggrandize their master, to a foreign physician and philosopher who too hastily believed them and ascribed to such a system all the desolation of which he had been a witness.

On these evidences, he advises the Company that the Indian should be governed according to their own laws on the model of benevolent and enlightened despotism. He was of the opinion that it would be unworthy of the British government to impose their system on the Indians. For "a system forced upon the people invincibly attached to opposite habits would in truth be a system of cruel tyranny". So, the British should follow the example of benevolent and enlightened despotism of Indian princes, and it "will secure the permanence of our [British] dominion".

2.4. Legacy of Jones: Asiatic Society of Bengal.

Although Orientalism had become a mature field of study in the late eighteenth century, but oriental researches had been chiefly the work of individuals such as travellers, diplomats, missionaries, and adventurers and of such other people working independent of one another. Due to the lack of coordination and improper exchange of knowledge, a number of misconceptions were developing among the Europeans about the orient. On the other hand, Company’s government was interested in the promotion of all those indigenous languages and cultures, which could be helpful in governing the Indian subjects. All these interests were matched with that of Jones’ interest. So, in January 1884, in a meeting of the learned men of Calcutta, Jones announced the establishment of Asiatic Society of Bengal. The main object

75 Jones, Sirajiyah, pp. IX-XI.
76 Ibid., p.xi.
77 Ibid., p.xii.
78 S.N. Mukherjee, op. cit., p.126.
79 Jones, Sirajiyah, p. xiii.
80 In this regard establishing the societies to organize the Oriental studies had become the fashion of the Orientalists of the day. In this regard Belles Letters Academy was working in France since 1718. In England had been founded Society of Antiquaries in 1751, Royal Academy in 1768 and Royal Society in 1780. The Dutch had established Batavian Society.
of the society was to promote the research on Asiatics\textsuperscript{81} and to provide opportunities to analysis, discuss and exchange the knowledge of, and views about Asiatics. Practically, its aim was to help the Company in administrating India through the understanding of indigenous ways, laws and methods, of which Jones was a devoted advocate. In his first discourse, he expressed his views about the aims of the society. He stressed the pragmatic value of Oriental studies. Asia was the “nurse of sciences” the “inventress of delightful and useful arts”. So, he was of the opinion, Europeans should spend their leisure to benefit from this treasure of sciences and arts. This would help them to improve the mode of ruling the new empire.\textsuperscript{82}

The proceedings of the society set the dimensions for future research in India. The Company patronized its activities fully. The Society held its monthly meetings in the Grand Jury Room of Calcutta Supreme Court, which were attended by high officials, some times by the Governor General. The society’s field of interest remained open. All aspects related to Asiatics could be discussed from the platform of the society. The area of interest included history, antiquity, numismatics, chronology, genealogy, religion, culture, politics, manners, customs, laws, soil, natural resources, products, wild life, relations and problems of the indigenous population. Jones not only kept alive the society but also maintained the proceedings of the society. With the financial assistance of the Company, the society translated a number of books from local languages into English. In 1885 when Francis Gladwin began a journal \textit{Asiatick Miscellany}, extracts from proceedings and papers presented to the society were published for the dissemination of knowledge of India among the Europeans. Later, the society published its own Journal in the name of \textit{Asiatick Researches}, in which all the proceedings and papers, presented or contributed, were made public and it became a source of indigenous knowledge. In the early period, most of the papers presented in the society’s meetings were written by Jones. Later, this Journal took the name of \textit{Journal of the Asiatick Society of Bengal} and all the orientalists of repute appeared, at one time, anxious to contribute for the Journal. This Journal welcomed all sort of inquiry about all aspects of Asia.

\textsuperscript{81} A field of study which deals will all aspects related to Asia.

\textsuperscript{82} \textit{Asiatic Researches}, Vol. I, pp. ix-x quoted by S. N. Mukherjee, \textit{op. cit.}, p.81.
The Society attracted the attention of a large number of officials and workers. Its founding members such as Charles Wilkins, Nathaniel Halded, John Shore, Francis Gladwin, John Carnac, Jonathan Duncan and William Chambers, were impressed by enlightenment. They welcomed and encouraged all sorts of knowledge from every person about every aspect of India. The travellers, administrators, researchers, missionaries, judges, officials, surveyors, diplomats, intellectuals and all interested in Asiatics were invited to participate in the monthly and annual sessions of the society. Their researches, observations, understandings, memoirs, interpretations, commentaries, translations, travelogues, histories and collections had to be presented before the members of the society for discussion and comments. For the next few decades, the society had become the centre of Europeans' research activities in India.

Sir William Jones promoted the romantic vision of knowledge and research. Aiming at the understanding of Asiatics, the Society became the centre and citadel for the promotion and protection of romantic thought. All the romanticists of fame in India seem to be using this platform to present their views and defend their stands. Some of the prominent participants can be named as William Robertson, H.H. Wilson, Charles Masson, Thomas Maurice, Charles Grant Duff, H.T. Colebrook, William Erskine, Sleeman, John Brigs, Mountstuart Elphinstone and John Malcolm.

The romanticists dominated the society and Hindu civilization was their central focus. Although the society encouraged the translation of some of the tracts on Islam and history of Muslim India, but all this was a part to facilitate the administration rather than an attempt to promote the understanding about Muslims of India. As a whole, Muslim history, culture, state, society, and religion seem to be neglected by the society. In the fifty years after its establishment, only a few papers related to the Muslims of India were presented in its proceedings. Among them some were related to numismatics.83

It is clear that the focus of Jones' and society's activities was Ancient Indian civilization. For Asiatic Society, India meant Hindu India and the Muslims had been treated as imperial ruling elite. Concluding the activities of Sir William Jones J. S. Grewal writes:

83 An auxiliary science of history which deals with coins.
with an earnest attempt to influence British policies towards India through their writings (on the model of Jones).

In this regard, the early romanticists' writings on India were closely following Jones' pattern of the assessment of Indian civilization, on the model of antiquity, literature and relations and resemblance of Indian civilization with the classical European civilization, for the self education and self understanding of Europeans in India. In this regard his immediate successors can be termed as Antiquarian Romanticists.

3. Antiquarian Apologetic Romanticists: Thomas Maurice's Exaggerated Antiquity of Hinduism and Denunciation of Muslim Conquests.

William Jones and romance created by Asiatic society was in a huge difference with the contemporary Hindu society. The contemporary Indian society was considered far behind the civilized status. Thomas Maurice was the person who took up the cause of interpretation of the difference. He placed all the blame of the degeneration of Hinduism on the Muslim rule and thus tried to defend the Hinduism against the enlightened and utilitarian approach.

3.1. Thomas Maurice (1754-1824).

Thomas Maurice was a famous classicist and orientalist. Being a friend of William Jones, he was impressed by Jones' "Indology". Jones had neglected a systematic and compact history of India. Thomas Maurice took up this task. He was the first British writer, who wrote a complete history of India from its mythological age to his contemporary times. Jones had focused his studies to the ancient times. It was Maurice, who epitomized the shift of British interest from the Muslim to the Hindu history.

3.1.1. Setting of Maurice's Thought.

Thomas Maurice was educated in traditional classical system and style and setting of his thought was almost the same as Jones'. Born in the house of a rich lady and a "Clapham" father during the age of enlightenment, he was brought up in classical manners. He passed his graduation from Oxford University at the age of twenty-five.⁸¹ Like Jones, he was impressed by classical literature and wanted to be an independent man of letters. His early

works emerged in the poetic form. He also translated a number of poetic works into English, became a member of eminent literary societies and was patronized by the leading literary figures. Being a classicist, Maurice was interested in all literary activities. He was impressed by the classical drama and wrote a play on India. He had been in contact with Jones before his departure to India and was seeking his career through Jones. He was much impressed by Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* and wanted to achieve its standard. Before 1783, he had been thinking of replacing Gibbon's appreciated Alexander Dow's *History of Hindostan*, by writing a more popular history of Muslim India. However, his acquaintance with Jones led him to the decision of emphasizing Hindu India as a subject of his future literary pursuits. Jones elevated charms of "Indian literature" helped him a lot to mould his interest from the field of poetry to history, in order to explore the treasures of Indian past. His job in the British museum as an Assistant Keeper of Manuscripts in 1798 much more strengthened leaning of his aptitude towards antiquity. Although Maurice never came in India, his European Orientalists' context kept him in touch with the oriental studies, which were diverted to the Indian studies after Jones' "Indology".

What is the place of Maurice's writing in one's understanding of British historical writings on India? For J.S. Grewal, Thomas Maurice's writings "epitomized the shift in British historical interest from Muslim to Hindu India". What he had planned in 1783 and what he had proposed to work on to the East India Company's Court of Director for financial assistance, was a history of India, which was almost neglected in his research pursuit. He had planned to write a *Modern History of India*. However, under Jones' influence, Maurice

---

85 His poems were published from Oxford and London from time to time between 1775 and 1819. Some famous poems were *The school boy* (1775), *Netherby* (1776), *A Monody* (1777), *The Oxonian* (1778), Westminster Abbey (1784), *Elegiac Lines* (1795), *Grove Hill* (1799), *Crisis of Britain* (1803), *Richmond Hill* (1807).
86 In 1770 Thomas Maurice became the member of Samuel Parr's Academy. Very soon he appeared as a well-known orientalist and some of the well known literary patrons began to patronize his efforts. Among them three men were very prominent patrons of arts and literature: Thomas Percy, Thomas Warton and Johnson. Johnson's patronage was so impressive for him that he came to be known as "Johnson's son".
87 He had constant contacts with Sir William Jones. His *Memoirs* have a number of letters sent by Jones to Maurice. In a letter, dated 20 December 1781, Jones expressed his good wishes for Maurice. See Maurice, *Memoirs*, Vol. II.
88 These concepts are derived from Thomas Maurice's memoirs. See for details Maurice, *Memoirs*.
91 In 1790, Thomas Maurice wrote a letter to the Company's Court of Directors in whom, he highlighted his plan of writing a *History of Hindostan* and requested for the financial assistance. In this letter his emphasis seems to be on the Muslim Empires and their relations with India. He has also introduced some most important
diverted all his attention to ancient India and dealt with modern history in a cursory manner. His whole work was planned, to be published in three volumes, but by 1800, Maurice had published nine volumes, all devoted to ancient Indian Civilization and Hindu religion, his originally planned modern history still untouched.\footnote{92} What he had originally planned as Modern History of Hindostan was given the weightage of only two volumes, written in haste on Dow's model. This shift undoubtedly has some intellectual and structural foundations based on Maurice's concept of history and his criterion for the study of history. His histories had been written to serve Jones' romantic purpose. However, he was more interested in the pleasures of antiquity.

3.1.2. Maurice's Concept of History.

The study of Greek and Latin historians had established Maurice's intellectual links with the history of Asia and Gibbon had cemented these relations. Maurice's concept of history was based on these foundations. For Maurice history was the exploration of truth and "knowledge of the genuine characters in the remote antiquity"\footnote{93} It was a multi-dimensional field of knowledge.\footnote{94} He wanted "to make that exalted science [history] subservient to nobler purposes". His noble purpose was the cause of British nation and government.\footnote{95}

In this understanding antiquity, theology and national government can be taken into question. There arises question, what is the relation between pre-Christian pagan mythology and Christian theology in Maurice's thought? In general Maurice seems to be more under the influence of antiquity than theology. In this regard, his desperate attempt to harmonize the Hindu antiquity with that of the debate on the nature of British Indian government seems to be a true purpose of his historiography. By this harmonization, he seems to be much anxious to secure the strength of his national government. On the other hand, in the Modern History

\footnote{92} These nine volumes were published under two titles. First seven volumes were published under the title of Indian Antiquities in between 1793 to 1800 from London. Last two volumes were published under the title of History of Hindostan: Classical and Ancient, in 1795 and 1798.

\footnote{93} Maurice, Hindostan, P. i.

\footnote{94} Maurice, Modern, p. vii. He acknowledges that he had taken this concept of history from professor Ockley. He quotes: "...[The] course of a great history should resemble the current of a vast river, with difficulty restrained within its bounds, and sometimes even overflowing its banks, sometimes rushing forward with a great and impetuous descent, and at others gliding on with an equal and almost imperceptible motion."

\footnote{95} Maurice, Hindostan, Vol. 1, p. xxiii.
of Hindostan, discussing the duties of an historian, he depicts himself a true romanticist; passionate and adventurer.96

In his History of Hindostan and Modern History of Hindostan, Thomas Maurice seems to be inter-linking the history of all civilizations and, in this way, developing a concept of universal history. This concept of universal history raises a number of questions. Universal history could be studied under one centre of civilization or according to the theory of progress, its centre shift from one potential area of civilization to another? If history is progressive then what have been the centres of this universal history? Are these centres constant or variable and what are the relations between these centres of civilizations? In this regard Maurice seems to be focusing only one potential centre of civilization. Although he mentions a number of ancient civilizations, but India occupies the place of a constant centre in his concept of universal civilization. He seems to be negating progressive concept of history. As a result, his antiquarian approach becomes more dominant over his concept of modern history and his world of antiquity appears more established and advanced than the modern.

He presents the history of man into two periods: ancient and modern. He categorizes these two periods as “eclestial” and “terrestrial”97 or “astronomical” and “imperial”.98 This concept of history is also classified as “ancient” and “modern” history.99 He is of the opinion that progress of human civilization depends upon the mutual relations of civilizations: contemporary, prior or posterior. He tries to harmonize the mythologies of various civilizations with each other and determining the civilization that owe the credit of the origin of civilization in the classical history. In this perspective, he relates the history of all the civilizations with the Indian civilization and India appears in his writings as the core of the world. His criterion of civilization and estimate of institutions appear to be same as that of William Jones.

96 Ibid. Maurice writes “[The] true historian descends not to trivial incidents, but seizing the striking facts and prominent characters of the times, consigns them to immortality on the faithful table of her recording page. It is above all things incumbent upon him properly to feel the various subjects which his pen describes. When the trumpets are sounded, he must glow with his hero and transport his reader with himself, amidst the thickest of the battles.”
97 Maurice, Hindostan, p. iii.
98 The theme of his ‘classical’ and ‘modern’ history is directed towards empires on the model of Gibbon. His modern age began with the establishment of Alexander’s empire.
3.1.3. Maurice’s Unit of Historical Studies.

Thomas Maurice treats history in two ways. He deals with ancient history in terms of the contribution of ancient race and civilizations to sciences and arts. However, for modern times, he was much impressed by Gibbons’ *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. In this way, “imperial theme” appears to be a dominant field of study and a unit of historical studies for him. He was of the opinion that dominant empires contribute to the human civilization. In this way, civilizations could be studied in the form of empires. He seems to be impressed by the East in the sense that orient established huge empires and advance civilizations. He claims that theme of imperialism adopted by Gibbon and the study of Arab, Turks and Mongols belongs more to his subject matter than to Gibbon.\(^{100}\)

However, Maurice’s emphasis began to change under the influence of Jones. Under the influence of Gibbon, the focus of his studies remained over modern empires, but under Jones’ its centre shifted from modern to ancient. In this reference, antiquity became his unit of historical studies combined with imperial theme. The study of ancient empires became the focus of his researches. However, he was of the opinion that ancient empires were of the celestial nature and “empires of imagination”\(^ {101}\). The focus of these early empires was astronomy, and it was the most developed science of the early civilizations. So, argues that ancient history should not be studied on the common principles of criticism but on the basis of “astronomical mythology”. He asserts that his *History of Hindostan: Ancient and Classical* may be taken as a history of ancient astronomical mythology.\(^ {102}\)

*On the issue* of the place of a civilization in the human history and the origin of civilization\(^{103}\), Thomas Maurice adopts a theme of world history. He is of the opinion that the nature of the *contribution* of a civilization to human progress can neither be explored nor

---

100 Ibid., preface.
101 Maurice, *Hindostan*, p. iii.
102 Ibid., p. i. His antiquarian interest can been seen operative in his work on the history of the other areas. See for example his *Observations Connected with Astronomy and Ancient History, Sacred and Profane, on the Ruins of Babylon*, as Recently Visited and described by Claudius James Rich I, London, 1816, and *Observations on the Remains of Ancient Egyptian Grandeur and Superstitions as Connected with those of Assyria forming the Appendix to Observations on the Ruins of Babylon with Illustrative Engravings*, London, 1818.
103 Some of the prominent orientalists who worked on these questions, and whose works are quoted by Thomas Maurice are Mr. Costard, *Sir Isaac Newton, Dr. Rutherford, Jacob Bryant, Dr. Hyde, Mr. Wilford, Mr. Volney and Sir William Jones.*
understood without the study of the civilizations connected with it. In this way he seems to
be adopting a concept of history of the human civilization.

However, he differentiates between his ancient and modern empires. Dealing with
ancient empires, Maurice focuses the symbols of civilization promoted by the ancient
empires. In contrast, while dealing with the modern empires, he highlights the conquests and
destruction done by the part of modern empires. He follows Jones’ antiquarian approach and
Gibbon’s imperial theme, simultaneously, without considering, whether the two approaches
could be adopted parallel. As a result there appears a huge gape between his ancient empires
and modern empires. His modern empires appear as a force leading to the destruction of
human civilization. The modern empires destroyed all the cultural heritage of the centre of
world history: India. In this estimate and criterion for the study of history, ancient India
appears as the only unit for historical studies, which had been destroyed by modern
imperialism.

In this perspective, Muslims seem to be marginalized in Maurice’s system of historical
understanding. His sympathy with and defence of the ancient Indian civilization led him to
adopt an antithetic attitude towards Muslims. He sees the Muslims always exploiting the
Hindus.

Being a romantic orientalist and an antiquarian, Maurice was willing to work for the
preservation of the ancient cultural heritage of mankind. He was also well aware of the
contemporary administrative debates in the company’s administration and was interested in
his contribution to the debate on historical ground as an antiquarian. In this perspective,
determination of identity and status of indigenous population seem to be his basic question.

He seems to differentiate between Indian races and imperial races. On this base, he was of
the view that Indian affairs should be settled in the good interest of the Hindus. Hindus were
considered a subject race and were expected to support the British rule by a good depiction of
their race and religion, so, Maurice inclines establishing a good faith between the British and
the Hindus. Although he did not write systematically on the British India, yet, he seems to be
looking at the Indian history in the context of contemporary questions.


Maurice’s historical thought was founded on the basis of ancient Indian civilization.
Jones’ emphasis remained over the presentation of Hindu civilization in an illuminated way
and antiquarians followed the same way. Mauric'e's concept of ancient India is largely determined by the purpose of defending the ancient Indian civilization against the questions posed by the missionaries and utilitarians. For that purpose Maurice seems to be elevating the ancient Indian civilization as one of the most ancient civilizations of the world and as origin of civilizations.

Thomas Maurice's *Indian Antiquities* was published in between 1793 to 1800 in seven volumes. Its emphasis remained over the presentation of Hindu civilization as an ancient, potent and resourceful civilization, still having the treasures of a splendid past. He tries to prove that Indian institutions were not only very ancient but also very perfect, in the sense that they kept the Indian society alive in spite of long time subjugation by the foreign rulers and cultures. It developed valuable sciences and arts. However, these contributions had not been preserved. He condemns the role of Brahmins in Indian society. In his *Brahmanical Fraud Detected*, he concludes that Brahmins were more interested in the history of their superstitions than in the preservation of records of empire and in the promotion of sciences and arts. Maurice seems to be apologizing for the questions raised against the contemporary Hindu society. By laying the responsibility on the internal forces of Indian society, he seems to be in sharp contrast with his concept of the role of imperialism in the decline of Hinduisn.

In the *History of India: Ancient and Classical*, Maurice defends the Indian society from another angle. Comparing the ancient Indian civilization with that of other ancient civilizations, he concludes that India was the land of the origin of civilizations, and, in this

---

104 In 1799 Maurice published his "Ode to Mitra" which can be considered as a symbol of his emotional attachment to the Hindu civilization. See Thomas Maurice, *Selected Poems*, London, 1903.


106 Thomas Maurice, *Brahmanical Fraud Detected or the Sacerdotal Tribe of India to Invest Their Fabulous Deities and Heroes with the Honours and Attributes of the Christian Messiah, examined, Exposed and Defeated, in a Series of Letters to the Right Reverend the Episcopal Bench*, London, 1812. The concept has also been discussed in the *Modern History of Hindostan*. Vol. 1, London, 1802, preface. Thomas Maurice accepts the view that the sources for the study of Hindu civilization are very limited. This is a very common judgement of historians on the concept of history among the Hindus. A large number of Historians are of the view that Hindus were unaware of historical sciences. There is hardly any historical writing to study the ancient Indian history. Both the schools of modern British historiography agree upon this view. Thomas Maurice's apology seems to be a part of this sort of understanding in the early phase of British historiography of India.
perspective, parent country of all civilizations, arts and sciences. Maurice even rejects Jones' opinion that Indian civilization was influenced by Greek civilization and Greece and Sanskrit languages were sister languages. He rejects the views of prominent Orientalists (such as Mr. Costard, Dr. Rutherforth and Mr. Volney) about the Chaldean, Egyptian or Greek origin of Civilization.108

To prove the antiquity of India as origin of civilization, Maurice develops a multiple system of arguments. First of all, he develops the view that all the ancient civilizations were "celestial empires". "Astronomy and astronomical mythology" was the foundation of all sciences and arts of ancient civilizations. He tries to prove that the astronomical symbols of Greeks, Chaldeans and Egyptians do not match with their environment and traditions, but with those of Indians.109 Therefore, he concludes that the astronomical tables and constellations were of Indian origin and were exported to the other civilizations. Then he focuses his arguments with reference to religious traditions. He tries to harmonize the traditions of Semitic religions (Islam, Christianity and Judaism) with that of Indian mythology. Confirming his belief in Christianity, he apologizes for taking this subject for discussion. He justifies it as a part of his curiosity to find out the true origin of man.110 He presents the opinion that all the symbols, personalities and events discussed in the Book of Genesis can be found in the Indian mythology.111 On the testimony of Jones, Maurice even claims that the word "Adam" belongs to Indian origin, meaning "the first". Therefore he claims that origin of human civilization belongs to Indian soil. However, he believes that Brahmins had taken these concepts from Christianity and he condemns such efforts.112

3.3. Imperialism and Indian Civilization.

Thomas Maurice was well aware of the vicissitudes, which Indian people faced. A number of foreign nations subdued the Indian soil, time and again, and made it tributary. He

109 Thomas Maurice's difference of opinion with the Orientalists on the issue is a general subject of his History of Hindostan. To prove this thesis he had written his History of Hindostan.
112 Maurice, Hindostan, Vol. II. p. 76.
113 Thomas Maurice, Brahmanical Fraud Detected or the Sacerdotal Tribe of India to Invest Their Fabulous Deities and Heroes with the Honours and Attributes of the Christian Massiah, examined, Exposed and Defeated, in a Series of Letters to the Right Reverend the Episcopal Bench, London, 1812.
points out that early history of foreign invasions is not very clear till the time of the Muslim conquests of India by Mahmud Ghaznavi. However, he mentions Egyptian Sesotries\textsuperscript{113} and Assyrian Semiramis\textsuperscript{114} as early invaders of India. The Persian penetration into India was so strong that India remained a tributary to Persians for ages. He is of the opinion that Alexander invaded India on the ground that it had been a tributary to the Persians, traditional rivals to Greek.\textsuperscript{115} As he holds imperialism responsible for the degeneration of Hindu civilization, he seems to find a sort of apology for Alexander’s invasion of India. However, he admires Alexander’s conquest of that vast and distant Indian Empire.\textsuperscript{116}

Maurice admires Raja Poros\textsuperscript{117} as a man of intellect and arms and as an Indian rival to Alexander. He is of the opinion that the defeat of Poros not only declared India a Greek dominion, but also gave the Macedonians a way to Babylonia. Maurice sees the history of Hindostan from the death of Alexander till the commencement of Mohammedans era as treacherous and unattractive, mostly disintegrated and subjugated. During this period India was not entirely independent of the Bactrian Empire.\textsuperscript{118} However, he praises the efforts of Sandracottus\textsuperscript{119} to shake off the yoke of Macedonians’ dominance.\textsuperscript{120} Maurice takes the period from second century B.C. to the dawn of Islam as an era of “interval of doubt and obscurity” in Indian History. He is of the opinion that “the clouds that darkened the historical page vanish before the effulgence of crescent of Mohammad”.\textsuperscript{121}

3.4. Maurice’s Islam: An Imperial Religion.

Thomas Maurice seems much impressed by Gibbon while framing his understanding of Islam. Like Gibbon, he does not accept the divine nature of Mohammadan prophecy but appreciates the contribution of Islam and Muslims to the human civilization. He presents Islam as an imperial power and does not appreciate the imperial character of Muslim empires. However, he praises the contributions of Muslim rulers to the promotion of arts, sciences and literature.

\textsuperscript{113} An ancient Egyptian tribe.
\textsuperscript{114} An ancient Palestinian tribe.
\textsuperscript{115} Maurice, Modern, Vol. I, p.7.
\textsuperscript{116} Ibid., Vol. I, pp.10-11.
\textsuperscript{117} Ibid., p. 202.
\textsuperscript{118} Raja Poros was the king of northern India at the time of Alexander the Great’s invasion of India in 320 B.C.
\textsuperscript{119} It was established by the Greeks in Syria and Central Asia about 200 B.C.
\textsuperscript{120} Chandragupta of Indian History who ruled from 322 to 298 B.C.
\textsuperscript{121} Maurice, Modern, Vol. I, pp. 7-8.
\textsuperscript{122} Ibid., p.8.
3.4.1. Thomas Maurice's Concept of Islam.

Maurice has depicted a dark and "terrified East" at the moment of the dawn of Islam. He sees the rise of Islam as a moon in that dark of the East. Maurice looks at Islam not as a divine religion, but as a system exacted on the basis of nature. In this regard, on the enlightened model he refuses to accept Mohammadan prophecy. His sketch of the Prophet (PBUH) seems to be very biased. He takes Islam as a product of highly advanced human faculties of intellect, wisdom, insight, enthusiasm, fanaticism and most of all superior experience of the Prophet (PBUH). He is of the opinion that the Prophet (PBUH) laid the foundations of Islam on the. He is of the opinion that to make Islam popular among the people the Prophet (PBUH) combined all heretic creeds into one code and provided psychological attractions to his followers in the form of the concept of the unity of God and that of the paradise. On the same lines, the Quran appears in his thought not as a divine book, but as a composition of the Prophet and his friends. As a whole, although, Maurice treats the Islamic Prophet in a very severe way, yet, appreciates his human faculties.\footnote{122}

3.4.2. Thomas Maurice and the Imperial Nature of Islam.

Maurice presents Islam as an imperial religion. He is of the view that the ambitions of the Prophet (PBUH) and the precepts of the Quran have developed the imperial nature of Islam. The Prophet (PBUH) had ambitious designs of glory and aggrandizement, which could not mature without the establishment of an empire. He is of the opinion that the Prophet (PBUH) had to leave Mecca due to such plans.\footnote{123} On the same foundations precepts of the Quran encouraged the bloodshed and inculcated the love for military glory and established the intolerant and destructive principles among the followers of the Prophet (PBUH).\footnote{124}

Maurice was of the opinion that this imperial theme of Islam flourished, in fact, due to the declining state of contemporary Persia and Rome. "The heroes of Arabian superstition" began to conquer the big empires. He appreciates the zeal with which the Muslims carried on this task and surmounted the almost impassable difficulties. They penetrated with equal ease the snows of Caucasus and deserts of India. They over took half of the kingdoms of Europe and usurped the thrones of many of their powerful monarchs. Maurice sees behind the Muslim conquests a series of murders, plunder, accumulation of wealth and destruction of

\footnote{123} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 186.  
\footnote{124} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 9.
antique idols.\textsuperscript{125} However, he was satisfied with the tyranny of history that the Arabian conquerors over ran the Syrian, Persian and Egyptian soil and in turn they were overrun by Turks and Tartars.

3.4.3. Maurice’s Muslim Empires: Patrons of Art and Literature.

Maurice thinks it partial, unjust and mistaken premises that all the Arabs and Tartars were barbarians, having no taste of arts, literature, sciences and culture and destroyers of all the sciences and records. Quoting Mr. Richardson,\textsuperscript{126} a well-known orientalist, and following Gibbons’ model, he seems to be much impressed by the literary achievements of Arabs and Tartars. He is of the opinion that in the middle ages, when European nations had become famous for their barbarity and ignorance, under the illiterate sovereigns, the Arabs became heirs to the Romans and of the “Augustan age”.\textsuperscript{127} He is of the opinion that the Muslims had not only a vast empire larger than the Romans, but also excelled the Romans in the development of arts and literature and in the refinement of life-style. Abbasid caliphs al-Mahdi, Harun al-Rashid, al-Mamun and other such patrons of arts, literature and sciences, appear in his thought as a model of enlightened, learned, genius and polite rulers. Their standard cultivated a culture of patronization of arts, literature and sciences by the princes, generals and other imperial machinery, and also developed their interest in these fields and some of them appear to be very uncommon literary figures.

Maurice seems to be surprised that this culture was so deep rooted that even Tartars continued to patronize it. In this regard, he refers to the designation of an astronomical table and the establishment of an observatory by the Nasir ad-din al-Tusi, a minister of Hulaguo Khan. In the same way Gauz Khan’s minister Fazi Allah wrote a history of the Mongols and Tartars. Timur was a great patron of arts and literature and his successors founded schools and colleges in the Islamic world.\textsuperscript{128}

In this way, on the one hand, if he seems to be a critic of Muslim conquests, on the other hand, he appreciates the Muslims’ contribution as successors of Roman Empire and as patron

\textsuperscript{125} Ibid., p. 9.
\textsuperscript{126} Mr. Richardson was a famous orientalist historian who wrote on the History of Islam. He appreciates the literary achievements of the Muslim world in an age of decline of human civilization.
\textsuperscript{127} The term has been used in the European literature in different ways. In general, it is applied to the golden age of the development of classical literature under Greeks and Romans. Gibbons presents the Islamic civilization as a logical and historical successor to that age. On the other hand, in the Christian history, Saint Augustine had a special place in the theological philosophy. In this regard, his times have been taken by some of the European writers as Augustan age or a time impressive because of the literary achievements.
of arts, sciences and literature. But, the question arises how he analyses the Muslim Empire in India?

3.5. Maurice's Muslim India: A Continuation of Muslim Imperialism.

Maurice takes Muslim India as a continuation of imperial theme in two ways. First, he takes it as a continuation of the tradition of establishing foreign empires in India like that of the Greeks. In this tradition, the Muslims were succeeding the Macedonian empire of Alexander in India as well as in Europe. Secondly, he sees the establishment of the Muslim Empire in India as continuation of the Arab Muslim Empire. In this sketch of foreign rule in India, Maurice follows the model of Alexander Dow's History of Hindostan. He arranges his Modern History of Hindostan as the history of foreign conquerors of Hindostan from Greeks to the Arabs, the Afghans, the Mughals, the Portuguese, the Dutch, the French and the English.

3.5.1. Nature and Purpose of Muslim Conquests.

Determining the purpose of the Muslim conquests, Maurice had some reservations. As a Christian historian, he has no sympathy with the divine religion. He has neglected the religious motive behind the Muslim conquests. He is of the opinion that the Arabs were nomads and deserted people. Therefore, Muslim conquests were directed by "love of plunder" and "thirst of glory". It was connected with the purpose of establishing a powerful empire to make the beautiful areas of Asia their domain and to exploit the wealth of great empires and rich areas. He presents the Muslim generals as plunderers, robbers and depredators. Providing examples from the Muslim historians such as Al-Waqidi, Al-Makin, Ibn Haukal and Al-Masudi, he tries to prove that the riches and wealth of Persia largely influenced the Muslims' conquest of Persia. The Muslims' plundered almost all the wealth in all the forms and destroyed the imperial city of Madayn. They conquered Central Asia, because it was an immensely rich and flourishing area in agriculture, trade, commerce and mining and because it was a centre of trade between India, China, Persia,

130 A famous Muslim historian of early period.
131 An Historian of later Abbasids' period.
132 An historian.
133 Famous geographer historian of Abbasid period and author of Marooj ul Zahh wa Maadan al Jawahar.
Russia and Arabia.\textsuperscript{135} He is of the opinion that the Central M\textaeque of Damascus was built by the wealth, which was sent by Muhammad bin Qasim from India.\textsuperscript{136} In the same way, Mahmud elevated Ghazni to the level of an Imperial City by using the booty, which was looted and plundered from India.\textsuperscript{137}

\subsection*{3.5.2. Causes of the Spread of Islam.}

Thomas Maurice has discussed some of the potential causes of the spread of Islam in Persia and India. His understanding of the causes of the spread of Islam is in marked contrast with his concept of Islam as an imperial religion. He has discussed the spread of Islam without an understanding of relations between the Muslim empire and Islamic religion. In this regard, there arise a number of questions. If Islam was an "imposture" and its aim was the establishment of an empire and accumulation of wealth, then why the Muslims were interested in the spread of Islam and why they spared the life and property of those who embraced Islam? Maurice has left such questions unanswered.

Thomas has discussed the nature of Islamic creed and its relations with other divine religions and with those people who embraced Islam, as the potential causes of the spread of Islam along with the Imperial behaviour. Maurice's emphasis remains on the point that the spread of Islam was a forced conversion. The governors and people of those areas, which the Muslims attacked, not only opened the gates of their cities, but a large number also readily embraced Islam to save their lives and property.\textsuperscript{138} The Muslim empire encourages the conversion by the grants of rewards for those people who were converted to Islam.\textsuperscript{139} In the same way the Muslim conquerors made it condition for peace in the conquered areas that people should embrace Islam.\textsuperscript{140}

Maurice accepts the view that Islam is a simple and natural creed and to be a Muslim is very easy task. By the announcement that "There is only one God and Mohammed is the apostle of God", a man becomes a member of the Muslim community and in this way his sworn enemies become his firmest friends. A concept of equality among all Muslims appears to Maurice an important factor working behind the conversion of Indians and Persians to

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
  \item [\textsuperscript{135}] Ibid., pp. 202-203.
  \item [\textsuperscript{136}] Ibid., Vol. I, p. 214.
  \item [\textsuperscript{137}] Ibid., p. 207.
  \item [\textsuperscript{138}] Ibid., p. 192.
  \item [\textsuperscript{139}] Ibid., p.194.
  \item [\textsuperscript{140}] Ibid., p. 212.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Islam. He confesses that the role of the *simplicity* of Islamic creed and its natural principles were not less important than sword in the spread of Islam in India and Persia.

Maurice appears to blame Christianity and the Judaism for the spread of Islam. He is of the opinion that both the religions failed to check the progress and development of Islam. Islam showed a respect for Hebrew patriarchs and for the Christ. Therefore, neither the Jews nor the Christians were alarmed at the spread of Islam.\footnote{Ibid., p. 193.}

In this way, although Maurice neglects the role of Muslim preachers in the spread of Islam, but he seems to be unable to ignore the nature of Islamic creed as a potential cause for the spread of Islam. His discussion makes it very clear that Maurice was trying to defend his imperial theme by laying the responsibility of preaching of Islam on the shoulders of the conquerors and not on the Muslim preachers.

**3.5.3. The Arab Empire and India.**

Maurice takes the conquest of Sind by Muhammad bin Qasim as the continuation of the Muslim conquests in Central Asia and Persia. He focuses the limitation of Arab influence and the strength of Indian arms. To Maurice, Arab rule was not much hard to India. The conquests of Muhammad bin Qasim were marked to Multan. He refuses the view that Muhammad bin Qasim penetrated into Hind. Muhammad bin Qasim might have attempted to conquer the areas on the both side of Ganges, but the strength of the combined arms of Indian rulers may not have allowed any foreign invasion of the interior provinces of India.\footnote{Ibid., p. 213-214.}

Maurice sees the period from Muhammad bin Qasim to the attacks of Sultan Mahmud in India as a period of interval in the Muslim conquest of India. During this period India remained free of Muslim exploits in the East. It was just because of the declining state of Arab Empire of Umayyads and Abbasids due to boundless luxuries, corruption of manners, relaxation of discipline, rise of powerful principalities and introduction of Turks to the central administration. Maurice looks at declining Arab empire as a blessing for India but new forces emerging out of the ashes of Arab empire seem to him a new challenge for Indian state and society.\footnote{Ibid., p. 215.} In this way, his attitude towards Arab empire is a little bit sympathetic. It may be due to the fact that Arabs did not establish an empire in India. As a result, India
remained free from the foreign yoke for about three centuries. This freedom of India seems to
Maurice to be owing to the declining state of Arab empire.

3.5.4. Ghaznavids and Ghaurids in India.

Maurice sees the Ghaznavids and Ghaurids empires as the continuation of Muslim
Empire, ruling over Indian dominion as a province. For Maurice, the emergence of the two
empires was the result of the declining state of Arab empire. None of the two empires
challenged the nominal sovereignty of the Arab empire. Ghaznavids and Ghaurids ruled over
India from capitals in Afghan territories and in this way continued to serve the cause of
Muslim imperialism. In Maurice’s perception, this period can be analysed as a period of
Hindu resistance to Muslim Imperialism for the preservation of their liberty and property.

Maurice takes the Ghaznavids and Ghaurids era as a period of attacks, marches, ravages,
massacres, plunders, assassinations, rebellions, invasions, usurpation, murders, destruction,
atrocities and religious bigotry. He accuses all conquerors of destruction and spares no one
unlike Jones. However, he divides the Muslim rulers into two categories on the model of
romantic thought. First: those who were famous for their justice, tolerance, patronization of
arts and literature or those who were distinguished for their literary character. In this regard,
his praise seems to be extraordinary for those who worked on or patronized the Indian
subjects and sciences. Second: those who practised atrocities, plunders and bigotry, were not
only in access, but, they were “Monsters of Vice”.144

Maurice appreciates the character of Mahmud Ghaznavi as a great conqueror who
extended his empire from Central Asia to Western India. In his expeditions to India
subjugation of people and plunder of wealth seem central to Maurice.145 He does not see a
bigoted Mahmud behind the expedition of Somnath, but he takes it as “Plunder of Somnath”.
To Maurice, the destruction of idols at Somnath was not an act of religious bigotry, but of
enlightened behaviour against superstitions prevalent among the Hindus.146 In this regard, his
interpretation of Mahmud’s conquest of Somnath seems to be directed by enlightenment and
his Imperial theme. He refutes the view that Mahmud attacked India seventeen times by

---

144 Maurice places the dishonour of that title upon Mubarak Khilji who ascended the throne of Delhi from 1317
to 1321.
145 For a detail of Mahmud’s conquests and the extent and exploits, which Maurice mentions see chapter four,
volume I, Part I of Maurice, Modern.
146 Maurice, Modern, pp. 292-296.
declaring his twelfth campaign as final and last one. However, dual nature and character of Mahmud surprises him very much. He looks at him as a politic, generous, polite, justice and virtuous one. On the other hand, he finds no justification for Mahmud’s conduct towards the “Homer of Asia”, Firdusi. Like Jones he is of the pinion that Mahmud not only took “Shahnama” coldly but also insulted the great poet. Maurice appreciates Mahmud’s literary skills. He mentions especially his translation of an Indian treatise on government. He depicts Mahmud as an enlightened and liberal patron of arts and sciences. Maurice appreciates as well as depreciates the other Ghaznavids rulers on the same criteria, criticizing their bigotry.

Maurice sees the Indian princes struggling against these Tartar and Afghan invaders, to preserve their liberty and creed. However, their failure against the Muslims seems to Maurice partly due to their mutual differences and partly due to the zeal of the Muslim arms.

3.6. Maurice’s Understanding of Indo-Muslim Empire.

3.6.1. Establishment of the Kingdom of Delhi.

Maurice takes the establishment of the Kingdom of Delhi as a centre of political power in India. He takes it, on the one hand, as the lessening of direct foreign influence and exploits in the form of wealth drainage from India to Central Asia and Arabia. On the other hand, as he analyses it as the extension of direct control of the Muslims on the Indian resources and the expansion of the Muslim empire to the utmost limits of Indian Territory. The shift of the seat of government of India seems to Maurice to have been under consideration for a long time. Mahmud was much pleased with the climate of Gujarat and was thinking of making it the capital of his empire. During the Ghaurids era, the shift of capital had been under discussion, to exploit the wealth and properly of Indian soil. During the turmoil between Ghaznavids and Ghaurids, Khusru declared Lahore his capital, but its conquests by the Ghaurids made Indian territories again a part of Afghan empire. The first Indo-Muslim Empire came into existence on the foundation of Ghaurids’ empire.

147 Maurice takes the Campaign of Gujarat as the final Campaign of Mahmud in India.
149 Ibid., pp. 300-332.
150 Ibid., p.321.
153 Ibid., p.355.
Maurice divides the Indo-Muslim empire into two periods: first, the rule of Afghan dynasties or Kingdom of Delhi from the beginning of thirteenth century to the establishment of Mughal empire; and second, the rule of Tartar dynasty or Mughal Empire. He seems impressed by the Mughal dynasty as the true heir to Tartars and treats the Afghans just to understand the foundations of the Mughal Empire. His treatment of all the dynasties enthroned in Delhi can always be questioned. Some historians treat Slave and Tughluq dynasties as Turkish in origin and he himself accepts the Arab origin of Syed dynasty. In the same way his understanding of the names of the rulers seems somewhat erroneous as he writes Balban as Balin. The names of a large number of rulers cannot be distinguished from each other.

3.6.2. Maurice’s Afghan Dynasties: An Era of Instability.

Maurice analyses the Afghan dynasties as an era of instability as compared to that of Mughals. For Maurice, the establishment of the Kingdom of Delhi was not an intended or planned act, but a result of the disintegration of Ghaurids’ Empire, de-centralization and independence of provincial governors in Afghanistan. In this way, Maurice analyses it as a new factor contributing the Indian affairs along with the dominant Tartar power since the decline of the Abbasids. Why does he give Afghans a secondary place to Tartars? is an important question. He is of the view that Afghans were unable to establish a sound system of government in India. The kings seem to him subservient to the nobles and this aristocratic system of government does not match either with his concept of modern democracy or with his romance of a powerful ruler having a “divine right of Kingship”. Most of all, he sees a more efficient and splendid Tartar (Mughal) empire on the ruins of the Afghans’ achievements, which make this period less important and less glorious. However, he appreciates the efforts of the Kings of Delhi for the stability and progress of the Indian empire.

The Slave dynasty seems to have no match with his traditional chivalrous romance either of kingship or of nobility. However, he praises the character of its rulers and their efforts to

\[154\] It is an age-old theory of kingship. According to this theory king is appointed by God to rule the subjects and in this regard king can neither be removed nor he is responsible to some one, person or institution, except that of God.
establish a sound administration. He sees Aibak’s success as the result of his war skill\footnote{Maurice, Modern, Vol. I, part II, pp. 393-400. Qutb-ud-din Aibak was the founder of Slave dynasty and first Muslim ruler in India. He was the slave of Muhammad Ghauri and his famous general. As conqueror of India, Ghauri appointed him as governor of Indian provinces. Later became independent and established his government at Delhi.} and Ilutmish’s success in his wisdom and enlightened behaviour.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 400-403. Ilutmish was the son in law of Aibak. His reign covers a span of fifteen years in Maurice’s description from 1221 to 1235.} Ilutmish’s training of Raziyya and acknowledgment of her abilities and skills seem to Maurice a dominant character of this enlightened ruler. However, the concept of a women ruler does not match with Maurice’s romantic myth of a warrior hero.\footnote{Ibid., pp.404-405. Raziyya was the daughter of Ilutmish and ruled over India about four years.} Mahmud II\footnote{Maurice’s Mahmud II is Nasir-ud-din Mahmud of Slave dynasty who ruled over the Kingdom of Delhi from 1266-1286.} and Balin (Balban)\footnote{Maurice uses the word Balin for Ghiyas ud Din Balban (R. 1266-1286). May his derivation of this word be a sort of misunderstanding, but Balban’s reign seems to him an impressive era.} occupy a prominent place in Maurice’s understanding of the Salves. He analyses Mahmud as a man “distinguished for learning, justice and temperance”\footnote{Ibid., p.417.} and Balban “as renowned for valour, generosity and political wisdom”. In this era, he places the kingdom of Delhi at “its proudest Height of Glory”.\footnote{Khilji dynasty was founded by Jalal-ud-din Khilji in 1290. He was succeeded by Ala ud Din in 1296. Mubarak became King in 1316 and was replaced by Khusru in1320, the year of the fall of Khilji dynasty.} \footnote{Maurice, Modern, Vol. I, part II, pp.472-476.} 

Khiljis\footnote{Maurice, Modern, Vol. I, part II, pp. 410-412.} appear in Maurice’s estimate as usurpers and tyrants, first among the Mohammedans, who massacred and plundered Deccan. Although magnificent in court, but Maurice highlights the treacherous and bigoted character of the Khiljis. In this estimate Mubarak Khilji appears as a “Monster of Vice”.\footnote{Maurice’s Tughluq I is Ghiyas-ud-din Tughluq, the founder of Tughluq dynasty. He was selected by nobility and ruler for the throne of Delhi from 1320-1325.} 

Maurice finds some potential for rule in the system and among the persons of Tughluq dynasty. The selection of Tughluq I\footnote{Maurice, Modern, Vol. I, part II, p.476-479.} attracts the attention of Thomas Maurice very positively. His wise, politic and virtuous character as a ruler and the unity among the political elite appear to Maurice as the most suitable form of government for India.\footnote{Maurice places the second king of Tughluq dynasty under the title of Muhammad III. His Muhammad I was the second Ghaznavi ruler son of Mahmud. His Muhammad II among the Indian rulers was Muhammad Ghauri.} However what Mohammed III\footnote{Ibid., p.417.} tried to impose on Indian subjects, seems somewhat strange to Maurice. He estimates the character of Mohammed Tughluq as “distinguished only by ambition”. He
was a scourge of Hindostan and his schemes for the conquest of China and the shift of capital from Delhi to Deogari (Daulatabad) proved to be more destructive for Indian people than his Indian wars.¹⁶⁷ In this situation Firuz Tughluq seems to Maurice an ideal king of India, trying to repair and improve the empire almost destroyed by his predecessor. His long "reign of justice and glory", Maurice takes as an era of prosperity and public welfare.¹⁶⁸ However, after Firuz, Maurice measures the decline and disintegration of Tughluq dynasty under ambitious and intolerant rulers, who were slaves of pleasures and luxuries.

From the time of Khiljis Maurice mentions the extension of Mongol's contacts to Indian territories. In this perspective, he deals with Timur's invasion of India.¹⁶⁹ His focus remains on the destruction of cosmopolitan-city of Delhi and massacre of its inhabitants by the Timurids' army. The destruction and the "universal plunders" of Timurids' army almost exterminated the native inhabitants.¹⁷⁰ Although he takes the Syed dynasty founded by Khizr Khan as the heir to Timur,¹⁷¹ but he analyses that the political disaster and destruction by Timur was so complete that Sayyids were unable to recover the empire to its former glory. The political instability led to the conspiracies and contests of nobles, which resulted in the disintegration of the Kingdom of Delhi. The trends continued throughout the period till the time of Bahlul Lodi, who was anxious to re-establish the Afghan Kingdom. Bahlul and Sikandar appear in his estimate with honour and splendour. They restored the honour of the kings of Delhi and established the empire to its former glory and splendour. Maurice analyses the role of nobles as a potential cause of the decline of Lodi dynasty.¹⁷²

He is of the opinion that Afghans had not accepted the extinction of Afghan rule. They were always struggling to re-establish their kingdom. The rise of Sher Khan seems to Maurice a logical end of this struggle. However, he elevates Sher Khan¹⁷³ as the most splendid, powerful and glorious of all the Afghan Kings who ever ruled over India. Maurice emphasizes that to Sher Khan, Mughals were foreigners; therefore, he wanted to drive these

¹⁶⁹ Timur invaded India in 1398. He has been considered as a great conqueror, but scourge of humanity. His capital was Samarcand.
¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, pp.56-68. Khizr Khan was the founder of Syed dynasty. He was appointed by Timur as the viceroy of India. In 1414 he founded a dynasty of sovereign rulers in India which lasted till 1450.
¹⁷² Bahlul Lodi was the founder of Lodi dynasty. He founded this dynasty in 1450 and was succeeded by his son Sikandar in 1488. Babar established the Mughul Empire by defeating his grandson Ibrahim in 1526.
¹⁷³ Sher Shah was an Afghan noble who occupied the Indian empire in 1540 and ruled over it to 1555.
foreigners out of India, back to their hereditary areas. He not only conquered all India, but also did a lot for public welfare, maintenance of law and order and to provide justice to his subjects. Maurice depicts him as a great patron of literature. He includes him among those historical personalities whose monuments still attract the attention of the Indian people.

3.6.3. Maurice’s Mughal Empire: A Splendid Continuation of Timurids.

Maurice impressed by the splendour of Mughal Empire. He takes it as the continuity of Timurids Empire. Maurice determines the role of Timurids in the world history on the basis of Mughals’ role in India. He is of the opinion that Mr. Gibbon has ignored the role of Tartars in the world history. He has depicted the Tartar sovereigns as very “remote actors on the historic drama”. He is of the view that Tartars role “is a very near and important one” especially when they come across India. In this regard, Maurice places the Tartars just second to the Arabs in the history of Muslim imperialism.

Maurice’s placement of Tartars on the scene of history raises a number of questions. Whether he was not satisfied with the place assigned to the Tartars by the contemporary historians, or, he wanted to show, how tyrannical the most splendid Muslim empires had been in the history that ruled over Indian people? How much plunderers and destroyers were, even the most learned among the Muslims? These questions can best be understood along with the question, why he stresses so much on the Timurids lineage of the Mughals? Whether he wants to show that destruction and massacres were in the nature of the Mughals. Although enlightened, the Mughals established their empire on the model of Timur, not on the ruins, but on the remains of Indian state and society. This depiction highlights a sort of underlying defence of the degeneration of Hindu society. In this perspective, he places Timur, Akbar and Aurangzeb in the same line as the scourges of India.

Maurice analyses the Mughals on the same model, as he analyses the earlier Muslim emperors: conquerors, plunderers, tyrants, destroyers and bigots. However, the strength of Mughal Empire seems to him an extraordinary element. He seems anxious to understand the

175 Ibid., pp.122-134.
176 Ibid., preface.
177 He himself has pointed out his difference of opinion with Gibbon in this regard. The same ideas have been projected by Mr. Orme in his History of Wazir in Hindostan and by Alexander Dow in his Modern History of Hindostan.
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nature of strength of Mughal Empire to utilize it to strengthen the British Indian empire. He analyses Mughal state and society on his own principles of romantic theory.

To Maurice, Babar\(^\text{179}\) was the true heir to Timur. Babar planned his conquests and administration on Timurids’ pattern and his emphasis remained on conquests and exploits rather than a peace maintaining administration. Maurice’ seems impressed by his bravery, power of will and decision, determination\(^\text{180}\) and his generosity. He sees Babar distributing heavy sum of money among his soldiers, nobles and subjects.\(^\text{181}\) Although bigoted,\(^\text{182}\) Maurice sees in Babar a king who rather likes a rational religion than a superstitious one and observes all the sound laws and ceremonies of Hanfi religion. Maurice admires his literary taste and universal acceptance of his literary work.\(^\text{183}\) This literary character seems to be matching with romanticists’ criterion of a potential ruler.

For Maurice, Humayun was a man of great talent, a learned patron of men of letters and devotee to the study of astronomy and judicial astrology.\(^\text{184}\) However, unluckily, he had to face very unfavourable circumstances. In the face of these circumstances, Humayun proves to Maurice a very brave, courageous, and a confidant man, always struggling to save his empire, facing jealousies and distrust of his clansmen, responding to the challenge of exile very courageously. In his exile to Persia, Maurice believes, he found the new seeds of tolerance and trust, which were acquired by the Mughals.\(^\text{185}\) However, Maurice finds the true cause of the strength of Mughal Empire in the reign of Akbar.

Maurice is of the opinion that Akbar’s policies were the true cause of the strength of the Mughal Empire.\(^\text{186}\) He depicts the picture and policies of Akbar in a very romantic way. Although, in the early years of his reign under his regent Bairam Khan, he did not take much care of state affairs and was responsible for many acts of despotism. The emphasis of state

\(^{179}\) Ibid., pp.90-108. Babar was the founder of Mughul dynasty in India. Dethroned from Farghana, a Central Asian state, he established his government at Kabul and in 1525 conquered Delhi. His reign lasted about six years. He died in 1530.

\(^{180}\) Ibid., p.102.

\(^{181}\) Ibid., pp.91,99.

\(^{182}\) Ibid., pp.98-99.

\(^{183}\) Ibid., p.107.

\(^{184}\) Ibid., p.109. Humayun was the second ruler of India and son of Babar. His reign can be taken into two periods. His first reign in India lasted from 1530 to 1535 and after a defeat from Sher Khan he choose an exile in Iran. In 1550 he came back to India and recovered his empire with the help of Iranians. He died in 1555.

\(^{185}\) Ibid., pp.109-122, 151-157.

\(^{186}\) Ibid., p.187. Akbar has been taken among the great rulers of the world. He was the third Mughul ruler in India. His reign lasted about fifty years from 1555 to 1605.
machinery remained on traditional issues of accumulation of wealth, power and plunders.\(^{187}\) The destruction of the enemies of his father remained Akbar’s main concern and, in this way, he himself killed the Hindu chief of Pathan army, Hemu.\(^{188}\) However, he was a man of vision and had vast and comprehensive plans to accomplish. Akbar accomplished all his plans very remarkably and beautifully. In Maurice’s estimate, Akbar appears as a peace-loving monarch. His plans could not be achieved with out peace and leisure and his wars were aimed to construct a state of peace. Although the Indian political scene could not afford such peace and leisure, however, Akbar designed his policies to establish peace in India and used these policies of peace during his reign very systematically to fulfil his plans.\(^{189}\)

Akbar’s construction of new cities and revival of historic cities seems to be a fascinating subject for Maurice. Maurice was impressed by the way the Fort of Agra was reconstructed. Maurice visualizes in the establishment of a splendid court, construction of beautiful Mughal palaces, strength of Mughal treasury and the establishment of all the institutions of public benefit, a traditional romantic oriental empire.\(^{190}\) Maurice seems impressed by the efforts of great Akbar to elevate Agra to a level of metropolitan-city. He sees Agra as a great centre of arts, learning, sciences, professions, trade and commerce as an imperial seat. Maurice is of the opinion that prosperity in India during the reign of Akbar could not be established without Akbar’s liberal religious policy. Akbar encouraged and patronized the migration of men of ability from all over the world to India, guaranteeing them all sorts of religious liberty and allowing them to establish their religious institutions for religious worship and even to come into dialogue with other religions.\(^ {191}\) Maurice is of the opinion that Akbar’s conquests were not motivated by religious fervour. It was inspired by a zeal for the establishment of a great empire. He projects the view that Akbar’s generosity, religious tolerance and “most enlarged and liberal sentiments in religion and morals” proved to be a key to the subjugation of Hindus, especially Rajputs. Against his predecessors’ policy of plundering and destroying the Hindus and their symbols, “Akbar nobly and wisely extended to them the tolerating

\(^{187}\) Ibid., p.161.
\(^{188}\) Ibid., p. 159.
\(^{189}\) Ibid., p.175.
\(^{190}\) Ibid., pp. 164-169.
\(^{191}\) Ibid., pp. 168, 187.
system of their own benevolent creed". In this perspective, Maurice analyses the strength of Mughal Empire and places the great Akbar among the great emperors of Asia.

Jahangir appears in Maurice's understanding a licentious person. His reign marks a contrast to that of Akbar. Apart from the "Chain of Justice", he found nothing important during his reign. His favourite queen Nurjahan had usurped all his powers and she had done every thing, whatsoever she liked. Due to his neglect of state affairs, "Kandhar" was occupied by the Persian king and his own son raised the banner of revolt against him. Maurice is of the opinion that the transfer of Akbar's empire to his successors in its integrity, was in itself was a great contribution on the part of Jahangir for Mughal empire.

Maurice sees the extension of traditional oriental splendour of Akbar in the person of Shahjahan. Although under the influence of his beloved wife Nurmahal, he built a great and splendid court. The prosperity of his empire, the magnificence of his buildings and his conquests seem to have a lasting impact on the mind of Maurice. His love for precious stones, the Pea-Cock Throne, Construction of Shahjahanabad or New Delhi, and a large number of architectural remains in the form of gardens, mosques, tombs and places of public utility provide delight to Maurice. This development culminated in a sense that under the Mughals Indian society was progressing. To meet with the expenditures of these developments he had to wage a war against his neighbours especially in Deccan. However he admits that Shahjahan not only checked the mal-practices and the abuses promoted by his father but also established a sound, efficient and accountable administration. Shahjahan revived the law and order and placed the responsibility of defending the life and property of his subjects and travellers on the shoulders of the governors. His policies and erections contributed a lot in making the Indian society organized, peaceful and prosperous. Maurice sees Shahjahan as a liberal and tolerant sovereign. Although, a religious person in
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192 Ibid., p.187.
193 Ibid., p.188.
194 Ibid., pp.189-212. Jahangir was the fourth Mughal ruler in India. His reign occupies a period of about twenty two years from 1605 to 1627.
195 Ibid., p.211.
196 Ibid. To provide justice to his subjects Jahangir placed a chain outside his palace. The people coming from different parts of the empire were obliged to present their claim before the emperor by ringing the bell posted at the tail of this chain. In this way it was supposed that the subjects could be able to present their claims without the exploits of bureaucracy.
197 Ibid., p.195.
198 Ibid., p.213.
temperament, he never interfered in the religious affairs of his subjects. Shahjahan was well aware of the nature of all his sons; Dara, Shuja, Murad, and Aurangzeb. In this regard, his appreciation of liberal, tolerant and humanitarian Dara, his eldest son, and almost declaration of his succession to the throne, prove him a patron of arts and literature and of a fair and enlightened form of government. However, what Akbar and Shahjahan had established, Aurangzeb’s policies were almost opposite to it.

3.6.4. Fall of the Mughals: A Tragedy.

Maurice traces the basis of the fall of the Mughal in the reign and policies of Aurangzeb. Aurangzeb appears in Maurice’s understanding in the form of a bigoted hypocritical religious zealot who adopted a fraudulent strategy even to his father and brothers. For Maurice, Aurangzeb was a man of lust for empire and he developed his behaviour to facilitate the achievement of this end. Tartars had no settled succession to the throne. There was no law of primogeniture among them and succession was almost on the will of reigning emperor. Therefore, the wars of succession came very frequently among the Mughals. Although Salem had raised the banner of revolt against Akbar and Shahjahan himself had revolted against Jahangir, but the war of succession among the sons of Shahjahan proved to be more fatal. It destroyed the reigning Mughal family and ended the solid tolerant policy of Akbar and Shahjahan. Shahjahan had almost declared Dara his successor and since this understanding, Aurangzeb had begun to pose like a person devoted to the cause of religion, having no interest in imperial crown. Maurice is of the opinion that it was the only secure means of attaining imperial crown for him. This bigotry also promoted in Aurangzeb a religious spirit of bloodshed and war. Under this spirit, he not only waged war against the Hindu infidels, but also took measures against those who were not true Muslim. In this term, he had focused his attention against those states of Deccan, which were being ruled by Shia rulers. In this perspective, exploiting the liberal and enlightened attitude of Dara towards non-Muslims, Aurangzeb began to declare him an absolute non-believer (kaffir). Shuja was also blamed of lenient attitude toward Shias, Persian courtiers and Hindus. In this way, Aurangzeb exerted the actual advantages of his bigotry. On the contrary, although he announced his support

199 It is the Christian law of succession. According to this law elder child always becomes the heir to a ruler.
200 Ibid., p. 430.
201 Ibid., p. 432.
for Murad, but at the end by his fraudulent tactics and traits deceived Murad and usurped the crown. Maurice is of the opinion that Aurangzeb's tactics to establish his government were so shameful that his family began to hate him. He almost destroyed the royal house. He was so indulged in the lust for wealth that on the death of his father, his concern was devoted to the cause of accumulation of jewels under his father's custody rather than in the burial. To Maurice, after the enthronement of Aurangzeb, his bigoted policy proved to be more fatal for the future of Mughal Empire. His scepticism towards Shiah elements and Persian nobility laid the foundation of Persians involvement in Indian affairs in the future. His religious crusades against the superstitions of Hindus and his policy of converting the Hindus to Islam were a total retreat from the Akbar's policy of religious tolerance. Maurice is of the opinion that Aurangzeb's policy of prosecution of Hindu priests, destruction of their images and temples and erection of mosques on their ruins and slaughter of sacred animal of the Hindus, cow, changed the Hindu image of Mughal empire. They rose up very gallantly to defend their religion. Maurice is of the view that new emerging forces contributed a lot in the degeneration of Indian society. The Marathas, the Jats, the Rajputs, the Sikhs and the Europeans came out as new forces. The wars of succession between the heirs of Aurangzeb provided opportunities to these new forces. Therefore, Mughal Empire began to decline very rapidly.

Maurice is of the opinion that fall of the Mughal empire was a tragedy. In 1819 he wrote an historical drama, which was performed as stage-play on the Indian issue. He depicted the Indian situation as a tragedy for the Hindus. In this tragedy he has no sympathy with the Mughals. He was sympathetic to the Hindus, who were long prosecuted by the Muslims. The decline of the Mughals added the rise of new powers of destruction such as Marathas and Persian Nadir Shah to the sufferings of the Hindus. He sees in the massacres of Nadir Shah the prosecution of prosecutors.

3.7. Maurice's Conclusions of Indo-Muslim History for the British.

Maurice analyses the British Indian history and policy on the basis of his conclusions drawn from Indo-Muslim History. He is of the opinion that the Europeans politics in India

---

203 Ibid., p.448.
204 Ibid., p.472.
205 Ibid., p.483-484.
was for the establishment of an economic empire, because in the orient the economy was almost under the state control. However, Portuguese, Dutch and French involvement in the indigenous religion and culture became the first cause of their decline.\textsuperscript{207} Being dissatisfied with the policies of British Indian administration, he advises them not to destroy and interfere to the religion and culture of Indian people. On the basis of Indo-Muslim history, Maurice tries to prove that India had enjoyed almost decentralized administration and provinces could be obliged to submit to central authority, through tribute or central taxes. In this way, he negates the view of highly centralized government in India. Instead, he propagates a loose and decentralized system of government, laying utmost responsibility on the shoulders of local administrators, so that they could be able to enjoy a sort of liberty to deal with the local population according to their customs and culture. Tracing the religious tolerance and enlightened administration as the cause of the strength of Mughal Empire, and religious bigotry as the cause of the decline of the Mughal Empire, he advises the British administration for the adoption of a liberal policy.\textsuperscript{208}

Maurice analyses the Indo-Muslim Empire in continuation with the Muslim imperialism. His emphasis remains on presenting Muslims as warriors, plunderers, destroyers, killers and scourges to humanity. He focuses the instability and decentralized nature of Indo-Muslim administration. However, Maurice traces the survival and strength of the Muslim rule in India in the tolerant and liberal religious and economic policies and enlightened political behaviour, though he seems unable to understand the nature of harmony between the scourge and enlightened character of Muslim rulers.

Maurice’s criterion for the study of the Indo-Muslim empire and his analysis of Indo-Muslim history was determined by his concept of ancient Indian history. He tries to defend the place of ancient Hindu civilization in the world history. For that purpose, he adopts two different criterions for the analysis of the ancient Hindu empire and that of the Muslim empire. Dealing with Hindu period or empires, he focuses the development of sciences, arts and culture, while dealing with the later history, he focuses the wars, conquests, plunders and destruction. In this regard there arise a number of questions. Whether, he thinks that Indo-

\textsuperscript{206} For a detail see Thomas Maurice’s Supplement to the Modern History of Hindostan, London, 1810 and Fall of The Mughuls: A Tragedy, London, 1819, p. xviii.

\textsuperscript{207} Maurice, Modern, Vol. II, pp. 214-255.
Muslim Empire contributed nothing to the development of sciences, arts and literature, and to the diffusion of these elements in the Indian society or, he wants to prove that ancient Hindu society was at a highly advanced stage than the Muslims society? In this regard, his concept of the superiority of Hindu civilization can be visualized in all his works. Some other questions are also relevant with the same concept such as why Maurice has focused and devoted a large space to the Indian wars, plunders, massacres and destruction, while dealing with Indo-Muslim empires? Why he relates the normal religious observances of Muslim rulers with that of the concept of bigotry and religious intolerance? In this regard, he defends the Hindu society against the severe attacks of liberals and tries to prove that Hindu society was a highly developed society. However, the long series of wars, conquests, plunders and destruction became the cause of the degeneration of the Hindu society. By focusing the religious bigotry of the Muslim rulers, he wants to lay all the blames for the destruction of the remains of the ancient Hindu civilization on Indo-Muslim Empire. In this perspective, for Maurice, Indo-Muslim Empire appears merely an instrument of the destruction of splendid ancient Indian civilization. What the Muslims contributed for Indians in the field of sciences, arts, culture, strength and prosperity of Indians seems to Maurice, unmatched with the contribution of ancient Indians, and with that destruction, which the series of imperial struggle imposed on the Indians.

He sees in the peace, prosperity and splendour, the development of local people and culture, otherwise the destruction of local arts and science.

It is important to note that inspite of all the misconceptions about and blames on the character of Muslim empires, Maurice does not use the word “despot” for the Muslim rulers as used by then contemporary romanticists. The despotic nature of oriental government was a long discussed issue in the European understanding of Indo-Muslim history. Then, why does he not treat Muslim rulers as “despots”? It appears very clear that in the European understanding “despot” was being used for a powerful, all independent and are unaccountable sovereign. In this way, it was a symbol of highly personalized and centralized administration. As, Indo-Muslim Empire was a symbol of well-established empire for the Europeans, it could lead towards the adoption of a centralized system of government for the

208 To understand the Maurice's stand see his criticism on the policies of British East India Company in the book fifth of his Modern History of Hindostan, Vol. II, Part Final.
British India. As could prove more ferocious to the indigenous population and could destroy their religion and culture and Maurice was foreseeing the revolt of local population against the British administration in this case, that is why he did not present the Muslim rule as a despotic one. However, contemporary theorists criticized Maurice’s views.

4. Romantic Response to the Rise of Utilitarianism: John Malcolm’s Administrative problems and Muslim India.


Major General Sir John Malcolm was a well-known military officer, diplomat and writer in the services of the Company. He has been considered as a “semi god”\(^{210}\) legend that was one of the most respected Englishmen among the indigenous Indians and Persians.\(^{211}\) However, home authorities, due to the same reason, disliked him. He was also appreciated for his “conciliatory talent and magnanimity.”\(^{212}\)

4.1.1. Setting of Malcolm’s Thought.

John Malcolm lived for sixty-four years and forty-seven years of that period were spent in India. In this perspective, his bent of mind was developed, primarily, by his contemporary Scottish tradition and his Indian experience. Born in a poor and big Scottish family of nineteen persons, Malcolm was not a highly educated man. He came in India as a “boy Malcolm”\(^{213}\) at the age of fourteen with enlightened ideals, zeal and ambition of “shining orient” as a “land of opportunity” and he continued to create opportunities for himself throughout his life.\(^{214}\) He arrived in India in 1783 and arrival of William Jones in 1784 marked the beginning of Indian romance in the British circles that influenced Malcolm a lot. In this way, he was “neither inspired nor acquainted with the Utilitarianism”. He had an


\(^{212}\) S. C. Mittal, *op. cit.*, p. 74.


agreement with the romanticists that society evolves its institutions. He refused to accept any transplantation of foreign institutions to a society. 215

In India, Malcolm came under Scottish philosophical tradition of Elphinston, Charles Metcalfe, Thomas Munro, and James Mackintosh 216 along with Jones: ‘Indological’ romance. Simultaneously, his administrative experience acquainted him with the Indian problems. He learned Persian language, which helped him to find out new opportunities. He was interested in poetry and wrote a number of poems. 217 His participation in Mysore, Pindari and Maratha wars, his diplomatic missions and assignments to Persia, 218 Indian states and his experience in the central India, Punjab, Deccan and the Maratha territories helped him to develop his understanding of the Indian situation. 219 In this perspective, Malcolm was of the opinion that the British should not establish their Indian policy on the presumption of their superiority on Indians. Rather policy should be based on the means “best suited to the peculiar natives of the objects”. 220 He was in favour of the Company’s rule in India. He supported an independent administration in India, having the authority to deal with the problems and issues according to the needs of time and space, rather than on British model in the form of consolidated rules. However, he wanted to see the dominance of the British power through wars as he sees the history of India as a continuity of foreign invasions. 221 So, he supported all the efforts, moral or immoral, to strengthen the British supremacy by Clive or Hastings. 222 He has twofold purposes of his writings:

- First, he was an ambitious person and wanted to be the Governor General of India by showing his efficiency in and understanding of Indian affairs. Second, he wanted to create a sense of pride and self-responsibility among the British Indian bureaucracy and “the

215 S. C. Mittal, op. cit., p. 75.
216 See for example Opinions of the Hon. Montesquieu Elphinston Upon some of the Leading Questions Connected with the Government of British India, Examined and Compared with those of the Late Sir Thomas Munro and Sir John Malcolm as Taken from their Evidence Before the Parliament, London, 1831.
217 His poems were published in 1829 from Bombay under the title of Miscellaneous Poems.
219 For his life sketch see Higgin Botham, Men Whom India has Known, Madras, 1874, pp. 279-284.
maintenance of the good faith of the British government was ever supreme in his thoughts".  


John Malcolm was greatly inspired by Mountstuart Elphinstone’s concept of history. History appears to be a purposive exercise. He saw history as a continuous process of change. On Edmund Burke’s model, he believed that society was a whole-representation of past, present and future. So, he tried to focus his present linked both with past and future. He believed in the romantic view of history. He adopted ethno-cultural and racial romantic approach to the understanding of history and society. Malcolm believes in the process of history in the form of the rise and fall of civilizations. He classifies human society into “civilized” and “half-civilized”. However, he analyses history in the form of nations and state, represented by religion, customs, traditions, laws and rulers. On the western model, India appears to be a “continent”, inhabited by ethno-cultural and religious nations: Rajputs, Marathas, Afghans, etc. He considers customs and traditions as a system devised by the common folk. Therefore, he concludes that Hindus had never accepted the Muslim rule, but had accepted the British rule. His leadership emerged out of worriers and soldiers on mythological model as he had been continuously fighting against the different nations as well as groups such as Pindari and Thugs.

4.1.3. Malcolm’s Unit of Historical Studies.

Malcolm spent most of his time in Central India and Deccan and wrote a lot on the problems of Indian politics and administration. He was dissatisfied with the state of Indian affairs under the Company’s administration. Well aware of the decline of the Mughal Empire in India, he wanted to see the British Indian Empire established on secure and strong footings.

226 In 1812, his Sketch of the Sikhs; a Singular Nation who Inhabit the Provinces of the Punjab, Situated between the River Jumna and Indus, was published from London. In 1822, the Government of the Company published his Report on the Province of Malwa from Calcutta. On the basis of this report in 1823 Malcolm published his Memoirs of Central India from London and in 1824 Index to the map of Malwa, as complementary to his report of 1822 was published. In 1821 he has issued a circular of instructions to the officers working under his authority. These instructions were also published from London under the title of Instructions by John Malcolm to Officers Acting Under his Orders in Central India in 1824. His Political History of India was published in 1826, in two volumes, in which he had compiled all his views on contemporary history and problems of state, society and administration. Second volume of his Memoir of Central India appeared in 1832. In 1835 his Government of India was published.
by a sound policy. He uses history of the Muslim India and contemporary Muslim society as a source to prove his theories on Indian civilization. He had a confirmed opinion that Hindu civilization was one of the rich and great civilizations of the world. Although degenerated, it has a potential to govern a vast empire on modern criterion of civilization. However, Malcolm did not adopt the concept of civilization as his unit of historical studies. His unit was "nation". He shares the concept with Elphinstone, Grant Duff and James Tod. He perceives his "nation" through its religion, rituals, customs and culture. Therefore, Muslims appear to be a nation in his thought.

His thoughts on Muslim India are scattered and can be found in various writings. However, his Memoir of Central India can be taken as the best source for understanding his thoughts. Some comments on the Muslim state and society can also be found in the Sketch of the Sikhs and Political History of India. Unlike the traditional historians, he had passed his opinion and observations on all the aspects of history of Muslim India. Although he follows the traditional romantic approach towards the Hindu-Muslim relations, his attitude towards the Muslims was sympathetic in the sense that he advocated the acceptance of the status of Indian Muslims in policy making.

Malcolm's forty-seven years of experience saw a variety of conflicting issues and ideas. His time was dominated by a sense of challenges for the British Empire, in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth from the French and Indian states and by the eighteen thirties, from the Russians. In this perspective his thoughts were dominated by a view of the adoption of a policy that could strengthen the British Empire. So, Malcolm was interested in three types of issue. Firstly, he had concern with the company's dominion and administrations' relations with the native states and powers. Secondly, he was interested in the handling of any Russian threat to the British dominion. Thirdly, the British Indian administrative policy was his focused area. For that his concern was with the expansionist policy, place of army, character of the British administrators, relations with the local princes, revenue settlement and collection and law and order. Treating Indian communities on non-communal national basis, Malcolm supported any sort of policy adopted for the expansion of the British Empire. Every state and prince, creating obstacle for the British, appears to be an enemy for Malcolm. However, the princes, accepting the dominance of the British, were considered enlightened and subject loving. He was of the opinion that for the establishment
of the British authority, use of every sort of tact, bribery or force was justified. He rejected the view that British government could deal with the Indian problems from home. He was of the opinion that Indian problems were different from the problems at home and in this context could best be dealt by a case-to-case strategy. He was of the opinion that Indians should be dealt on national basis, as communal differences were no more operative among the Hindus and Muslims. On that basis, he advocated a sympathetic policy for the common people, but a harsh policy with the Indian states that had no sympathy for the indigenous people. Malcolm saw a prosperous company as well as community at home in case of peace and tranquillity in India. He was advocate of the personal interests of the servants of the company so that they could serve the company with devotion and to the best of their abilities.

4.2. Malcolm’s Understanding of Muslim Indian Empire.

Malcolm’s understanding of the Muslim India was based on the former romantic vision of Muslim India. For Malcolm, the Muslims were usurpers, foreigners, plunderers, warriors and destroyers of Hindu images. However, he appreciates the Muslim rulers policy towards and relations with their native subjects and strengthens the romantic view of the British Indian administration. He is of the opinion that the Muslims had established Indian empire in a despotic way. They set the political map of India and rendered valuable services to the cause of political stability in India. Abu-l Fazl divided it into provinces for political and administrative purposes. In spite of all the efforts of Hindu princes and chiefs they established a strong and powerful empire in India. However, he confesses that prosperity, splendour and works of public benefits, which could be seen in the form of remains of palaces, colleges and tombs, erected during the period of Muslim rule in Central India, gave the Indian Muslims respect and a good reputation among the subject population, whether

227 This argument appear to be the central theme of his political history and biography of Lord Clive.
229 See Black, Parry, Observations on Lieu-Colonel Malcolm’s Publication relative to the Disturbances in the Madras Army containing a refutation of the opinion of that Officer, London, 1812.
231 Ibid., p.2.
232 A learned and able minister of Akbar the Great (1555-1605).
Muslims or Hindus. He praises Muhammad Khilji (Tughluq) and Akbar the Great in this regard a lot.

4.3. Religious Policy of Muslim Indian Empire and Its Effects on India.

Malcolm traces the causes of prosperity and splendour of India under Muslim rule, and of the respect and reputation of Muslim rulers, in the friendly relations with, and tolerant policy of the Muslim Empire towards their subjects. He is of the opinion that "mandates and institutions" of even Mughal empire were unable to alter the long established usages of Indian people. Malcolm believes that this gap was filled through the tolerant policy of the Muslim rulers. Malcolm believes that in a despotic system of government, prosperity of the people always depends on the local institutions. Therefore, his statement confirms the view that the Muslims not only tolerated, but patronized the local institutions and culture. For Malcolm subjugation of warrior tribe of Rajputs under a chief like Rana Sunga of Chitor by sword was almost impossible. Muslim state was incapable of subjugating these Rajputs. Their struggle for independence is still remembered in folk tales. However, complete subjugation became possible only through the person and policy of Akbar. They had to pay a nominal submission, a moderate tribute and occasional military services. Although Brahmins refused to cooperate with the Muslims, yet the Muslims established good terms with other Hindus. The Muslim despots placed the Kaithis in court, provided them with government services and placed on them state confidence. In this way, turbulent Rajput soldiers and nobles were kept under strict check by their own people. In the same way, the subjects were granted equal religious liberty. Akbar even protected Jains from the tyranny of the Hindus.

Deviation from this religious policy and distrust on the indigenous Hindu population seems to Malcolm the root cause of the decline of Muslim power in India. This change of attitude was the result of those troubles, which were created by the Muslims for their own government. These troubles were in the form of conspiracies, wars of succession, plundering

234 Ibid., p. 42.
235 Malcolm seems to be intermingling the Khiljis and Tughluqs. Muhammad was the second Tughluq ruler and ruled over India from 1325 to 1351. However, Malcolm calls him Khilji.
237 Ibid., p. 39.
238 Sir W.H. Sleeman has termed it as the learned class among the Hindus. It can be termed as Intellectual Class of Hindu society or elite of the Hindu society.
of the subject population and such other measures to create lawlessness and decentralized system of government. The active participation of indigenous population in these affairs led to the distrust between the ruling elite and Hindu population. Malcolm found the seeds of this distrust from the time of Mahmud Khilji (Tughluq). Due to his policy the clashes between the Muslims and Rajputs appeared on the surface. However, Malcolm measures this distrust between the two communities at its zenith during the reign of Aurangzeb. His bigoted policy and distrust towards the Hindu nobles and chiefs led to a political disaster, which resulted in the disintegration of the Mughal Empire.

Malcolm approaches two different angles of Muslim rule in this way. First that the cause of the success of Muslim rule in India was a sort of religious liberty and a moderate administrative policy. Second that if Muslims could have been unbiased and tolerant, their power would have not been declined. Third that Hindus had not opposed the Muslim power. They had been cooperative to their Muslim rulers and the Muslims and the Hindus had equal liking or disliking for the benevolent or oppressive rulers. In this way, Malcolm propagates a view that good terms with the indigenous population could result in the establishment of a strong and powerful empire in India. If we look at his understanding of contemporary the Muslim society, it will appear more clearly that he is trying to negate any potential difference between the Hindus and the Muslims and responding to the utilitarian view that Muslims were somehow superior to the Hindus.

4.4. Revenue Policy of Muslim Indian Empire.

Malcolm analyses the revenue policy of Muslim Indian empire in relation to the rights of property under the Muslims. He is of the opinion that acceptance of the right of property leads to a polite attitude towards the levies and their collection. The Muslims were usurpers; and they had occupied the Hindus' government and had no respect for Hindus. They came from countries where, against the tradition of tyrannical despotism, the rights of property belonging to individual were not only accepted but also guarded and Muslims under some necessity accepted the individuals' right to property. At least claim to the soil was
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admitted by the worst of oppressors. Muslims accepted the value of ancient village institutions, which had established every village to a status of an independent community, ruled by its own officers. The Muslims preserved the rights of land to their former owners. The Mughals rehabilitated the vast barren lands through measurement and divisions for revenue collection based on local institutions. Although they increased the land tax to some extent, yet, they were moderate in their assessment of the taxable commodities. Malcolm concludes that a society develops and flourishes in moderate and "tolerably just principles". In this regard, he presents the view that the progress of Indian people under the Muslim rulers shows the efficiency, justice and moderation of the system established by the Muslims.

4.5. Contemporary Muslim Community.

Malcolm forms his opinion of the then contemporary Muslim community of India on the basis of his Central Indian observations and on the basis of his political experience. In his understanding, Muslim community was the potential trouble-shooter for contemporary British Indian Empire. He advises the British Indian government for a special treatment to the Muslims not on the basis of principles but on realities.

Malcolm takes the Muslims as a warrior community, which had been the ruling elite of India for a long time. They had pride and pleasure in their past. However, disintegration of Muslim state and social and religious degeneration of Muslim society seems to Malcolm the cause root of the political and administrative problems of contemporary India. The Muslims were professional soldiers who had been unemployed by the decline of the Mughal power. In this way, this elite and armed power had to fight the war of their survival in India. Malcolm identifies four different types of responses to this problem on the part of the Muslim community.

First, some of the independent Muslim rulers of the provinces had tried to establish their empires, but failed. Malcolm analyses the reign and rule of Tipu Sultan of Mysore in this context. Tipu appears in his understanding a usurper and bigoted ruler, who wanted to extend
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his government all over India. He was posing serious threats to his neighbouring states and was deadly against the British due to their engagements with his neighbours. He extends the view that Tipu had made peaceful co-existence almost impossible. However, he relates the theory of Muslim usurpation with that of legitimacy. After the defeat and death of Tipu the state of Mysore was restored to its legitimate Hindu sovereign family.\textsuperscript{251} By depicting the character of Tipu, in this way, Malcolm defends the extinction of the Muslim state of Mysore. On the other hand, he presents the British as the champions of the cause of indigenous people. \textit{\begin{math} a \times \{ \begin{array}{l} \text{t} , \\ \text{t} \\ \text{t} \end{array} \} \end{math}}

Second, since the disintegration of Muslim power in India, the Muslims had joined the services of Marathas who were a newly emerging power. He believes that the Maratha power was based on Muslim soldiers.\textsuperscript{252}

Thirdly, they were ready to welcome any foreign power from the traditional Northwestern passes connected with the heartlands of the Muslim invaders. In this regard, Malcolm seems to be worried about any invasion from Iran or Persia. This threat was so serious for the British that they sent embassies to Afghanistan\textsuperscript{253} and Iran\textsuperscript{254} under Mountstuart Elphinstone and John Malcolm respectively.

Fourthly, a large number of people had established and organized themselves as freebooters. Although people belonging to all religions and races were attached to these groups, the leaders of these groups were unemployed warrior Muslims. They were looting and plundering all over India. Earlier patronized by the Marathas, these freebooters became so powerful that Indian governments were unable to subdue them. Therefore, he has contributed a lengthy chapter on one of the leaders of these freebooters: Amir Alam. He highlights the reality that the British Indian government was also unable to crush these predators by force. Their submission was the result of a moderate policy of give and take. According to this policy, a number of new principalities were established in Central India. He appreciates the

\textsuperscript{251} Malcolm, \textit{History}, Vol. I, Chapter 2,3.
\textsuperscript{253} Elphinstone's mission to Kabul has a dual purposed of establishing good terms with the first line neighbour and on the other hand to counter the Napoleon's intention of posing war on British India. It was sent in 1808. For a detail see Elphinstone's \textit{An Account of the Kingdom of Kabul}, Two Volumes, Karachi, 1972.
\textsuperscript{254} Lord Minto dispatched to Persia in the early months of 1808.
settlement made with the freebooter Amir Alam, and his elevation to the rank of Nawab of Tonk.255

Malcolm seems to be very conscious about the role of Muslim community in the contemporary India. The Muslims were the only force capable of creating any trouble or establishing any potential resistance to the British power. In this regard, he advocates a special status for the Muslim community in India to maintain the British control over Indian for a long time.  

4.6. Hindu-Muslim Relations.

Malcolm is of the opinion on the basis of his Central Indian experience that settlements with the Muslims could also resolve the problems with the indigenous population. First, because the Muslims were the only professional soldier class working behind Indian forces; and second, because now there was no big difference between the Hindus and Muslims. He exemplifies that there was not any sort of Muslim settlement in Central India except the ruling family of Bhopal. The majority of the Muslims were Pindari “half-converts”. They were either forced to embrace Islam by their Muslim Pindari chiefs or they had become convert to share an equal status with their Muslim masters after the settlements with the British Indian Government. They were nominal Muslims and following their ancient ancestral traditions and customs, they had not even adopted the Muslim names. They even intermarry with Hindus.256 On the other hand, he analyses that Afghans, a Muslim race, were fast adopting the Hindu traditions and customs. He observes:

The Muhammadan natives of the country have been for generations in the habit of obeying Hindu masters and have completely amalgamated with that race and without decidedly adopting its habits and customs, they seem in a great degree [to] have lost their own...There can not be a strange proof of Muhammadan population than that there is hardly to be met a priest or religious person of any rank, learning or character, among the best societies of that tribe in Central India.257

In this way, Malcolm strengthens romantic view of Indian history and that of the administration in three ways. First, by clarifying that the role of the Hindus in the contemporary Indian warfare and lawlessness was almost nil. The Muslims were in fact responsible for that. Second, by proposing that Muslims had lost their own identity and have been amalgamated with Hindus, so could be treated under Hindu laws. Finally, by

256 Ibid., p. 107-114.
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responding to the utilitarian view that Muslims were more civilized than the Hindus he accepts the utilitarian view of Muslim history. However, he negates it by the view that the Muslims had lost their superiority. In this sense romantic vision of Hindu civilization always seems to be dominating his understanding of Indian history, ancient or contemporary.

Malcolm's view of Muslim-Indian state and society seems to be determined by his approach towards the questions of Indian administration, which he has discussed in his Instructions, The Political History of India and Government of India. He wants to see Indian administration run in a moderate way in coordination with native powers. He seems to be of the opinion that British were a commercial power, facing hostilities of other European powers. The cause of their strength in India was the confidence of local states on the British for providing them security from the opportunists, both internal as well as external. In the chaos of Indian affairs the European rule was a blessing for the natives. The practical propagation of this concept could help the British in strengthening the Indian empire.\(^{258}\) In this way, he seems to be developing the opinion that British should establish friendly relations with indigenous population to strengthen their Indian Empire. He praises the policies of Lord Carnwallis and shows his disagreement with that of John Shore. He advises the British policy makers that in dealing with Indian natives they must keep in view "the plain practical reasoning combined with a correct view of human nature rather than abstract principles of general policy". The British should be more moderate and "less dogmatical" in their attempts to correct the system of Indian administration.\(^{259}\) They should give toleration to their religion, security to their property and promise to them "a tranquillity more durable than what they had ever enjoyed".\(^{260}\) He also refers to the favour and protection granted by Akbar the Great to the English\(^{261}\) and advises the adoption of the same policy for British Indian administration.

In his view of Muslim India, Malcolm tries to strengthen his stand on Indian administration. For that purpose, he develops a contrasting picture of Muslim history and Contemporary Muslim Community. By the depiction of a prosperous and splendid India

\(^{259}\) Ibid., pp.3-4
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under Muslim rulers, he takes a plea for tolerant and friendly relations with the indigenous Hindu population. On the other hand, by presenting the Muslims as a declined, degraded and degenerated community, mixed up with the Hindus, he seems to be clearing the way for the adoption of the Hindu institutions for Indian administration. In this way, in contrast to Jones’ Hindu nationalism or Colebrook’s two nations concept, Malcolm propagates Indian nationalism. However, this concept of one Indian nation cannot be taken as a secular concept. It indicates a complete supremacy of Hindu culture and Muslim amalgamation in this culture, in the perception of John Malcolm.


During the third and fourth decades of the nineteenth century, the British administration was sharply divided in its perception of Indian history and people. Romanticists and utilitarians were criticizing each other’s on the issue of the placement of Indians on the scale of civilization. For romanticists Indians had developed a highly civilized society and for the utilitarians and missionaries Indians were immoral and savage entities. The Muslims were far better than the Indians. In this perspective, Elphinstone tried to harmonize the two views in favour of the romantic school.


Mountstuart Elphinstone (1779-1859) has been taken as the most able diplomat, administrator, politician and historian of the British India. He is well known for his sympathetic approach towards Indian culture and history. Elphinstone emerges as an initiator of a sense of compromise between oriental romanticists, utilitarians and ethno-regional romanticists. The romanticists were propagating the idea of Indian civilization on the classical level, which was destroyed by foreign Muslim rule, and utilitarians were propagating a very barbaric and rude picture of the ancient Indian civilization which was to some extent brought to a better point than earlier by the foreign Muslims rule. Elphinstone’s own contemporary ethno-regional romanticists had challenged the concept of the unity of Indian civilization. In this perspective, Elphinstone seems to be presenting a harmonized
picture of Indian history. He accepts the romantic view of the classical status of the ancient Indian civilization. At the same time, Elphinstone differentiates between the Muslims and Indo-Muslims. In this way, he develops continuity in Indian history and civilization and brings the Muslims into the fold of Indian civilization. In the same way, by presenting the Muslim Empire in India as an evidence and an attempt to develop a whole Indian nationhood of different racial, ethnic, linguistic and religious nations, Elphinstone seems to be removing the effects of ethno-regional romance which he had promoted. In all his efforts Elphinstone focuses on presentation of Indian civilization on a status different from all other civilizations, in cultures, religions and in rule. However, by accepting the superiority of Europe over India and Indo-Muslim civilization, Elphinstone supports the cause of social change in India through a cautious policy.

5.1.1. Setting of Elphinstone’s Thought.

Born in a noble Scottish family of politicians and merchants, Elphinstone was educated in Scottish philosophical and intellectual tradition, based on classical languages and literature. However, during his early life he had to face a conflict between enlightenment, evangelicalism, romanticism and utilitarianism. This conflict seems to have been assimilated in his thought during his Indian career. His India career not only provided him with a sort of opportunity to deep observations into the different sections of Indian society, but also provided him opportunities to visit Turkey, Persia, Afghanistan and Egypt. The contemporary intellectual debate on British Indian administration through the study of Indian history as seen in the different schools of British thought, attracted his attention. In this debate Elphinstone’s classical background combined with the ground realities of British Indian administrative environment had attached Elphinstone with the Scottish romantic
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262 His father was the Governor of Edinburgh and his uncle was one of the directors of East India Company. See for details J.S. Cotton, *op. cit.*, chapter II.

263 Elphinstone got his brought up during a period when enlightenment was being divided into the issues of its sub-interest. Elphinstone’s environment was under the influence of Scottish enlightenment. If this enlightenment had produced Benthamite utilitarianism during the period of Elphinstone’s growth, a reaction to enlightenment’s extreme rationalism had emerged in the form of romanticism. However, the emergence of evangelical had also been taken as a reaction to enlightenment’s deistic formation of tough.

264 Elphinstone spent more than thirty-one years in India from 1796 to 1828. During this long stay in Indian, Elphinstone served on different posts in the Company’s administration from the assistant to the Governor of Bombay.
school. Elphinstone not only learnt the Sanskrit and Persian languages, but also got a thorough understanding of Indian culture and civilization. However, his years after retirement formed his real bent of mind for writing a history of India. Being a classical romanticist, Elphinstone was eager to establish his reputation as a writer. The contemporary hot debate on Indian affairs in the perspective of Mill’s History, along with Duff and Tod’s works on Marathas and Rajputs led him to write his History of the British India. Although his History has been presented as ‘the summing up’ of debate on Indian affairs, it seems to be a romantic compromise with utilitarian schools of thought as an apology for the status of Indian civilization and nation and plea for a cautious policy for social change in India. In this way his historiography has a policy-oriented purpose, having an apology for the company’s activities and policy guidelines for the future.

5.1.2. Elphinstone’s Concept of History.

Like other administrative and Scottish philosopher historians, Elphinstone had a purposive view of history, however, his purpose combined the romantic ‘amusement’ and utilitarian intellectual, philosophical or theoretical pursuits. Elphinstone was not ready to treat mythology as history, he sharply criticized Mill’s pure rational and Euro-centric approach. Elphinstone saw history as a narration of events in a meaningful way. For that, a comparative methodology seems to be a priority for Elphinstone. In this sense, Elphinstone was more interested in the minute details to draw solid theoretical conclusions on the regional basis. He emphasized the use of facts with judgment to make a consistent and

267 Elphinstone had developed a thorough taste for reading. By the 1805 he had read a lot of works written on all aspects of intellectual curiosity including, philosophy, classics, literature, languages, history, geography, etc.
269 Elphinstone’s Papers present his deep attachment with Indian culture and civilization. At a number of occasion Elphinstone expressed his deep attachment with the Indian culture in written. For example see Elphinstone Papers, MSS. Eur. F 88 in Oriental and India Office Library At British Library, London.
269 On the back up of Elphinstone James Grant Duff, a Scottish and relative of Elphinstone wrote History of Marathas, on the basis of original sources which was published in 1825?
270 Tod wrote Annals of Rajhistan and Travels in Western India.
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rational history out of a mass of fables and gossip. For that, he was idealizing Thucydides, like Macaulay, for a narration of events in which the historian himself participated. However, he was looking for a style of narration not dull, but condensed, and animated with striking and profound reflections.

Elphinstone sees history in relevant and coherent terms. In this regard he saw every history in its connection with the general history of the species, through a thorough knowledge of the principles of human action. Elphinstone sees all history of man in progressive terms. He divides history into Hindu, Mohammedan and British periods, and presents history in a linear progression, combining ancient with medieval and modern. However, cultural differences appear to Elphinstone a phenomenon worth studying.

Elphinstone widens the romantic criterion for the study of a civilization from William Jones’ literature and mythology to James Mill’s institutions and philosophy. Religion was in this perspective only one expression and mode of civilization. However, religions as well as morality appear to Elphinstone socio-cultural phenomena. Thus, he considers religious leadership, social devotees and evaluates them on the temporal ground. So, Indian identities were indigenous social cultural and geographical realities for Elphinstone and Indian Muslims had their own place separate from the Arabian or Turkish Muslims. Elphinstone assigns rulers a very important role in the development of civilization as promoters of the signs of civilization and as model for the common people. However, common people appear in Elphinstone’s estimate as followers of the benevolent rulers, but playing an important role through the following of traditions and religio-cultural rituals and ceremonials.

5.1.3. Elphinstone's Unit of Historical Studies.

Although Elphinstone as a romanticist was inclined towards a literature having the quality of amusing the people in substance along with usefulness, or having a relation with classical antiquity, yet his long administrative and political assignments in India diverted his attention towards the contemporary political structure. In this perspective, Elphinstone was
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interested in the political history of the Mughals as predecessors and legitimate rulers of India and in the history of the dominant nation of the area in which he was serving since long: the Marathas. As his colleague, James Grant Duff undertook the project of the History of the Marathas and in the mean while James Mill's History of India had won a status of modern western classic on India and had initiated a hot debate on the status of Indian civilization, Elphinstone diverted his attention towards this structure of historiography. As “civilization” was Mill’s unit of historical studies, the same is adopted by Elphinstone. Although classifying civilization, Elphinstone deals with all prominent aspects of a civilized society from language and culture to philosophy and institutions, his focus remains over politics and empire as embodiment of nation and civilization. Mill had presented Hindu, Muslim and British periods of Indian civilization as very distinct from each other. Elphinstone’s criticism of Mill’s mal-treatment of Hindu civilization and neglect of the importance of Muslim contribution in Indian civilization leads him to treat Indian civilization in unity and continuity through the ages, under the Hindus, the Muslims and the British. However, Elphinstone adopts a comparative approach to measure the development. His analysis emerges as a sort of apology for Hindu civilization in ancient and the Muslim period. His treatment of the Indian Muslims is sympathetic in the sense that he accepts Indian Muslims as a separate nation in the Indian subcontinent and antithetic in the sense that he does not believe in the unity of Muslim “Ummah” as a nation. In this way, primarily, Elphinstone addresses the question of Indian identities and administrative as well as policy treatment of these identities. He projects the view that the Indians should be treated in accordance with their national traits and the imperial relations with the Indian subjects should be established on this principle. So, administrative policies as well as authority should be deputed on this principle. Elphinstone rejects the view of the establishment of the control of the crown’s parliament on Indian administration. Rather, he supports the monopoly of the company on the ground that parliament could not see the indigenous Indian situation. Elphinstone also supported the view that British Indian administrators should be given
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maximum authority to deal with the indigenous situation. However, the indigenous laws should check their treatment with the local population.

Elphinstone’s treatment of India was determined by European romantic philosophical vision as well as by the concept of geographical and cultural nationalism. Scottish enlightenment leads him away from the concept of divine religion and emerging historicism links him with the method of historical treatment of current issues for their solution. As imperialism was a solid base for Elphinstone, so, he combines all these aspects for the use of history for the imperial purposes.

5.2. Elphinstone’s Apology for Hindu Civilization.

Elphinstone was dissatisfied with the view of Indian society presented by Christian Missionaries as well as utilitarians like Mill. They had depicted India as a land of immoral and barbarian culture. Elphinstone primarily differed from this view of India and had “concerned with the cultural achievements of the Hindus”. Elphinstone rejected the view that ancient India society was not a civilized one. Rather, he accepted the view that India had a civilized status even in remote antiquity on a level of Greece and Rome. Even the Hindus were “teachers not the learners”. However, he accepted the view that his contemporary Indian society was degenerated.

Elphinstone treats the Hindu civilization in two ways. On the one hand, he presents his view that ancient Indian society had achieved a high level of civilization according to contemporary norms. In this perspective, he discusses in detail the achievements of Hindu civilization in the field of arts, sciences and politics. On the other hand, he argues that root-base changes in the customs, habits, manners, institutions, religion, economy and philosophy of the Hindus had taken place, since the time of antiquity, which was the main cause of the degeneration of the Hindus.

Elphinstone measures the causes of root-base changes in Indian civilization in two ways. First that India was a “Continent” inhabited by “ten civilized nations”. In this way, he proposes that the immoral and degenerated status of one nation should not be applied to others. Presenting Indo-Muslims as an Indian nation, Elphinstone negates Mill’s difference
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between the Hindu and the Muslim civilization and upgrades the status of Indian Civilization. Second that a long spell of foreign yoke prevailing in India, since the time of Alexander, pushed the Hindu society into a state of degeneration. However by the establishment of Muslim empire in India, Elphinstone measures the growth of a “whole Indian nation”. Muslims appear in his understanding in two ways: first as foreign invaders and second as an Indian nation in the name of Indo-Muslim.


Elphinstone divides the period of Muslim rule in India into the Muslim and the Indo-Muslim period. He marks the Muslim period by the commencement of the Arab conquests to the establishment of Muslim rule in India, which he deals in his first book. He was “the first British historian to give separate treatment to the Arab conquest of India”. Elphinstone marks this era as a period of foreign Muslim rule from a centre out of India under the caliphs, or after the break up of caliphate, under the newly emerging dynasties such as “House of Ghazni” and “House of Ghaur”. In this period, Elphinstone sees the growth of the Muslim arms and conquests to form an empire with a harsh criticism of the Prophet (PBUH)

Elphinstone depicts this period as an era of Mohammedan treachery, tyranny, despotism, bigotry, destruction and degeneration in India. India was time and again invaded by the Muslim mighty rulers and was plundered. It has been depicted as a period of the Muslim suppression of the Hindus. Elphinstone sees in this period, a rapid degeneration of Hindu society and civilization. This period laid the foundation of a permanent Muslim rule in India, which Elphinstone takes as a dominant cause of the degeneration of his contemporary Hindu society. Elphinstone sees the sort of polity initiated during this period a permanent element in the Indian politics: a sort of despotism, tyranny and suppression.

5.4. The Indo-Muslim Nation.

Elphinstone identifies the Indo-Muslims as a nation different from the other Muslims. In all other conquered areas the Muslims almost converted all native population. In India, the Muslims not only left nine-tenth of local population unconverted, but they themselves were

---

290 Grewal, Muslim, p. 135.
at one time "turning infidels". Elphinstone sees this process as break-up of Indo-Muslims from other centres of Muslim politics.

For Elphinstone, the emergence and growth of an Indo-Muslim identity separate from the Arab-Persian tradition was subject to a number of factors: First that the progress of Islam in India was very slow due to a sort of passive resistance by Indian society because of which they were never subdued completely. Second that there was a sort of assimilation between different ethnic factions under the Muslim empire such as Turks, Persians, Arabs and Indian Muslims. The permanent residence in India and habitual cultural intercourse with the natives changed the manners of the invaders. Thus a "foundation [was] laid for the present character of Indian nation". The Persian people were much modified by Muslim institutions, influenced by power and example of the Turks. However, this structure was much more strengthened by the native Muslims. In this way, Elphinstone sees the emergence of Indo-Muslim nation different from other Muslim nations.

5.5. The Formation of a 'Whole Indian Nation'.

Elphinstone praises the Indo-Muslim nation for its efforts to create a "whole Indian nation". Elphinstone sees the rise of this nation due to a number of factors and forces mostly an outcome of the "intermixture" of the Hindus and the Muslims and to the increased importance of "natives" in the Muslim empire. Elphinstone identifies a complete national state under Akbar the Great. However, he views the period of Muslim rule since the "separation of kingdom of Ghore [Gaur] and India to the reign of Akbar" as an era of development of a "whole India nation" which, took the form of a national state in the reign of Akbar.

Elphinstone maintains that a comparatively moderate and tolerant behaviour of Indo-Muslim state, which he sees as a distinction of Sultanate period, contributed at large in this development. In a scenario of wars and conflict and struggle for a balance of power between the Muslim states inclined the Muslim and the Hindu rulers to become confederates of each other on equal terms. In this regard, "religion had no connection with the civil government".
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292 Elphinstone to Erskine, quoted from Colebrooke by Grewal, *Muslim*, p. 140.
295 Quoted from Elphinstone's MSS, by Grewal, *Muslim*, p. 139.
There was a large-scale inclusion of Muslims into the services of Hindu states and Hindus to the services of Muslim states. The rise of "country born" rulers in Indian politics, in between the reigns of Muhammad bin Tughluq and Akbar, Elphinstone sees as an acceleration of the process of development of a "whole India nation", because of the increased importance of the Hindus and native Mohammedans in politics. Muslims had won the ministerial seats in Hindu governments and Hindus in Muslim states. It increased the respect of Hindu and Muslim religion in the policies of the government.

Elphinstone identifies a simultaneous internxiture on religious and social levels. Amir Khusru’s celebration of love of Khizr Khan and Deval Devi, the rise of Urdu as the language of Indo-Muslims from an Indian dialect, the rise of tolerant culture of Indo-Muslim Sufism and the preaching of "universal tolerance" by the Hindu theist reformists seem to Elphinstone to be some of the prominent contributions to the development of an Indian state, prior to Akbar. In this way, Elphinstone maintains that the reform and the process of the formation of Indian nation was, by and large, a product of Sultanate era. Akbar’s empire was not greater than that of Ala-ud-din Khilji, Muhammad bin Tughluq or Aurangzeb. It was not more prosperous than that of Shahjahans. The distinction of Akbar was that he succeeded in achieving the highest mark in the formation of a single community in Indian state and society, "without distinction of race or religion", which was initiated by his predecessors, especially, by Sher Shah.

Elphinstone evaluates the rest of the Mughal reign on the standards set by Akbar. He sees the process of the strengthening of Indian nation disturbed by Jahangir and destroyed by Aurangzeb. An attempt was made by Shahjahan to maintain and improve that system. There emerged a conflict between liberalism and orthodoxy, which was at large visible in the personalities of Dara Shikoh and Aurangzeb and Aurangzeb's success in the war of succession seems to Elphinstone the decline of the formation of a "whole Indian nation". Elphinstone measures the strength of Muslim Empire in India in relation to the progress,

300 In his treatment of Aurangzeb Elphinstone focuses the policies of Aurangzeb leading to a distinction between Hindus and Muslims.
development, rise and decline of “whole India nation”. In this perspective, he sees the decline of Mughal Empire in the decline of Indian nation under Aurangzeb.\footnote{Elphinstone, History, II, pp. 494-500.}

5.6. Indo-Muslims Contribution to Civilization.

Elphinstone identifies a great contribution of the Muslims and the Indo-Muslims in the Indian civilization. He accepts that the real source of Mahmud’s glory was his patronage of sciences and arts, and not in the strength of his arms. He maintains that the Turkish Sultans were inferior to the Indo-Muslims in terms of architectural achievements.\footnote{Elphinstone, History, II, pp. 245-6.} In the same way, he was much impressed by the spirit of Persian literature.\footnote{Elphinstone, History, I, pp. 287-9.} However, Elphinstone praises the contribution of the Indo-Muslims in the historical literature of India.\footnote{Elphinstone, History, II, pp. 249.}

As a whole, Elphinstone seems to be evaluating the Muslims in India in a wider perspective of Indian civilization and tries to prove that even Muslims were forced to be a part of Indian civilization and they were not a separate entity in the Indian environment. In this way he advocates that civilized status of India should be accepted and their civilization should be tolerated. By presenting the concept of the unity of Indian civilization Elphinstone seems to be resisting the view of radical social changes in India. However, in this conflict the separate civilized status of the Indo-Muslim seems to be at stake.


The romance of India, which was being harmonized by Elphinstone with the reformists, missionaries and utilitarians, was strongly resisted by the antiquarian and cultural romanticists such as Sleeman, Elliot and H. H. Wilson in the fourth and fifth decades of the nineteenth century. Missionaries had already targeted Islam and Muslims. In this perspective, Islam and Muslims seem to be under the harsh criticism.


Major General Sir William Henry Sleeman was an officer in the services of the East India Company. He is well known for his sympathy with the indigenous Hindu culture. He has been considered as one of the most efficient officers of the company. He is
known as “thuggee Sleeman”. Philip Woodruff in The Founders calls him “The Titans” of the British Empire. He has been praised by the Hindu natives of India as well as by the imperial masters.

6.1.1. Setting of Sleeman’s Thought.

Sleeman’s thoughts were dominated by a very passionate romance of Indian culture and history. Born in an age, when romanticism was emerging out of enlightenment, Sleeman was brought up in an environment congenial to the development of the faculties, varied and contrasting in their nature. Sleeman’s selection for the services of the company was a great honour for the family involved in the illegal trade. He arrived in India at a time when the British supremacy in India had been established on the official level and the problems of maintenance of the law and order had become crucial for the British in the form of Pindaris, Bagree dacoits and Thugs. The Indian intellectual scene was occupied by the romantic view of Indian past. Sleeman was much impressed by the consistent tradition. On the romantic model, he plunged into close relations with the natives. He learned Pushto, Persian, Arabic and Hindustani and some secret languages spoken by a number of groups. During his earlier period of his services, Sleeman served as an army officer, with intentions to move to civil bureaucracy. However, he spent all his service of forty-seven years as an officer working for the establishment of British power through the maintenance of law and order. During the earlier period, he served the army and participated in the wars with Gorkhas and Marathas and after 1822, he diverted his attention to the suppression of groups creating law and order problems in the parts of the British Indian Empires. His close contacts with the natives and romantic background created a deep sense of affection for the Hindus in his thoughts. He emerged as a staunch enemy of the utilitarian philosophy. He criticized the utilitarian concept of economy taking its eminent form in the ideas of Ricardo, Malthus, James Mill, Adam Smith, Say and T. R. McCulloch.

306 Ibid., p. xi.
307 Ibid., pp. 1-33.
308 W. H. Sleeman wrote two books on the issues related to the utilitarian debates. One work was On Taxes of Public Revenues, The Ultimate Incidence of their Payment, their Disbursement and the Seats of their Ultimate consumption, Calcutta, 1827. This book was reprinted from London in 1829 and New York in 1888. Second
objected to the concentration and accumulation of wealth. He was of the opinion that national stocks were the criterion to judge the economic condition rather than the accumulation of wealth.\(^{109}\) So, he condemned the attitude of analysing Indian problems on the criterion devised to serve the British home country. He can be taken as the only figure in India working against the utilitarian logic of political economy at the time of the rise of utilitarianism.\(^{310}\) In this perspective, the second phase of Sleeman's Indian service presents a number of his works related to his active assignment and his views on Indian history, which were no more different from the extreme romanticists. Sleeman's writings had a purpose to guide the British policy makers in the light of his experiences.

**6.1.2. Sleeman's Concept of History.**

Sleeman was a staunch believer in religion and believed in the religious concept of history. He saw uniformity in the process of history in the religious sense, finding similarities between Christ and Krishna and assimilating the Hindus, the Muslims and the Christians. History bears an important place in his thought as the surface of his famous *Rambles and Recollections* highlights Pope's saying: 'the proper study of mankind is man'. He believes in the eighteenth century philosopher Bolingbroke's concept that "history is philosophy teaching by examples". However, he applies it with equal truth to fiction. Fiction appears to him a "philosophy teaching by passions". In this way he combines Jones' literary skill with that of prevalent historicism in the romantic mode.\(^{311}\) In this way he follows the traditional romantic lines.

**6.1.2. Sleeman's Unit of Historical Studies.**

Although Sleeman's basic concern remain confined to the issues of law and order, especially, to the white collar crimes, or to the territories he served, such as Oudh, yet, in his *Rambles and Recollections of an Indian Official* he discusses almost all aspects of Indian society from the state of civilization to the state of morals. In this perspective, state and society in its totality seem to be his central units of historical studies. However, his basic focus remains on the degenerating elements in the current state of society. He

---


\(^{310}\) Barry J. Gordon, has treated Sleeman as one of the five theorists producing non-Recordian economic theories. Collison Black in his article "Parson Malthus, the General and Captain", in *Economic Journal*, Vol. LXXVII, pp. 59-74, compares Sleeman with Malthus.
wants to eliminate the evil elements from the society. That is why Sleeman tries to determine the place of these evils in the religious, moral, social and economic structure of the society in its historical perspective. These evils were a constant source of problems for the British administration.  

On the one hand, if administration’s credibility and support from the subject people was at stake, on the other hand, such type of internal problems were creating difficulties in relations with princely states and frontier countries. The attachment of evils to the religion was a big hurdle for a real assessment of Indian situation for Sleeman. As his focus was on the law and order situation, so Sleeman does not comment on the pure historical facts. Adopting the pattern of “issues” or “strictures” of William Tennant, Sleeman selects the historical material from romanticists, evangelicals and travellers and places these historical facts to stabilize his arguments.

Muslims were not the general focus of Sleeman’s efforts to understand the Indian society. For him, Hindus were the original inhabitants of India and Muslims were the invaders and imperialists. In this perspective, his attitude towards the Hindus seems to be very sympathetic and towards Muslims very antithetic. He defends all the aspects of Indian society and attaches the growth of evils among Indians to the suppression induced by the Muslim rulers.

Sleeman’s attitude was determined by imperialist motives, geo-cultural concept of nationalism, romantic thought, anti-utilitarian attitude and to some extent to the Christian view of Islam and Muslims, all based in the western thought. However he seeks the application of all these views in the Indian society in such a way that may strengthen the British rule in India.

---

Sleeman, *Rambles*, p.117.

Sleeman wrote some major reports and published books on the issue of Indian evils. Some of these writings are:

*Ramaseena or a Vocabulary of the Particular Language used by the Thugs with an Introduction and Appendix*, Calcutta, 1836; *A Report on the System of Megunnism or the Murder of Indigent Parents for Their Young Children’s (who are sold as slaves) as it Prevails in the Delhie Territories and the Native States of Rajpootana, Ulwar, and Bhurpoor*, Calcutta, 1839; *Thugs or Phansigars of India: Comprising a History of Rise and Progress of that Extraordinary Fraternity of Assassins*, Two Volumes, Philadelphia, 1839; *Report on the Depredations Committed by the Thug Gangs of Upper and Central India*, Calcutta, 1840; *Report on Budhuk Alias Bagree Dacoits and Other Gang Robbers by Hereditary Profession and on the Measures Adopted by the Government of India for their Suppression*, Calcutta, 1849.
6.2. Sleeman's Hinduism.

Sleeman was much impressed by the novelty of Hindu customs, traditions, fairs, fiction and culture. On the testimony of Bishop Heber\textsuperscript{313} and Sir Thomas Munro,\textsuperscript{314} he tries to prove that the Hindus are a cultured, civilized, chivalrous and the most tolerant community. He believes that their cultural heritage had been destroyed by the Muslim conquerors. However, what has been left has promoted fiction in Hindu mythology and has strengthened the supernatural worth of Hindu religion.\textsuperscript{315} On the romantic model, Sleeman highlights not only the cultural relations between ancient Europe and Hindus, but also tries to prove that Krishna of Hindu mythology was Christ and Hindus had adopted it in accordance with local traditions rather than accepting conversion to Christianity.\textsuperscript{316}

6.3. Sleeman's View of Indo-Muslims and Islam.

Sleeman tries to prove that the Hindus and the Muslims are no more different from each other. Their ceremonies of birth and marriage are almost identical. Although the Muslims regard the Hindus as superstitious, but they themselves are not less superstitious than the Hindus. Referring to the concept of Shooting stars in Mishkat ul Masabih,\textsuperscript{317} he tries to prove that these superstitions are like those of the Hindus and are originated in the Muslim religion. The Muslim religion discourages the physical and astrological sciences and strengthens the irrational behaviour.\textsuperscript{318} In this regard, the Muslims are bound to believe such superstitions.\textsuperscript{319} In the same way, he tries to prove

\textsuperscript{313} Heber, Narrative of a Journey Through the Upper Provinces of India, Three Volumes, London, 1828.
\textsuperscript{315} Sleeman, Rambles, pp. 7, 54. He has quoted two stories famous among the Hindus in this regard. At Bheraghat according to Hindus one of the Muhammedan idol breaker was converted into stone. Aurangzeb is generally notorious for his bigotry. His army almost destroyed all around Ghauri Sankar's seat. However when they tried to destroy this seat, they were attacked by a nest of hornets and ultimately they had to retreat.
\textsuperscript{316} Although it is a fabulous concept, but was propagated by a number of romantic and missionaries to strengthen their arguments. Romanticists propagated it to create a sense of harmony between the Europeans and Indians. On the other hand Roman Catholics propagated it just to get the attention of local population. Through this concept they seems to be trying to highlights that what the Christian missions were propagating was not a new thing. It was the revival of true Indian religion.
\textsuperscript{317} Mishkat ul Masabih is a collection of the most authentic traditions of the Prophet (PBUH). Author os using the translation of Matthews under the title of Mishkat ul Masabih or the Collection of most Authentic Traditions Regarding the Actions and Sayings of Muhammad Exhibiting the Origin of the Manners and Customs, Civil, Religious and Military Policy of the Musalmans, from Calcutta in 1809-10.
\textsuperscript{318} Sleeman, Rambles, pp.36-37.
\textsuperscript{319} Ibid., pp.33-35.
that even the concept of *Avagon*\textsuperscript{320} and custom of *Suttee*\textsuperscript{321} had prevailed among the Muslims.\textsuperscript{322} He also highlights that Muslim women are suppressed by religious laws.\textsuperscript{323} However, his discussion on the state of property rights in India discloses his biases, clearly. In this discussion, he negates the theory that superstitions were deep rooted in the society through religion. He relates these superstitions with the social and cultural ceremonies and believes that these are the result of political suppression. He is of the opinion that under an unsettled and despotic government people do not feel their property secure. Therefore, they feel it better to spend their earnings on superstitious rituals and ceremonies that promise them a psychological satisfaction and advantage for life-hereafter.\textsuperscript{324} However, in addition to the depiction of Islam as a superstitious religion, Sleeman is of the view that Islam is an imperial and despotic religion and has established psychological foundations to defend these imperial and despotic trends.

Sleeman looks at Islam with a biased eye, taking it as a “cook’s religion”.\textsuperscript{325} He depicts the Muslims as a religiously militant community having a faith in imperialism. The Muslims as warriors, according to him, were plunderers and destroyers of idols. They made the same use of army that was made by European rulers in the middle ages.\textsuperscript{326} However, he admits that Muslim rulers were very kind to their subjects. They issued their orders and grants without any distinction of religion to the Muslims, the Hindus, the Dutch and the English, alike.\textsuperscript{327} In this regard, he praises the policy of Akbar the great\textsuperscript{328} and Shahjahan.\textsuperscript{329} He was much impressed by the beauty of the Muslim constructions and the generous and kind way they treat their subjects in times of trouble.

\textsuperscript{320} The concept of rebirth among the Hindus. According to this concept every person comes back to this world after his death. If he does good acts in the first life he comes into good form otherwise he appears in the form of some animals or insects.

\textsuperscript{321} Suttee was a custom among the Hindus. According to this custom a good woman had to burn into ashes with the body of her deceased husband alive.

\textsuperscript{322} Sleeman, Rambles, pp. 34-40. In this way he quotes that a women of Lodi Muslim Tribe insisted on being Suttee with a Hindu who was not even her husband on the claim that the deceased was her husband in the earlier birth.

\textsuperscript{323} Ibid., pp. 198-200.

\textsuperscript{324} Ibid., pp. 38-39.

\textsuperscript{325} Ibid., p. 254.

\textsuperscript{326} Ibid., p.144.

\textsuperscript{327} Ibid., p.137.

\textsuperscript{328} Ibid., pp.318-324.

\textsuperscript{329} Ibid., chapter 52.
That is why the indigenous population does not indulge in the feelings of hatred against their superiors and rulers.\textsuperscript{330}

However, he traces the decline of the Mughal Empire in the intolerant behaviour of the Muslims. By writing his dialogues with the Muslims, he tries to indicate that the Muslims are intolerant even among themselves. On the testimony of a Muslim religious scholar, he highlights that the Muslims are divided into seventy-two sects and every sect challenges the authenticity of others.\textsuperscript{331} In this perspective, he is not surprised by the reversal of Akbar's tolerant policy towards non-Muslims by Aurangzeb. However, he traces the decline of Muslim power in India to this reversal. The Rajput blood had contributed a lot in the strength of the Mughal Empire, but Aurangzeb's policy created a sense of enmity among the Hindus and the Muslims. However, Sleeman believes that this enmity was a blessing for the British rule in India.

\textbf{6.4. Indian Institutions.}

Sleeman is of the opinion that the Indians had never established a sound system of government and laws. There were no institutions like that of the European senate, assembly, bar or bench. The absence of any law of succession among the Muslim seems to Sleeman an important cause of political instability in India. It provided the opportunities to the obedient subjects and nobles to change their allegiance from one candidate of succession to the other and created political unrest in the country. Sleeman finds the footing of contemporary unrest in this seclusion. He blames that there was no law of succession in Islam, which had resulted in this seclusion.\textsuperscript{332} He points out the rise of Pindaris, Freebooters and Thuggs as a result of this trend. He also blames that the Thuggs were the disciples of Hazrat Nizam-ud-din Aulia.\textsuperscript{333} However, he tries to prove that Islam and Muslims were creating problems of law and order for the British government.

However, he admits that although the Muslim rule was despotic but there was an efficient system of local government.\textsuperscript{334} He advises the British government to establish

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{330} Ibid., p.152.
\textsuperscript{331} Ibid., pp.48-49.
\textsuperscript{332} Ibid., pp.239-240.
\textsuperscript{333} Ibid., pp.491-492.
\textsuperscript{334} Ibid., p.394.
\end{flushleft}
good terms with local population, levy tolerant taxes and promote Hindu-Muslim differences.\textsuperscript{335}

As a whole, Sleeman sees the degeneration of the Hindus as a result of the Muslim rule. However, he admits the Muslims' contribution to the development of Indian institutions and to the maintenance of law and order in India. His views seem contradictory as to harmonizing the imperial motives with the sympathy to the natives.

7. Conclusion.

India had always occupied a considerable place in the western thought. The modern Indian romance was the out come of the late eighteenth century Romantic Movement against extreme contemporary rationalism. The romanticism focused on antiquity, literature, passions and diverse and distinct aspects of nature of man, society, culture, civilization and universe against rational focus on cotemporary state and society. The romanticists were more concerned with the people and passions than institutions and constitutions. Their source of pleasure and inspiration seems to be the diversity of language, culture, race, ritual, and religion, having a tradition from antiquity. The romanticism promoted such trends for the understanding of western civilization, and applied these parameters to the understanding of the Orient, thus gave birth to orientalism. In this perspective, it was the "Oriental Romanticism". Sir William Jones appears to be the solitary figure to give birth to modern orientalism, historical antiquarianism, Indian romance and "Indology".

Oriental romanticists' criterion for the identification of status of civilization links them with the common people through culture and religion through rituals, customs and traditions. The politics and government become one with religion, rituals and culture. They idealize the mythological rulers in the form of saviours of their people or heroes in the form of poets, writers, warriors and benevolent rulers. Laws and administration appear to be the facilitators of the people for their benefits, based on their customs, traditions and rituals.

Oriental romanticists', historiography of India as well as Muslim India under goes an evolutionary change during the period under discussion. It represents the change not

\textsuperscript{335} Ibid., pp. 482-483.
only in the western romantic thought but also the change of issues, problems, concerns and motives in India as well as in the British Indian aspirations and policy. The contemporary rival schools of thought, especially, missionary and utilitarian further aggravated it. Jones had initiated the romantic vision in the late eighteenth century with a view to focus on the understanding of Indian culture and religion to provide justice to the people of India. In his understanding India appears a land of Hindus. Thus, Jones was unable to assign the Muslims any proper place, except that of a non-indigenous religious community and his concern was just to provide justice to the Muslims, according to their own religious laws under the British administration. Otherwise, Jones was interested in the racial and cultural orientations of the people. In this way, romanticists separated themselves from the enlightened focus on Muslim India.

The Indian romance diverted the attention of the romanticists toward the antiquity, race and literature. The dialectics of contemporary and of the ancients, between the enlightened and romantic, led the romanticists toward the ancient Hindus against the Muslims. Accepting the indigenous character of the Hindus and exotic character of the Muslims, Jones neglect of Muslim India seems to be replaced by Thomas Maurice. The conflict between ancient Indian romance and imperial motives were at its peak in Maurice’s historiography. Maurice blamed the Muslims for the degeneration of the Hindu civilization as foreign imperial power. Malcolm and Elphinstone tried to assign the Indian Muslims a place among the indigenous people; their treatment seems an attempt to undermine their separate character as a community of nations. Their effects appear an attempt to assimilate Hindu civilization with utilitarians’ Muslim civilization. The utilitarians had assigned Muslim civilization a better place than that of the Hindus and by eliminating the distinction between the two and by combining the two civilizations, they try to reject the utilitarian criticism of Hinduism. These trends seem to be at their extreme in Sleeman. He not only defends Hinduism but also criticizes Islam and the Muslims and tries to prove that the evils of Hinduism were a result of its interaction with Islam.

In this regard, Hinduism appears to be the central concern of the romanticists. They looked at Islam and the Indian Muslim with an antithetic view. By placing them as a foreign community or by merging them into Hindus, they seem to be curbing the identity
of the Indian Muslims. The attempt to harmonise the romanticism with the utilitarianism also aims to the glorification of Hinduism. Although during the early years romanticists had a thorough support of the missionaries on the policy matters, the trend seems to be replaced after the rise of utilitarianism and the Scottish missionaries arrival in India. After the 1820s, the concept of the superiority of the western civilization dominated the British mind, which remained operative until the 1840s. After 1840 a wave against the Muslims again revives the romance of Hinduism. Therefore, during the 1820 to 1840s, the romantic issues were focused on the issues of the contemporary or comparative problems and methods, reviving the Hindu rituals and religious culture afterwards.

The theories of British treatment of India as “self and other” are positively traced from the majority of the romantic writings, especially, literary. The divisions still exist in the debate on the Indian identities. However, Malcolm and Elphinstone’s differentiation between the Indian “civilization” and Indian “nations” has laid the foundation of a new school of Ethno-Regional Orientalists that treated the Indian identities, separately, and which is the subject matter of the next chapter.

The romantic historiography had imperial administrative objectives. As the Muslims were the ruling elite and majority of the population was Hindu, so, by a sympathetic view of Hinduism, the British were seeking the popular support of Hindus against their rival Muslim power. Simultaneously, under the modern concept of nationalism, they want to set an administration according to the national traits of the subject people.
Chapter Four:

THE ETHNO-REGIONAL ROMANTICISTS

This chapter aims to analyse the Ethno-Regional British historiography of Muslim India at the level of the nations inhabiting the Indian subcontinent or South Asia. Ethno-Regional romance emerges as a result of the application of romantic ways and ideals to the level of coherent units of historical studies. In this regard, five examples from the nations of South Asia in British historiography have been taken for evaluation. Charles Stewart takes the Bengalis as a nation that was governed by the foreign Muslims. However, inspite of a sort of conflict and controversy, the province of Bengal always seems to Stewart an important region in Indian politics due to its prosperity. Wilks' Mysore appears to be a model for apology for the British policy. He seems to be of the opinion that Mysore had always been a centre of Hindu resistance to the Muslims and the House of Hyder Ali was established without legitimacy. In this perspective, he tries to affirm the Hindu base of Mysore state and justifies the over-throw of the Muslim ruling house. In the same way, Duff discusses the rise of the Marathas as a result of the conciliatory policy of the Muslim state. In this regard, Marathas appear in his understanding as direct heirs to the house of the Mughuls in India. James Tod highlights the importance of the Rajputs' character by comparing it with the chivalrous norms of medieval Europe. Focusing on their foreign origin, Tod accepts their status as a nation. He sees the Rajputs as a permanent factor in the strength as well as decline of the Mughul Empire. In the same way, Cunningham sees Sikhs as a foreign nation identifying itself through a new religion having the qualities of all Indian religions. In this perspective, Ethno-Regional Romanticists believed in a multi-national status of the subcontinent.

1. Ethno-Regional Romance.

1.1. Emergence of Ethno-Regional Romance.

By the beginning of Nineteenth century, Romanticism had emerged as a term applied in varied ways, deriving its intellectual foundations from the romance of Greek-Roman civilization, aided by historicism. Antiquity, literature and romance and exploration of unknown venues in human history, thought and imagination were its focus areas. Combined with Orientalism, romanticists looked at the Orient with an understanding based on
superficial generalizations as a unit on the scale of similarities and dissimilarities with the Occident, in the background of antiquarianism. However, these units were constructed on some major geographical realities such as India, China, Arabia, etc. Looking at these realities from the distance from Europe to Asia in a commercial and Euro-centric intellectual perspective with political and imperial motives, Oriental romanticists' focus remained on the study of ancient civilizations in terms of more superficial generalizations, determining the relation of priority and posterity between the civilizations. By the beginning of the nineteenth century the romanticists began to infuse their concepts of diversity, antiquity, language and literature, and amusement to the lower level of identifiable units of historical studies.

This tendency seems to be emerging out of a number of factors and forces that were promoting the concept of unity in diversity rather than the concept of diversity in unity. The growing researches and application of the methods of historical criticism in the study of Christian scripture and Greek-Roman civilization had begun to challenge the concept of the unity of Greek-Roman civilization as well as scripture. Evolutionary and contributory nature of scripture and diversified and dissimilar system of Greek-Roman mythology had began to attract the attention of the researchers to the aspects of diversity, not between the civilizations, but rather among the various ethical, commercial, racial, political and cultural units, claiming their own separate identities as nations, under the influence of modern individualism. In this perspective, by the beginning of the nineteenth century, the romance of nationalism had began to create a sort of upheaval in the European ethnic, cultural, linguistic and regional communities, breaking the strength of the Empires and Emperors in Europe.

This Ethno-Regional romance seems to be further boosted by the colonial and imperial motives, same as Orientalism and oriental romance. By the penetration of Western imperial powers into oriental lands, they came into contact with the public and culture of people rather than with the political and commercial elite. The conquests and out coming political problems further aggravated the ethno-regional romance and, as a result, ethno-regional studies.

The rise of ethno-regional romance can be seen in two perspectives; one can trace that the imperialists used the ethno-regional romance to create a fragmentation and decentralization among the different ethnic and regional communities and, in this way, weakened the target or enemy empires. Simultaneously, to improve the administration of the conquered areas, the
imperial administrators tried to understand the systems, rituals, laws, customs, habits, history, religion, geography, language and literature of the people of different regions and ethnicities, so that an adequate system of administration for local people could be devised. In this way, ethno-regional romance seems to be a methodological as well as administrative phenomenon.

1.2. Ethno-Regional Indian Romance.

The late eighteenth century ethno-regional Indian romance emerged out of the problems of empire. British ethno-regional writings during the period were primarily motivated by regional literature or romance of contacts with the conquered people. However, due to the rise of the moral and administrative debate on philosophical grounds, the ethno-regional romance took the form of a separate school. The necessity of contacts with the people of different dialects and problem of assessment of revenue at local level connected the late eighteenth century British administrators with the people of different regions in a form devoid of oriental romantic vision. Simultaneously, the romance of conquests seems to be elevated to show the bravery and superiority of the British who had a commitment to the cause of liberating Indian people from the yoke of oriental despotism and who were committed to elevate the righteousness, justice and legitimacy in social and political affairs, which were absent in the earlier system.¹

However, the ethno-regional romance seems to be taking its real shape under the Scottish-British philosopher administrators, mostly motivated by Mackintosh and Elphinstone, against the blind Euro-centric view of the degeneracy of the Indian people, radical social change and replacement of local institutions with the Western institutions as a universal administrative principle. Liberals, Utilitarian and Evangelicals' plea against romantic views of Indian civilization and for the introduction of Western institutions radically, was creating problems for the Anglo-Indian administrators in the form of resistance among the local people. These pleas were also motivating the application of restrictions on the authority of the administrators in the same way as were applied in Britain. The administrators were of the view that with such restrictions they could not be able to keep in control on or contact with the local people. They adopted the view that India was a "continent" consisting of so many nations, cultures, languages and communities and could

¹ This type of argument can be seen in every British writing on India during the period. In this understanding, local or pre-British systems were considered totally unjust and the British appears to be serving a moral duty by conquering and civilizing India.
not be administered or governed under a single universal principle even in indigenous ways, let alone on the Western model. They argued in favour of a multiplicity of administrative models and methods by approaching the regional history, culture, language, manners, customs and religions of the people, opposing the idea of radical social change on Western model. They tried to prove that the concept of the unity of Indian government and administration even under the Great Mughuls was an error.

The Ethno-Regional romance appears as a view devoid of the oriental romanticists’ view of Indian nationalism and Sanskrit language. The concept in itself seems to be shattering the myth of the unity of antiquarian Indian religion and civilization in the perspective of diversity of laws, rituals, norms, behaviour, manners, customs, religion and system of government and administration in India. In this perspective Ethno-regional romanticists focused a number of Indian nations, claiming their own identities on the basis of ethnic, regional, linguistic or literary heritage. The concepts are very much criticized by the Indian nationalists even today.

A number of such works can be found on every part of South Asia. However in this chapter our focus will remain over five ethnic regional historians, Charles Stewart, Mark Wilks, James Grant Duff, James Tod and J.D. Cunningham writing respectively on Bengal, Mysore, Marathas, Rajputana and Sikhs.

2. Charles Stewart: Muslim Rule in Bengal.

2.1. Charles Stewart (1764-1837).

Charles Stewart was a famous Orientalist. His eighteenth century career was dominated by military service. However, the year eighteen hundred till his death he won fame as an Orientalist and an academician, serving the Fort William College as well as East India Company’s Hailbury College.

2.1.1. Setting of Stewart’s Thought.

Born in a family having a background of military services, Charles Stewart was educated in the traditional learning of the family. However, the dominant trends of the enlightenment seem to be influencing his bent of mind as a transitory period. In this perspective, he seems to be ready to inter-relate medieval times with the contemporary developments in India. His arrival in India as the Company’s military servant, a few years before William Jones, seems
to be connecting him more with enlightened tradition than with the school of Jones. As enlightenment pattern was dominated by the study of Mughul India and his administrative problems were connected with contemporary history, Stewart seems to be attempting to understand the contemporary administrative problem through the experience and eyes of his predecessors - the Mughuls. For that, he learnt Arabic, Persian and Hindustani languages, all three connected with Mughul rulers and Muslim community. This linguistic bridge seems to be linking him with the linguistic and literary romance of the time, but not with the antiquarian or Sanskrit language. His career as an assistant professor of Persian, Arabic and Hindustani in contact with Gladwin\(^2\) at Fort William College seems to be strengthening his attitude towards the study of medieval Muslim India. His career as a writer and academician after 1806 at Hailbury confirms this attitude. At Hailbury, his earlier writings show his tendencies towards regional studies, which seem to be diverting to the study of Mughul imperial history in the form of the translations of the memoirs. However our concern in this study will remain with his regional interests, especially with Bengal. In this perspective, his works seem to be purposive exercise to understand the Bengal region of India, with a motive of utilizing it for the policy orientation of British Indian administration.\(^3\)

2.1.2. Stewart’s Concept of History.

Stewart believed in purposive history as a “monument of antiquity” relevant to the contemporary world. He seems to be looking at history in terms of a continuity of past in present and condemns the admiration of ruins “merely for their romantic situation or picturesque beauties”.\(^4\) In this way, he rejects any claim of antiquity without proper evidence.\(^5\) He takes history as a source of information “instructive” as well as “interesting” showing “pleasing” reflections. So, a contemporary or relevant to contemporary history seems important to Stewart. However, he takes it as a recall of “happiest period”.\(^6\) History appears to him as a progress from barbarianism to civilization.\(^7\) He seems to be of the opinion that history should narrate the “state of civilization” and “progress of arts and sciences”. For that, his focus remains on the political history. He seems to be seeing the progress of

\(^2\) Gladwin was also appointed the Professor of Persian language at Fort William College about the same time.


\(^5\) Ibid., p. v.

\(^6\) Ibid., p. 1.

\(^7\) Ibid., p. 1.
civilization attached with the strength of government and focuses on the personal abilities of rulers for the strength and success of a system or dynasty to rule. For him, administrative policies were a reflection of the personality of a ruler. However, religion and morals seem to have no prominent place in his estimate. He sees the evolution of civilization as a political process culminated in the progress of “arts and sciences”. He criticizes the Muslim historians for missing such narrations due to despotic nature of Muslim government, focus of education on military habits, historians being pensioners of the monarch and non-suitability of narration of arts and science to the readers’ aptitude.

2.1.3. Stewart’s Unit of Historical Studies.

Following the enlightened trends of Indian studies, contemporary history having its roots in the Mughul period seems to be Charles Stewart’s unit of historical studies. As an administrator academician during the period of James Mill’s influence, political history of a period connected to the company’s rise seems to be his major concern. However his concern remains focused on the understanding of Indian problems through the local authorities and in this regard his major focus appears in the from of translation of the sources of the political history of India under the Mughuls. As Bengal was the centre of British power in India, the history and administration of Bengal seem to be his early concern, although he had already produced a number of works on some regional issues.

His Assessment of the Muslim rule in Bengal is sympathetic. For him, Muslim rule had contributed a lot to the welfare of the Bengali people and he generally admires the character of the Muslim rulers of Bengal. He sees the history of Bengal in the British colonial context. At that time the nature of British policy and the character of the Anglo-Indian administrators were the burning issues for Stewart as an administrator. There was a harsh criticism of British Indian administration and in this perspective he seems to be seeking guidance from the Muslim period of rule in Bengal. However, a comparison of Muslim rule and British rule seems to be a big problem for Stewart. So, he declared his contemporary Muslim rule in Bengal unjust, unwise and cruel.

---

8 Ibid., p. ii.
9 Ibid., p. ii.
2.2. Stewart’s History of Bengal.

Charles Stewart published his history of Bengal in 1813 at a time when British rule in India and especially in Bengal was paramount. His history covers a period from “the first Mohammedan invasion until the virtual conquest of that country by the English”. He begins by Sultan Mahmud of Ghazni and following the Muslim dynasties looks at the Governors of Bengal up to 1756, all as subordinates to central authority. He has divided his history into sections, every section containing an account of a Governor. The contemporary kings of England are also mentioned. A list of Governors is also included in the form of a four column table; first column for Christian dates; second for Hijra dates; third for the names of Governors of Bengal and fourth for the Emperors of Hindostan. It seems a sort of translation of a source although written in a very simple style and language. In core, it seems to be motivated by imperial administrative motives.

2.3. Bengali Nation and Foreign Rule.

Taking India as a land inhabited by a number of “nations”, Charles Stewart accepts the status of the natives of Bengal as a nation on the basis of Bengali language and literature. However he rejects any antiquarian claim of their existence as an independent nation at any time in the history of India.\(^{10}\) He differentiates between native Bengalis and foreigners. Hindus appear for Stewart the “original inhabitants” of Bengal having concern with the encouragement of agriculture and commerce through the protection of the fruits of the work of a weak man from the oppression of a powerful.\(^{11}\) Bengalis were peaceful people not inclined towards political or military branches of social service. So, the foreigners dominated these departments.\(^{12}\) Therefore, Bengal remained a tributary to Oudh, Delhi or Magadha. Secure from foreign invasion because of its geographical and environmental conditions. Bengali’s militarily and politically dominating rulers of foreign origin were equally safe from any insurrection of the natives because of the mildness of disposition and aversion to war of natives.\(^{13}\)

\(^{10}\) Ibid., p. v.
\(^{11}\) Ibid., pp. ix-x.
\(^{12}\) Ibid., p.v.
\(^{13}\) Ibid., p.vii.
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2.4. Rise of Muslim Power in Bengal.

Charles Stewart sees the rise of Muslim power in Bengal in the perspective of the Muslim power in India. As there was always room for foreigners in the political and military departments, the Muslim rulers were despotic and tyrants, giving no room to the people for politics. On the other hand, every Muslim individual was educated from his childhood in military habits.\textsuperscript{14} Stewart takes both these traditions as suitable to rule Bengal. Rejecting authenticity of ancient sources, he begins his History of Bengal with the Mahmud's invasion of India. Depicting Mahmud's invasions in terms of ravages, destructions of temples and killings of Hindus, Stewart sees the History of Bengal as a continuity of his legacy by later emperors and governors.\textsuperscript{15} This legacy was not only extended towards the Hindus, but also even to their own fellow believers of Mohammedanism.\textsuperscript{16}

Inspite of this stern, cruel and despotic depiction of Muslim rulers and soldiery, and the view that the Muslims were averse to arts and sciences, Stewart sees the history of Bengal as a gradual rise of Hindus "from a state of barbarism to a high degree of civilization".\textsuperscript{17} In this way he seems to be accepting that Muslim or foreign rulers contributed a lot to the development of a high degree of civilization in Bengal and at the time of the first European visit to Bengal during the Mughul period, Bengal was enjoying a high degree of civilization. The view that Muslims had no aptitude for arts and sciences as symbols of civilization and acceptance of the role of Muslim rulers in attaining the high degree of civilization appear contradictory to each other.

2.5. Afghan Dominance in Pre-Mughul Bengal.

Stewart mentions that Bengal was governed by a number of foreign races, before the arrival of the Mughuls, including Abyssinians, Slaves\textsuperscript{18}, Khiljis, and Afghans, all Muslims by religion.\textsuperscript{19} Afghans proved to be the most powerful and important nation until their conflict with the Emperor Akbar.\textsuperscript{20}

\textsuperscript{14} \textit{Ibid.}, p. iii.
\textsuperscript{15} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 36.
\textsuperscript{16} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 55.
\textsuperscript{17} \textit{Ibid.}, p. v.
\textsuperscript{18} Not finding any difference between a ruler from a racial group and slaves, Stewart considers slaves a racial group equally struggling for power in Bengal like Afghans.
\textsuperscript{19} Charles Stewart, \textit{History of Bengal, London.} 1813, p. 114
\textsuperscript{20} \textit{Ibid.}, p.149.
Stewart compares the government of the Afghans with the feudal system of Goths and Vandals in Europe. The conquerors reserved certain districts as their own dominion and other districts were assigned to the inferior chiefs of army, who sub divided the land among the petty commanders of their army for the maintenance of their bands of soldiers, consisting of their relations. However, their lands were cultivated by the Hindu tenants and Afghan officers served as landlords of small estates. These officers governed their states on the principles of justice and moderation without religious bigotry. In this perspective he assumes that although in this system private property was little regarded, “the cultivators of soil would have been placed in a state of comparative happiness and agriculture would have flourished, as it was later under the government of Rohilla Afghans”. However, he takes the rise of Sher Shah as an example of Afghan influence and efficiency of the system.21

As a whole, he takes the era of Afghan kings of Bengal as an era of instability for the governing princes but stability for the ruled.22


Stewart maintains that although conditions of Hindu cultivators under the Afghans were in a state of happiness but the condition of the upper classes of Hindus deteriorated. However, many Afghan officers farmed out their estates to the Hindus who were also permitted to retain the advantages of manufacture and commerce.23 The racial competition between the Afghans and the Mughuls provided Hindus with the opportunities to rise. Due to the continuous revolts of the Afghans, Akbar gave prominent positions to the Hindus.24 In this period Stewart sees the Mughul history as a period of conflict between Afghans, Mughuls and Hindus which gave rise to Hindu influence in politics and soldierly.

2.7. Bengal’s Relation with the Empire.

Stewart applies the internal conflict among the foreign races for power in Bengal to Bengal’s relation with the central imperial government. He sees these relations in the form of a continuous struggle between centre and the provinces. The provinces were an important part of the Empire, capable of maintaining independence because of their wealth. So, the

21 Ibid., pp. 164-165.
22 Ibid., p. 165.
23 Ibid., p. 165.
24 Ibid., p. 171.
success and secure condition of a governor and distorted state of the central government always influenced the ambition of independence among the governors of Bengal.  

As a whole, the sovereigns of Bengal were undisturbed in their possession of Bengal during the period when the Empire of Delhi was torn to pieces by ambitious aristocracy, both pre-Mughal and Mughal. However, the governors failed to maintain independence due to the strong central despotism, although some of them tried to seek the help of Timur and Nadir Shah.

2.8. Relations between Bengal and British.

In the history of wars among different foreign fractions, Stewart adds Portuguese as "plunderers and pirates". However, the wars between the Portuguese and the Muslims seem to Stewart religious in substance in which Hindus remained neutral.

Stewart presents English as merchants and traders who contributed significantly to the revenue of Bengal. Depicting Aurangzeb as a bigoted ruler, he praises his assessment of the benefits of the cordial relations with the British. He subordinated his passion to policy and established good relations with the British on the ground that they could create problems for the subject people and pilgrims visiting Mecca. However, he condemns all those governors and emperors trying to check the growth of British commerce in India, especially Shayista Khan, Ali Verdi Khan and Siraj-ud-daula. He presents them as scourges of humanity, devoid of any sense of morals, tyrants, selfish, foolish and oppressors of the human race, having every evil habit that was condemned by the society. He presents them as "enemies of trade and commerce" and even of civilization.

Stewart sees the interference of British in local politics justified to defend the progress of trade as a source of civilization. Bengal trade and commerce was vital for British and for the growth of civilization in India. He sums up his History of Bengal by the appointment of Mir Jafar and sees the power and influence of English paramount in Bengal. However, by

---

25 Ibid., p. 65.
26 Ibid., p. 96.
27 Ibid., pp. 208, 242.
28 Ibid., p. 326.
29 Ibid., pp. 301, 442, 443.
giving a list of tutelage Nabobs up to 1810, Stewart shows the nature of British control over Bengal.

Stewart seems to be highlighting the importance of Bengal in India on the one hand and, the importance of foreign rule on the other. By depicting Bengal as a seat of contest among different foreign ethnic forces during the Muslim rule in India, he seems to be extending the scope of wars between English and other European and Muslim contesters. In this perspective he seems to be presenting British as the successors of the Mughuls as they had been of the Afghans.

3. Mark Wilks: An Apology for the Abolition of Muslim Rule in Mysore.

3.1. Mark Wilks (1760-1831).

Mark Wilks has been taken as a devoted soldier, generous, laborious and talented servant of the East India Company. He had been depicted as “a man so enlightened, so judicious, so mild and affable or so much beloved”. His kindness for the people under his administration, his firmness and philanthropy caused his departure to be regretted by all ranks either in India or St. Helena. Although he wrote a report on Mysore and a philosophical article on Akhlaq-i- Naṣri of Tusi, yet, his Historical Sketches of the South of India, in an Attempt to Trace the History of Mysore from the Origin of the Hindu Government to the extinction of Mohomedan Dynasty in 1799, won a real fame for him. Although considered a conservative and romanticist, he was praised as first systematic historian drawing his conclusion on a vast study of primary sources on the philosophical and theoretical

31 Wilks, Sketches, Vol. I, p. vii. Mark Wilks, Historical Sketches of the South of India, in an Attempt to Trace the History of Mysore from the Origin of the Hindu Government to the Extinction of Mohomedan Dynasty in 1799, Three Volumes, was first published from London during 1810 to 1817. It was republished in 1867 from Madras and again in 1932. However, in this research, Mark Wilks and Murray Hammick’s edition published from Delhi in 1990 is being used.
foundations. However, he seems more to be a moral imperialist and apologist for British rule and policy in India. His focus on South India represents an Ethno-Regional Romanticist tinted with the romance of British success and moral righteousness. Wilks served the British administration in India for twenty-six years and after his return to England in 1808, was appointed the Governor of St. Helena till the arrival of Napoleon Bonaparte.

3.1.1. Setting of Wilks' Thought.

Mark Wilks' system of thought seems to be determined by a number of forces and factors. Born in an educated family, he was brought up in a religious atmosphere. His early education, to become a minister, brought to his focus medieval history, classical languages and literature. Under this religious and Medieval growth of mind, the question of moral justification of human actions seems to have become central. After his arrival in India, his contacts with the administrators brought up under Scottish philosophical tradition, such as James Mackintosh and John Malcolm seem to be extending Wilks' moral concern from religious to philosophical and theoretical perspective, a genuine interest of Scottish administrators, dominated by contemporary romantic trends propagated by the Asiatic Society of Bengal. However, a long Indian career as Military administrator kept him occupied with the military and political problems of conquests, peace and administration in India, the problems which became central to his researches as an observer. His return at a time of conflict between the forces of revolution and reaction in Europe seems to be affecting his thought very deeply. He seems to be looking at Indian problem under the issues of debate in internal European politics such as legitimacy, big powers, balance of power, property

40 He was posted as Resident of Mysore in place of John Malcolm.
42 He arrived in Madras in 1782, became secretary to Military Board in 1786, was appointed Fort-adjutant of St. George in 1789 and served as Brigade Major, Assistant Adjutant General, Military Secretary to General Stuart, Private Secretary to the Governor, Town-Major and Military Secretary to the Commander in Chief. He retired to England after serving as Political Resident at Mysore from 1803 to 1808.
43 See preface to the first edition of Wilks, Sketches.
rights, enlightened administration, reforms and relations with colonies.\(^4^4\) As a whole his religious and moral humanitarianism, combined with the romantic literary and philosophical approach in imperial perspective seems to have developed Wilks’ outlook towards life, politics and administration along with contemporary European intellectual and political debate. Simultaneously, contemporary liberal man-centred and Europe-centred view of empire seems to compel him to play a wider role in the form of an historian to influence the British political and administrative policy in India. In this perspective his historiography has a dual purpose of apology for British policy and guidance for British administration.

3.1.2. Wilks’ Concept of History.

For Wilks, history appears to be a purposive exercise to satisfy the personal “curiosity” and “public interest”.\(^4^5\) In this regard, to learn the lesson from human past to reform the present and to plan the future seems to be his purpose in writing the *Historical Sketches*. Although he relates history with the character and manners of people based on the romantic model,\(^4^6\) but being a “Gibbonian”,\(^4^7\) he looks at history in terms of the rise and fall of states and likes history in its political form.\(^4^8\) States appear to him as the foundation of civilization. As a military administrator, he was much concerned with the contemporary political scenario, which was dominated by the rise and fall of “nabobs” dynasties.\(^4^9\) Thus the rise and fall of “nabobs” becomes his basic concern. However rulers have no prominent place in Wilks’ estimate of development and progress. He sees the political development in terms of rules, laws and principles, providing legitimacy to the rulers and rules. However, he had no interest in the common people. His focus in historiography remains on the justification of British policy in South India. As it was a work of contemporary nature under the utilitarian influence, ancient history had no place for Wilks as symbol of “fables” and “myth”. He criticizes oriental history for its mythological nature.\(^5^0\) In this regard, he had very little interest in ancient past or history of the ancient civilizations. Wilks evaluates history as a narrative of facts, which for him is a “moral obligation” of those who know the facts. Thus,

---

\(^4^4\) His *Sketches* seem to be occupied with a debate on such issues.


\(^4^8\) The trend had become very common under the influence of Gibbon at the end of eighteenth century and beginning of the nineteenth century.


on the basis of the facts that he knows, he develops his model to influence the construction of contemporary political and administrative debate on British India.\textsuperscript{51} In this perspective his history emerges as comparative, discursive, dialectical and polemical.\textsuperscript{52} Wilks believes that history should be written on the testimony of sound primary sources, or on personal observations, presenting all the aspects of a society and having the ability to solve the current problems of a society.

Wilks divides history into ancient, medieval and modern periods and compares the three periods. For Wilks, ancient states were savage and rude, but independent republics and they maintained their independence even during the medieval despotism. Neither ancient nor medieval times had peace and security. Wilks criticizes modern claims of self-superiority and modern notion of the inferiority of savage man appears to Wilks, his superiority over Modern man. The savage and rude men were exempt from modern "universal error" that "his state and his alone, is wisest, happiest and best".\textsuperscript{52} Wilks believes that these ideas can best be verified through the study of Indian History.

Wilks assigns an important role to religion in the political process. He considers religion as a divine instrument to change the world. He sees the growth and development of state and challenges to the state in terms of their impacts on the religion. He justifies the aggression of British administration against the native states as defence of Christian religion against Islam. However, he does not take Hinduism as a rival and defends the restoration of Hindu monarchies.

\textbf{3.1.3. Wilks Unit of Historical Studies.}

As a "Gibbonian", political history seems to be Wilks' central focus, in terms of the rise and fall of states. However, two basic facts in the formation of his thought system seem to be altering this formation. First, that as a military administrator, he was much concerned with contemporary problems. Second that as contemporary geo-political scene was dominated by the "nabobs", his focus seems to be shifting from empire and state to "nabobs", almost independent of degenerated central authority. In this regard, the politics and mutual relations of the "nabobs" among themselves and with the British seem to be his central theme and basic concern. In this interest, his concern to the ancient or medieval Indian past appear as a

\textsuperscript{51} Ibid., Vol. 1, p. xxi, xxv.
\textsuperscript{52} Ibid., Vol. 1, p.2.
product of his justification, apology, interpretation and explanation of his contemporary British policy. However, focusing the role of British military and administration, Wilks defends them very strongly. In this regard, he defends, appreciates and promotes the cause and stand point of British Indian civil and military establishment. However his questions are based on his contemporary Whig-conservative debates and dialogue which was going on in Europe after his return and in which he was personally involved as the governor of St. Helena, Napoleon’s destination after deposition. In this dialogue, he seems to be supporting conservative cause through traditional morality, by tracing the foundation of all modern trends from ancient and medieval society, like Gibbon.

In this perspective, apology for the British rule was a central theme of Wilks’ history. However, this focus appears in the form of an apology against the extinction of the Muslim rule. So, the Muslim rule in South India appears to be competitive of British rule. He sees the Muslim rule as rival of and challenge to the British rule. Therefore, his attitude seems to be sympathetic towards the Hindus and antithetic towards the Muslims. This attitude seems to be constructed by contemporary trends in the European thought as well as in the politics. Writing in an age of conflict, he seems to be following the traditional approach of enlightenment against the romance of French revolution. Conservative romance of legitimacy and philosophical slogan of utility seem to be attracting in the background of religious footing of these concepts. Simultaneously, constitutionalism, democracy and public rights had become the part of western tradition for Wilks. Wilks applies these concepts to the understanding of Indian history. However, Wilks seems to disagree with the application of these concepts to the Indian politics as these concepts had become identical with the French influence and British-French rivalry was an important factor in the development of Wilks’ historiographical logic.

3.2. Mark Wilks’ South India.

Mark Wilks’ India appears to be a region, consist of many smaller states, conflicting with each other, either under the local Hindu or foreign Muslim sovereigns. Wilks accepts the view that this region was primarily an area of Hindu religious, cultural and political origin.

---

54 Ibid., Vol. I, passim.
55 The view was strongly presented by William Robertson and was later promoted by H. T. Colebrooke, who considered South India as the origin of all Hindu nations. The views seem to be influencing later the views of E.
dominated by Marathas. Its original political structure was founded on indigenous mythological tradition, accepting the legitimacy of sovereign houses on the basis of their claims to ancient Hindu mythological lineage. In this way, Wilks determines the original and legitimate inhabitants of South India. These sovereign dynasties originally had a very moderate system of government, preserving property rights and an enlightened system of revenue collection. The rise of Muslim power led them to a state of subjugation under the central government, or during the period of decentralization, under the regional Muslim powers such as Golkonda and Bijapur. However, they maintained their identity and independent status. The traditional Orientalists’ view of the miseries of the Hindus becomes less important in Wilks understanding through the study of minute details in the manners of people which broke the force of despotism by the spirit of independence. In this way, Wilks seems to be presenting South India as an independent region. However, he looks at the history of this region in terms of wars, conquests and destruction, missing peace and security, presenting the rise and fall of dynasties in the forms of the houses of “nabobs”. For Wilks, these dynasties were unable to establish a strong interior rule and fell to “sudden ruin” or gradual dissolution. If the rule of these dynasties was prolonged to a few generations, consequences of wealth, relaxed forces, warrior chiefs and cupidity of neighbours undermined its prosperity. Wilks sees the best example of such trends in the rise and fall of ruling dynasties in the state of Mysore. In this perspective, he focuses his interest on the rise and fall of Muslim power in the South India.

3.3. Mysore: A Legitimacy of Independent Identity, State and Dynasty.

In the background of the view that South India maintained its independent status throughout history, Mark Wilks traces the history of Mysore as a separate and independent state. As in medieval dynastic interpretation and in modern western nationalist interpretation,


58 Ibid., Vol. I, Chapter I, passim.
60 Ibid., Vol. I, p.2.
state has been taken as a national identity. Wilks seems to be tracing a nation. Defining South India, as a region South of River Kistna, Wilks distinguishes it from Deccan, and accepts its separate identity on the ground that this region always maintained its independent status and never came under direct Muslim rule. Wilks identifies the region as ancient Dravida and an independent state in ancient times as Carnatic, a Canara language-speaking region, ruled by families claiming mythological origins. By the fourteenth century, the region came under continuous Muslim invasions due to the "extravagant fame" of its riches to plunder. The conquest of Deccan Hindu states shifted the centre of Hindu politics to this Southern region, which led to the formation of Hindu Empire of Vijayanagar. Wilks points out that inspite of successive inroads, cruelties and plunders of South India by the Muslim Mughuls, Vijayanagar grew stronger, partly because of being a Hindu empire and partly because of Mughal Pathan political conflict in India and resisted the Muslim arms. Foreign conquest and explosion of Muslims were more fashionable themes at the Court of Vijayanagar. However, he remarks the idea of civil liberty as absent from their political code. Much of these areas escaped from Muslim Conquests until the rise of Hyder Ali in 1763.

Subversion of Vijayanagar by the confederacy of Muslim states of Deccan, in the later half of the sixteenth century, appears to Wilks, creating opportunities for the rise of new dynasties. Raj dynasty of the village of Mysore was one of them. Disastrous state of affairs, emerging out of Aurangzeb's Deccan policy, seems to Wilks to have provided room for the extension of the territories of Mysore. However, Muslim soldiery, seeking employment

---

63 Ibid., Vol. I, p. 4.
64 Ibid., Vol. I, pp. 4, 17-25. For Wilks, Deccan was the area in between river Nerbudda and Kistna which came under Muslim rule by the fourteenth century.
65 Ibid., Vol. I, pp. 5-6.
69 Ibid., Vol. I, p. 22.
70 Ibid., Vol. I, p. 17.
71 Ibid., Vol. I, p. 29.
73 Ibid., Vol. I, Chapter II.
74 Ibid., Vol. I, p. 113, 118.
under this new dynastic state appears to Wilks the real cause of the strength of Mysore
state.\textsuperscript{75}

Asserting the view of South India as a region always independent of Muslim yoke, Wilks asserts the case of the legitimacy of ruling dynasty on a number of grounds: First, that the family had a royal lineage connected with one of the ancient ruling families of India, founding its legitimacy from mythological tradition.\textsuperscript{76}

Second, that Aurangzeb, the Mughul Emperor accepted the independent status of the state of Mysore under Raj dynasty and guaranteed the sovereignty of the state.

Third, that the dynasty preserved its status even during the Maratha anarchy in South India.

Fourth, that some of the territories comprising the Mysore state were bought by the dynasty from the Marathas. By applying the property rights to right to rule, Wilks seems to be legitimising the rule of the dynasty.

In this perspective, Wilks accepts, rather defends the separate identity of Mysore as a state. In the background of the concept of legitimacy and rise of nationalism in European politics, his acceptance of Mysore as a separate state through history seems to be defining Mysore as a political nation within the wider identity of the unity of Hindu culture and civilization.

3.4. Muslim Rule in Mysore.

Wilks sees the Muslim rule in Mysore in terms of its relations with the Muslim polity and Muslim rule in India. For Wilks, the nature of government in all Eastern nations was despotic and the rulers were tyrants. The Muslim rule in Mysore was an extension of this sort of polity.

3.4.1. Nature of Muslim Polity.

Wilks believes that "despotism of East" is a "law of nature" and there is no difference on the issue between the two great classes of mankind: Hindus and Muslims. For Wilks, this despotism derives its origin from theology, in the form of divine authority. The whole is sacred according to Muslim theology and the Quran is sufficient for temporal as well as religious purposes. Because of this nature of the Muslim creed, rational enquiry has proved itself insufficient to satisfy the Muslim mind. Muslims take the kingdom as a gift of God, and
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\textsuperscript{76} Ibid., Vol. I, Chapter II.
victory as the manifestation of divine will. Caliph or Imam appears to be the vicegerent of God upon earth. Every thing emerges as sacred and unchangeable and leads to a sort of despotism. In this regard, the idea of civil liberty is absolutely alien to the Muslim thought in particular and Eastern thought in general. Simultaneously, there is no “rule of inheritance in the Quran”, which makes room for opportunists and opens the way for political instability and disorder.\(^{77}\) Other than this internal warfare and that war against the non-believers is the religious duty of the every Muslim, leads them to find opportunities for that purpose.\(^{78}\) Wilks seems to be concluding that Eastern and Western system of polity are totally different from each other.

3.4.2. Muslim Rule in India.

For Wilks Muslims are a warrior group of mankind. He takes the Muslim rule as the history of plunders, murders, killings, tyranny, oppression and suppression in terms of wars and conquests. They subverted the Hindus in a state of subjugation. The riches of India attracted the Pathan and the Mughul conquerors to India. They plundered the wealth of India and transferred the wealth to Tartary.\(^{79}\) The encroachment of Muslim arms destroyed the structure of Indian administration and limited the natives to civil administration.\(^{80}\) They usurped all power and wealth, maintaining their foreign status on the strength of their arms. In this way Muslim rule in India appears to him a sort of despotic foreign rule, suppressing the natives in every sense through cruelty and tyranny.

3.4.3. Muslim Rule in Mysore.

Wilks sees the Muslim rule in Mysore as continuation of the Muslim rule in India in terms of foreign, despotic usurpation. Wilks seems to be justifying the destruction of House of Hyder Ali, the Muslim ruling dynasty of Mysore in the late eighteenth century. He looks at Muslim rule in Mysore in this context. His preface to his Historical Sketches, seems primarily a charge sheet against the Muslim rule in India.\(^{81}\) Blaming all the immoral, despotism, tyranny, bigotry and suppression and treachery on the ruling House. Wilks takes Hyder Ali as a usurper who gradually took over all the authority of the Hindu House of
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Mysore, which had never been under Muslim rule, due to internal and external threats and his bravery and war skills. Although Hyder Ali was a wise administrator and he tried to deal with the political and administrative problems very carefully and maintained the legal, moral and legitimate right to rule to the Raj dynasty, the deposed Hindu sovereign and subject population resented at the rise of Hyder Ali. They believed that the Raja and government was hostage to Hyder Ali’s army. However, he was a staunch enemy of the British and tried to create problems for British.

Wilks’ real grievances against Muslim rule in Mysore become clearly visible against Tipu Sultan, the son of Hyder Ali. Tipu Sultan appears to Wilks the worst type of ruler and embodiment of all evils, which a Muslim ruler could be at his worst. He accuses him for personal immorality and all types of bigotry, tyranny, suppression and sectarianism. Tipu deposed the ruling dynasty and established his own direct rule without legitimacy, plundered all wealth of the dynasty, posed very unjust and heavy taxes, threatened the property rights and suppressed the Hindus. He was an enemy of the British and made very regular alliances to destroy the British power in India. For that purpose he developed relations and signed agreements with the French. Wilks sees his wars against the British in a religious context. Wilks visualizes a sort of holy war against the infidels in Tipu’s commitment against the British. In this way, he tries to prove that Tipu was the worst type of rulers and his deposition was a blessing for the subjects living in the state of Mysore and for the British as well as for the Christians.

3.5. Administrative Justification of the Restoration of Mysore State.

Wilks tries to justify the restoration of Mysore state in other ways. It appears that for Wilks the security of the East India Company’s property was the real issue, which had raised a criticism on the issue of restoration of Mysore state. For the British in India the extension of the British rule could be the best way to save the Company’s commercial interests and its property. So Wilks tries to prove that property rights were always respected in India. In the
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ancient India, every state was a republic and property rights were respected in all ways. Although Muslims restricted property rights for the infidels, however, their system of inheritance respects the property rights very strictly. In this regard, he seems to conclude that there is no danger to the British property in India and thus, he tries to justify the British administrators' policy of reconciliation with the local powers.

At a time when Charles Stewart was treating the Bengalis as a separate nation on cultural-lingual grounds, criticizing the absence of political autonomy, Wilks identification of Mysore as a separate entity on the political ground, seems to be a great defence of romantic view of India. However, the identification seems to be a justification of administrative problems. After the fall of Seringapatam, the British did not abolish the Mysore state, but again transferred the government to old ruling Hindu dynasty instead of Muslim. Through his understanding of the history of Mysore, Wilks seems to be justifying this act. He argues that the ancient dynasty was a legitimate one and its restoration has contributed to the strength of the British interests in India. On the same ground, Wilks argues that the local states had a very strong administrative structure and ability to survive. In this regard, plea of the radical and evangelical reformers for social and political changes could not be applied to these states. Wilks stress that the independent status of local states should be maintained. However, he seems to be of the view that by extending a moral and political support for the legitimate rulers, British could get much more commercial and political benefits than by extending direct British rule that may arouse public sentiments against the British.


4.1. James Grant Duff (1789-1858).

James Grant Duff has been taken as one of the most prominent British historians. His only work History of the Marathas has been at a time much criticized for its harsh treatment of the Marathas and much praised as the first authentic source on Maratha history, based on
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primary sources and acute research. Duff wants to treat the rise of Marathas to power as the "immediate predecessors" of the British in the South India and, in this regard, he sees the seeds of the rise of the Marathas under the Muslim rule. He points out that Marathas mutual differences were the root cause of the establishment of Muslim rule in India and a conciliatory policy of the Muslim rulers and a formal political training strengthened the political roots and power of the Marathas. However the Marathas were very rude and barbarous people. The decline of the Mughul Empire proved fatal for Indian people in the form of the rise of the Marathas.

4.1.1. Setting of Duff's Thought.

Born in a Scottish family at the eve of French revolution and rise of romanticism and utilitarianism, James Grant Duff was educated in traditional Scottish manners, having a leaning to Scottish philosophical approach. However his eighteen-years of service in India on military, political, administrative and diplomatic assignments from 1805 to 1823, in an environment of literary romance promoted by the Literary Society of Bombay, under the patronage of Mountstuart Elphinstone, attracted his attention to the Elphinstone's approach to Indian problems and his concept of Indian history. While serving in the military against the Marathas and rendering the political and diplomatic services in Marathas territories, Duff planned to write a History of the Marathas on the pattern initiated by Elphinstone. In this regard, Duff's history appears to be an attempt to understand the Marathas' politics and culture with a motive to utilize this understanding for the solution of contemporary political and administrative problems of British-Maratha territories.

4.1.2. Duff's Concept of History.

Duff had much the same concept of history as that of Elphinstone. Believing in "purposive" history, Duff viewed history as an instructive and informative tool for administration as well as for human curiosity. As guided by Elphinstone, use of an original source and knowledge of local languages was a necessary requirement for the writing of history for Duff. Like Elphinstone, he also differentiated between mythology and history by
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93 James Grant Duff remained in permanent contact with Mountstuart Elphinstone, seeking his guidance on all aspects of his interest. In this regard, Elphinstone Papers, Mss. Eur. F.88 contain a lot of letters exchanged between the two on this matter. However, Elphinstone was not satisfied with the quality of work produced by James Grant Duff.
authenticity through records. Duff sees history in the form of manners, customs and habits of the people, however, much affected by politics and vice-versa. Rise of a community to politics and the forces working behind were his basic concerns. He considers an indigenous ruler as a representative of common people and analyses the government functions in terms of social and political customs and tradition. In his estimate, customs and traditions even surpass the religion. Being a Scottish man, on the model of Scottish enlightenment, Duff did not assign any important role to religion in politics. However, arts, crafts, literature, sciences and architecture appear to be the symbols of civilization. He differentiates between civilization and nations. Civilization appears to be the collective and common mode of different nations in his understanding and nation as a community having common ethic, cultural and political ties as well as interests. All these aspects seem to Duff to be forming the crest of a society, which he sees tied together by an efficient political administration.

4.1.3. Duff's Unit of Historical Studies.

Aiming at the study of the rise of the Marathas as predecessors of the British, contemporary politics was Grant Duff’s unit of historical studies. However, as advised by Elphinstone, this rise could not be understood without an understanding of the progress of the Marathas as a nation under the Muslims and especially their rise to power under the Mughuls since the time of Aurangzeb. So, the nature of British policy towards and relations with Marathas were basic issues for Duff. His concern was to propose a policy, which could control the Maratha predatory plundering and establish good and cordial relations with the Maratha chiefs so that the challenges to the British rule could be minimized. In dealing with the Marathas, Duff’s emphasis remains on the Indian administrative problem, tinged with the romantic views. He seems to be not much interested in the European cultural and intellectual debates, either religious or secular. Contemporary political history of a nation in the form of rise and fall of state seems to be Duff’s primary unit of historical studies.

Duff treats the Muslim rule and Maratha-Muslim relation with a moderate view. He criticises the Muslim leniency towards the Marathas on the one hand, and the measures adopted by Aurangzeb on the other hand. However, his treatment of the Marathas is not sympathetic. He seems to be much influenced by the problems created by the Marathas for the British rule.
4.2. Muslim Conquest of Deccan and the Marathas.

On the footsteps of his predecessor *on the Marathas*, Edward Scott-Waring, and his mentor, Mountstuart Elphinstone, Duff was uncertain about the ancient history of the Marathas. He evaluates the primary contribution of Muslim conquest of Deccan in terms of the availability of proper record of native history. For him, the proper study of the Marathas' culture, religion, customs, economy and politics begins with the study of their conditions at the eve of the Muslim conquests in Deccan. *Defining* the Maratha territories and natural conditions, Duff states that the Marathas had a very firm attachment with their homeland (*Watan*), which was very strong to resist the foreign invasion. A system of chieftainships was the dominant polity of the nation under the titles of Naiks, Poligars and Rajas. So, the success of Muslim arms seems impossible to Elphinstone without aid or help of "native princes". Inspite of the fact that first Muslim state (*Bahmani Kingdom*) in Deccan was established with the aid of native princes, the Muslim conquest of Maharashtra was partial. However, Like Elphinstone, Duff too sees the emergence of a nation in the conciliatory policy of Muslim rulers. The Bahmani Kingdom seems to have provided a centre to the fractioned Maratha chiefs. The desire of the dynasty's founder to "bind all subjects to his interest" began to unite Marathas. In this perspective *Duff sees a prominent part played by the Marathas, although at a subordinate level, in the Deccan's Muslim polity through the capacity of their native chiefs to act as supporters of the kingdom.*

The power and influence of Marathas seems to Duff to have been enhanced by the decline of Bahmani Kingdom and the emergence of the comparatively weaker powers: Bijapur, Ahmadnagar and Golkonda which were competing for supremacy. The conflicts among the states gave Marathas a status and role of the decisive factor in Deccan Affairs. Their influence increased to such a level that they began to hold the posts of the Prime Minister in the Nizam Shahi government under their local title of Peshwa. The Muslim
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rulers showed a great preference for the natives in all respects. This local influence and assimilation of Muslim ruling elite with the Marathas gave them a marvellous strength.

4.3. Mughul Invasion and The Strength of the Marathas.

Duff believes in the great influence of the Mughul invasion in Deccan in the rise of the Marathas. They served the Mughuls as well as Muslim kingdoms of Deccan with a zeal based on self-interest. This inspiration, Duff feels, served the cause of the rise of the Maratha Empire more than the sultans of Deccan or the Mughuls. They deducted a full price for their services. However, Aurangzeb’s Deccan policy seems to Duff a turning point for the elevation of Marathas from the status of imperial auxiliaries to that of imperial power. The destruction of Deccan Muslim States not only disrupted the direct Muslim Maratha contacts, but also lifted a direct check from Marathas. Simultaneously, Shivaji’s emergence as Maratha leader and his military and civil measures, developed to resist Aurangzeb, seem to Duff to provide a kind of cohesion which made the Maratha people a nation. In this sense of nation, during the last twenty years of Aurangzeb’s reign, Duff considers to be a period of “mutual sympathy” among the Marathas which initiated a struggle for independence and this struggle could not be possible without a complete sense of nationhood. Thus Duff sees the process of conversion of Marathas to a nation that began with the Muslim invasion of Deccan, completed by Aurangzeb’s policy. In this regard, Duff believes that Aurangzeb’s politics and policies failed and the Emperor was a “defeated man in his own Empire”. Within thirty years of his death a Maratha empire had come into existence.

4.4. Fall of the Mughuls and the Maratha Empire.

Fall of the Mughuls seems to Duff as the root cause of the rise of Marathas. By the 1740s, Duff sees the Marathas as successors of the Mughuls. However this falls of the Mughuls and rise of the Marathas proved very destructive for the Indians. The decline of imperial power and decentralization of Indian polity seems to Duff to be promoting a sort of corruption, mismanagement, mal-administration and mutual jealousy, alliances and wars. In this perspective Duff analyses the rise of the Marathas as a group of plunderers. Duff sees no
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change in the character of the Marathas under the Muslims. As their power in India became paramount they began to show a rule of power without regard of laws. Although Durrani’s campaign in 1761, checked the progress of the Marathas and destroyed their power, yet, they recovered their power after Shah Alam accepted their protection.  

4.5. Indian States, Tipu, Marathas and English.

Duff presents a very degenerated condition of his contemporary Indian states. “All the states in India were inimical to Europeans of every nation” without regard of alliances or pacts. However, in their mutual differences and tyranny, he sees a cause of their decline as well as the success of the British. Depicting the Marathas as plunderers, he depicts Tipu as a bigoted ruler who “forcibly circumcised many of the Hindus”. In this regard, he presents the British policy as humanitarian and more beneficial for the prosperity of the Indians.

Duff draws some guidelines for the British administration in India. He seems to be of the opinion that a collaboration and intermixture with the natives was essential for the success of the British rule in India as he sees in Muslim rule in Deccan which Elphinstone later highlighted as having occurred in the Muslim rule in all of India. He supports a favourable treatment of the natives in all spheres. By the criticism of Aurangzeb’s policy, Duff supports the continued existence of Indian states, destruction of which may lead to the rise of some destructive forces such as the Marathas. In this perspective, Duff favours the liberal treatment of the privileged sections of Indian society. However, he has no conflict with the view that Western civilization was far superior to the natives and should be introduced in India, although not in the form of radical changes. He sees the introduction of radical social changes as harmful to the interest of British as well as of Indians.

5. James Tod: Rajput Muslim Relation in State and Society.

5.1. James Tod (1782-1835).

James Tod was one of the most able and “subjects friendly” military servant of the company. However, he has won fame as the “founder of modern historiography of
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change in the character of the Marathas under the Muslims. As their power in India became paramount they began to show a rule of power without regard of laws. Although Durrani’s campaign in 1761, checked the progress of the Marathas and destroyed their power, yet, they recovered their power after Shah Alam accepted their protection.

4.5. Indian States, Tipu, Marathas and English.

Duff presents a very degenerated condition of his contemporary Indian states. “All the states in India were inimical to Europeans of every nation” without regard of alliances or pacts. However, in their mutual differences and tyranny, he sees a cause of their decline as well as the success of the British. Depicting the Marathas as plunderers, he depicts Tipu as a bigoted ruler who “forcibly circumcised many of the Hindus”. In this regard, he presents the British policy as humanitarian and more beneficial for the prosperity of the Indians.

Duff draws some guidelines for the British administration in India. He seems to be of the opinion that a collaboration and intermixture with the natives was essential for the success of the British rule in India as he sees in Muslim rule in Deccan which Elphinstone later highlighted as having occurred in the Muslim rule in all of India. He supports a favourable treatment of the natives in all spheres. By the criticism of Aurangzeb’s policy, Duff supports the continued existence of Indian states, destruction of which may lead to the rise of some destructive forces such as the Marathas. In this perspective, Duff favours the liberal treatment of the privileged sections of Indian society. However, he has no conflict with the view that Western civilization was far superior to the natives and should be introduced in India, although not in the form of radical changes. He sees the introduction of radical social changes as harmful to the interest of British as well as of Indians.

5. James Tod: Rajput Muslim Relation in State and Society.

5.1. James Tod (1782-1835).

James Tod was one of the most able and “subjects friendly” military servant of the company. However, he has won fame as the “founder of modern historiography of
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Rajputana. He has been much praised as a writer very sympathetic to the Indians. He has been taken as the "Herodotus of Hindustan". He was the first British author who used ancient mythological sources. He presented the Rajputs in a very romantic way by comparing them with medieval European state and society. However, in his estimate of the Rajputs little attention is paid to the Muslims.

5.1.1. Setting of Tod’s Thought.

Born in a family of merchants and indigo planters who settled in India after his birth, James Tod was brought up in United Provinces at a time when Jones’ Indian romance had become much popular among the Company’s servants. His joining of the Company’s services and work as a soldier from the rank of a lieutenant to lieutenant-colonel at different military and civil posts, provided him opportunities to establish close contacts with the Rajput people. He served all his period of service in Rajputana and was forced to resign due to his extreme sympathy with the natives. However, his interest in Jones and romanticists’ writings on India along with British medievalists converted him into a “staunch” romanticist. He seems to be seeking similarities between India and Europe like Jones and comparing the Rajputs with Hallam’s study of the Europe of Middle Ages. In this perspective he seems to be emerging as an anti-thesis of utilitarians and evangelicals. His writings seem to serve the romantic aims in the understanding of Indian history as well as in the British Indian administrative policy.

5.1.2. Tod’s Concept of History.

James Tod had a purposive view of History. This purpose was to develop good relations between the Rajputs and the British. He derives “a political lesson of great value” from history and wants to “apply history in its proper use” in imperial policy. Tod had not
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intended to “treat the subject in a sever style of history”.\textsuperscript{118} He wants to see all sorts of information in his work. Tod believes that all sorts of sources should be utilized for the understanding of history, in this regards, on Jones’ pattern, he accepts mythology as a source of history. He believes more in the collection of information than an analytical history. However, he gives importance to the use of indigenous sources for the information, which he gathered. He himself collected a lot of source material about Rajasthan in all forms such as coins, manuscripts, statistics and personal observations.\textsuperscript{119} However, he relied more on literary sources.\textsuperscript{120} He believed in a comparative study of civilization on a sympathetic ground especially a comparison of the European and the Hindu civilizations. He considers civilization a continuity of cultural, literary, customary and institutional tradition from the remote past to the current age. Literature and myth appear to be his most wanted elements of the civilization. He considers religion as an integral part of that tradition rather the core of tradition. Like Duff, rulers appear to be the representation of common people in Tod’s understanding and common people represented by traditions and customs. However, Tod sees all these elements tied together by the ethnic relations and thus inseparable from each other. As an administrator-soldier he assigns the task of preservation of these traditions and culture to the administrators as representative of the culture. Thus, he proposes the defence of indigenous culture even on the part of foreign imperial rulers for the success of their rule as well as administration. Tod makes the success of rule synonymous with the success of the administration.

5.1.3. Tod’s Unit of Historical Studies.

Tod seems to be interested in all aspects of society. His unit of studies does not appear limited to a strong sense of historical evaluation. Rather it includes sociological as well as anthropological studies. He had a very keen interest in geography. However, his romantic and anti-utilitarian and anti-evangelical spirit seems to be connecting him with ancient history. The romance of similarities between the ancient European and Indian races seems to be attracting his attention and he tries to find out a pattern of similarities between the Rajputs
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and medieval Europe. In this perspective Tod neglects the contemporary history, although he seems to develop all his arguments to utilize them in the contemporary administrative debate. Thus a contemporary focus on political history seems to be visible in his work. He assigns seven books to the description of seven prominent Rajput states.

The Rajputs are the central focus of Tod’s writings. The Muslims are dealt with in terms of their contacts and relations with the Rajputs. The Rajputs are treated very sympathetically. However, the treatment of the Muslims is neither sympathetic nor antithetic. The Muslims are praised whenever in good terms with the Rajputs and criticized whenever they are found encroaching over the sovereignty of the Rajput states.

The attitude seems to be set by contemporary western imperial thought on romantic model. It seems that Europe’s internal politics was less influencing Tod’s attitude than the imperial motives along with personal experience and emotions. However, a romance of medieval Europe seems to be the core of his understanding, symbolized in chivalrous mythology, religious bigotry, feudal system, dynastic rule and clan ties. All these elements seem to be his criterion to analyse the strength of a culture as well as civilization. On this criterion, Tod declares the Rajputs a strong nation and assigns a high place to the Indian society on the scale of civilization declaring them foreigners along with the Muslims.

5.2. Tod’s Defence of Ancient Hindu Civilization Through Rajput Nation.

James Tod seems to try to defend the Hindu civilization against utilitarians and evangelicals. He tries to prove that all the criticism against Hindu society is baseless. Although Tod traces the origin of the Rajputs to Scythians as a foreign race, however by initiating a view of the common origin of European and Indian races, Tod lays the foundation for the study of the similarities between the two nations. He depicts Rajput system in state and society on the standards of medieval Europe: the tribal system, chivalry, women’s place, bravery, wars, heroism, feudal system, etc. By accepting mythology as a source of history, Tod accepts the status of ancient Indian society at a high level of civilization and praises the morals and practices of the Rajputs.
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5.3. Rajput Resistance to the Muslim Rule.

Tod presents the Rajputs as the only constant force of resistance to Muslim Imperialism in India. Praising the Rajputs’ love for liberty and their bravery, Tod presents the medieval Indian history of the Rajputs as a struggle against the Muslim Empire to maintain their liberty. The Rajputs had a supreme virtue of self-defence and the preservation of liberty which was cemented by a strong sense of unity among them based on a strong sense of “the mental similarity”,124 “loyalty and patriotism which combine a love of the institutions, religion, and manners of the country”.125 In this way, he maintains that the successive inroads into Rajputana remained unsuccessful to completely subdue the Rajputs. The Arabs, the Ghaznavids, the Ghaurids, the Khiljis, the Afghans and the Mughuls had been more or less successful in their wars with the Rajputs, but they have failed to suppress or annihilate the Rajput states. One prime example of the Rajputs’ resistance to Muslim Imperialism, Tod sees in the survival of the State of Mewar and Jaisalmer. The two states survived on the map of India facing devastating challenges of the rise of the Turkish and the Mughul Empires in India. Tod sees the rise and decline of other small states as a source of inspiration for resistance to the Muslim imperialism.126

However, James Tod sees a sort of strength of the Rajput sense of nation in the periods of conflict with the Muslims. The defence of Chitor against Ala-ud-din Khilji, the resistance of Jaimal and Fatta to Akbar’s and Aurangzeb’s arms seem to Tod to promoting a sort of worship of chivalrous heroism to the Rajputs, same as in medieval Europe.127 The suppression, destruction, bigotry and challenges of the Muslim empire and religion seem to be raising a sort of resistance among the Rajputs. As a whole his treatment of the Muslims appears very critical. The editor of Tod’s Annals criticizes his neglect of the Muslims.128

5.4. The Rajputs and the Mughuls.

James Tod saw the establishment of cordial relations between the Mughuls and the Rajputs by Akbar’s policy of conciliation and assimilation with the Rajputs. His matrimonial alliances with the Rajputs as well as opening of Mughul services to the Rajputs, Tod sees in

Akbar’s understanding that a constant exhibition of authority would not only be ineffectual, but dangerous. The best way to find hold on them would be giving them a personal interest in the support of the monarchy.\textsuperscript{129}

In the perspective of a policy set by Akbar the Great, Tod sees a very prominent Rajput role in the policy of Mughul Empire. The warriors and brave, the Rajputs not only played an important role in the conquests during Akbar’s reign but also that the most brilliant conquests of Jahangir, Shahjahan and Aurangzeb were an outcome of the strength and bravery of their Rajput allies.\textsuperscript{130}

James Tod sees the decline of the Mughul power in Aurangzeb’s Rajput policy, criticizing Aurangzeb very sharply. Tod is of the opinion that the Rajputs were “the keystone”\textsuperscript{131} of Mughul power and by neglecting rather making them enemies: Aurangzeb initiated the process of decline of the Mughul Empire. In this perspective, Tod concludes that the Mughul Empire was tottering to its foundation long before the death of Aurangzeb. However, Tod sees the decline of the Mughul Empire as harmful to the Rajputs in the form of cruelties of Marathas and Afghans.\textsuperscript{132}

In this perspective he draws some policy conclusions for the British administration. He advises the policy makers to establish good terms with the Rajput states, by preserving them and not to adopt a policy of radical social and moral imperialism as propagated by the utilitarians and evangelicals. He assures that good terms with the Rajputs will ultimately contribute to the strength of the British Empire and a conflict with them to the decline as evident in Mughul history.\textsuperscript{133}


6.1. J.D. Cunningham (1812-185).

J.D. Cunningham has been considered a very brilliant and devoted officer in the Company’s service, which he served for almost eighteen years from 1831 to 1849. His
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History of the Sikhs has been taken as "the culmination"\textsuperscript{134} of ethno-regional British historiography of India and especially the Sikhs. His work has been much admired by the intellectuals of South Asia and has been considered as an "authentic public paper" and won him the title of "the conscientious and faithful historian".\textsuperscript{135} On the other hand, he became notorious in British administrative and Christian circles. He was punished because of his Sikh friendly criticism of the British policies in the Punjab\textsuperscript{136} and was called more "a Sikh than a Christian, more a Punjabi than an Englishman".\textsuperscript{137} His History has been taken as very unbiased, authentic and primary work on the Sikh religion and rule and still holds a prominent place among the writings on the subject.

6.1.1. Setting of Cunningham's Thought.

Born in a Scottish family of writers, J. D. Cunningham was brought up in an environment very much congenial to the development of the faculties and taste of literary romance and tradition. Every member of his family had won fame as journalist, poet, play-writer or novelist.\textsuperscript{138} The religious environment at a time of evangelical revival and traditional education, first in Scotland then in London and at Cambridge,\textsuperscript{139} seem to link him with Protestant Christian and literary romance. In this regard J.D. Cunningham was well aware of the intellectual and philosophical debates of the day. Cunningham, like Macaulay, seems to derive an understanding of the prominent role of religion in the progress of human civilization. For him, modern Europe was constructed on the foundation of medieval religious Europe and the concepts of liberty, public rights, property and democracy were all based on the medieval Christian legacy. In this sense all these concepts seem to be emerging in his scheme of thought as the essence of religion and consequently sacred.\textsuperscript{140}

\textsuperscript{134} G. Khurana, *British Historiography on the Sikh Power in Punjab*, New Delhi, 1985, p. 120.
\textsuperscript{135} N.K. Sinha, *Rise of Sikh Power*,
\textsuperscript{136} He was dismissed from his services due to his History of Sikhs and Governor General, Harding, criticized his views. J. W. Kaye was officially asked to prepare a review of Cunningham's work which was published in *Calcutta Review*, volume xi, number xxii, Jan-Jun 1849, on page 523. See for details S.S. Bal, "Joseph Davey Cunningham's Dismissal from the political Service" in K.S. Bedi and S.S. Bal, ed. *Essays on History, Literature, Art and Culture*, New Delhi, 1970. Also see J.S. Grewal, *Essays in Sikh History*, Amritsar, 1974, pp. 132-133.
\textsuperscript{137} Sir Henry Lawrence quoted by J.S.Grewal, *From Guru Nanak to Maharajah Ranjit Singh*, Amritsar, 1972, p.123
\textsuperscript{140} Cunningham sees the growth of Christian religion on these principles. Cunningham believes that if a system contains these principles, it should be promoted and defended even if it does not contain the title of Christianity. The Sikh religion seems to him one of such creeds that, in fact, represent the Christian system.
Moreover Cunningham was born in a family of masons by profession. He himself had obtained first prize in Mathematics and was trained in the profession of engineering for East India Company’s Military services.\[141\] Therefore he was much interested in logical philosophy.\[142\] However, his long career including civil, military, diplomatic and engineering appointments in Central India, Bhopal, Tibet, Afghanistan and Punjab seem to have affiliated him with indigenous realities.\[143\] As much of Cunningham’s time was spent in contact with Sikh colonies in Central India, Punjab and Northwestern frontiers, he was much impressed by the nature of the race and religion and its place in the Indian socio-political, cultural and religious environment. As the Northwestern region was very important in the scenario of emerging threats of Russia due to its geographical and territorial links with Persia, Russia and Afghanistan,\[144\] Cunningham’s deep understanding of the region linked him closely to the administrative and diplomatic debates connected to the region. His literary taste, religious affiliations, administrative assignments and writers’ blood had always kept him linked with the contemporary writers and intellectual controversy. As a whole his thought system seems to be emerging as that of a liberal classicist, having a romantic view of history, literature, philosophy, religion, science, geography and geology.\[145\] He read all the sources on Indian history from Orme to Elphinstone and on Sikh History from Brown to Payne.\[146\] In this perspective, he was unsatisfied with the British policy adopted in relation to the Sikhs. The purpose of his History of the Sikhs was to influence the British policy towards the Sikhs. For that Cunningham prescribes his understanding of Sikh religion and culture with a view of its importance and utility for the Britain and the Christianity.

6.1.2. Cunningham’s Concept of History.

Cunningham was much impressed by Hallam, Gibbon and Ranke’s view of history. History appears in his system of thought as a purposive exercise to differentiate between

---


\[142\] G. Khurana, op.cit., p. 126.


\[144\] See for Details S.S. Bal, British Policy Towards the Punjab, Calcutta, 1971, pp. 57-58.


\[146\] Cunningham’s History of the Sikhs, London, 1849 contains very systematic discourse and notes on the opinions of Western as well as indigenous Muslim, Hindu and Sikh historians.
fable and truth. In this regard, a minute understanding of facts through a careful examination of sources was necessary. Facts of history should be understood and interpreted in proper perspective and according to the socio-cultural construction of the society. Cunningham sees the exactness of a scientific history in personal observations rather than in prevailing understanding. Ground realities seem to be more important concern to Cunningham than various forms and methods. Believing in a progressive view of history, Cunningham regards the understanding of universal history as the objective of an historian. His ethno-regional history appears in this perspective as a part of the "general history of humanity". He divides history into ancient, medieval and modern construction according to the prevailing intellectual framework; however, he insists that every phase of human development should be evaluated according to contemporary environmental criterion. Cunningham does not believe in the view of the determinism of history. He believes that creative power of human beings is the active instrument of change and identifies "freedom and necessity" as the forces working behind the rise of some thing original.

Cunningham’s concept of unity of history leads him to the view of unity of religion and civilization. He sees the work of religion in the development of civilization in the form of principles and on that points he comes closer to the utilitarians. However, like other Ethno-Regional historians, he considers customs, traditions and religious rituals as the key to the understanding of a society and thus of historical process. He sees the success of ruling principles, personalities and dynasties in their relation to indigenous customs and traditions which indicate that on the romantic model he considers these traditions as a representative of common man’s thought and thinking. Although believing in the religions, Cunningham rejects the view of the fat-bound human destiny and insists on the freedom of man in God’s divine plan.

6.1.3. Cunningham’s Unite of Historical Studies.

Writing at a time when the contemporary intellectual and administrative environment was occupied with a discourse on the nature of Indian states and society and the role of religion in the values and manners of the Indian people, Cunningham contributed to the

---

147 J.D. Cunningham, op. cit., p. xx.
149 J.D. Cunningham, op. cit., p. xx.
150 G. Khurana, op. cit., p. 128.
151 J.D. Cunningham, op. cit., p. 80-81.
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discourse by focusing the relations between civilization, nation and empire.\textsuperscript{152} Cunningham identifies an important role of religion in the progress of nation, empire and civilization on the pattern of Hallam and Ranke.\textsuperscript{153} However, for Cunningham, this role of religion becomes more effective in combination with a racial quality or a race becomes more consolidated by the power of religion.\textsuperscript{154} However, in his view religion, empire, nation and civilization show their worth in institutions and characteristics of the people that form the basic units of historical studies.\textsuperscript{155} As Cunningham at history in progressive terms, like Gibbon, he looks at all these aspects in terms of continuity and change and evaluates them with a comparative approach, focusing the mutual relations and their relations with other religions and civilizations.

In this perspective, Cunningham's central interest was Sikh religion and rule and his emphasis on the Muslims comes in terms of their relations with the Sikh religion and rule. His estimate of the Muslim seems to be positive in their relations with the Sikhs and he does not appear to be antithetic to the Muslims. He recognizes the role of Islam in the development of the Sikh religion and makes it clear that the Muslim-Sikh tension was political in its nature. Being an administrator, he believed that the strength of the British power lay in its relations with the natives. In this perspective, Cunningham was much annoyed by the immoral and Britain-centred policy of the administration. He was in favour of assigning the natives proper place in the British Indian policy.

In his assessment of the Sikhism Cunningham was much impressed by the contemporary enlightened and rationalist movements of Europe focusing the principle-base change in the world. He seems to be influenced by the Scottish missionaries' views, which had presented Christianity and the modern western civilization as synonyms to each other. In this perspective, on the one hand, Cunningham was interested in the romantic view of the

\textsuperscript{152} Cunningham's early writings consist of his official work which was later published in the Journal of Asiatic Society of Bengal between 1844-1849, representing his religious, civilization and institutional interests. These works include "Notes on Moorcraft's Travel in Ladakh", "Notes on the Antiquities of the Districts within Bhopal Agency", "On the Ruins of Puthree", and "Notes on the limits of Perpetual Snow in the Himalayas".

\textsuperscript{153} Cunningham sees the rise of Jat race in the form of Sikh religion and empire. He adopts the criterion of Hallam, Sketch of Europe in the Middle Ages, London, 1818.

\textsuperscript{154} J.D. Cunningham, op. cit., pp. 1, 9, 13, 16.

\textsuperscript{155} Cunningham looks at Sikhism in terms of religious institutions and, simultaneously sees the rise of Sikh nation and Empire.
acceptance of the diversity of identities and, on the other hand, he was seeking Unitarianism as propagated by the Evangelicals and the Utilitarians.

6.2. Cunningham’s Sikh: A Racial, Religious and Political Nation.

Cunningham discusses History of The Sikhs in terms of the growth of a Nation. Influenced by the early nineteenth century German nationalism, he tries to trace a three dimensional growth of Sikh nation: racial, religious and political. For Cunningham establishment of Sikh Empire was a political assertion of the right and authority of the nation. In this way, “the accidents of the position of contemporary genius” were less important than the racial and religious forces. However, he was not sure that race had a stronger role than religion in the growth of Sikh nation.

Although the concept of unity of Sikh religion with Hinduism and perception of Sikhism as a reformative sect of Hinduism is still a dominant factor in Indo-Sikh studies, but Cunningham refutes this view of Sikhism by his contemporary historians, either of the Sikhs or of India, from Mill to Wilson. Identifying “the core of Sikh nation” as the Jats’ race, “the finest rural population of India” inhabiting central India and Punjab, Cunningham traces the binding thread of nationalism in the historical process. His concept of immoral and degenerated nature of Indian religion and people, combined with the view of foreign origin of the Rajputs and Jats led him to identify Sikhs with Scythians and Kushans who “migrated in India from the upper plains of Central Asia”. Against the despotism, priesthood and Brahmanism of Indias, he praises the love for liberty and bravery of the Jats and Sikhs. Cunningham points out that in the beginning, Hinduism assimilated the Jats, but by the introduction of Muslim creed the process of digestion and assimilation had stopped and under the influence of Islam Sikhism emerged as a new force. This racial and religious combination was further fabricated into a nation by the decline of Muslim political power and rise of Sikh power in the Punjab. The acceptance of the independent status of Sikh Empire by Indian as well as Afghan and Persian rulers legitimised the political power of the nation as a sovereign state.

156 J.D. Cunningham, op. cit.; pp. 1.
157 Ibid., pp. 90-91.
158 Ibid., p. 12.
159 Ibid., pp. 90-91.
160 Ibid., p. 9.
6.3. Rise of Sikh Religion as Successor of Islam.

Cunningham evaluates the nature and rise of Sikhism in its relations with other universal religions: Buddhism, Hinduism, Islam and Christianity. In this way, he seems to be evaluating Sikhism as a universal religion. For Cunningham, the rise of Sikhism was a natural result of the progress of the Indian situation in which Sikhism seems to be succeeding Islam. In the evolutionary progress Cunningham begins the religious history of India with the rise of Buddhism in India which was dominated by Brahmanical Hinduism, later. However, this domination brought "the seeds of decay" from within for Hindu civilization.

Cunningham identifies the emergence and rise of Sikhism as an influence of Islam over this decayed state of Hindu society which had also influenced the Jats of Scythian origin. For Cunningham, early interaction of Islam with the Indian civilization proved insufficient to influence India. But after seeking converts from Turks, although Islam itself was Indianized, its doctrinal purity and social dynamism did not fail to influence the static Hindu society. Because of that influence "the Hindu mind was no more stagnant or retrogressive" by the sixteenth century. By the sixteenth century, Ramanand had already preached the creed of religious purity. Chaitaniya had not only denounced but also condemned the caste system. Kabir had criticized idol-worship and Valabha was teaching religious devotion.

Although Cunningham sees the rise of Guru Nanak's teaching in the context of influence of Islam, he refutes the prevailing view that Sikhism was a reformist movement of Hinduism. He seems to be of the opinion that reformative movements were unable to revive Hinduism or Islam. These movements "perfected forms of dissent rather than planting the germs of a nation". Cunningham was of the view that the real purpose of a religion was to liberate and transform, to make man throw aside every "social as well as religious trammel and to arise a new people freed from debasing corruption of ages". It was Guru Nanak's teaching which perceived the true principles of reform, possessing all the merits but none of the grave defects of its predecessor and contemporary reform movements.

---

161 Ibid., p. 9.
162 Ibid., p. 27.
163 Ibid., p. 40.
164 Ibid., p. 40.
165 Ibid., p. 62.
166 Ibid., pp. 40-43.
Refuting the status of Sikhism as a reformatory movement of Hinduism, Cunningham identifies a close relationship between Sikh religion and Islam. Sikhism emerges in his understanding as a natural and important result of the Muslim conquests.\footnote{167} It was a product of the interaction of the “genius of Arabian prophet” with the “corrupt Brahminical Doctrine”,\footnote{168} and Guru Nanak disengaged his chelas “from Hindu idolatry and Muhammedan superstition.”\footnote{169} Cunningham observes in Sikhism that spirit of Islam “which imposed the naked Arabs upon the mail clad troops of Rome and Persia”. Cunningham believes that was the spirit, which has provided success to the Europeans in Asia. Cunningham appreciates the Sikh doctrine that “the lowest is equal with the highest in race as well as creed in political rights as in religious hopes”.\footnote{170}

Cunningham sees Sikhism as a theocratic political system against Islam and Christianity. In this system, “God was their helper and only judge, community of faith or object was their moving principle and warlike array... was their material instrument”.\footnote{171} He presents Sikhism as a successor of Islam in India. This sense seems to be further strengthened by the sense of Sikh Empire as a successor of the Mughul Muslim Empire.

### 6.4. Rise of Sikh Empire as Successor of Mughuls and Afghans.

Cunningham not only seems to be taking Sikhism as the philosophy of Indian religions, but also looks at the rise of Sikh power in term of the legitimate successors of two Muslim ethnic powers: Mughuls and Afghans. Cunningham seems to be of the opinion that the Mughul Empire was not a theocratic empire. However, Sikh polity was essentially theocratic in its character. By the time of Guru Govind Singh, Sikhs had already achieved a “kind of separate state within the [Mughul] Empire”.\footnote{172} Sikhs remained unsuccessful in subverting the Mughul Empire and establishing their own empire till the mid-eighteenth century. However, the force employed by the Mughuls, provided a sort of strength to the Sikhs and contributed a lot to the political strength of the nation. Simultaneously, the execution of Guru Banda by the Mughuls provided the stimulus for a mythological and symbolic heroism.\footnote{173} The differences

\footnote{167} Ibid., preface to the second edition, p. xxviii.\footnote{168} Ibid., pp. 80-81.\footnote{169} Ibid., p.80.\footnote{170} Ibid., p. 40.\footnote{171} Ibid., p. 94.\footnote{172} Ibid., pp. 68, 70-71.\footnote{173} Ibid., pp. 77-95.
between the Mughuls and the Sikhs and “an active persecution” of the Sikhs were political rather than religious issues. Even the mutual jealousies of Sikhs were more active in the treatment of Sikhs by the Mughuls. He sees the bitterness between the two communities due to the relations of the Sikhs with the Mughuls. However, he sees the rise of the Sikh power as a result of Afghan invasion. The decline of the Mughul power after the invasion of Nadir Shah, helped Sikhs to establish their own Empire, in a scenario in which, provinces and nations were declaring their independence or at least their autonomy. The Sikhs began to observe their religious ceremonics and preach their creed very enthusiastically and built forts on the Ravi. India for Ahmed Shah Durrani was a field of conquest just for the sake of “losing and recovering province rather than establishing an empire”. The defeat of the Marathas at the hands of Ahmad Shah, and absence of any regular government of the Mughuls or Durrani, seems to Cunningham, the real turning point to the rise and strength of emerging Sikh power. Cunningham points out that although Ahmad Shah conferred the title of Raja on Sardar Alha Singh to widen the differences between the Sikhs, but later by leaving the idea of the conquest of Lahore, the Durrani chief “endeavoured to conciliate” the Sikhs and accept their sovereignty in the Punjab and granted “the title of Maharaja and office of military commander in Sirhind” to the successor of Sardar Alha Singh. Even Ahmad Shah’s successor Timur Shah seems to have accepted the Sikh power because he “had no thought of the re-conquest of Lahore”. In this way, Cunningham seems to be presenting the Sikhs as rightful heir to the Mughuls and Afghans. As he does not consider the Indo-Muslim Empire as a religious state but as ethnic power of the Mughuls and the Afghan, hence, his Jat-Sikh power appears to him a true successor of the Mughul and the Afghan power, just as Sikhism a true successor of Indian Islam. In this perspective, Cunningham identifies a very fundamental role of Islam and the Muslim empire in the development and rise of Sikh religion and Sikh power. Much impressed by the Sikhism, Cunningham looks at this religion as a philosophy derived from the history of Indian religions and, in this regard, a synthesizing religion. Cunningham seems
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175 Ibid., pp.83-84.
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to be of the view that Sikhism represents also Christian doctrines and by promoting Sikhism the Christians could fulfil their aims. Cunningham even criticized the British for their unfair treatment of the Sikhs. In this regard, although Cunningham identifies a very strong influence of Islam on Sikhism, his treatment of Islam in Sikh perspective seems to be very critical. Islam appears to be a foreign religion incapable of treating contemporary Indian problem.

7. Conclusion.

Emerging out of enlightened romantic trends of the late eighteenth century nationalism and their contemporary problem of imperial administration, the Ethno-Regional romanticists' historiography of Muslim India during the first half of the nineteenth century seems to be representing an identical school of thought in politics as well as historiography and imperial administration. Primarily, differentiating between civilization and nation, the Ethno-Regional romanticists accept the civilized status of India. However, they seem to be negating the concept of a civilization based nation. They seem to be presenting a nation based civilization. Their concept of Indian nations seems to be presenting an evolution, identical with the growth of the British power in India. By the expansion of the British imperial power, they seem to be coming into contacts with the new areas and identifying the national status of different ethnic groups. Primarily, Ethno-Regional romanticists' understanding of a nation seems to be emerging out of territorial or ethnic identity. The five selected Ethno-Regional representations of the chapter; Bengalis, South India, Marathas, Rajputs and Sikhs cover almost all prominent areas of India and sharply indicate the Ethno-Regional romanticists' understanding of the problem of nationality and identity in the British India.

The Ethno-Regional romanticists' concept of nation seems to be different from Elphinstone and Malcolm's romance of the unity of ten nations under one Indian civilization. The Ethno-Regional romanticists were primarily impressed by the native traditions of the areas where they served for a long time. They seem to be applying the western principles of identity and nationality to the Indian ethnic and territorial identities. Under the pressure of administrative and intellectual developments of the time, they seem to be trying to synthesize the conflict of Indian cultures and western civilization to solve their problems.

Inspite of the fact that the Ethno-Regional romanticists accept the oriental romanticists' view of the civilized status of the Indian society, they consider the foreign races as the major
contribution to the Indian civilization on the pattern of the utilitarians, Stewart presents a picture of strong Muslim influence in Bengal throughout the known history. Wilks seems unable to highlight any potential contribution of the Hindus of South India to the state of civilization. Duff depicts Marathas very harshly and Tod and Cunningham consider Rajputs and Jats as foreign races. However, none of the Ethno-Regional romanticist deals with the Indian Muslims as a separate nation on the level of foreign races of Jats or Rajputs as their concept of nationality seems sharply identical with races and region and the Muslims religion has claimed its identity, independent of ethnicity and regionality.

However, Ethno-Regional romanticists appreciate the contribution of the Indian Muslims to the Indian civilization. In their attempt to understand the Indian society, they seem to be focusing on the regional realities and thus trying to derive more unbiased results to utilize for the British Indian administration. Stewart and Duff seem to be appreciating the moderate Muslim approach toward Bengalis and Marathas. They see the strength of the Muslim rule in the moderate laws of the government, participation of indigenous population in the state administration and in the moderate religious policy. In this regard the character of Muslim rulers is generally appreciated. Simultaneously the Hindu-Muslim relations are depicted as moderate and the contribution of Indian Muslims to the arts and architecture is appreciated. Cunningham depicts the most important relation of Islam with the indigenous population in the form of Sikh religion.

The treatment of the Indian Muslims by the ethno-Regional romanticists seems to be identical with the indigenous cultural contacts and administrative problem. The Muslim state craft as a foreign, minority ruling elite seem to be emerging as a model to deal with the Indian problems and the Ethno-Regional romanticists seem to be propagating for the cause of a treatment of Indian communities on the basis of their identities and not as singularly as was propagated by the oriental romanticists.
Chapter Five.

THE UTILITARIANS.

- This chapter aims at analysing the utilitarian historiography of Muslim India during the first half of the nineteenth century. The development of utilitarian thought regarding the utilitarian perception and understanding of Muslim state, society and civilization has been analysed in the context of contemporary socio-political, cultural, intellectual and administrative debate and dialogue in India and Britain. Avoiding the subtle themes of utilitarian philosophy, development of historiographic themes regarding Muslim India has been focused in this chapter. However, references to the influence of missionaries and reaction to the romantic themes and theories have been taken as an essential part for the understanding of utilitarian historiography of Muslim India.

Utilitarianism as a philosophy emerged as a continuity of enlightened trends against extreme romanticism. Aiming at seeking the "happiness of man" in the concept of "utility", the utilitarians focused on contemporary political and cultural history, which was dominated by the Muslim community. In this perspective, at the end of the eighteenth century, when ancient Indian romance was at full swings, Francis Gladwin continued the trends developed during the age of enlightenment in India. He focused on the Muslims as political and cultural community and on Persian language as intellectual, cultural, administrative and public language. However, his approach was non-philosophical. It was James Mill who systematically narrated the history of India on utilitarian logic and philosophised the Indian history. Combating the challenges of liberalism and romanticism and criticising the nature of Hindu state, society and religion, Mill considered Muslim culture and administration slightly better than the Hindus. However, he tried to prove that western institutions were more useful than the Muslim, thus concluded that western institutions should be introduced in India to make the Indians civilized. However, he refused to accept the indigenous status of Indian Muslims and considered them foreign rulers to justify the British rule in India and the claim of succession of the Muslim power.

Macaulay accepted almost all conclusions of James Mill. He strongly supported the case of social change and introduction of western institutions even English language. However his concern with the Indian Muslims was based on the view that Muslims have so many
similarities with the Christians and especially, the Catholics and the Muslims were the ruling elite and an influential community of India. So, he concluded that in the British policy matters the Muslims should be given proper weightage and even supported. On the foundation of these ideas, Edward Thornton defended the utilitarian view about the Muslims. Rejecting the romantic view that the Muslim rule was the significant cause of the degeneration of the Hindu state and society, Thornton highlighted that Muslims rule was not a cause of the degeneration, rather Hinduism was the cause of the degeneration among the Indian Muslims; and contemporary Muslim revivalist movements against the influence of Hinduism on Islam were the proof of his thesis. The controversy seems to be solved by William Erskine’s paternalistic view of the Mughul rule. Erskine presented his view that the Mughul Muslim rule was paternalistic. Mughuls not only preserved the indigenous political and social culture in combination with their amendment on Persian models but also harmonized the Indo-Muslim state with indigenous society.

As a whole, the utilitarian view seems to be slightly better towards the Indian Muslims. There is a gradual development in utilitarian view of Indo-Muslim history. However, it seems to be joining hands with the romanticists by the 1857.

1. Utilitarianism.

1.1. Nature of Utilitarianism.

Utilitarianism emerged, by the dawn of the nineteenth century, as a philosophy dealing with most fundamental issues of the human mind. In this context, it has since been widely read, understood, explained, interpreted and criticized in different ways with multiple approaches. A number of terms have been devised to explain the different aspects of utilitarian doctrines\(^1\) such as rule-utilitarianism, act-utilitarianism,\(^2\) extreme-utilitarianism, restricted-utilitarianism,\(^3\) liberal-utilitarianism,\(^4\) hedonistic-utilitarianism,\(^5\) radical-

---


\(^2\) The concepts have emerged out of the question that whether "principle of utility" should be applied to rules of society or actions of man. For a view of stand points see Gerald Barnes, "Utilitarianism" in *Ethics*, LXXXII/1, (Oct., 1971), pp-56-64 and George C. Kerner, "The Immortality of Utilitarianism and the Escapism of Rule-Utilitarianism", in *The Philosophical Quarterly*, XXII/2, (Jan., 1971), pp.36-50.

\(^3\) The terms are devised in relation to utilitarian attitude towards literature and religion. For a detail discussion of the concepts see J.J.C. Smart, *op. cit.*, pp. 344-354.
utilitarianism,²⁸ theological-utilitarianism,⁷ revisionist-utilitarianism and utilitarian-idealism⁸. On the other hand, a trend of devising inter-conceptual, definition-planted terms to understand the utilitarian thought can be found operative in the modern philosophy.⁹

Simultaneously, assimilation of a number of trends and theories has been attached to utilitarianism. It has been taken as a philosophy, exploiting a number of contemporary intellectual trends such as associationalism, consequentialism, radicalism, political commercialism and Evangelical morality.¹⁰ On the other hand, utilitarianism has been credited with the initiation of a number of new approaches to the study of human mind and mentality such as Psychology, Sociology, Anthropology, Political Economy and Statistics.¹¹ However, utilitarian relation and approach to social problem with reference to the relations between individual mind and society and vice versa, seem to be developing a landscape of social, political, economic, moral, educational and intellectual aspects in integrity. Utilitarians have generally been considered Whig in politics, liberal in behaviour, radical in reform, rationalist in thoughts, Euro-centric and later, Anglican in colonial biases. However,

---

¹ The term has been applied to the strict defence of liberty of the masses by utilitarian doctrine. John Stuart Mill's *On Liberty* has been taken as a best example of liberal utilitarianism.
² The term has been applied to an early concept of universal utility with out any distinction or interpretation. Bentham has been regarded as a hedonist.
³ The term is devised with regard to utilitarian attitude towards reform. Mill was a great supporter of radical social change. In this regard he has been viewed as extreme and radical utilitarian.
⁴ William Paley (1743-1805) has been considered a well-known "theological utilitarian". He believed in the "perfect goodness and wisdom of God" and happiness in the followings of divine scripture: the words of God. See for his views William Paley, *Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy*, London, 1785.
⁵ In the late nineteenth century Cambridge, a group of philosophers, idealizing utilitarianism, was attempting to revise the utilitarian doctrines in the light of late criticism. Among them Sidgwick and Marshall are famous for their rational revisions of utilitarian theory. For an analysis of the views see C. J. Dewey, "'Cambridge Idealism': Utilitarian Revisionists in Late Nineteenth-Century Cambridge" in *The Historical Journal*, XVII/1, (1974), pp. 63-78. Also see Henry Sidgwick, *The Methods of Ethics*, Chicago, 1907.
⁶ For example many compound terms such as Rule-Consequential Utilitarianism or Qualitative Hedonist Utilitarianism can be found in D. Lyons, *op. cit.*; Also see H. R. West, "Mill's Qualitative Hedonism", *Philosophy*, LI, 1976 and B. Hooker's "Rule-Consequentialism, Incoherence, Fairness", in *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, XCV, 1995 quoted by Roger Crisp, ed., *J.S. Mill Utilitarianism*, Oxford, 1998.
it has been considered a most influential intellectual force in Britain in matters of internal as well as colonial policy, during the first half of the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{12}

Utilitarianism as a philosophy in European context and a debate in colonial context emerged as a reaction to extreme romanticism, focusing natural philosophy and reason against literary fiction and mythology. As romanticism was a reaction to extreme rationalism of enlightenment, utilitarianism proved to be a return to enlightened multiplicity of themes, theories and thought, combining a number of varied and conflicting contemporary trends in Indian government and administration and British philosophical and intellectual circles, such as liberal, moralist, associationist, futurist, Whig and the idealist. However, their focus always remained on the philosophical issues, the determination of moral character of man and his actions on rational and empirical foundations. In this regard, the utilitarians idealized the empirical reason, natural law, good government, institutions, human liberties, justice and equality, all working in current society. Looking at the history of human civilization with a progressive view, they practically rejected the view of the degeneration of human society and placed the European civilization at the top-peak of human development and progress. Indian affairs provided a base to construct the building of, and a ground to fight the battle for the defence of utilitarian thought and theories, through the evidences from history, either contemporary or remote, current or classical, modern or antique.

\subsection*{1.2. The Origin and Development of Utilitarianism.}

Utilitarianism has been considered a theory, seeking a criterion for the justification and evaluation of morality, working behind human actions.\textsuperscript{13} The origin of the question is as old as human wisdom. However, utilitarians have justified the human actions in terms of “utility and happiness”\textsuperscript{14}. Traditionally, the origin of morality, utility and happiness has been owed to religion and divinity. With the rise of Evangelicalism in the late eighteenth century the concept again became a focal point in the self-asserted agenda of reform in and conversion to Christianity in contemporary European thought.\textsuperscript{15} However, the rationalist successors of

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{14} Roger Crisp, \textit{op. cit.}, p.55.
\textsuperscript{15} See for example William Paley, \textit{op. cit.} Also see Balfour Chandra Ragan, \textit{op. cit.}, p.95.
\end{flushright}
enlightenment have traced the origin of utilitarianism back to Hellenistic intellectual antiquity of Socrates and Plato.\textsuperscript{16} To Aristotle, man has, in general, feelings of “pleasure or pain, both too much or too little and in both ways not well”. Having these feelings “at the right time, about the right things, towards the right people, for the right end and in the right way” was pleasure for Aristotle.\textsuperscript{17}

During the middle ages, theological concept of morality, utility and happiness remained dominant. However, scientific revolution and the eighteenth century enlightenment brought the emphasis of intellectual pursuits back to reason and man-based morality. The conflict of religion and science, discovery of natural laws and beginning of scientific understanding of society in accordance with natural laws seems to be working in the roots of utilitarianism. In this age Locke, Hartley, Kant, Tooke and Dugald Stewart’s emphases on sensual development of human psychology can be taken as the foundation of the nineteenth century Utilitarianism.

John Locke (1632-1704) in his Essay tried to explain the work of human mind in terms of natural law. Locke correlated the human understanding with the ‘operations of mind’. Mind contemplates nothing but “impressions”, expressed in “sensations or feelings”, which are called “ideas”. Such an attempt was also made by Immanuel Kant (1724-1804). Immanuel Kant was of the opinion that ethics or morality should be based on human rationality. In his rationality, human action could best be understood in accordance with the principles of universal law of nature.\textsuperscript{18} Hartley expanded Locke’s “operation of mind” from natural to social “impression”.\textsuperscript{19} He promoted the view of association between human mind and social as well as natural environment. His associationist-psychology promoted the concept of social responsibility and role in the development of human mind and its response to society.\textsuperscript{20} John Horne Tooke more focused on his understanding of morality working behind human mind. He related the work or “operation of mind” with the “operation of

\textsuperscript{16}Roger Crisp, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 49. In the modern western Euro-centric intellectual scholarship, there is a tradition of tracing the origin of every concept either related to man or matter, back to Plato, Socrates or their disciples. The same practice can be found among the Hindus focusing Vedas and Muslims focusing Koran.

\textsuperscript{17} Aristotle, \textit{Nicomachean Ethics}, tr., T. Irwin, Indianapolis, 1985. The utilitarians have frequently quoted the statement.


language" and explained human understanding and activity as a response to linguistic understanding. However, he emphasized the place of language in law and verdicts of law.  

Dugald Stewart (1753-1828) further studied the problem of justification of human action and morality. He presented a "common sense" doctrine working behind human understanding and action on the model of Reid. "Common sense" was taken by Reid as "mother wit" or average opinion of fairly intelligent man who could speak of "fundamental laws of belief". Reid's "excellent work" tried to explain more specifically and "satisfactorily" that human morality could not be constructed on sense-given data only. Certain "inspirations" work behind the fundamental belief of man. Dugald Stewart followed the theme very loyally. To him, it was "a plain statement of fact". He took this statement in the wider context of knowledge and philosophy. To him, philosophy was not a "theory of knowledge" or of the universe but "philosophy of the human mind". In this understanding, mind appeared as a combination of "senses" and "inspirations", "inspirations" indeed more subtle and complex. As an academician, Dugald Stewart very potentially propagated his thoughts among his students and bred the generation that constructed a very solid and practically effective philosophy in the name of "utilitarianism". Utilitarians seem to be finding this "inspiration" of Reid and Stewart working in human mind as morality. However, the utilitarian philosophy was shaped and Bentham and Mills determined setting of the doctrine: James and John Stuart.

1.3. Setting of Doctrine.

Although the philosophy has been derived from the "concept of utility" or "usefulness" or "being useful", yet it has been understood in a wider sense and a democratic way all

---

21 Leslie Stephen, op. cit., Vol. I., pp. 137-142. Tooke's expressed his views in this regard in a letter to Dunning, which was originally published in 1778. It was reprinted in Richard Taylor, Diversions of Mind, Edinburgh, 1786.


24 Leslie Stephen, op. cit., p. 150. Also see Michael Slote, op. cit.

25 Thomas Reid, op. cit., Vol. I, p.188.


27 Ibid., passim. Stewart explained following in his work on Reid. The work was reviewed in Edinburgh Review and initiated a hot debate.

28 Leslie Stephen, op. cit., pp. 142-168. The early generation of utilitarians was educated by Dugald Stewar. James Mill and Mackintosh were his disciples along with the philosophical minded servants of the East India Company's Scottish gentry in India. See for details Jane Rendall, "Scottish Orientalism: From Robertson to James Mill" in The Historical Journal, XXV/1, pp. 43-69.
aspects of social and psychological discipline of man and society. For utilitarians, utility was the only force creating "inspiration" which works behind the human mind and actions. However, they combined it with "happiness" and diluted the distinction between utility and happiness. They demanded the "utility" and "happiness" for the individual. As utility and happiness appear vague and superficial terms and application of the concepts to all individuals was practically not possible in the material form, they defined it as "maximum happiness for maximum number of individuals" by arranging a marriage between happiness, individualism and democracy, which began to flash out a number of issues related to individualism and democracy such as; government as an agency to fulfil utility, nature of government, representation in democracy, suffrage system, class representation, freedom and liberty, mostly, the issues raised by the middle class having no representation in government administration.

Bentham contributed to the utilitarian philosophy by challenging the concept of customary laws in British constitution. As a lawyer his focus remained on the utility of laws as a contribution to happiness of individual as well as society. In this regard, he stressed the need of revolutionary reforms in British laws. James Mill extended the scope of the philosophy to all functions of state and society. He combined the functions of reforms in government and society with each other and extended the role and authority of government to individual liberties for the purpose of reforms on utilitarian principles. As the question of reform and utility has always been concerned with contemporary society, Mill's focus

---

29 The concept of "happiness" seems to be derived from religion in which happiness could be derived from a spiritual source. However utilitarians seem to be making this concept of "happiness" a material entity by combining it with utility. For detail see Bentham, An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation, ed., J.H. Burns, London, 1970, chapters I, II and IV, and Roger Crisp, op. cit.
30 James Seth, "The Alleged fallacies in Mill's 'Utilitarianism'", The Philosophical Review, XVII/5 (Sep., 1908), pp. 469-488.
31 For details of the concept see Roger Crisp, op. cit.
37 Ibid.
remained on contemporary Europe. Mill criticised religion as merely a system of rituals promising abstract happiness, having no utility in the world and by this approach practically launched the materialist method in politics and mission of reform prior to Marx. James Mill rejected the authenticity of imaginary ideas and fancies of literature. Philosophy and history were two culminations of human wisdom for him. In this perspective, he seems to be visualizing the imposition of European civilization as a universal system over the world. However, it was John Stuart Mill who tried to systematically explain all developments of utilitarian thought in pure philosophical terms. This chapter does not aim at discussing in detail the logic and development of utilitarianism and its conflict with other methods of thought as explained by John Stuart Mill. However the ideas and thoughts advocated and promoted by Bentham and James Mill are being taken as the roots affecting the nature and scope of this chapter, influencing each other. However, James Mill was the only philosophical force behind the utilitarian thought during the period under discussion.

In this perspective, utilitarianism emerged as a philosophy aiming at a systemized study of human system of morality. Its focus remained on rational and physical aspects of human actions and thought focusing contemporary society in the footstep of dominant trends of the age of reason.

2. Enlightened Utilitarians: Francis Gladwin - Enlightened Bridge to Utilitarian Thought.

Under the romantic rise focus remained on Hindu religion, Sanskrit Language and ancient races. From the arrival of Sir William Jones to the rise of utilitarianism in the early 1820s, these themes were the dominant representations of British interest in India. However, a number of British writers on India belonging to Scottish Philosophical School criticized this mythological and literary focus of Indologists and tried to establish empirical

38 Most of the writing of James Mill concerned with contemporary Europe. Even his The History of British India has been considered as a battle of English philosophical and political conflict in Indian history.
39 Balachandra Rangan, op. cit., p. 80.
40 Mill, India, passim.
41 Ibid., Vol. II, p.527.
philosophical models for the understanding of India’s past.\(^{43}\) One person who continued to understand Indian past in imitation to enlightened trends, which were later incorporated by James Mill, was Francis Gladwin. However, in India the focus was not on the Philosophical aspects but on the following of enlightened method and assessment of Indian scene.

2.1. Francis Gladwin (d. 1813).

Francis Gladwin (d. 1813?) is a neglected orientalist. "The good and preserving Gladwin"\(^{44}\) has been taken as an enthusiastic writer, translator and editor. He was the first professor of Persian at Fort William College and in this capacity contributed a lot to the British understanding of Persian language and culture by his translations of Persian writings. He was a "soldier diplomat"\(^{45}\) and in this capacity served the East India Company for a long time from mid 1760s to 1813, at different positions.\(^{46}\) All his life and works seem to be devoted to the task of understanding Indian state and society.

- Francis Gladwin seems to be linking the enlightened trends with utilitarian thought and theories related to India in historiography. In an age of antiquarian romance of Jones and his influential followers, with an empirical approach, he continued his emphasis on contemporary political history and Persian moral literature rather than antiquity, literary fiction and European relations with remote and romantic antiquity of Indian history and fiction of Sanskrit literature. Unable to lead a group in intellectual circles, he seems to be committed to the trends prior to Jones’ conversion to ancient Indian romance. Although Gladwin remained unsuccessful in winning a prominent place among the contemporary intellectual circles dominated by upper hierarchy of servants of the East India Company, yet, an early nineteenth criticism and reaction to extreme and antiquarian romance seem to an indirect assertion of Gladwin’s themes of work. This criticism and reaction appeared in its philosophical form under James Mill.

---

\(^{43}\) Jane Rendall, op. cit., pp. 43-69. Also see Mary Fearney-Sander, “Philosophical History and The Scottish Reformation: Robertson and the Knoxian Tradition”, The Historical Journal, XXXIII/2 (June, 1990), pp. 323-338.

\(^{44}\) Annual Asiatic Register, Calcutta, 1801, p.112.


\(^{46}\) Francis Gladwin served the East India Company in a varied capacity. He joined the Company as a soldier and then served as translator, superintendent of the company’s press, professor of Persian at Fort William College, Collector of Customs and also Resident at Patana.
2.1.1. Setting of Gladwin’s Thought.

Francis Gladwin, brought up and serving the East India Company in an age of reason and enlightenment, seems to be fully occupied with the enlightened trends and the Company’s commercial and administrative interests. He was fully convinced of the enlightened style of translations of oriental writings to understand the orient.\(^{47}\) Hastings’ encouragement to oriental learning especially to solve the problems related to administration of justice and revenue collection set the focus of Gladwin’s concentration on administrative issues.\(^{48}\) However, arrival of Sir William Jones in India at the end of eighteenth century raised a romantic passion among British elite in India. Gladwin seems to be influenced by this epoch. His focus seems to be diverted to poetry and fiction.\(^{49}\) However, contrary to Jones, he remained firm in his enlightened footing of concentrating on contemporary Indian state and society and Persian language rather than ancient India and Sanskrit language. The rise of the question of morality in the late eighteenth century also directed his attention more to Persian poetry of Hafiz and Sadi\(^{50}\) than to ancient Sanskrit. In this perspective, his thought seems to be fully occupied with enlightened orientalism, East India Company’s administrative problems, literary passions of romanticism and moral question of the evangelicals and rising utilitarians. As enlightened orientalism, administrative problem and question of morality can be seen combined in utilitarian philosophy, so Gladwin could be taken as an enlightened bridge to utilitarianism and his writings serve the purpose of moral as well as indigenous administrative purposes.

2.1.2. Gladwin’s Concept of History.

Gladwin does not describe his concept of history in any definite form. However, his works depict his understanding of history. He seems to be adopting a purposive approach to history and to be combining history with moral or administrative purposes, without defining any literary or philosophical bias. However, his complete neglect of ancient history and focus on contemporary history shows his disliking of mythological and dictionary approach to historical and mythological literature. He seems to be much concerned with a straightforward

\(^{47}\) That is why he began to translate Indian writings into English. His works include a number of translations.

\(^{48}\) Hastings encouraged Gladwin to translate Ayeen Akbar and other Persian writings, which, could contribute to the understanding of India’s administrative and revenue problems and their solution.

\(^{49}\) His writings after 1785 seem to be dominated by a literary perspective rather than an administrative one. However Gladwin’s Persian base remains firm in his works.

\(^{50}\) Two Persian Poets.
understanding of history, more suitable in the form of translations from the oriental languages and original documents than an interpretative or analytical method. Even in Persian poetry, Gladwin refused to include immoral and imaginary and licentious fiction. In his edited *Asiatic Miscellany*, the same approach has been adopted. As a whole, Gladwin’s concept of history is more attached to a moral purposive approach to history and literature than philosophy, fiction or mythology. The same concept depicts his criterion for the study of a civilization.

Gladwin sees the development of civilization in terms of the development of political institutions and assigns rulers a prominent role in this process. He sees the state of civilization fluctuating by the change of rulers. However, he measures the success of rule and ruler with the success of administration. Thus administration appears to be the most effective tool, contributing in the rise and decline of civilization. As ruler and ruled are two vital components of society, therefore, system of morality seems to be a force uniting ruling elite and administration with common people. Success of a ruler and administration as well as growth of civilization depends on the relation between moral structure and these institutions for Gladwin. In this way, Gladwin assigns religious leadership a prominent role as the preachers of morality and as harmonisers of different interests and fractions of society. These theories seems to be underlying current of Gladwin’s writings, therefore, he focused on these trends in the study of Indian history.

2.1.3. Gladwin’s Unit of Historical Studies.

As Gladwin was thoroughly committed to his administrative work, his utmost concern remained connected with this problem. Therefore, contemporary and near past administrative institutional history appear to be his unit of historical studies. Gladwin’s foremost-appreciated work was his translation of *Ayeen Akbary*, which he translated in the name of *Institutes of Akbar*. He also appreciated Jones’ works on administrative institutions. Further more he seems to be taking language as an institution essential for administrative and moral development. He focuses on moral Persian literature, which also indicates that to Gladwin morals were also an institution, which could be promoted by language and literature and

---

51 Gladwin, *Institutes.*
could be helpful in solving administrative problems in an immoral society. He seems confirm in the view that the Mughal administration of India was suitable system for the region and a balanced approach to administrative problems. This Mughul system and near past were dominated by Persian language and administration was concerned with revenue system and distribution of social and religious justice. These issues seem to be his priority areas. However, his sources and method seems to be purely enlightened, focusing on the understanding of indigenous society by indigenous writings through translations.

Gladwin focus was on his contemporary history, therefore, the Muslim rule appears his central focus. As he was just trying to understand his contemporary history through the indigenous sources, which were almost written by the Muslims, so, he adopted the Muslim view of the Muslim rule in India, which is very sympathetic to the Muslims. He depicts a good administrative coordination and cultural relations between the Hindus and the Muslims and highlights the indigenous support for Muslim rule due to sound and just administrative policies. The same trend Gladwin sees as a cause of the rise of Indo-Muslim civilization.

The East India Company’s administrative problems and issues of its involvement in the political problems of India were the leading questions of Gladwin’s time. On the one hand, if the romance of the superiority of western civilization was fast growing, on the other hand, the company’s concern with the trade and commerce was issue of the day. In this problematic scenario, Gladwin supported the limitation of the company’s concern to the administration, underlining the question of moral superiority of west or inferiority of India. His approach was based on the enlightened trends of the romance of diversities of cultures. His treatment of religion seems to be based on the same ground. Simultaneously he was not aware or impressed by the post-French Revolution trends. However the loss of American colonies seems to be working actively behind his focus of suggestion on administration of India. Therefore, Gladwin does not suggest any structural administrative change or any active attempt for the westernisation or evangelisation of India.

---

52 For example see Francis Gladwin, tr., Pandhanah or Book of Advice Comprising a Compendium of Ethics of Shaikh Sadi, Calcutta, 1786. Whether Gladwin’s not commenting on Sadi’s moral and ethical view can be taken as his acceptance or agreement with Sadi’s moral approach or not, is a question which can be resolved in the view that Gladwin was not philosophical minded. On the other hand he was not on good terms with mythological approach. Simultaneously his not referring to Christian morality, indicates that he was much impressed by the moral approach presented in the Persian moral poetry of Shaikh Sadi.
2.2. Gladwin's Focus on Muslim India.

In an age of the rise and spread of antiquarian romance of the Hindu religion and Sanskrit language, Gladwin seems to be following the themes very strongly identified as belonging to the Muslim state or society. Three major areas of his interest, contemporary administrative problem, Mughul history and Persian literature appear to be closely associated with the Muslims. At the end of the eighteenth century, the British were taking over the political and administrative control in India from Mughuls who had been taken as most talented administrators of India in the contemporary British writings. Mughuls had been taken as a symbol of Muslim cultural and political zenith in India. They promoted Persian language and literature in India and Persian became more important for Muslims in India than Arabic. Gladwin's translations were more important because of the use of these translations for the students of Fort William College and the Company's servants. Gladwin seems to be developing a simple and favourable view about the calibre of the Muslims that surely would have influenced the young minds of his age. Jones had no public contact; therefore, contrary to Jones, Gladwin's dealing with the Muslim mind and morals can be taken as a public and common understanding of the issues. He focused on Akbar and Jahangir in his histories, translated the memoirs of a Bengali Muslim and promoted Persian language as professor at Fort William College. Even his translations from Persian poetry have still been taken as a symbol of Muslim moral and reformist literature. His Dictionary of Religious Ceremonies was also strongly dominated by Muslim religious rituals and festivals. In the same way, he translated An Epitome of Mohammedan Law aiming to administer the distribution of justice among the Muslims on the Islamic principles. Only one writing of Gladwin deals with the theme other than the Muslims or Persian language and literature, which he wrote about

53 See Gladwin, Jahangir; Francis Gladwin, A Narrative of the Transactions in Bengal During the Subahdaries of Azeem us Shan, Jaffier Khan, Shuja Khan, Sirfaraz Khan and Aliyverdi Khan, Calcutta, 1788.
54 Francis Gladwin, Memoirs of Khojed Abdul Kercem, Calcutta, n.d.
56 For Example see The Tuti Namah or Tales of a Parrot, London, 1801; Pandhanamah or Book of Advice Comprising a Compendium of Ethics of Shaikh Sadi, Calcutta, 1786; The Gulistan of Saadi, Two Volumes, Calcutta, 1806.
58 An Epitome of Mohammedan Law, Mirat al Masail, Calcutta, 1786.
Bible⁵⁹. However, his constant emphasis on the translation of Muslim Persian moral literature, confirms his sympathetic attitude towards the Muslims. Although he seems to be in an open conflict with the dominant leaders of literary circles in Calcutta belonging to Jones’ school and Asiatic Society of Bengal,⁶⁰ yet, he remained committed to his approach.⁶¹

Whether Gladwin was following the enlightened tradition of understanding different contemporary cultures with their indigenous foundation or trying to understand the administrative history of India through the language and political history, is an important question. Enlightenment recognized the world other than Christian and tried to know and understand this “other” through the sources of “other”. Gladwin continued this method. However, his method seems to be very strongly directed by administrative problems or understanding of the system, overtaken by the interest of the East India Company. Gladwin, by not making any reference to any contemporary intellectual discourse or issue, even in his translated works, shows his non-philosophical bent of mind.

On the other hand, a psychic British pragmatism can also be identified in Gladwin’s writings. The fundamental pragmatism working behind the success of the Mughul Muslim administration in India for a long time, as highlighted by Bernard Cohn, appears to be a source of inspiration and a way out for the solution of Indian problems of the British Indian pragmatic administrators.⁶² Mughul history was closely associated with the presentation of Indian problem, on the one hand and solution of these problems, on the other. These administrative problems were again linked with contemporary problems faced by the British as successors of the Mughuls. Again the question of the legitimacy of the Mughul power was being traced in the Mughul administration. By adopting a Mughul administrative policy,

⁵⁹ Ostervald’s Abridgement of the History of Bible and Catechetical Instruction, Calcutta, 1792.
⁶⁰ Jones’ letter to Hastings. Gladwin was also a founder member of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal. His name is included in the list of founder members of the society published in the first issue of the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal. However, prior to the publication of the journal of the society Gladwin published his Asiatic Miscellany without mentioning the name of editor, in the hope that the society will own it and organize it. But Jones very strongly refused to own it as society’s publication. Later Jones even showed his distrust on Gladwin as in charge of company’s press, responsible for the publication of Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal. Whether this was a personal rivalry or intellectual conflict, is an important issue. It seems that the method and focus of Asiatic Miscellany was very unlikely for Jones. Rather than focusing the Jones’ favourite style of interpreting and explaining mythological and ancient literature in the form of Sanskrit, Gladwin’s focus was on contemporary moral and historical literature in the form of Persian.
⁶¹ See the contents of the Gladwin’s edited Asiatic Miscellany, Calcutta, 1785, and New Asiatic Miscellany, Calcutta, 1788. Both the edited works are primarily based on translations from oriental languages and strongly dominated by Persian language and Muslim administration and religion.
⁶² Bernard Cohn, An Anthropologist Among the Historians and Other Essays, Delhi, 1987, p. 139.
British could claim a continuity of the system. In this perspective, *history of the Mughul India* as a contemporary history and Persian as the administrative and political language seem to be attracting the attention of Gladwin. Adoption of the view that Muslim administration in India was a brilliant success and that Persian was a cultural as well as administrative language suitable for India, in the background of two emerging philosophies, Bentham’s institutional utilitarianism and Jones’ literary romance, *seem to be very important*. Although generalization and philosophic approaches were never adopted by Gladwin, yet, by his method, Gladwin seems to be accepting the Muslim India on a level of an advance civilization according to the standards set by both encroaching philosophies. The status of Muslim India inherited in Gladwin’s view, can be taken as an attempt to make the policy of adopting Mughul institutions for the solution of Indian problems as an undisputed fact.

### 2.3. Mughuls and Administrative Institutions in India.

Gladwin’s approach to Indian studies was very closely associated with his official work and stand in administrative debates. Most of his works, other than linguistics, seems to be closely associated with administrative issues and problems.⁶³ He approaches the Mughul administration in the perspective of division of authority and duties between the centre and the provinces. For Central administration, his model comes from the reign of Akbar, the Great. By translating *Ayeen Akbar* into English Gladwin seems to be presenting the solution of Indian administrative problem from the contemporary and “near past” in history. He seems to be idealizing Akbar’s administrative system, “presenting a high idea of government” and a “lasting monument”, which was the main cause of the success of Mughul rule, prosperity of India and regard for the person and property of the meanest peasant. As English concern was mostly associated with Bengal, *so Gladwin also focuses the Bengal administration in another work*.⁶⁴ The large sum of revenue collected by central authority through provincial administration inspires Gladwin a lot to adopt the Mughul system for Indo-British administration.

Gladwin shows his astonishment as to how a person born in a Muslim family could establish such a system.⁶⁵ To Gladwin, Islam was “a faith notorious for its intolerance”, an antonym to “freedom and rights of humanity”. He sees Muslims “persecuting all those who

---

⁶³ See for details the list of Gladwin’s works.
embraced not their particular creed... even those amongst themselves who differ but in the most immaterial points regarding them as absolute infidels”. However, Akbar’s “Universal Philanthropy”, as identified in his Institutes was the root cause of the splendour and prosperity of the Mughul Empire. Although a minority, Akbar’s administration was benevolent. Akbar developed matrimonial alliances with the Hindu Rajas and strengthened his empire. He writes:

We contemplate with still higher admiration and reverence, the monarch, who in opposition to the prevailing maxims of despotism, could not only adopt such enlarged sentiments himself, but have the generosity to authorize their promulgation in order to diffuse general happiness, by establishing peace and unanimity amongst his subjects of such opposite persuasions as Bedes and Muhammadan faith.

Gladwin presents Mughul rule as personalized despotism, very effective under enlightened rulers such as Akbar and Jahangir. Gladwin finds the shifting of despotism to the provincial authorities, especially in Bengal. In this perspective, he seems to be looking at the success of Indian administration on administrators, in Mughul case “Omrah”, also having a military role. Gladwin takes Mughul Emperor as a nominal head of the administration, the real powers shifted to the Omrah. As a personalized system, Mughul administration was dependant on personal qualities of Omrah, and its success associated with the wisdom integrity and economy of highly efficient Omrah such as Beram Khan. Therefore, Gladwin believes that the elevation of licentious and hereditary Omrah to administrative ranks was the real problem for Mughul administration. However, this problem emerged out of the interference of Harem in administrative affairs. Gladwin exemplifies his

---

66 Gladwin, Jahangir, p. iv.
67 Ibid., p. vii.
68 Vedas: some ancient tracts of Hindu religion.
69 Gladwin, Jahangir, p. iii.
70 See Ibid.
71 See Gladwin, A Narrative of the Transactions in Bengal During the Subahdaries of Azeem us Shan, Jaffer Khan, Shuja Khan, Sirfaraz Khan and Alyverdi Khan, Calcutta, 1788.
72 Nobles and Courtiers.
73 Gladwin’s History of Jahangir bears the same concept. The same concept can be found working behind his translation of Memoir of Khojeh Abdul Kareemee, primarily an account of the contemporary Omrah working as administrators.
74 Gladwin appreciates Jaffar Khan, a Governor of Bengal, for his character as an administrator Ameer. For Gladwin’s view of Omrahs and Governors of Bengal see his A Narrative of the Transactions in Bengal During the Subahdaries of Azeem us Shan, Jaffer Khan, Shuja Khan, Sirfaraz Khan and Alyverdi Khan, Calcutta, 1788. He is of the opinion that Jaffar Khan’s administration was at a time liberal and strict and religious and secular. pp.109-127.
75 Gladwin, Jahangir, p. ii.
76 Harem is a term applied to inner household (Zenana Khan).
thesis by the role of Noor Jahan in the administrative and succession issues during the reign of Jahangir.77

Gladwin is of the opinion that the character of the Mughul structure underwent a change during the reigns subsequent to Akbar. The purpose of writing a History of Hindostan was “a delineation of most material changes that happened in the rules of Hindostan” during the succeeding reigns of Jehangir, Shahjahan and Aurangzeb. However, he believes that the reigns of Jehangir and Shah Jahan afford only few instances of innovation or reform. Jehangir confirmed the rules and laws issued and officers appointed by his father. He was moderate in his conduct. His theory of government was that “when the peace of the empire is at stake, no regard must be paid to our children, for that a king has no relation”.78

Gladwin seems to be of the opinion that for Akbar and Jahangir, empire and its peace was prior to even religion and relations. However, this policy faced a very strong challenge. The contests for succession, the problem generated by the close relatives of the emperors, created a permanent problem for the smooth sailing of administration and divided the loyalties of Omras. On the other hand, the reign of Aurangzeb furnished many important documents of change, as under the government of that monarch, Islamic law, which was before that time only implied, was publicly declared the constitutional law of Hindostan. However, he asserts that even in these edicts the landed property and other rights of the subjects were clearly stated and he appreciates this constitutional nature of Aurangzeb’s edicts.79

Gladwin’s presentation of Mughul administration as a model appears to be based on a few understandings. First that it was based on a clearly defined constitution even during the reign of Aurangzeb. Second that it clearly stated the rights of the subjects. Third that religion and relations had a minimum role in this administration, except during the reign of Aurangzeb. Fourth that this administration imparted prosperity and “happiness among its subjects”. It can be supposed that Gladwin wanted to see British Indian government to be based on these principles.

Why Gladwin was idealizing Akbar’s administration can be a very interesting question. One can identify two main reasons working behind Gladwin’s attitude. First: a fundamental

77 Gladwin, Jahangir, pp. 1-5.
78 Ibid., p. 5.
79 Ibid., p. 5. By using the word “constitution”, Gladwin seems to be of the opinion that Mughul monarch was bound to some basic rules and regulations designed to run the system of government. In this regard, he had no absolute powers and Mughul despotism was not a lawless phenomenon of authority.
pragmatism has been identified working behind Mughul administration\textsuperscript{80}, which could be best, matched with English pragmatism. This correlation between the attitudes seems to be attracting the attention of Gladwin. Second: Gladwin seems to be well aware about the dual nature of Mughul administration, Hindu and Muslim. In \textit{Ayeen Akbary}, Gladwin sees Akbar and his Minister Abul Fazl seeking a plural society, based on mutual respect. This character of tolerant enquiry exerted a lasting impact on many members of Muslim and Hindu intelligentsia\textsuperscript{81}, which resulted in the systematic consideration of classical Hindu philosophy under Muslim administration.\textsuperscript{82} Gladwin takes Akbar’s administration as representative of both ruling and ruled community, which seems to him to be an ideal situation.

2.4. Persian Language, Literature and Administration.

The East India Company was much interested in the growth of administrative and cultural languages to have a good communication with indigenous people and a command over administrative problems. Warren Hastings’ administration had promoted scholarship in Hindustani, Persian, Arabic and Sanskrit. Gladwin had a deep interest in identifying the relations of languages with the solution of administrative problems. Hindustani language was being projected as a common language for Indian people. Therefore, Gladwin was very conscious of this issue. He seems to be against the view that Hindustani could be a language for common Indian people. He seems to be in favour of the continuation of Persian language as administrative language. If Persian was being identified as the language of the Muslims, Gladwin takes Hindustani as the language of the Moors\textsuperscript{83}, which was primarily based on Persian and Arabic.\textsuperscript{84} In this perspective, he seems to be negating the need of replacement of Persian Language with Hindustani.\textsuperscript{85} He had full confidence in Persian as a language having administrative and cultural records of India. In pursuance of this confidence, he was emotionally committed to the promotion of Persian language. He had a “considerable reputation as an accomplished Persian scholar” and translated a number of administrative

\textsuperscript{80} Bernard Cohn, \textit{An Anthropologist Among the Historians and other Essays}, Delhi, 1987, p. 139.


\textsuperscript{82} Wilhelm Halbfass, \textit{India and Europe}, Delhi, 1993, p. 37.

\textsuperscript{83} The word “Moors” has been applied to the Muslims in Spain. However some writers have used it for the Muslims in general.

\textsuperscript{84} See Addenda to Gladwin, \textit{Institute}.

Persian tracts into English. After the formation of Asiatic Society of Bengal, when the new administrative and intellectual elite's concern had become limited to Sanskrit language and literature, Gladwin showed an unchallenged commitment to Persian Language and literature.

For the promotion of Persian as a contemporary and administrative language, Gladwin issued two journals: Asiatic Miscellany and New Asiatic Miscellany, both devoted to Persian language and literature. In the preface to the second volume of Asiatic Miscellany, commenting on the Persian literature Gladwin wrote:

...while these works of imagination give us a title to the notice of lovers of poetry, the more solid productions of an historical and political kind afford us a claim on the attention of the learned and the curious.

In these journals, he published the translations of Persian moral literature and administrative records. He faced a very unwelcoming response from his colleagues in the Asiatic society of Bengal. However, he continued his commitment and ultimately was appointed Professor of Persian language and Literature in 1801.

As a whole Gladwin seems to be much impressed by Mughul administration. He judged this administration on its role for the spread of happiness among its subjects and its constitutional nature, which can be identified as two criterions, set by utilitarians to judge the efficiency of a government. His appreciation also comes from the negation of the role of religion in the administration. He seems to be of the opinion that Persian language was a language having full credentials for the solution of administrative problem, especially when its administrative records had a harmony with the ancient Indian culture. In this perspective, his commitment to Persian shows his view that he was against the efforts made by his contemporary romanticists for the revival of the ancient Indian language, Sanskrit. Simultaneously, the romanticists tried to create problems for his enlightened-utilitarian approach. In this way, inspite of not being a theoretical utilitarian, Gladwin seems to be using those standpoints which the utilitarians adopted from the tradition of the Enlightenment.

---

66 see the list of Gladwin's works.
68 See Supra chapter third.

Gladwin silently resisted the romantic views. He continued his pragmatic enlightened approach in a non-debating way to work for his own understanding without condemning any school of thought or view. However, this attitude seems to be taking a polemical and rhetorical form in James Mill's History of India. James Mill expressed his opinion through an historical analysis of Indian civilization in an authoritative way.


James Mill (1773-1836) has been taken as a utilitarian philosopher, a radical reformer, a journalist, a psychologist and as an economist. However, he won a controversial but prominent reputation as an historian of India. He has been criticized at large by the Indian as well as western writers for his views on Indian civilization since the first publication of his History of India. He has been presented as an extreme rationalist and as an exponent of utilitarianism. James Mill was given a charming post in the East India Company's home administration after the publication of his views in his History of India. He wrote on a variety of aspects, all linked with his utilitarian thought and the cause of reform and had been taken as a tone setter of the British attitude towards Indian Hindu and Muslim people.

3.1.1. Setting of James Mill’s Thought.

James Mill born in a Scottish family during an age of reason and enlightenment was educated in Scottish philosophical tradition dominated by reason, from Hume to Stewart. In his early age, he was much impressed by the contemporary philosophical debates and his mind was inclined to a philosophical perspective by this environment. Mill was much annoyed by imaginary thinking and criticized his contemporary romanticists and their method. He was deeply involved in analysing things on rational foundations with

---

89 For the criticism of Mill’s History of India see the writings of William Erskine, Sleeman, etc., among his contemporaries and writings of Balachandra Ragan, etc. among the moderns.
92 See his criticism of Jones and his method in the first volume of his History of India, Vol. ii, pp. 137-141. Also see Javed Majeed’s "James Mill’s 'The History of British India' and Utilitarianism as a Rhetoric of Reform", in Modern Asian Studies, 24/2, pp. 209-211.
philosophical approach and logical faculty.\textsuperscript{93} This approach seems to be developing a sense of generating generalized or universal principles in Mill’s thought system.\textsuperscript{94}

As contemporary philosophers were addressing the question of criterion for the justification and evaluation of morality, Mill too, asks the same question. He looks at all aspects of man, mind and universe, even religion, in terms of natural and rational laws.\textsuperscript{95} Going through Locks’ theory of “natural operation of mind”,\textsuperscript{96} Kant’s “human rationale”,\textsuperscript{97} Hartley’s “social impression”\textsuperscript{98} and Reid and Dugald Stewart’s “common sense”,\textsuperscript{99} Mill associated himself with Bentham’s concept of “utility”, working behind all human actions.\textsuperscript{100} Mill applied the concept of “utility” to all aspect of man and society and judged all institutions and morals, from civilization to individual action, on this criterion. Believing in the theory of human progress in the form of constitutions and institutions, he places western civilization as the “maxim” of human development in terms of institutions.\textsuperscript{101} He idealizes western institutions such as democracy, liberty, equality, free trade, industrialization, bourgeoisie class. … etc.\textsuperscript{102} However, he seems to be dissatisfied with the current state of

\begin{footnotesize}\begin{enumerate}
\item See Mill, \textit{Mind.; Alexander Bain, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 420.}
\item James Mill, \textit{Essays}, London, 1828, p. 8.; G. S. Bower, \textit{Hartley and James Mill,} London. 1990. pp. 234-235. Mill writes in his essay on education that “the great object [of education] is to ascertain sequences (of knowledge) more extensivly, till the succession of all events may be reduced to a number of sequences – sufficiently small for each of them to receive a name” In the same way Mill takes \textit{Laws of Nations} and Jurisprudence as such attempts for generalization and philosophization. See Mill’s essay on “Jurisprudence” and “Laws of Nations”. Winch is of the opinion that all the writings of Mill were based on deeply held conviction concerning the importance of theory or abstract principle. Mill promoted this approach to economy by pushing Ricardo to write \textit{Principles of Political Economy} and Mill himself explained these elements in his of \textit{Elements Political Economy}, London, 1821.
\item \textit{Mill, India,} Vol. I, p.284-293.
\item D. Hartley, \textit{Observations on Man, His Frame, His Duty, and His Expectations,} Two Volumes, London, 1794.
\item For Mill such institutions were democracy, liberty, education, new middle class, free trade, jail system, universal suffrage, etc.
\end{enumerate}\end{footnotesize}
western and especially British affairs. He was an advocate of radical social change and reforms in the society, which was based on associationist psychological philosophy.

Following Hartley's thought, Mill believed that organizing principle of human mind was association of ideas. On this foundation, Mill believed that human mind was a raw material, which could be moulded according to the utilitarian dictates. He stressed the need for a purposive universal education, for the dissemination of liberal and useful knowledge. Although Mill believed that political power, the worst kind of privilege, yet, he was of the opinion that government should play a role in moulding the minds of the people and he was ready to vest in state and government authority, necessary for the reformation of "degeneracy of social intercourse". Mill also sees this authority linked with external challenges. However, amelioration of the institutions of government was the highest virtue for Mill. As Mill's utility, education and reform all were associated with contemporary state and society, so his contemporary state and society, especially British, became central in his thought system.

103 Mill was very closely associated with Evangelicals for the advocacy of social change. In one of his letters Mill assured Zachary Macaulay of his support for the cause of Charles Grant, see Lady Knutsford, Life and Letters of Zachary Macaulay, London, 1880, pp. 341-8. This combination influenced to a great extent the British Indian policy. For a critical assessment of the view see P. Spear, "Bentinck and Education" in Cambridge Historical Journal, 1938, Vol. X, pp. 78-101.

104 Alexander Bain has quoted some of his statements, which show his concept of reform. Mill believes that a genuine reformer is a radical who stands up to his principles. Mill warns his co-activists that anti reformists were merging into reformists in the name of moderation. Alexander Bain, op. cit., pp. 378-380. Also see for details Leslie Stephen. The English Utilitarians. London, 1900.

105 See Mill, Mind.

106 Ibid.


110 Ballachandra Rajan is of the opinion that Hegel's theory of state was a systematic elaboration of Mill's authoritarianism. Ballachandra Rajan, op. cit., p. 78.

111 Jack Lively and John Rees explain that the utilitarian view of education was fundamentally didactic and authoritarian. The aim of education is to inculcate those social and moral truths, which will enable men to grasp and pursue their long-term interests. See Jack Lively and John Rees, Utilitarian Logic and Politics, James Mill's "Essay on Government", Macaulay's critic and the ensuing debate, Oxford, 1978, p. 48. Also see Leslie Stephen, op. cit. Alexander Bain, op. cit., p. 399.

112 For instance debating on the nature of Colonies, Mill writes that colonization is not the interest of common people, but a few or the many to exploit the bad government. There is physical force of enemy and terror to keep the colonies intact under the British authority. See for details James Mill, Essays, London, 1828, p.30-3.

113 Alexander Bain, op. cit., p. 289.

Following this thought pattern, Alexander Bain appreciates Mill's "love of truth", self-denying faculty, and his deep concern for the refinement of manners in the society. In this perspective, Bower concludes that Mill was trying to harmonize practice with theory. For that he had a conviction that a syllogism could always be applied to existing social conditions. So, he had an extraordinary devotion to newborn ideas such as individualism, liberty and freedom of press. He believed in reforms rather than revival and in the possibility of altering the world by Bentham's Chrestomathies. However, Mill presented his thought system in the Indian context, advocating the introduction of constitutional form of government and western institutions in India, criticizing despotism and the company's monopoly.

3.1.2. Mill's Concept of History.

James Mill was primarily a follower of Scottish rational philosophical tradition, focusing on man's relation with society in terms of natural laws. So, Mill looks at history in philosophical terms. He takes history as a significant opportunity for the testing of his utilitarian "philosophical approach", on the model of Scottish philosophers. For Mill, knowledge of the past was useful "only for the improvement of the future". He presents his philosophical ideas as "the verdict of mankind's experience" which could best be utilized

---

115 Ibid., pp. 419-426.
116 James Mill, Essays, London, 1828, pp. 1-13. Mill's "Prison and Prison Discipline" can be a good example of Mill's devotion for these ideas. It represents his individualistic morality, seeking individual safety and rights in custody and taking a sense of reformation in the punishment and prison. Simultaneously Mill believes that freedom of censor on the conduct of their rules is necessary for the good of people. It is necessary for a discussion to present and analyse the opinions of different sections of society to reform the state and society. See "Freedom of Press" in James Mill, Essays, pp. 19, 27, 30. In his article on "Jurisprudence" Mill has a close concern with the protection of rights. See Mill, Essays, p. 7. Simultaneously, in "Government" Mill criticizes all forms of government for their failure to provide requisite securities to the people which are the end of Government. James Mill, Essays, p. 13.
In this perspective all articles of James Mill seems to be moving around the concept of liberty, freedom and individual rights.
117 G. S. Bower, op. cit., p.236
118 Mill criticizes any positive estimate of any non-western civilization and criticises them for their being based on "scattered light" and "fables". See Mill's estimate of civilizations at the beginning of the section.
120 His views on the issues can be seen in Mill, "Wilks' Historical sketches' in Electric Review, volume VI, August 1810.
121 Jane Rendall, op. cit., p. 43.
122 James Mill, "William Gipin's The Lives of Reformers", in The Philanthropist, IV, 1814, p. 117
123 G. S. Bower, op. cit., p. 186.
by drawing generalization through the sequences of events. As a philosophers' utmost concern remains with principles and laws, Mill adopts the same approach. He believed that the historian’s task was to delineate the natural laws in human progress. For Mill, history was not a set of recited but of methodological phenomena and the laws which regulate them. The historian should completely understand this. In this regard, Mill combines the philosophical approach through idea of progress with history, which makes his History of India a philosophical history. Winch and Duncan Forbes designate this technique and method as “conjectural history”. As this approach brings into action some sort of purpose, so, Mill takes history as a force to judge and distinguish between real and false cause as well as good and bad end.

Mill distinguishes between “history”, “mythology” and “superstitions” as well as between fact and opinion and wishes to establish a clear distinction between the two. Thus history appears to be a mature field of knowledge and becomes by itself a scale to evaluate the status of a civilization, as well as a tool of comparison.

However, his criticism of Indian historiography can also be explained in terms of his concept of history. By criticizing ancient Indian sources, Mill confirms his views that a history of philosophy, not fables and institutions or mythology, was the subject matter of

124 Mill writes in his essay on “Education” that “the great object [of education] is to ascertain sequences (of knowledge) more extensively, till the succession of all events may be reduced to a number of sequences – sufficiently small for each of them to receive a name”. James Mill, Essays, p.8; G. S. Bower, op. cit., pp. 234-235. On the same way Mill takes laws of nations and jurisprudence as such type of attempt for generalization and philosophisation. See James Mill, Essays.
126 In his essay on “Toleration”, Mill tries to argue in favour of toleration by subjective and objective ways. For mill an understanding of subjective elements creates a sense of toleration as a sense of objectivity frees man from personal biases. He measures all these things in terms of degrees and levels as Ricardo does in his theory of utility.
127 James Westfall Thompson, op. cit., p.293.
132 Donald Winch, op. cit., p.384.
133 Mill has adopted the method of comparative study of civilizations through the different ages of human history.
134 Grewal, Historian, p.54.
history. Mill takes history as a source of knowledge based on evidence. In this perspective, as belief has no such evidence, Mill condemns religion, rituals and church as baseless, having no authenticity to be spread in the society.\(^{135}\) So, he marks the status of civilizations on the basis of their historical records in any form. However, he divides the history according to the dominant approaches as in India: Hindu, Muslim and British, which represent their different systems. However in Mill’s thought history appears a progressive movement, leading mankind to the achievement of her utility and dissemination of happiness to the maximum number of people. To Mill, Western civilization was at the highest in the ranking of progress and dissemination of happiness. This appears to be a pragmatic approach adopted by Mill to resolve the conflict between “theory and practice”\(^{136}\) in his study of history.

James Mill’s civilization seems to be based on institutions and philosophy working behind the institutions against Gladwin’s concept of the role of rulers. He does not believe in the role of religion in the development of civilization, rather he considers religion a cause for the savageness of a society. Thus, he moves from man-centred enlightened approach to institution-centred utilitarianism. However, he sees the development of these institutions by the philosophers for common people.

3.1.3. Mill’s Unit of Historical Studies.

According to James Stuart Mill, James Mill’s *History* was a landmark in the “history and philosophy of civilization”.\(^{137}\) According to Mill’s standard history of civilization was a “complete history” and history was the “analysis of civilization”.\(^{138}\) However, Mill’s criterion for the assessment of civilization becomes a necessary part of his unit of historical studies. He analyses a civilization in terms of its religion, laws, institutions, literature, form and system of government, social stratification and, most of all, utility of all such things in the promotion of happiness of man. On this model, he divides the history of civilizations into three categories, according to the dominant philosophies of the civilizations: barbarian, semi-civilized and civilized. In this way, Mill takes two simultaneous paths of philosophy of history and history of civilization into a single narration. In this elevation of history, political history became a small part. This unit depicts Mill’s attitude to define things in terms of

\(^{135}\) "Toleration" in Mill, *Essays*, pp.1-3


\(^{138}\) Grewal, *Muslim*, p. 69.
universal laws applicable to the majority of people. Civilization appears to be the biggest unit of human socialization, affecting maximum number of people. Mill seems to be of the opinion that by adopting civilization as a unit of historical studies, a civilization could contribute maximum happiness for maximum number of people on earth. This concept leads to the elevation of the west as the single, most potent civilization, which could provide maximum happiness to the maximum number of human individuals.

However, Javed Majeed’s assessment seems to be very logical that Mill was afraid of questions of identities and cultures that were a threat to his philosophical generalizations in terms of universal principles. That is why Mill adopts civilizations as his unit of historical studies.

British India was Mill’s central focus and Hinduism was its potent rival for him. Mill deals with Muslim India just as a supporting argument to prove his thesis of the savage state of Hindu society and civilized status of western civilization. He assigns Muslim period of Indian History only one hundred pages in his History. His treatment of the Muslim is not sympathetic. Although Mill’s treatment of Muslim India seems sympathetic as compare to his treatment of Hinduism, but his declination to accept the civilized status of Muslim civilization shows his antagonistic approach to the Muslim civilization. However, Mill depicts a great impact of the Muslim civilization on Hinduism, especially, in the institutional and political framework.

Nature of laws, government’s domestic as well as imperial policies and the role of the East India Company were the burning issues of Mill’s times. On the one hand, nature of home administration was under discussion and, simultaneously, the relation of the company with the home government was focused on. In this perspective, Mill was of the opinion that issue should be prioritised as well as be resolved on the basis of their utility for the socio-political purposes. Mill was of the opinion that home administration should be brought to check and balances, but, Indian administration should remain in the hands of the Company and policy should be devised on the basis of objective conditions of the two countries that do not similar with each other. Although believing in the universality of socio-political norms of

---

\(^{139}\) Javed Majeed, "James Mill’s ‘The History of British India’ and Utilitarianism as a Rhetoric of Reform", in *Modern Asian Studies*, XXIV/2, p. 221.
western civilization, Mill supports the Company’s treatment of India contrary to emerging western pattern and system.

Mill’s system was dictated by his wish to reform the home administration and, to promote the imperial cause. It was based on his contemporary concepts of enlightenment, utilitarianism, colonialism and newborn humanitarianism. However, he applies his enlightened, utilitarian and humanitarian concept in his treatment of India in the colonial context, which was fast growing out of Industrialization and nationalism. For that, he uses his contemporary emerging trends of historicism in a philosophical way to deal with liberalism and orientalism, which were considered sympathetic to the orient.

3.2. Mill’s Utilitarian Scaling of Civilizations.

Mill division of history of human society according to barbarian, semi-civilized and civilized seems to be replacing ancient, medieval and modern divisions of the history of civilization. Mill systematizes his understanding of India in the form of ancient Indian civilization, medieval Indo-Muslim civilization and modern British civilization. This division seems to be dominated by political power and authority and, in this way, he seems to be highlighting his view of the role of government in the reformation and development of civilization.\(^{140}\) As his concept was largely developed on the assumption of the superiority of the western civilization, especially, the British system,\(^{141}\) and condemnation of romantic approach to ancient Indian civilization, Mill compares the Hindu civilization with the Muslim.\(^{142}\) In this approach, comparison of the western civilization with the ancient Indian appears out of question for Mill. Therefore, Mill compares the Hindu and Muslim civilization and considers them as natural and equal.


Mill depicts a very critical picture of Hindu society. Criticizing William Jones and his schools’ assessment of ancient India as a highly civilized society,\(^{143}\) Mill made an open “attack on Indian culture and Hindu civilization and branded the whole system as barbaric

---

\(^{140}\) See Mill’s essay on “Government”, in Mill, *Essays*.


and despotic". He tried to prove that Hindu state, society, laws, ritual, social structure, economy, philosophy, science, literature, and even Deities, were false. On the basis of this argument, Mill concludes that Hindu society is anti-development and static and is in the same state of affairs as it was during the ancient times. In their view of Hindu society, utilitarians closely join hands with the evangelicals, especially, Charles Grant and William Ward.

3.4. Mill’s Evaluation of Indo-Muslim Civilization.

Mill considers the comparison between Hindu and Muslim civilizations, equal and natural, but, after taking a very critical view of Hindu society, Mill devotes a small portion to the Muslim India. He focuses on the difference between Hindu and Muslim civilizations, and analyses the Muslim rule in India on the utilitarian scale. However, Mill treats Indo-Muslim civilization as a part of Middle Eastern Muslim civilization. This small portion of Mill’s history is being discussed in the proceeding pages as Muslim India forms the central theme of this study.

3.4.1. Origin of Indo-Muslim Civilization.

Mill takes Indo-Muslim civilization as a part of Persian-Islamic civilization and compares Indo-Muslim civilization with Hindu civilization in this background. In general, Mill seems to be following Gibbon’s view of the superiority of Western civilization over the Muslim. But he seems to be neglecting Gibbon’s view of the role of Islamic civilization in the history of civilization and the natural development of the modern western civilization on the foundations laid by the Muslim civilization. His evaluation of Greek and modern western societies as the only societies attaining the status of civilization and direct approach to Greek civilization as predecessor of modern western civilization seem places Muslim civilization to a more critical assessment than Gibbon. In this assessment, Muslim civilization is inferior to the Greek and its role in the promotion of happiness of mankind is

144 S. C. Mittal, op. cit., p. 21.
146 See Charles Grant, Observations on the State of Society Among the Asiatic Subjects of Great Britain, London, 1813. Also see Infra, Chapter six.
less than pre-Christian civilization. Mill paints Muslim state and society as semi-civilized on the level of Ancient Persian, Egyptian, Mexican and Peruvian societies.\textsuperscript{151}

Mill does not treat Muslim history in continuity with the Roman Empire like Gibbon. Grewal is of the opinion that Mill “compares the state of civilization in Islamic Persia with Hindu” civilization. He relates Indo-Muslim civilization with the state of civilization in Muslim Persia. In this perspective, his comparison was not between Hindu and Indo-Muslim civilization, rather it was a comparison of Hindu society with the “state of civilization among the Mohammedan [Muslim] conquerors of India”,\textsuperscript{152} who were Persianized even before their advent in India.\textsuperscript{153}

3.4.2. Comparison of Hindu and Muslim Civilizations.

James Mill makes India a seat of two civilizations: Hindu and Muslim. However, by taking the Muslim part of his history, as history of Mohammedan conquerors of India, Mill seems to be classifying the Indo-Muslim society as a foreign society. Grewal points out that Mill professed to do this on three considerations: That Islamic civilization was worth studying because of its significance in the history of the world; its existence in India was a significant reality and it should be studied in order to decide whether by Muslim conquests Hindus received an advancement or suppression.\textsuperscript{154} Mill’s treatment of Hindu as well as Muslim civilization appears to be a response to romantic treatment. Romanticists extraordinarily praised the Hindu civilization, putting all the blames of its degeneration on Muslim conquest of India.\textsuperscript{155} Mill traces the germs of degeneration, suppression and superstition in Hindu society from ancient times to modern era and concludes that Hindus were as barbarians in the remote past as in the modern times. Therefore he believed that the degeneration of Hindus could not be attributed to the Muslim conquest of India.\textsuperscript{156}

Mill believes in Charles Grants’ statements about the morals and manners of Hindus and Muslims. According to this estimate, Mill finds all the evils among the Muslims as among the Hindus. What is differentiated between the two communities for Mill is the difference of

\textsuperscript{151} Mill, \textit{India}, passim.

\textsuperscript{152} \textit{Ibid.}, Vol. II, pp. 424-5

\textsuperscript{153} \textit{Ibid.}, Vol. II, pp. 425-8

\textsuperscript{154} Grewal, \textit{Muslim}, p. 85.

\textsuperscript{155} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 85, See for details chapter third of this thesis.

\textsuperscript{156} A defence of this view can be found in the writings of Edward Thornton who accused Hinduism for the degeneration of Muslim society. For details see fifth section of current chapter.
degrees. Muslim religion was superstitious, manners rude, customs irrational and morals depraved.

As Mill takes the Indo-Muslims as conquerors, so, he compares the state of government among the Hindus and the Muslims. Beginning with Mehmud Ghaznavi, Mill marks a great difference in the working of the Hindu and the Muslim governments in India. He argues that the Hindus were used to despotism due to their religion and social structure. Contrarily, the Muslims government was subject to some rules and regulations. For that he makes references to Institutes of Timur and Ayeen Akbary. The Muslim institutions were much less despotic than those of the Hindus. In the same rhetoric, Mill concludes that Muslims contributed to the Hindu civilization a lot and improved it. The state of civilization among the Hindus was much better under the Muslims than under the ancient and original system.

Mill's comparison of Hindu and Indo-Muslim civilization and treatment of Indo-Muslims as foreigners and conquerors can best be understood in imperial and reformist motives. By placing Hindus in a constant state of barbarity, Mill seems to be assuming that a foreign power in India was necessary to make them civilized. By placing Indo-Muslims as foreign and imperial conquerors, placing them in a better state of civilization and highlighting the impact of the Indo-Muslims on the Hindus, Mill advocates for the role of the British in making the Hindus civilized.

3.4.3. Utility of Muslim Civilization.

After determining place of Hindu society in world history on the basis of the standards set by the utilitarians in religion, economy, law, literature, government and institutions on the foundation of utility, happiness and liberty. Mill places the Indo-Muslim civilization in a slightly better category as compared to the Hindu. According to his judgement, the Muslim institutions, culture, government, religion, laws and literature attained a much higher standard of civilization than those of the Hindus. To Mill, the Muslims were superior to the Hindus in all spheres of activity of the civilized world. As romanticists were criticizing the Muslim state for the degeneration of the Hindu society, so, Mill places his utmost

---

159 James Westfall Thompson, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 293.
emphasis on the nature of Muslim political system introduced in India and on religion and government for their role in the development of the behaviour of people.

3.4.4. Muslim Despotism in India.

Mill differentiates between the despotism among the Hindus and among the Muslims. He argues that the Hindus were not fond of liberty. Despotism was inherent in their religion and political system. On the other hand, despotism among the Muslims was due to the Muslim subjects who were not ready to submit to tyranny and suppression. The Muslim rulers were afraid of their Muslim subjects’ insurrections against a tyrannical government which seems to Mill as equal to the modern concept of liberty. Mill takes this attitude of the Muslim subjects in two ways: First, this attitude makes it indispensable for Muslim rulers to become despots. Second, this attitude proved itself as a check on the despotism in a way that the Muslim rulers were afraid of insurrections in case of suppression. However, Mill accepts that the Muslim religion was less despotic, theocratic and tyrant, and it had set the rule and regulations for the working of governmental institutions. The ruler could not violate these rules. He takes these rules as a constitution, acting as a strong check on the authority of a Muslim despot.

Regarding the Muslim rule in India, Mill believed that it was a benevolent kind of despotism. As Hindus were prone to despotism due to their religious beliefs and caste system, so, Muslim despotism was indispensable. This benevolent despotism became violent due to the treacherous acts of Hindu subjects. Shivajee appears to be an example of this treacherous attitude. While criticising Aurangzeb, Mill considers Akbar as a symbol of Muslim benevolent despotism, criticizing Aurangzeb. He points out that by the time of Akbar “the powers of government were distributed and employed with a skill which would not disgrace a period of considerable knowledge and refinement”. The Hindus had no such system. However, Mill categorizes Muslim politics as “oriental despotism”. Although the Muslim rulers were subject to some rules and laws, they were free in their exercise of power.

Mill seems to be looking at the Indo-Muslim civilization in the line simultaneous with the Hindus and views it in terms of a history of unprovoked aggression, warfare, ambitious, treachery, bigotry, insurrections, disorder, tyranny and despotism. Confusion of dynastic rule in all Indo-Muslim sovereignties seems to Mill a “common fate” in which the rival princes looked at each other with dark suspicions or either as “victim or a butcher”. The Muslim
sense of insurrection was inherited in the Indo-Muslim system of state and society. Mill does not want to see a moment of tranquillity even during the reign of Akbar, the Great. Mill takes all these aspects most harmful to progress and seems to be concluding that although the Indo-Muslim civilization was better than that of the Hindus and was not as barbarian as the Hindus, yet due to all these problems, Indo-Muslim society was unable to gain a civilized status and remained on a level of semi-civilized status.

As a whole, politics is the main subject of Mill's utility, aiming at the development of the British Empire. As Mill depicts the Hindus deficient and the Muslims proficient in politics and empire building, it appears to be a basic difference for Mill between the two communities. In an age of Imperialism, empire building and strengthening was a major task before all British intellectuals: administrators, philosophers, academicians and politicians. By defining a role of government in reformation, and empire building as a symbol of success of administration, Mill seems to be defending imperialism. In this way, Mill establishes a criterion for the study of civilization on the basis of institutions, manners and politics for the promotion of human happiness. The concept was later interpreted and defined by J. S. Mill in as "Liberty' among a maximum number of people". Mill declares that the Muslim civilization was superior to the Hindu civilization, according to this criterion. On the other hand, by promoting a cause of empire, Mill practically takes up the case of suppression, tyranny and despotism, which can best be defined as the main tools of empire, contrary to the concepts of liberty, equality and constitutionalism. As he vests in government the duties of reformation of society, in the same way, he vests in a nation the agenda of imperialism to reform the world. That task he assigns to British nation. Mill seems to be in a conflict with power, romance and liberalism. His reformism compels him to take a dark side of things even at home. Thus Mill deplores romanticists. On the other hand, his philosophic mind impresses upon his mind to promote a cause of liberal and utilitarian institutions, which seem to Mill dangerous to the British Empire. He believes that western imperialism had a utility for the Hindu society, which was prone to despotism. So, by depicting the success of the Muslim state and politics, Mill seems to be advocating despotism and imperialism, which was the cause of success of the Muslim rule in India.
3.4.5. Muslim Religion, Morals and Manners.

In Mill’s thought system religion seems to be a geographical phenomenon. Mill divides Indian history into two parts representing two religions and civilizations; one indigenous and the other foreign. He takes Hindus as one without distinguishing between Buddhism, Jainism and Hindu caste religions which are still persistent in Indian communal life. James Mill seems to be firm in his opinion that the Muslim religion and manners were better than Hindus. He criticizes a number of issues except the status of women in the Muslim religion and relates a number of absurdities developed among Indian Muslims to the Quran.

Mill condemns religion in general and takes it as a semi-civilized or barbarian mode of devising morality based on “terrors”. In describing the Muslim society as a religious one, Mill asserts his belief in the semi-civilized status of the Muslim society and accepts that in matters of religion “the superiority of Mohammedans is beyond all dispute”. Muslim religion was more rational than that of the Hindus. By a comparison of Hindu Vedas and Muslim Quran, Mill concludes that the Quran is more societal and practical and less mythological and superstitious. Then Mill traces in the Quran similarity with Jewish and Christian religion. In the Muslim religions, if priesthood was denied on the one hand, some regular standards were set for rulers and officers. Mill confesses that Muslim laws are of “very high standard of excellence” which solve the disputes among the people very effectively. Muslims were free from caste system, which was the worst “barrier against the welfare of humanity”. In the Muslim state and religion all men were treated equal and alliance between priests and princes to exploit the subjects was “much less complete”.

3.4.6. Indo-Muslim Arts, Sciences and Literature.

James Mill believes in useful arts and literature. He condemns mythological and fabulous arts and literature. Mill takes the Quran as a religious as well literary symbol of Muslim civilization. Mill believes in purposive literature and arts and appreciates the Muslim contribution to arts and Literature. Mill tries to prove that in mechanical arts the Hindus were “decidedly inferior” and in fine arts Muslims were decidedly superior. He compares Shahnama of Firdusi with the Hindu Ramayana, and concludes that in the branches of

---

162 Ibid., Vol. I, pp. 128-134. James Mill had criticized the church in 1812, and since that time a thorough and provocative anti-utilitarian approach began to develop among religious intellectuals, which came to a synthesis by Mill’s assurance to Evangelicals, to work for the cause of reform and by the rise of Macaulay, Thornton and Erskine.
literature, Muslim conquerors of India were decidedly superior. In sciences Muslims contributed a lot. Mill takes the contribution of the Muslims in terms that the Muslims were heirs of Greek civilization, which was the only civilization on earth before the modern European civilization. However Mill does not explain that how a society following the most civilized rules became semi-civilized.

Mill believes that historiography was a most prominent indicator of the use of reason and has a “considerable influence in the direction of human affairs”, which needed a degree of intellectual maturity to record past events and provides the relevance of the past with the future. Mill condemns the Hindus for lack of interest in this important field of Knowledge. However, he confesses that Indian Muslims were far better than not only the Hindus but even the Persians. To Mill there was “no specimen” comparable with Farishta and Gholam Hussein’s Histories in Hindu literature.

For Mill differentiation between “myth” and “history” was the basic criterion to judge the sources of the history of civilization. His basic difference with the romanticists emerged out of this issue. By rejecting mythological sources, Mill virtually rejected all foundations of ancient civilizations. The Muslim tradition of historiography seems to Mill a proof of backwardness, rudeness and barbarity of the Hindus and Mill focuses on this issue. However, as history is a systematized and purposive narration of human past, it fulfills the need of a reformative mind, which was the prime focus for Mill.

3.5. Contribution of Indo-Muslim Civilization to Hindu Civilization.

The interaction between the Indo-Muslim and the Hindu civilizations was a big question for Mill. He was to decide “whether by a government, moulded and conducted agreeably to the properties of Persian civilization, instead of a government moulded and conducted agreeably to the properties of Hindu civilization, the Hindu population gained or lost”. For Mill, the promotion of happiness was the single most important task of the government and the Muslims introduced a government that determined a role for the rulers and government, even though it was of despotic nature, for the promotion of happiness of the subjects. The Muslim rulers of India introduced an active, efficient and benevolent administrative system in India. The taxation system promoted economic justice and consequently economic activity

\[163\] Ibid., Vol. II, pp. 59, 60, 460.

\[164\] Ibid., Vol. II, p. 428.
gained a big boost. In this way an efficient system of government, consisting of laws, rules, regulations, governmental institutions and offices was the most valuable work, inherited by the Hindus from the Muslim conquerors of India and their administration. Mill concludes his comparison of the Hindu civilization with the Indo-Muslim with the view that human nature in India gained very considerably through an interaction with the Muslim civilization. For Mill, this fact is as undisputable as the superiority of the Indo-Muslim civilization on Hindu civilization. Although Mill does not mention any moral impact of Islam on Hinduism, however his linkage of Sikhism to Islam shows its moral impact.

3.6. Indo-Muslim Civilization and Western Civilization.

When Mill compares the Indo-Muslims with the Europeans, he places them of a lower status than Greek civilization. Mill begins with an assumption of the over all superiority of western civilization and institutions. In this perspective, he analyses all history of Europe from Greek times to modern times. Simultaneously, Mill not only depreciates rather condemns the role of religion and places it lower than reason, thus his treatment of Hindu and Muslim civilizations on the basis of religion and treatment of Western civilization on the bases of geographical or rational utilitarian criterion creates a self developed concept of the non-civilized status of Hindus and Muslims in Mill’s thought.

Mill’s sense of superiority and agenda of reform seems to be joining hands with authority. He believes that Western institutions were best in the history of civilization, in spite of the fact that he stressed the need of reforms in these institutions. He believes that this reformation could be possible through the authority of the government. In the same way, Mill is of the opinion that these institutions should be spread to the non-western world and this too could be done with the power and authority of the empire. Under these assumptions, it is impossible for Mill to compare Muslim civilization with western or present western civilization at any stage of human history. So, Mill seems to be seconding the opinion of Patrick Brantlinger that India had not attained a status even two centuries later, which Europe had attained during the middle Ages.\textsuperscript{165} Mill is firm in his opinion that “Britons were in the days of Caesar more civilized than the people of India”.\textsuperscript{166} Simultaneously, Mill seems to be following Gibbon in his assessment of Muslim civilization, but he does not accept the role of

\textsuperscript{165} Patrick Brantlinger, quoted in Balachandra Ragan, \textit{op. cit.}, P. 91.

\textsuperscript{166} Mill, \textit{India}, Vol. II, p.527
the Muslim civilization in the regeneration or development of Modern civilization. He accepts the superiority of Muslim institutions over Hindu, however, confirms that these institutions were not as good as western, even though he had criticized some western institutions even before the publication of his “History”. Mill’s conscious and philosophical attempt to maintain the superiority of western civilization on all other civilizations appears to support a case for the powers of government in Britain on the one hand and, on the other hand, to face the challenge of liberalism in the colonial context. By placing western civilization superior to all other, Mill believes that India was contributing nothing to the British wealth, rather that the Company’s government was a blessing for the Indians in spite of all its vices. In this regard, Mill believes that this “utility” should be extended.167 He confirms the west’s right of reform through the empire in the world and in this perspective, Javed Majeed168 rightly takes his case for reform as a case for the empire.169

As a whole, although Mill depicts the Indo-Muslim civilization in a favourable light, his treatment was a continuity of romantic Orientalists’ approach. Muslims occupy only a peripheral and marginal status in Mill’s treatment of India. What is important is that India has not only been elevated, but accepted as a Hindu country, and Hinduism appears as a “central” force in India affairs.170 The Hindus appear to be the “other” or dialectical partner in Mill’s Western and British “Self”. The treatment of the Muslims as despotic but benevolent is just to show that the Hindus were incapable of governing themselves and they could best be governed in a despotic ways as was done by the Muslims. Having a “militant faith” in utilitarianism,171 Mill’s purpose was that India must be studied so that English might govern it. In this regard, in spite of all its defects, the East India Company, as a monopoly was the most suitable way to rule India and make it civilized.172

Although Javed Majeed and C.A. Bayly173 are of the opinion that utilitarianism had a very limited effect on the British India, yet the influence of Mill’s views on the later

167 Donald Winch, op. cit., pp. 386-7 quoted from Edinburgh Review.
169 Ranjeet Guha also confirms the same thesis on a broader scale of all British writings in his Dominance Without Hegemony: History and Power in Colonial India, Delhi, 1997.
170 Balachandra Ragan, op. cit., P. 95.
172 Donald Winch, op. cit., pp. 386-7 quoted from January to March Issue of Edinburgh Review.
utilitarians seem to be marvellous. All subsequent utilitarian and liberal writers including Macaulay, Thoroton and Erskine, not only followed the same lines, rather followed the same rhetoric.


The nineteenth century British liberalism emerged out of new European thought, focusing the concept of human liberties in all walks of life and the development of new western institutions, Whig polity and social, political and economic liberties, religious tolerance, humanitarianism and rights of women. Liberals came into close contact with the utilitarians on the agenda of reform. Despite the early differences of the liberals with James Mill on the issues of state authority, women's rights and religion in home politics, they expressed their confidence in his findings and suggestions regarding the empire and colonies especially, in India. However, after John Stuart Mill's systematic interpretations of utilitarian philosophy, religion and politics, utilitarianism and liberalism seem to have developed harmony in almost every issue of internal and colonial politics. One can apply to this phase the term "liberal utilitarian" to differentiate these thoughts from Mill's authoritarian utilitarianism. The most prominent among the exponents of this kind of utilitarianism was Thomas Babington Macaulay. Even James Mill supported his name to implement his views on India.


T. B. Macaulay has been taken as one of the most prominent and influential writers and politicians in Britain, especially, in Indian affairs. He has been taken as a missionary, utilitarian and romanticist as well as an historian, essayist, politician, critic, reviewer and reformer. He wrote extensively in the magazines of his time. His literary essays or biographical sketches won fame and popularity for him as a writer and his eloquence popularity as a politician. He served as lawyer, member parliament, law member of India Council and as incharge of a number of public institutions. He wrote extensively and his writings, and speeches won a public acceptance as unchallenged facts of the days. All his writings, formal or informal, even his letters, were published several times during his life and
to sum them may require a bibliographical book. He has been a centre of interest for researchers and thousands of books and articles have been written on his life and works.

4.1.1. Setting of Macaulay’s Thought.

Born and bred in a chaotic world of wars, revolutions, counter revolutions and reform movements, Macaulay’s thought represents a variety of ideas on social, political, cultural issues such as evangelical, romantic, utilitarian, liberal, conservative and Whig.\(^{174}\)

Born in a religious family, interested in the evangelization,\(^{175}\) Macaulay was brought up with a zeal for Christianization of the world, especially, the British colonies.\(^{176}\) In this perspective his ideas towards world and India were highly influenced by Charles Grant’s Christian-centric and James Mill’s Euro-centric and reformation views. His Classical education at Cambridge, associated him closely with languages and literature.\(^{177}\) His thought represents a combination of classical and modern approaches and trends. For Macaulay, Europe was the best civilization in the world, which was at its best represented by the British, especially the English. Macaulay had a complete belief in the modern western institutions based on the Whig principle of individual liberty such as democracy, human rights, women rights, adult franchise, equality, property rights, etc. Although he criticized James Mill’s stance on authority, religion and women’s right of vote,\(^{178}\) he had a complete agreement with James Stuart Mill’s utilitarian views, thus making room for religion, women right to vote and liberty.\(^{179}\) For Macaulay, all the achievements of Europe, especially Britain and England, were based on the rise of Protestantism in Europe and England. For Macaulay, Protestantism was the foundation stone of modern European civilization and all the modern institutions were based on this foundation.\(^{180}\) In this perspective, taking the theory of reforms in the world for granted as the object of the western imperialism, for Macaulay, Anglicization or Christianization were two ways synonymous with each other. As a whole, his religious family background was creating his reformist and missionary outlook towards life.


\(^{175}\) Macaulay’s father was a famous Evangelical missionary, Zachery Macaulay, the editor of Christian Observer and a member of Clapham Sect.


\(^{177}\) Andrew Browning, op. cit., p. 151.

\(^{178}\) He was an excellent linguist, being thoroughly familiar with Latin and Greek, having a sound knowledge of French, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, German, and Dutch, and possessing a mastery over English.

\(^{179}\) Donald Winch, op. cit., p. 21.

\(^{180}\) J.S. Mill, op. cit.

Contemporary Whig and utilitarian political and philosophical ethics was affiliating him with Euro-centric and British-centric view of modern institutions. At the same time, classical education was promoting a literary romance in Macaulay’s system of thought. Therefore, Macaulay had a purposive approach to life that he applied to his historiography.

4.1.2. Macaulay’s Concept of History.

Macaulay attributes to history a dual purpose of amusement and understanding of the contemporary society. Although he did not believe much in ancient history, as a liberal evangelical, his model came from Thucydides. He believed that the concept of a complete truth was a fallacy and it was very difficult to differentiate between fact and fiction. In this regard, Macaulay was proud to continue the tradition of Greek historians who wrote about the events in which they themselves participated. Not believing in the romantic construction of history of mythological evidences, Macaulay believed in the reliability of sources. A history presenting all the facts true could be false for Macaulay. Macaulay also criticized Mill’s attitude towards facts and sees history as having the accuracy of facts as well as charms of literature. Thus he combines the utilitarian and romanticists in style. For Macaulay history “in its state of ideal perfection is a compound of poetry and philosophy.” This style seems to lead Macaulay to “love of exaggerations” and overstatements. Generalization appears to be merit of a history. However, he criticizes that in modern times generalizations have surpassed the ancient times. He believes that history should be practical. In his attempt to reconcile literature and history, and different schools of British thought, Macaulay seems to be shifting his focus from one school to other from time to time, maintaining his interest in literature.

Macaulay believes in a progressive view of history. He sees history in terms of continuity from past to future and wants to find the means and method of improvement from history.

---

182 Ibid., p. 17.
183 Ibid., p. 8.
186 Ibid., p. 52.
189 Ibid., *op. cit.*, p. 39.
190 Ibid., p. 50.
191 Ibid., p. 51.
He divides history in terms of ancient, medieval and modern or liberal phases. He sees in history the development of liberalism, which seems to him represented at large by Protestantism. This shows that he assigns to religion an important role in history.\textsuperscript{192}

Although Macaulay adopted the literary style of ancients on the romantic model, yet, his focus was the history linked with his contemporary society and its institutions. Macaulay sees the development of civilization as a result of the impact of religion on society. As religion claims its origin from a prophet, thus Macaulay assigns individuals a prominent role in the development of civilization, especially, in the form of politicians and generals. Although his structure of society and administration appears to be secular, yet, it seems to be based on a religious belief initiated and promoted by religious leadership. For Macaulay, the promotion of liberal ideas was the mainstream purpose of administration, politics and rulers.

4.1.3. Macaulay's Unit of Historical Studies.

As a liberal, following an enlightened trend in utilitarian philosophy, \textit{Macaulay had a belief in the practical importance of history}, which he sees in contemporary history, like Mill. However, as a politician and reformist, his basic concern remained with government. As the cause of reform in government was always taken up by the men of talent especially politicians, so, biography of men of talent emerge to be his basic unit of historical studies.\textsuperscript{193} His biographical articles published in \textit{Edinburgh Review}, cover a period of recent past since the seventeenth century and his \textit{History of England} too covers about the same period.\textsuperscript{194} Although writing on some contemporary social and economic issues, his focus remains on political biographies.\textsuperscript{195}

Macaulay's speeches and letters were published during his lifetime and were well received as an authority on contemporary affairs, enlightened, liberal, utilitarian, evangelical and romanticist. His speeches in the House of Commons on Indian affairs were received with a reformist spirit and the same seems to be dominating his system of thought.

Muslims were not the basic concern for Macaulay. His focus was on the reformation of British administration on liberal ideals, which were the result of the growth of the Protestant

\textsuperscript{195} His works include a number of biographical essays such as Joseph Addison, Bacon, Lord Byron, Milton, Johnson, Southey, Pitt, Clive, etc.
Christianity. However, his treatment of the Muslims seems to be sympathetic. Macaulay condemns the British romantic administrators focus on the Hindus, neglect of the Muslims and attempts to deal with the two fractions as superior and inferior.

4.2. Indian Muslims and Macaulay.

4.2.1. Macaulay’s Understanding of Islam.

Macaulay understands Islam at different levels. At one level, he deals with the followers of all religions as humans and seems to be accepting the concept of the unity of all religions. However, he also perceives history of religions in a progressive way. He links Islam and Christianity with Judaism, in a comparative way and finds “arguments for the divine authority of the Gospel” more solid than the “divine authority of the Koran [the Quran]”. Accepting the Greece as the first civilization, Christianity emerges in his thought as the second civilization of mankind. Macaulay modifies Mill’s concept that modern civilization was the direct heir to Greek. However, none of them was ready to reserve any place for Islam in the index of the progress of human civilization.

Macaulay shows a great veneration for Islam on two occasions. On the controversy of Somnat Gate in his speech in the parliament Macaulay criticized Indo-British administration’s policy of supporting the cause of idolatry against a religion believing in one God. In his article on “Lord Hastings” he supports the appointment of a Muslim candidate as prime minister of the Nawab of Bengal on the ground that the Muslims were better according to the Indian moral standard, if not according to the European standards.

---

196 In his article on “Gladstone”, Macaulay deals with all religions in general terms and seems more confined to the liberal ideals.
197 “Gladstone” in Macaulay, Critical E., p. 480
198 After the first Anglo-Afghan War 1839-42, Lord Ellenborough announced that the company’s administration would bring back the gates of Somnath that were taken over by Mehmud of Ghazna to Afghanistan and will be placed back to its original place. In this way, romantic administrators tried to win over the sympathies of Hindus for the Company’s rule.
199 Macaulay in a speech in the Parliament dated March 9, 1843, strongly criticized the policy and statement of Lord Ellenborough. He said that by escorting the gates to Somnath “the homage was paid to Lingamism. The insult was offered to Mohammedanism [Islam]. Government should take no part in the disputes between Mohammedans and idolaters. But if one government does take a part, there cannot be a doubt that Mohammedanism is entitled to the preference. Lord Ellenborough is of a different opinion. He takes away the gates from a Mohammedan mosque and solemnly offers it as a gift to a Pagan temple. Morally it is a crime and politically a blunder. Nobody who knows anything of the Mohammedans of India can doubt that this affront to their faith will excite their fiercest indignation. Their susceptibility on such points is extreme. Valore 1806 and in Bangalore in 1842-3 are caused by disrespect shown to the person or places of Muslims. A governor General’s this act proves him misfit for this post. Macaulay, Speeches, p. 134-135.
200 “Lord Hastings” in Macaulay, Critical E., pp. 611-613
same way, in a letter to his father Zachary Macaulay about the future of Christianity in India, Macaulay presents Islam in its similarity with Catholic Christianity, which appears to Macaulay a great hurdle in the promotion of Christianity in India.\textsuperscript{201} He criticizes Catholicism for its superstitious behavior when compared to Protestantism and simultaneously rejects an independent status of Islam as a religion on the traditional pattern of the Christian criticism of Islam.\textsuperscript{202} While proposing a policy of social reform through laws and education, Macaulay does not differentiate between the Hindus and the Muslims.\textsuperscript{203}

Macaulay measures a great impact of Islam on Christian world through crusades in terms of wealth and prosperity. He attaches the Muslims with Christian world. This attitude is evident in his article on “Machiavelli” in which he explains that the Turkish Sultans framed their system on the basis of “Prince of Machiavelli”.\textsuperscript{204} He takes Muslims as warriors and less accustomed to submission.\textsuperscript{205} He criticizes the Muslims that “Saracens rule in Sicily desolated the fertile lands” and “spread terror to the walls of Rome”.\textsuperscript{206} As a whole, Macaulay reserves no place for Islam as a religion, but he is critical of the sympathy of the romanticists with the Hindus.

4.2.2. Macaulay’s Acceptance of Mill’s Views on India.

Macaulay praises Mill’s History of India very heartily at different levels from parliament to private correspondence. In a letter to his friend, he describes his history as one of the “Classics of Europe”.\textsuperscript{207} Macaulay confirms Mill’s criticism on the morals and manners of the contemporary Indian society on the testimony of Charles Grant, William Ward and such other narrators.\textsuperscript{208} In this criticism, Macaulay treats the Hindus and the Muslims alike.\textsuperscript{209} As Mill had given a comparatively better place to the Muslims than the Hindus, the same seems

\textsuperscript{202} In a letter to John Kent dated June 4, 1853 Macaulay writes: “When I say that Mohammedanism [Islam] is a false religion, no man of sense and candour understand me to mean that the Mohammedans are wrong in asserting the unity of God. Of course I mean only to condemn those Mohammedan doctrines which are inconsistent with Christianity”.
\textsuperscript{203} Macaulay in his minute advocates a general policy of reforms for both Hindus and Muslims. Even at the time of Somnath Gage controversy Macaulay does not support the Muslims as a religion. He seems to be criticizing a policy of discrimination between Hindus and Muslims, which he feared would lead Muslims against the administration.
\textsuperscript{204} Macaulay, \textit{H. Essays}, p. 59; N. Machiavelli, \textit{The Prince and Discourses}, ed.,
to be adopted by Macaulay. His preference appears more based on religious similarity than Mill’s political or civilizational criterions.\textsuperscript{210} Mill, Macaulay, Ward and Charles Grant treat the contemporary society alike without any distinction. However his concern remained focused on contemporary society and he does not refer to the ancient or Hindu and the early Muslim period.\textsuperscript{211}

Like Mill, Macaulay sees India as a charming land for the invaders from central Asia and from the west of India. In this regard, he sees a constant controversy among the native Hindus and foreign Muslims.\textsuperscript{212}

4.2.3. The Mughul Empire.

In his article on “Lord Clive” Macaulay highlights the achievements of the Mughul empire. He seems to be much impressed by the splendor and prosperity of the Empire. “The Empire which Baber and his Mughul reared in the sixteenth century was long one of the most extensive and splendid in the world”. He fails to see in Europe a kingdom with “so large a population” subject to a single prince or so large a revenue poured into treasury’.\textsuperscript{213} He seems to be impressed by the riches, administrative and revenue system of the Mughul Empire, which seems to him greater than all centers of contemporary European civilization: St. Peters, Barcelona or Cadiz.\textsuperscript{214} The extent of the Empire surprises him that the provincial viceroys ruled a population greater than the subjects of the King of France or the Emperor of Germany.\textsuperscript{215}

All splendor and prosperity of Europe appears “superficial” to Macaulay. As he believes that the worst type of Christianity is better than any other religion in the world, he takes the Mughul Empire “worst governed than the worst governed parts of Europe”.\textsuperscript{216}

\textsuperscript{210} In a letter to James Stephen dated 21 January 1834, Macaulay writes about Mill’s History: “I still think myself quite right on all the main points of what I formerly wrote in the Edinburgh Review about his [Mill] book. I certainly used language about him personally which I now feel to have been neither just nor decorous. The truth is that I had not read his History of India, which when the difficulties of such undertaking are considered, must be allowed to be a very extraordinary performance, nor had I read his metaphysical work… I judged of him in the Essays in the Encyclopaedia and by the absurd rants of some foolish young men who talked as if all human knowledge were induced in those essays and would have burned every other book in the world on the same principle on which Omer is said to have burned the Alexandrian Library. See Thomas Pinney, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 16

\textsuperscript{211} For Mill’s view of Muslim India see section on Mill. Supra.

\textsuperscript{212} “Lord Hastings” in Macaulay, Critical E., p. 624.

\textsuperscript{213} Ibid., p. 506.

\textsuperscript{214} Ibid., p. 502.

\textsuperscript{215} Ibid., p. 506.

\textsuperscript{216} Ibid., p. 506.
seems to Macaulay an embodiment of all the “vices of oriental despotism” and a “domination of a race over race”. In this perspective, he blames the rulers for public disaster, crimes, bigotry and destruction.\textsuperscript{217} He sees a constant state of warfare in India even during its best days. In this way, on the one hand, he seems to be establishing Mill’s theory of a lower status of India on the scale of civilization even during the medieval times. Simultaneously, he seems to be accepting that the Muslims were not an indigenous race. He maintains that:

\begin{quote}
Inspite, however, much mal-administration, inspite of occasional convulsions, which shook the whole frame of society, this great monarchy, on the whole retained during some generations an outward appearance of unity, majesty and energy.\textsuperscript{218}
\end{quote}

Macaulay sees the germs of decline even in the foundation of the Empire and Aurangzeb’s policy seems to have “hastened the dissolution” which was “fearfully rapid” and violent.\textsuperscript{219}

\textbf{4.2.4. The Decline of the Mughul Empire.}

At a time when the empire of Charlemagne\textsuperscript{220} was passing through changes, Macaulay estimates a change in the history of India, forty years after the death of Aurangzeb.\textsuperscript{221} He sees the role of foreign invasions and racial contests alike contributing in the destruction of the Empire, i.e., Afghans, Persians, Rajputs, Sikhs, Marathas, and Jats. Simultaneously, feudals and nobility began to separate from the center.\textsuperscript{222} Macaulay presents the period of decline as the period of “horror” in which even the harems of Muslim rulers were not safe.\textsuperscript{223}

Macaulay analyses the eighteenth century Indian history on European standards. He finds no one ruler maintaining the standard of legitimacy.\textsuperscript{224} Macaulay takes Sarajuddolah of Bengal as “worst specimen” of all types of vices of “oriental despotism”, who wanted to curb the wealth of the English.\textsuperscript{225} In the same way, he presents Hlyder Ali and Tipu Sultan as usurpers and suppressors of the Hindus.\textsuperscript{226} Macaulay argues that the concept of the splendor of the Mughul Empire had passed long before the coming of the English. At the out-break of English power, India was a distorted country in which English interests were always at stake.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{217} *Ibid.*, p. 506.
\item \textsuperscript{218} *Ibid.*, p. 507.
\item \textsuperscript{219} *Ibid.*, p. 507.
\item \textsuperscript{220} *Ibid.*
\item \textsuperscript{221} *Ibid.*, p. 629.
\item \textsuperscript{222} *Ibid.*, pp. 507-508.
\item \textsuperscript{223} *Ibid.*, p. 631.
\item \textsuperscript{224} *Ibid.*, p. 636.
\item \textsuperscript{225} *Ibid.*, p. 518.
\item \textsuperscript{226} Macaulay’s letter to Edward Cropper dated, June 27, 1834 in Thomas Pinney, \textit{op. cit.}, Vol. III, p. 16
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In this perspective, he praises the role of the British especially of Lord Clive, for the establishment of their government on account of maintaining law and order and for the safety and security of the British trade.

4.3. Macaulay and Social Change in India.


In his article on “Lord Hastings” and in his *Minute on education* and law, Macaulay criticizes the Indian and the Muslim literature and languages as a whole. He was of the opinion that the Hindus were stagnant and the Muslims and the Portuguese had suppressed the sciences and had promoted the superstitious literature. In this perspective, like Alexander Duff, he believes that Asiatic learning contains false logic. Therefore, he criticized Lord Hastings policy of the promotion of oriental learning.

On the question of language, Macaulay was more definite. Although he supported the existence of Persian language in the court procedures, yet, he excluded it from the Indian Civil Service examination. Arabic and Sanskrit were included as religious languages. He believed that a language is bearer of useful knowledge. Thus in promoting oriental languages: “We are told to teach it because it is fruitful of monstrous superstitions. We are to teach false history, false astronomy, false medicine, because we find them in company with the religion.” In this way Macaulay totally rejects all things oriental.

4.3.2. Macaulay’s View of Reformation of Indian Society.

Macaulay was committed to the cause of social change in India. He was of the opinion the English had restored peace and order in India and were so powerful that they needed no protection of the Mughul government. Rather he wanted the Company’s government to contribute to the reform of Indian society, which could provide happiness to the Indian subjects, which was the prime duty of the government.

---

231 C.D. Dharker, *op. cit.* p. 130
234 Macaulay, *Speeches*, p. 69
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Macaulay sees the happiness of the Indians in the introduction of western institutions and sciences. He sees the Indians not capable of running the western institution without prior training. He does not measure the British rule in India in terms of prosperity. He accepts that India was prosperous in the reign of Akbar than under the Company. He sees the contribution of the west in terms of introduction of western institutions. The spread of education seems to Macaulay a viable source of reformation through English the language. His criticism of oriental languages and literature can best be understood in this perspective.

Macaulay believes that for the spread of education they need an English educated Middle class. He writes:

I feel that it is impossible for us, with our limited means, to attempt to educate the body of the people. We must at present do our best to form a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern—a class of persons Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinion, in morals, and in intellect. To that class we may leave to it... convey knowledge to the great mass of the population.

His concept of middle class seems to be emerging from the rise of the middle class in Europe. Mill and Macaulay both have been taken as representatives of the middle class in British politics. However, the general understanding of Mill and contemporary administrative writers, taking Muslims as foreigners and mediators between the Hindus and the British seems to be raising in Macaulay’s mind the necessity of creation of a mediatory class among the Indians and through that class he sees the spread of western education and institutions which the British were visualizing would contribute to the strength of the British Indian Empire.

Macaulay has been taken as a representative of the liberal utilitarians. Following the Utilitarian understanding of India, he extends his Liberalism from a base of Christian-Muslim similarities to the ones Romanticists have found between Greece and India. Macaulay represents a case for more extended scope of liberty and democracy as against Mill’s focus on states’ authority to reform. However, he justifies British Imperialism in India in terms of extension of the benefits of European civilization towards Indian people.

235 C. D. Dharker, op. cit., p. 132
236 Macaulay’s Speech dated July 10, 1833 in Macaulay, Speeches, p.68.

Mill and Macaulay formed the philosophical and intellectual foundations of utilitarianism. Although John Stuart Mill later strengthened this foundation and elevated it to a logical philosophy, yet, in Indian affairs, most of the utilitarians followed the ideas and themes of Mill. Edward Thornton is prominent among the followers of utilitarian view because of his *History of British Empire in India*.

5.1. Edward Thornton (1799-1875).

Edward Thornton was a very loyal and committed servant of the East India Company. He served the Company for more than forty-three years, joining in 1814.238 He was posted as writer, magistrate, Assistant to Revenue Commissioner, Collector in the Bengal Establishment239 and as head of statistical department in between 1831 to 1857. He has been taken as a pioneer in the systematic collection and publication of Indian Statistics.240 His works include some contemporary histories, surveys, statistical narrations of contemporary India and commentary on administrative debates under the company.

5.1.1. Setting of Thornton's Thought.

Born in an age of evangelical revival and controversy between romanticists and utilitarians, in a famous evangelist family, Edward Thornton was overwhelmed by the contemporary spirit of radical reforms, advocated both by the evangelicals and the utilitarians. As both schools of thought were propagating the concept of advancement of civilization through commerce and supporting the cause of mercantile class, Edward Thornton became a devoted supporter of the cause in the company’s services. Therefore, reform of administrative system under the company was his great concern. He wanted to see the administration of the company sound and established. For him, the liberty of trade was the liberty to the East India Company to trade with the regions of eastern seas.241 As a Company’s servant, he was interested in the continuation of the Company’s monopoly, authority and profit. In this perspective, his approach to the Indian question with reference to

---

240 C.F. Buckland, op. cit., p. 423.
British seems to be same as that of Mill and Macaulay. By referring to the debate on the Indian issues between the romanticists and utilitarians, he seems to be very closely connected with the utilitarian standpoints which were radical and reformist like that of evangelicals. As an effective civil servant, he wished to influence the policy of the company and his writings seem to serve the same purpose.

5.1.2. Thornton's Concept of History.

Edward Thornton does not explain his concept of history, yet he believes in the purposive history to be utilized to decide between contending debates. He seems to be using history as an agent helpful to understand the issues in the future. In his understanding, history seems to be a political and administrative form dominated by imperial economic motives. He sees history in terms of the Empire, but as under the Company, dominated by economic motives. Under these assumptions, Thornton focuses on the contemporary history. He differentiates between mythology and history and takes ancient Indian history as mythology, "unworthy not only of belief, but even of grave consideration". Thornton does not believe in the mythological interpretations of history. He believes that such "consistent interpretations of history deprive history of interest."

Thornton's criterion for the assessment of a civilization seems based on Mill and Macaulay's theories. However, he ignores Macaulay's literary style and focuses on the utilitarians' contemporary issues. Simultaneously, he adopts Macaulay's criterion for the identity of the community by supporting the cause of the Indian Muslims. Thus religion becomes a force working through a community in Thornton's mind. Common people appear to be representing the state of society and the calibre of the rulers. The state of society appears to be more important for Thornton than the form of government or status of the ruler.

5.1.3. Thornton's Unit of Historical Studies.

To Edward Thornton, history was a sort of political and administrative form, dominated by imperial economic motives. Like other utilitarians, his focus appears to be on the

---

242 See Infra chapter six.
243 Thornton, History, Vol. V, pp. 459-60, referred to "The Political Appendix to the Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons", 1832 and "Negotiation Papers 1833", in which these debates are very widely discussed.
245 Ibid., Vol. I, p. I.
contemporary history. He explores the past very close to his times to see the problems of his time in continuity. This contemporary history, Edward Thornton formulises in terms of empire, wars, controversies, conflicts, conquests, administration, authority, legitimacy and relations of subjects among themselves and with the rulers as its complementary issues. Empire building appears to be a great achievement for Thornton and he focuses all the issues since the establishment of the company to his time in this perspective. On the other hand, his surveys of the territories indicate a set of local histories, included in the name of cities and places. As a whole his concern remains with the administration of the Indian Empire under the British East India Company.

Thornton’s central focus appears to be the interests of the British East India Company and he deals exclusively with the British Indian history. Therefore, the Indian Muslims come into his focus in terms of their relations with the British. Thornton’s treatment of the Indian Muslims is sympathetic in the way that he condemns the policies discriminating between the Hindus and the Muslims and, on the Mill’s foundations, assigns the Indian Muslims a place better than the Hindus. He rejects the view that Muslim rule was the cause of the degeneration of the Hindus. Rather Hinduism was the cause of the degeneration of Islam in India. Thornton sees the Hindu-Muslim relations in terms of a religious conflict, always dominant in the Indian politics. These views seem to be a part of the debate on the British Indian policies. With the placement of the two communities, the British were determining their policies to treat with the two communities in administration and politics and that was the basic issue in Thornton’s treatment of the Muslim India. However, his pattern of thought was set by utilitarian logic, colonial interest, British commercial and administrative problems and oriental debate in western writings.


5.2. Thornton’s India.

In his understanding of India Thornton seems to be following and extending Mill’s argument, focusing on the issues of the British rule. On the pattern of Mill, Thornton divides the Indian history into three periods according to political dominance: Hindu, Muslim and British.\textsuperscript{248} As with Mill, religious society was a barbarian or a semi-civilized form of society, so, Thornton refuses to accept the romantic view of Hindu civilization. He does not question the comparison of Indian antiquity with that of Egypt or any other ancient civilization, but attacks the Hindu civilization by challenging the validity of the history of all ancient civilizations, including Roman civilization.\textsuperscript{249}

For Thornton, India appears to be a contemporary problem faced by the British. Rather than focusing on Mill’s intellectual, moral and philosophical questions in the understanding of Indian history, Thornton simply focuses on the imperial and commercial purposes on the simple foundations of the nature of the company’s interest. In this perspective he emphasizes India as a land of two nations: the Hindus and the Muslims, with whom the British were dealing.\textsuperscript{250} By adopting this view, Thornton rejects Mill’s view of India as a seat of contest among the civilizations: Hindu, Muslim and the British. In his emphasis on civilization as a unit of historical studies, Mill expressed a pride in a Euro-centric foreign status of the British, resulting in the symbolization of Indian Muslims as foreigners and imperialists, although they had been inhabitants of India since one thousand years. However, Thornton’s treatment of the Hindus and the Muslims as two “parties” was an acceptance of the Muslim’s separate identity rather than indigenous status in India.

Like the views of Charles Grant’s evangelical and Mill’s utilitarian schools, Thornton does not mark any big difference between the Hindus and the Muslims. He takes the Hindus as they were depicted by Charles Grant, William Ward and James Mill as an immoral and vicious race and, on the other hand, seems to be afraid of the Muslim character as “aggressive” religious warriors and bigots.\textsuperscript{251} However, like Mill, Thornton places the Indian Muslims a little bit better than the Hindus in morals and politics.

\textsuperscript{248} See Thornton, History, Vol. 1, preface and introduction.
\textsuperscript{249} Thornton, History, vol. 1, p. i.
\textsuperscript{250} Ibid., Vol. V, pp. 184-5.
\textsuperscript{251} Ibid., Vol. 1, p.2; V, pp. 184-5.
5.3. Thornton’s Economic Treatment of Indo-Muslim Empire.

What Edward Thornton focuses in his writings, closely connected with contemporary problems, especially, the East India Company’s commercial interests and imperial motives, brings the Muslim community close to his interests as the predecessor empire builders and as landed aristocracy that formed the basis of economic, commercial and administrative system at the same time. So, Thornton views the Muslims religion and rule in terms of economic interests. Thornton criticizes Muslim law of inheritance and defines the purpose and impact of the Muslim conquests and empire building in terms of plundering, looting, pillage, and “accumulation of treasure” by every means. Thornton traces the roots of political instability and succession problems and revolts from the same cause. It was Muslim conquests that sealed the economic fate of Roman Empire and provided a vacuum for the establishment of an Empire as a permanent source to serve the economic interests. He sees the establishment of Indo-Muslim Empire in the same context.

Thornton views all Muslim rulers from Mahmud to Aurangzeb in this perspective. With the exception of a few, Thornton accuses all Indo-Muslim rulers of tyranny for the sake of wealth and revenue even during the period of decline. However, he appreciates the efficiency of the Indo-Muslim administration in revenue collection. Following the utilitarian view, Thornton, like Mill, could be expected to focus on the political aims in the form of the empire. Thornton seems to be extending this argument to the view that empire and economic interest are closely associated with each other. His appreciation of Akbar’s view and system of imperial administration and depreciation of missionary activities

---

252 Thornton’s History was closely connected to the Muslim political elite, which was in one way making a room for British East India Company and in another way was still a symbol of unity among the Indian political elite, for both Muslims and Non-Muslim. Administrative system, geo-administrative units and administrative class, which were being replaced, all were presenting overwhelmingly a Muslims pattern and perspective. So Thornton’s histories, gazetteers and narration of state of contemporary India, all reserved a big room for Muslims. However this treatment is almost an introductory to the British rule. Only one chapter is contributed to hundred years of Muslim reign.


254 Ibid., Vol. I, p.15


260 Thornton, History, Vol. I, pp.19-20. The role of the sons of Tipu Sultan seems to be working behind this assumption.
confirms the priority of economic and imperial interests in his system. He takes this link as a cause of bloodshed, wars of successions and revolts among the Muslims because of the "personification of royalty". Impressed by the extent of Mughul Empire, its legitimacy and Aurangzeb's role in this process of extension, in spite of condemning his bigotry and warfare, he seems to be promoting a view that every sort of activity is justified for the cause of empire building and that the empire cannot be established without such activities. However, he accepts the magnitude of public works under the Indo-Muslim rulers, clemency of Indo-Muslim Empire and love for learning in the behaviour of Indo-Muslim rulers.

5.4. Degeneration and Revival Among the Hindus and the Muslims.

- As an administrator, Hindu-Muslim relations were a burning issue for Thornton. Although he condemns the Muslims for their bigotry against the Hindus, he traces a stronger religious bigotry among the Hindus. However, he realizes the establishment of the Muslim Empire in the Indian political environment as a great achievement. Thornton accepts the general evangelical and utilitarian view about the moral, cultural and political status of the Hindus on the scale of civilization and seems to be rejecting the view that

---

261 Ibid., I, ix.
262 Ibid., Vol. I, pp.23,28. So Thornton looks at Indo-Muslim rulers and their administration in a non-religious way. Taking Babar as an example he writes "The character of Babar as depicted in his Autobiography exhibits traits not expected in a Mohammedan [Muslim] conqueror. He not only cultivated the literature of his country and religion. He seems to have been not less emulous of distinction as a wit and convivial companion than as a soldier. He lived with his courtiers and camp associates with all the freedom and ... elements might have been thought of impossible occurrences under the reign of an Oriental Prince"
263 Ibid., Vol. I, pp.27; V, p. 179.
267 Ibid., Vol. I, p. 67. "The ruling passion of Aurangzeb was the love of dominion and he subjected it to no restraint from the obligation of morality. He was a consummate hypocrite ever ready to cover the most guilty designs with pretences of devotion and religious zeal. He is said to have made good laws, and to have enforced them with vigour at the same time that administration of the Empire was mild and equitable, but though his dominion may not have been in all respects so badly governed, as that of some other Oriental despots, the general tenure of his life evinces an utter disregard of all the principles of justice, and a total insensibility to the kind and generous emotions of nature."
268 Thornton derives the view as a Mughul imperial belief from Shahjahan that empire must be extended by posterity ruler and this cause justifies a number of evils even a war. (Ibid. p.39.) In this way Thornton seems to be differentiating between religion and empire.
269 Ibid., Vol. I, pp.24-26
271 Thornton, India is States and Prospects. London, 1835, pp. 130-145.
273 Contrary to John Malcolm and Sleeman, who focus on the origin, Thornton integrates Pindari predators and Thuggs to Hindus. See for details Thornton, Chapters, pp. 389-99; Thornton, Illustration of the History and
Hindu society was in a state of degeneration because of Muslim tyranny and suppression. On the contrary, the Muslims provided them opportunities to learn the science of administration and politics and tried to reform their society. Thornton argues that the Hindus were tyrants and Hinduism posed serious threats to the Muslim religion, culture and empire and Muslim bigotry was a response to this challenge. Thornton interrelates the Muslim revivalists movements in India to this challenge, especially during his own time, launched by Titu Mir and Syed Ahmed.

5.5. The British and the Muslims.

On these grounds, Thornton seems to be developing an argument that an empire was essential not only to serve the economic interests, it was essential because of socio-economic and political environment of India. What the Muslims had done was a necessity in the Indian environment. In this way, he tries to present a case for the extension of the British Empire in India. Thornton advises the British administration, not to take part in, or be a party in any type of dispute among the Hindus and the Muslims as both have behavioural resemblances and have natural philosophy. So, the British should concentrate on administration of the Empire. However, Thornton advises British administration to take a careful attitude towards the Muslims because of two reasons. First that “Musalmans literature very nearly resembles what the literature of Europe was before the scientific revolution. Musalmans take their logic from Aristotle, filtered through many successive traditions and commentaries and their


Ibid., Vol. I, p. 135. For example while dealing with Marathas Thornton points out that Marathas learnt the art of war from the Muslims and they were placed to a rulers status by Muslims in Deccan.


Thornton, History, Vol. V, pp. 179-183. However, Thornton criticizes the attitude of these revivalists and reformers. He writes that “The rigidly of the doctrines of [these reformers] was disagreeable to the mass of their fellow believers, who found some of their most popular religious observances denounced as superstitious and inconsistent with the parity of Muhammadanism [Islam] as it was delivered by the Prophet. However, they themselves borrowed the caste tradition in their sectarian attitude, restricted themselves to the people believing in their preaching. The exclusion was so strictly maintained as to lead to the separation of even the nearest relations.”

Ibid., Vol. II, p. 185.
metaphysical system professedly derived from Plato." As medieval European society was being taken as a pre-modern European condition and not as barbaric, having germs for modernity, so could be the case for the Indian Muslims. This medievalist background makes the Muslims deserving a better treatment. Second that inspire of a degraded state of regal authority, "the prestige of the name of Mughuls throughout India... was remarkable. The feelings of defence of the throne of Delhi extended to provinces very remote from the seat of its former grandeur, and to the Hindus not less than to the Mohammedans". Simultaneously, he believes that degenerated aristocracy was creating problems for reforms and, for that, it was necessary to have developed good terms with the ruling elite. In this perspective, Thornton advises a cautious policy towards the House of Mughuls, and for the extension of the Empire. Thornton visualizes social change as an imperative for the strength of the British Empire in India, which was in progress. However, he believes the policy of radical social change as harmful to the British interest. Taking the introduction of English language, western literature and sciences as a proper method for social and, in some way, religious change. So, he suggests that the western literature and sciences should be introduced gradually and slowly. The introduction of western sciences, in this way, "will supersede the trifling and deadening studies, which for ages have added to the darkness of India, in place of tending to dispel it".


By the 1840s, the conflicting British schools seem to be seeking a redress of their views. In this understanding administration of Indian affairs was a core issue. Some of the

---

281 For details of his views see Bishop Heber, Narrative of a Journey, London, 1822.
283 Thornton, Chapters, p. 443.
285 Thornton, Chapters, pp. 2, 17-20, 448.
287 Thornton, Chapters, p. 443.
288 Thornton, India its States and Prospects, London, 1835, pp. 157-69
administrator intellectual proposed a paternalistic approach to the Indian people. William Erskine was one of them. In this perspective, he seeks examples from the Mughul India.


William Erskine has been considered as a neglected historian of India. He spent twenty years in India working on different administrative assignments; therefore, he was very closely associated with Indian problems of the British Empire. After his return to Scotland in 1823, he remained attached to academic activities and research and produced his writings in published form. He has been taken as a medievalist, idealizing and focusing on the Mughul India. He contributed a lot through translations and collections of sources of Mughul Indian history and was highly appreciated among his contemporaries. It was expected that his History "may take its place by the side of Gibbon's great work". As ancient India and Hindu community have dominated the British perception of India, Erskine's medieval and Muslim studies contributed nothing to his fame as historian. However, Erskine's work remained unrivalled till the appearance of the works of William Irvine and W.H. Moreland on the Mughul India.


Born in a famous religious Scottish family of Edinburgh, in an age of reason, finding a career as lawyer and having a contact with the famous utilitarian writer James Mackintosh (1765-1832), William Erskine had a philosophical mind, influenced by the contemporary utilitarian view of legal reforms, political economy, intellectual radicalism and liberalism.

He was a great advocate of free and purposive education aiming at the "growth and progress of human improvements" which he measures in terms of formation of philosophical views for the benefit of human race. For that, he stressed the importance of political justice. However, his religious family background kept him closely attached to medieval times, dominated by religious learning. This attachment seems to be strengthened by the rise

---

290 His assignments were mainly administrative and judicial such as secretary to administrative officers, superintendent magistrate and member of regulation committees. However he was removed from his duties on the charges of misconduct. See for the details of his duties India Register, years 1803-23.
291 Allen's Indian Mail, Vol. xii, p. 404.
of Heeren’s (1760-1842) view of the rise of modern Europe on the medieval foundations.\textsuperscript{295} As medieval times were dominated by religion so he attached a great importance to the study of religion in the understanding of a society.\textsuperscript{296} Although unable to divert his attention from medieval times, his close association with Indo-British romanticists such as Mountstuart Elphinston, Sir John Malcolm and Bombay Literary Society, brought medieval Indian Persian literature and history to his focus.\textsuperscript{297} For that, he learned Persian, Arabic and Turkish languages.\textsuperscript{298} In this way, Erskine appears only writer who remained firm on his enlightened footing and was neither influenced by romantic antiquarianism nor by utilitarian focus on contemporary history. His thoughts were tied up in all four major branches of human curiosity: history, literature, philosophy and religion.\textsuperscript{299} As a servant of the East India Company, he was closely associated with administrative and commercial issues of the time and supported the utilitarian views of the evaluation of issues on the scale of happiness. However, his work began to appear after his return to Britain like Mountstuart Elphinston.

6.1.2. Erskine’s Concept of History.

Erskine seems to be looking at history in terms of continuity and progress, which seems to be evident in his medievalist attitude. A thorough and systematic study of medieval history of India was neglected both by romanticists and most of the utilitarians. By his studies, he seems to be linking ancient and modern civilization with medieval civilization and developing the concept of continuity and progress of human civilization.\textsuperscript{300} and thus, in India, his studies fill the gaps of Jones and Mill. Criticizing Jones for blind acceptance of literary evidences and Mill for a static view of literature and believing in beneficial and progressive view of history and human pursuits, Erskine had a purposive understanding of history.

\textsuperscript{295} Heeren was a famous German professor of History at the University of Gottingen.


\textsuperscript{297} Erskine’s personal “Diary” and “Bibliographical Notes” and “Notebook” contain a large number of Persian literary contexts and notes. See Erskine Papers, MSS. EUR, B4, and C10 in IOL, London.

\textsuperscript{298} His Diary, Note Book and bibliographical notes contain notes on all the three languages. However Erskine Paper, IOL, MSS. EUR, A4 contains a Glossary of Turkish language in alphabetical order.


\textsuperscript{300} Erskine, History, preface, pp.x, 2, 6. The references are to the original edition unless other edition is mentioned.
finding happiness in literature. His translation of Memoirs of Babar was an embodiment of his concept of literature as a source of history. He conceived history as a record of human experience in all its manifestations: “domestic manners, the habits of thinking, religious and philosophical opinions, laws, taxation and revenue, on which so much the happiness and misery of a people depend” as “the real substance of history”. “Public events, the rise and fall of princes and of states in war” appear to him mere as supportive elements of history. He was of the opinion that generalizations could be drawn on an extensive study of all sources, without which generalizations could not be possible. However, against Mill’s view, for him a local, thorough and minute knowledge, instead of theoretical generalizations was essential to understanding the history and manners of any people to govern them, for which he had undertaken the writing of Indian history. Unlike Mill, Erskine’s history comes from literature and material remains or archaeology. However, his interest in ancient remains seems to be linked with his medieval religious instinct. As for Erskine, history was a purposive work so his purpose in history was linked with contemporary problem and medieval history with modern times and in this sense he loved contemporary history. For him, an historian’s work was to clear the way for other people.

6.1.3. Erskine’s Unit of Historical Studies.

Having a medievalist interest, Erskine had an interest in religious studies. His early interests were devoted to oriental religions and not to ancient civilization. He focuses on

---

301 Erskine, Memoirs, p. vi-xvi. Erskine places Arabic as the language of science among the Tartars and Persian as language of taste. However he combines in Turkish both the qualities.

302 Memoirs of Babar were partly translated by William Erskine on the initial work of John Leyden. The translation was completed in 1816, however it was published in 1826. Translation was again published by R. M. Caldecote in 1844 and Lucas King in 1921. General references are given from the original translation. Other editions are mentioned by the name of editors.

303 Erskine’s letter to Elphinstone, Nov. 18, 1845, Elphinstone Papers, IOL, MSS. EUR. F.88.

304 Erskine’s letter to Mountstuart Elphinstone, August 1820, Elphinstone Papers, IOL, MSS. EUR. F.88/7


306 By these studies he seems to be interested in Brahmanism, Buddhism, Jainism, and Parsees. For example see his “On the Sacred books and Religions of the Parsis”, in Transactions of Literary Society of Bombay, Vol. II, London, 1820. This view seems to be proved by the view of his medieval Indo-Muslim Studies, which are dominated by Erskine’s effort to understand Muslim religion. See for details his...

307 Erskine’s letter to Lundie, quoted by Tripta Wahi, op. cit., p. 63.

308 Erskine’s letter to Elphinstone, 22 July 1836, IOL MSS. EUR. F.88.
dominant medieval religion, Islam.\(^{109}\) For Erskine, understanding of a particular people was not possible without the understanding of their religion. Although rising Indian romance diverts his attention to literature and contemporary political and administrative problems to military and civil institutions,\(^{310}\) his personal papers seem to be dominated by the notes on religious issues. He combines his literary aptitude with the medieval Indian Muslim literature in Persian language.\(^{311}\) Similarly Erskine deals with contemporary political and administrative problems in continuation of, and in relation to, medieval history of Muslim India.\(^{312}\) Therefore, religions, medieval Persian literature and civil and military institutions seem to be his unit of Indian historical studies. All his personal papers and diaries contain massive notes on medieval dominant religion, Islam, medieval dominant literature, Persian, and medieval dominant military and civil institutions of the great Mughuls. Erskine sees the construction of his contemporary socio-political fabrics of India to be based on the medieval Muslim legacy. Therefore, his treatment of Muslim India seems to be rational, logical and empirical as well as systematic and sympathetic as he admires the success of the Muslim administration to develop a harmony with the indigenous system and society as well as to resolve the problems of the indigenous population. In this perspective Erskine appreciates the attempts of the Mughul rulers to create a harmony with the indigenous people and their tolerant policy. However, all his construction of thought seems to be focused on the colonial and imperial issues as part of the British intellectual debates.

### 6.2. Erskine’s Muslim India.

Erskine’s setting of thought and studies associate him closely with the medieval Muslim history. All his early interest in religion, his notes focusing on the terminology of Islam\(^{313}\) and his two works Memoirs of Baber\(^{314}\) and History of India Under Baber and Hamayun\(^{315}\)

---

\(^{109}\) Erskine Papers, IOL. MSS. EUR. A3, A5, B4, C9, C10 in IOL contain a large number of Erskine’s collection of data on Islam, especially his Bibliographical Notes and Diary. In the same way Erskine Papers, MSS. EUR. C.10 in IOL contains a lot of his collection on the Muslim rulers of Middle East with chronological tables.


\(^{311}\) Elphinstone praises his literary skills and style in his History of India, London, 1905, p. 429.

\(^{312}\) Taripta Wahi owes his attention to Indian Muslim history due to his Maratha experience. Taripta Wahi, op. cit., P. 51.

\(^{313}\) See Erskine Papers in The British Library Oriental and India Office European Manuscripts sections files: MSS. EUR. A3, A5, B4, C9, C10

\(^{314}\) The translation of Memoirs was begun by 1811 after the death of Ledyan and was completed in 1816. However it was not published until the 1826
represent a typical focus on the Muslims. Writing in a period when people like Elphinston\textsuperscript{316} and Elliot\textsuperscript{317} were writing extensively on ancient and medieval India, Erskine was of the opinion that Mughul Muslim history was not properly understood and written. The histories written on the Mughul period were theoretical and more generalized. Praising the contribution of Elphinston to the understanding of Muslim period of Indian History,\textsuperscript{318} Erskine felt the need of an extensive and thorough study of the Mughul period, instead of a theoretical analysis.\textsuperscript{319} He was well aware of the fact that his understanding of Mughul India was different from the opinions of his contemporaries.\textsuperscript{320} He collected a lot of Persian manuscripts with the view that an attempt could be made to correctly understand the Mughul period of Indian history.\textsuperscript{321} Although he was discharged of his Indian services due to his misconduct, his scholarly efforts show his sincerity with his cause. However, a shift from general medieval studies to the study of civil and military institutions of medieval India seems to be evident due to contemporary political and administrative problems, which arose out of Maratha-British wars and establishment of administrative structure in the British conquered areas.\textsuperscript{322}

6.3. Erskine’s Mughul India.

Erskine tied up his interest in medieval history with his contemporary administrative and political problem. Believing in the view that things could best be understood through an understanding of their origin, Erskine planned to write a history of Aurangzeb as an era originated the Maratha problem and the desired to understand Aurangzeb’s system led him to the study of Mughul history, which was already an area of his interest as the end of medieval age and beginning of modern times. In this perspective “a considerable acquaintance” with

\textsuperscript{315} It was initiated as the History of the First Two Sovereigns of House of Taimur. It was completed in about 1846. However it was posthumously published by the family of William Erskine in 1854.

\textsuperscript{316} Elphinstone’s History of India was published before the completion of Erskine’s History.

\textsuperscript{317} Elliot wrote a number of books on the Muslim period with romantic euro-centric approach. Two of them are very notorious for his biases: Bibliographical Index to the Historians of Muhammadan India, Calcutta, 1849 and History of India as Told by its own Historians, London, 1867-1877. The later was compiled in collaboration with Dowson.

\textsuperscript{318} Erskine’s letter to Elphinstone, Nov. 11, 1834, IOL, MSS EUR. F.88.

\textsuperscript{319} Ibid. Also see Erskine, History, pp.2-6.

\textsuperscript{320} See Erskine’s Diary, passim, in Erskine Paper.

\textsuperscript{321} Erskine points out a number of manuscripts collected from different quarters in his letters to his friends such as Henery Russel, John Malcolm and Elphinstone. His Papers in IOL, MSS. EUR. B.4 contains a Bibliographical notes book having comments on manuscript sources.

\textsuperscript{322} Dr Tripta Wahi focuses the shift in Erskine’s interest from ancient to medieval period, which seems in more critical way a shift from the study of religious institutions to civil and military institutions.
the Mughul period was necessary for Erskine.\textsuperscript{323} However, Heeren’s view of developing analogies between the rise of modern kingdoms in Asia and Europe, seems to be directing his attention back to the Central Asian origins of the Mughuls.\textsuperscript{324} His focus in all its diversions remained on the medieval administrative, military and civil problems, which were linked with his contemporary concerns. Inspite of the fact that his study of Mughul history was more thorough than his contemporaries he was conscious of the “greatest poverty” of his work in relation to the contemporary state of society.\textsuperscript{325}

Taking Central Asian Mughul history as a history of wars, conspiracies, bloodshed, and some literary developments and by focusing on the relation of the House of Mughul in India with the House of Taimur, Erskine highlights that the Mughuls in India were the successors of the House of Taimur in all respects; warfare, government functions, and civil and military institutions.\textsuperscript{326} However, as it was supposed that all foundations of Turks were based on Islam, Arabic and Persian literature, so Islam had a dominant place in their system.\textsuperscript{327} They adopted the same means and methods to conquer and administer India, which were applied by Taimur. He seems to be pointing out that the establishment of the House of Taimur in India could not be possible without such qualities of warfare and administration. As a whole, Erskine places Mughul rulers at a higher and more sophisticated scale of manners and customs than its predecessors both the Hindus and the Muslims.\textsuperscript{328} However, taking the reign of Baber and Humayun as transitory, Erskine was looking at the reign of Akber as a period of settled and established Mughul government.\textsuperscript{329} Erskine sees the strength of the Mughul rule was based on two factors.

First that Mughul government established some permanent contacts with the people of their own origin and faith west of India. In this way he seems to be promoting a view that Mughuls were foreign rulers and they continued to rule India with the support of foreign

\textsuperscript{324} Early chapters of Erskine’s History are almost devoted to the Mughuls’ activities in Central Asia. Also see Erskine’s letter to Elphinstone, 18 August 1844, Elphinstone Papers, IOL, MSS. EUR. F88.
\textsuperscript{325} Erskine’s letter to Elphinstone, 3rd May, 1847, Elphinstone Papers, IOL, MSS. EUR. F88.
\textsuperscript{326} The same ideas he seems to be floating by translating the Memoirs of Babar.
\textsuperscript{328} His high esteem for Mughul rulers is evident from the titles collected in his general note book in his papers, MSS. EUR. A5. The titles are described as follow: Babar (Firdus Makani), Hamayun (Aïyna Ashiyani), Akber (Arsh Ashiyani), Jehanger (Aïyna Makani), Shah Jahan (Firdus Ashiyani, Qiran Sani), Aurangzeb (Khild Makani), Bahader Shah (Khild Manzil), Raffial Darajat (Aïyna Aram Gah), Muhammad Shah, (Firdus Aram Gah), Muhammad Alamger (Arsh Manzil).
\textsuperscript{329} Erskine’s letter to Elphinstone, 21 January 1845, Elphinstone Papers, IOL, MSS. EUR. F88
elements and India could best be governed by foreign rulers with foreign support. Otherwise ruling India could have been a very difficult task. By this approach, on the one hand, Erskine seems to be negating Elphinstone’s view that the Muslims were one of the ten nations of India and, on the other hand, he accepts the evangelical and utilitarian view of the degeneration of Indian society.

Second that the development and establishment of a system of political and administrative harmony with the native people and culture was at its peak in Akber’s reign. On the testimony of Akber’s historians, Erskine does not take up Thornton’s view that the Hindus accepted the Mughul system. He seems to be of the opinion that Mughul fiscal system was established on the Hindu manners and military establishment was based on Central Asian foundations. Simultaneously, Mughul rulers had good terms with the Hindus: Rajputs, Jats and Marahattas. However, a strong commerce was the cause of these good terms, which could not have flourished without a sense of right of property. Moreover their differences and warfare were also due to clash of interests or class, mostly commercial. Erskine considers the Mughul rule in India as despotism and this despotism seems more powerful than contemporary Europe due to the absence of hereditary nobility and absence of regular army.

Taking the development of Human society on the Mill’s model from rudeness to civilization, under geographical and psychological factors, Erskine takes “flourishing cities and cultivated fields” and trade and commerce as notable features of civilized nations and “strong proofs of comparative civilization”. In this way, Erskine seems to be placing Mughul India on a civilized status, promoting trade and commerce and luxuries, although he takes their origin as rude. Erskine takes the prosperity of India, on the one hand, due to geo-environmental conditions and, on the other hand, due to the intercourse between various societies under the Mughuls. However, his sense of comparison leads him to the view that Mughul India was far inferior on the scale of civilization as compared to the his

---

330 see supra, chapter third.
331 l. p. 529.
332 Erskine is of the opinion that the wars in India were not religious but interest oriented. For that he takes the example of wars between Afghans and the Mughuls. See Erskine, History, 1. 211.
335 Erskine, Memoirs, p. xlv.
336 Erskine, Memoirs, p. xxviii.
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contemporary West, especially the British. The absence of regular military, free institutions, along with non-hereditary nobility and despotic rule seem to be some basic areas of Erskine's criticism on the Mughul India.\textsuperscript{317}

6.4. Policy Implications for British rule in India.

As problems of military and civil establishment in India were Erskine's central focus, his themes can best be understood in terms of an attempt to evaluate the problems and influence the administrative debate. By the growth of liberalism, a criticism on British Indian Imperialism was fast rising. By his minute study, Erskine seems to be justifying foreign rule as a natural and historical phenomenon in India to current past. In this way, he seems to be justifying British rule, commercial despotism and even civil and military administration from abroad: Britain. He seems to be promoting a view that British Home government's administrative control over Indian administration, and a permanent contact between British Indian ruling community and Britain, was essential for the establishment of empire in India, as it was done by the Mughuls. In this way, he seems to be opposing the concept of independent Indian administration, as upheld by the romanticists' view.

Simultaneously, his themes promote a view that inspite of a control or contact by home government, there should be a flexible system of government in India. The success of the Mughul system was primarily because of an administration combining local Indian and Central Asian tradition. In this way, he considers the idea of radical reforms in India harmful to imperial interest. He seems to be proposing a cautious policy towards reforms in India. He seems to be advising through his History a system of administration and military and civil institutions based on local institutions, reformed on Western models, more suitable for India than a straightforward introduction of Western Institutions. However, whether he considers Mughul system as a form of local institutions or not, and whether he advises reformation of Mughul system on Western model, are important questions. Placed in continuity of Mill's and Elphinstone's tradition, his stance seems to be an advice for combining Hindu system and western model. However, accepting the vitality of Mughul method for combining the two systems, Erskine seems to be advising the British administration that combination of local system and Western model following the Mughul method would be suitable for Indian administration.

7. Conclusion.

Emerging out of the continuity of the historiography of enlightenment’s rational and man-centred trends, against the extreme romantic focus on literature and antiquity, utilitarianism seems to be taking the form of a school in philosophy and historiography during the period under discussion. Contemporary history and philosophy appear to be utilitarians’ major concern with a motto of “maximum happiness for a maximum number of people”. Utilitarians seem to be fighting the battle of thought in Indian historiography. However, Mill appears to be the only philosopher-cum-historian in the utilitarian historiography of India. All others seem to be either filling the gap between enlightenment and romanticism or following Mill’s paradigm in historiography.338

The Utilitarian historiography of Muslim India represents an evolution not only in the understanding of Indian Muslims but also in the development of utilitarian philosophy. The followers of enlightened thought provided utilitarians a link with the enlightened trends of Indian historiography with a focus on the Muslim period of Indian historiography in an age of romanticism. However, the substance of utilitarian understanding seems to be emerging against the romantic literary antiquarianism and taking the form of dialectics between romanticism and utilitarianism. In this perspective, Hinduism appears to be the field of dialectics, developing utilitarians’ breach from the enlightened focus on the Muslim India. As the dialectic was on the issue of superiority of civilizational status of a society, to prove the superiority and utility of the western civilization, utilitarians seem to be even rejecting the Gibbonian placement of the Muslim civilization as the successor of the Roman civilization. Their concern with the Muslim India was to prove that the status of Hindu society is very low on the scale of civilization and that foreign rule was a must for Indians as it was under the Muslims. So Muslims are depicted as a symbol of authority and power, a need of Indian people, in the utilitarian historiography of Muslim India.339 The same concept seems to be followed by Macaulay with a slightly positive view of Muslim religion by comparing it with


339 The concept is the key issue of doctoral researches of Javed Majeed (1992), Teng Gue Chen (2000) and Door Ingmar Westerman (2001).
the Catholics. However, the plea seems to be *taking the form* of a British Indian policy plea to deal with the Muslims. Thornton goes a step forward and instead of proving that the Hindus were savages, he argues that Muslims have their own place and they need to be defended through government policies. However, Erskine goes back to the primary logical question of British Indian administration with *a plea to synthesise* the two views in favour of western ideals.

The views seem to be indicating a progress in the utilitarian philosophy. Emerging out of rational aspects of the enlightenment, utility of authority seems to be the major theme of James Mill's *History of India*, which seems to be tinged with liberal ideals and Whig political philosophy in Macaulay. However in Thornton and Erskine it was confined to administrative problems.

Contrary to the views of C. A. Bayly and Javed Majeed, utilitarian thought seems to be very influential in Indian administrative policies after 1820. Against the romanticists, the utilitarians won a thorough support of the missionaries on the issues and methods of social change and on the issue of the role of government in bringing about a radical change in India with a complete harmony on the view of the superiority and utility of western civilization. Simultaneously, the gradual change in the British Indian policy was always in favour of the utilitarian view on India, except on the status of Indian Muslims. Although utilitarians failed to combat the romantic view of ancient India, they left a marvellous impact on the policy of social change in India. As Muslims were never their concern so on this issue their impact could not be considered worthwhile.

*As a whole* in the utilitarian historiography, Muslim India had a marginal and peripheral place. Their major concern was the elevation of western civilization par excellence against the romantic view of Ancient Hindu civilisation. The Muslims were dealt as a supporting argument and as foreigners. This understanding *seems* to be the core of utilitarian thought and policy.
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Chapter 6:

THE MISSIONARIES.

This chapter aims at analysing the missionary historiography of Muslim India during the period under discussion. Its purpose lies in the analysis of the work of missionary historians with reference to the changing socio-political, economic and cultural behaviour of the British administration as well as that of the Indian subjects. It will also focus the study of the developments within the missionary attitude towards historiographical purposes, means, methods, models and theories during the period.

The formal contact of Christian missionaries with India had begun with the advancement of the Portuguese commercial and navigational interests in the coastal areas of Indian Ocean. However, the development of British commercial interests provided the British missionaries the opportunity to initiate their ventures in India. The British East India Company seems to have resisted the strength of missionary work in India due to a fear of reaction by the indigenous population, which could be harmful to their commercial interests. At the end of eighteenth century the strength of missionary activity and argument seems to be determined by an “apology for promoting Christianity” in India. Through this activity the missionaries can be found trying hard to seek support from within the administrative circles of the East India Company for the missionary work. Their main argument appears to be the immoral state of Indian society both Hindus and Muslims which must be reformed in radical ways by an introduction of Christian religion through the support of the government. Charles Grant’s Observations presents such form of arguments. William Tennant sees the strength of the British power in India through the introduction of Christianity, which will develop religious ties between the Indians and British. However, Henry Martyn had an undeclared support of the Company’s government. Rather than focusing the role of government in the missionary activities, he seems to be in direct contact with the people whom he wants to convert, especially, the Muslims. He tried to debase the Muslims religion through scholastical and polemical approach. After 1813, the Company gave permission and support for missionary activities, and the focus of missionaries shifted to the method of conversion. Education seems to be the medium of conversion for the missionaries. Alexander Duff seems to be focusing the immoral and barbarian nature of eastern literature and languages, to declare it unsuitable
for teaching in India. Hence to make the Indians Christians, he concentrated on the use of English language and literature. However, by the forties the company made history a tool for the presentation of the advantages of the British rule in India as compared to the pre British eras of rule through education. Marshman’s History having educational motives, presents the advantages of the British rule as advantages of Christianity.

In this regard, the period presents a development of British missionary perspectives on Indian History in an evolutionary progression beginning from the role of government on moral grounds to the propagation of Christianity to the inclusion of missiological historiography in the syllabus of education.

1. The Christian Missionaries.

The belief in a universal and omnipotent one supreme God and His contact with and guidance for mankind, through revelation, makes the universal spread of revealed message a duty of the prophets and their believers. The prophet hood by itself appears to be a missionary responsibility inherited to the followers of the religions. In this perspective, three religions claim their universality by focusing their belief in one God and their concern with mankind instead of tribe, race or region: Buddhism, Christianity and Islam. Christianity and Islam derive their inspiration for the spread of revealed knowledge from their respective scriptures. In this regard, since their dawn the followers of all three religions are promoting the missionary activities all over the world. However, Christians' claim to be the only universal and missionary religion spreading all over the world. This chapter aims at the analysis of Christian Missionary historiography of Muslim India during the first half of the nineteenth century.

1.1. The Christian Missions.

Christianity emerged out of Judaic tradition and had to face a conflict between racial laws of Jews and its claim of universality. However, the Jerusalem Council of 49 A.D. is

---

2 Ibid., pp. 14-15. Stephen Neill assumes that Buddhism has been an “Eastern religion” and Islam is the religion of the “desert and Middle East” with “outliers in all directions. However, Islam claims a more universal outlook today having a significant following even in the Christian heartlands. A number of modern social scientists working on the relations between West and Islam see the spread of Islam as a great threat to the Western civilization and analyse the recent conflicts in this perspective.
supposed to have established the universal and missionary status of Christianity on the
testimony of Gospel. Jesus’ doctrine of “salvation through love, sacrifice and faith” became a slogan to call all oppressed people to accept the doctrines of Jesus Christ. Simultaneously, the followers of Christianity were urged to follow the commands: “The gospel must first be preached to all nations” and “Go therefore and make disciples of all nations”. In this perspective, “a strain of universalism, or a sense of worldwide responsibility”, runs through the entire Old Testament, boosting a missionary activity from the very dawn of Christianity. St. Luke was the first Christian who felt that “sacred history must be related to the history of the world”. Although sectarianism could shatter the strength and arguments of the Christian missions, yet, “the Ecumenical Movement” kept the followers of Christ united ever since the first century A.D. and hence strengthened the missionary activities. Islam proved to be a great check to the growth of Christianity towards Asia, yet Christianity continued its expansion through missionary activities.

1.2. The Evangelical Revival.

The rise of the new Europe by the Renaissance, passing through Reformation, Counter Reformation, Scientific Revolution and Age of Reason, seems to be checking the pace of the missionary activities. However, Christianity seems to be meeting this challenge very sharply by adopting the cultural modes, maintaining the unity through “the Ecumenical Movement” and highlighting the humanitarian face of its belief system. In this way, enlightened Deism of the eighteenth century seems to have been countered in two ways: First, the man-centred approach of enlightenment was adopted as slogan of Christianity, focusing the rational and material aspect of Christian civilization. Second, facing crucial problems in Europe, the church shifted its centre of activities to the non-Christian areas, and in this way boosted the missionary activities throughout the world. Both the activities seem to be resulting in the revival of Christian missionary activities at home as well as abroad. The revival of religion in

---

Europe combined with the rise of western imperialism and new inventions, facilitating the communication, seem to provide a very strong support for the revival of Christian missionary activities all over the world. Stephen Neil concludes that the economic and imperial upsurge of Europe was accompanied by an unforeseen religious awakening which affected almost every Christian dominion in every country of the West.\footnote{Stephen Neil, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 250.}

By the beginning of the nineteenth century, revival of Christian churches, as a reaction to and conciliation with the enlightened rationalism seems to be a dominant phenomenon, which led to a broad based revival of missionary activity through the institutional structures in the form of societies.\footnote{Although the Christian missionary activity can be observed throughout the history, however the late eighteenth century observes a lot of new initiatives in the field of missions from almost all western countries, Britain, France, America, Germany, Switzerland, Denmark, Portugal, Sweden, and Russia by all major churches, Catholic, Protestants and Orthodox. Although a number of societies were very actively working for the conversion of heathens to Christianity in different areas of the world since the mid seventeenth century such as Corporation for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England (1649), Society for the Conversion and Education of Negro Savages in the British west Indies, also known as Christian Faith Society (1691), Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge (1698) and the Society for the Propagation of Gospel in the Foreign Parts (1701). However by the end of Eighteenth century a number of new societies seem to be coming into existence. In Britain the phenomenon was overwhelmingly dominated by the protestant societies such as: Baptist Missionary Society (1792), London Missionary Society (1795), Church Missionary Society (1800), General Baptist Missionary Society (1816), Church of Scotland Mission (1824), Free Church of Scotland (1843), Irish Presbyterian Mission (1840), etc. For a list of the protestant missions working in the world during the first half of the Nineteenth century see Church Missionary Society, \textit{Statistics of Protestant Missionary Societies 1861}, London, 1863, pp. 8-12.} The increased missionary activities and interest in the evangelisation also can be seen in the establishment of new institutions for theological training. There were only three\footnote{Bristol Academy founded in 1679, Homerton College, London in 1730 and Western Academy, Devon in 1752.} theological training institutions in Britain at the last quarter of the eighteenth century. The number was raised to forty-two\footnote{For a list of these theological training institutions see Stuart Piggin, \textit{Making Evangelical Missionaries}, Sutton, 1984, pp. 290-293.} by the mid nineteenth century.\footnote{These societies and institutions also introduced their periodicals and pamphlets to boost the missionary work or promote the support for missions very actively. All this activity systematized the missionary activity as well as thought in a very disciplined way.} These societies and institutions also introduced their periodicals and pamphlets to boost the missionary work or promote the support for missions very actively. All this activity systematized the missionary activity as well as thought in a very disciplined way.

\section*{1.3. The Indian Missions.}

The history of Christian missions in India has been traced far back to the first century of Christ. Thomas the disciple of Christ is supposed to had initiated the missionary work for the conversion of Indians which was later supported by the mission of Bishop Thomas of Syrian
church in fourth century A.D.\textsuperscript{15} However, the discovery of new routes to India in 1498 initiated new Christian missionary contacts with India. The Portuguese Jesuits, Saint Xavier\textsuperscript{16} and Nobili\textsuperscript{17} took up the task of conversion of Indians to Christianity, which was later over taken by the Catholics. However, the fanaticism and forcible conversion by the Jesuits and Portuguese Catholics has been considered a deplorable legacy for the future of Christianity in India.

Protestantism preserved the missionary enthusiasm in Christianity, armed with the tools of modern developments. The growth of trade and commerce promoted missionary activity. French, Dutch, Danes, Swedes, Moravians and Armenians all carried the work of Christian preaching along with their trade and commerce. However, the real work for conversion of Indians to Christianity seems to be launched by the British Protestants, especially evangelists.

The evangelical revival has been taken as a predominantly British exercise. Fourth fifth of the total contribution to the missions is supposed to be contributed by the British. As India was the centre of British imperial as well as commercial activity, naturally, the British missionary zeal also made India the centre of gravity for its activities. By the growth of British trade, commerce, and power and influence, the British missionary activity seems to be seeking a growth in the number of Christian converts. The Indian scene seems to be influencing the evangelical revival in two ways: On the one hand, the conflict between the zeal for evangelisation and commercial interests seems to be developing theoretical and ideological foundations of the theology and theory of missions. A short-term ban on missionary activity by the company seems to be practically ineffective due to the evangelical work by the company's servants’, especially, the chaplains. However, by 1813, there began a regular missionary activity under the Company’s auspices. On the other hand, the paramount British influence seems to be attracting all societies and individuals interested in missionary work to India. By the mid-nineteenth century, the missionaries from all over the Christian


\textsuperscript{16} Xavier came to India in 1542 and stayed here for four years. His observations have been taken as first specimen of modern European observation of Indian state and society.

\textsuperscript{17} Nobili came to India in 1605. See for details Vincent Cronin, A Pearl to India: The Life of Roberto de Nobili, London, 1959.
world can be found working very hard for the conversion of Indians. However, the British dominated this activity.  

1.4. The Missionary Logic.

The evangelical missionary movement has always derived their logic from a self-asserted concept of distinction between right and wrong on the criterion provided by the Christian religion. The Christian missions have been founded on the view that Christianity is a divine religion, containing a divine message to be spread all over the world. This message is the only true path for the salvation of humanity and individual. In this perspective, the missionaries divided the world into two groups: those who are saved and are right or Christians and those who are not saved and are wrong or losers. In this way, they seem to be dividing the world into “Christians and heathens”. It is incumbent upon all followers of the Christ to work to save the heathens, either at home or abroad.

As the Christian religion has a concern with the beliefs and morals of the people, therefore, the missionaries have always focused on the moral state of society and have been seeking a demographical impact. In the traditional missionary logic, the mission had been symbolized as the conversion of individual souls through the preaching of metaphysical doctrines of the Christianity. For that, they established contacts with common people without focusing their social status. However, to make the conversion effective and substantial, they advocated a sort of social change and waged a crusade against “poverty and oppression”, which they believed distracted the people from reflecting on their spiritual state.

---


20 The general division among the European has been Orient and Occident, East and West, Europe and Asia in the debates on the determination of the place societies on the scale of civilization. For a debate on the issue see Geoffrey A. Oddie, “‘Orientalism’ and British Protestant Missionary Constructions of India in the Nineteenth Century”, in South Asia, Vol. XVII/2 (1994), pp. 27-42.

21 In the debate on the nature of non-Christian society all Christian missionaries seem to be using the same distinction.

22 See for details Stuart Piggin, op. cit., Chapter 4.

Baptist missionaries considered the involvement of government dangerous to the missionary activity as it has always been tinged with worldly purposes and oppression. On the contrary, the other evangelical groups, especially “Clapham sect” was looking at the imperial phenomenon in a different perspective. For them, the emergence of modern western civilization was the gift of protestant Christianity. They saw the progress of Christianity and Western civilization as synonymous. However, measuring the role of government in the growth of civilization, they tried to get the support of government for the social reformation and conversion to Christianity, especially, when there was a clash between government and missionaries. They were greatly stimulated by the extension of western imperialism. They presented the spread of Christian dominated western imperialism as a symbolic sign of the truth of Christianity against all other religions and regarded the western imperialism as God-given or “providential”, providing the right kind of political environment for the conversion of subordinate or subject heathens. In this perspective, they seem to be taking imperialism a tool for the evangelisation and, simultaneously, the evangelisation a tool for the strength of the Empire. However, a conflict over the determination of the priority between the two themes always existed among the missionaries.

This paradigm of missionary conflict can best be observed in India and in the missionary historiography of pre- Mutiny India. The Christian missionaries composed the early writings on India. They had depicted a sort of immoral social hierarchy and a despotic and foreign political structure. In this perspective at an earlier stage missionaries were cautious not to come into conflict with the religion of Muslim rulers in India. Even, after the success of European arms, the Christian missionaries had not focused Islam and Muslims as the centre of their activities. They had a very long history and tradition of scholastical and polemical conflict and debate with the Muslims and were not very hopeful about the response of the Muslims, on the evidence of the history of Christian Missions. In this perspective, the active focus of missionary activity during the first half of the nineteenth century seems to be

on the Hindus. Muslims appear to be tough respondents in argument. In this regard, they seem to be treated from a distance.


Charles Grant initiated the work of seeking formal and systematic support for the Christian missions. He simply stressed on the company’s administration that missionary activities should be supported on the ground that the Indians were ignorant and immoral people and the British were deriving financial benefits from their soil. So to work for the salvation of the Indians was the moral duty of the British.

2.1. Charles Grant (1746-1823).

Charles Grant as a servant of the East India Company, as a merchant and as a politician, served the company for more than forty years from the position of a cadet to the Chairman of the Company and a member of the Parliament.27 However, his “most characteristic”28 services have been counted as an evangelist. As an East India Company servant, He tried his level best to influence the Company’s policy towards the Christian missions in an age of reason as well as in the age of romance.

2.1.1. Setting of Charles Grant’s Thought.

Born in a poor Scottish family in the age of enlightenment, Charles Grant was unable to proceed to higher education, his family’s reputation as observer of social and religious morality,29 seems to have influenced his association with his contemporary movements, working for the revival of Christianity in a missionary way, in Britain as well as abroad, against extreme rationalism and enlightened Deism.

His arrival in India at a time when the East India Company administrators had become notorious for their mal-practices, financial as well as moral, and had created the need of pointing out the errors and suggest the corrections on “the principle of consulting the welfare of people in Grant’s mind.30 In this perspective Charles Grant seems to be presenting his

28 Grewal, Muslim, p. 65.
30 Charles Grant presented the view, time and again, in his statements and speeches in the parliament.
tenure in India as a struggle for the reformation of British Indian administration and welfare of the Indian people. However, he seems to be connecting this reformation with the teachings of a religion with high morals: Christianity. All other beliefs appear "vulgar" to Grant with this reference. However, his own financial benefits and the dependence of British prosperity on the Eastern trade and commerce developed a sense of defence of British commercial attitude. He saw the growth of commerce as the source of western civilization on the foundations of protestant and rational Christianity as it was propagated by his contemporary Scottish Church. However, he idealized a monopolized growth of commerce through which British occupied territories could be kept in control. The conflict between the moral and the material seems to be resolved through a reference to a series of miseries in the seventies of the eighteenth century in India, which Grant took as "an object of the displeasure of God". He began to appear more a Puritan and Methodical, having interest in the "vital experimental religion", as a matter of "continuous self-examination, private religious exercises and good work". This attitude seems to be strengthened by John Shore's continuous appeal to Grant's religious feelings. As a result, he seems to be emerging as a "self righteous" person armed with the Divine Providence for the evangelisation of the world. In this perspective, his attitude for the support of missionaries to enhance the work of evangelisation came to act in the Company's policies. He tried to alter the Company's policy towards missionaries. In India and at home alike. After his return from India in 1790, he came into constant contact with the Evangelical Movement and "Clapham Sect" in England and all his efforts seems to be devoted to the enhancement of missionary activities and for the defence of the East India Company's monopoly. However the monopoly was also attached with the evangelisation in the name of welfare of the subject people. In this way his works had moral as well as apologetic purposes at a time.

2.1.2. Grant's Concept of History.

History appears in Charles Grant's understanding as a work of Divine Providence. In this perspective, religion becomes a practical power and source in human history and Grant sees human history as the history of morals preached by religion. So, Grant does not see history in

31 Ainslie Thomas Embree, op. cit., pp. 158-177.
33 Ainslie Thomas Embree, op. cit., p. 52.
34 Ibid., pp. 53-54.
a form of progression, in term of ancient, medieval or modern, rather in the form of a constant division between good and evil. In this division Christianity appears to be a constant source of good, which "has wrought any reformation among mankind" and all others combined in one "vulgar" or "evil" that "have made men easy in their immoralities". This sense seems to be linked with his concept of the superiority of European over Asiatic, as representatives of moral and immoral and right and wrong, respectively. In this regard, his criterion to determine the place of a civilization in the history seems primarily compatible with the utilitarians. He sees the growth of civilization in terms of morals, institutions and commerce and tries to harmonize the three in one that of Christian ethics. Administration appears to be an instrumental element for the growth of civilization as well as religion, which is always determined by the ruling elite in Grant’s understanding. Therefore, he differentiates between the oriental despotic rulers and company’s commercial ruling elite. However, all these purposes he sees to be justified under the banner of religion and the coordination and cooperation in the society appears to be task essentially done by a religious leadership that he sees divided among the native Indians.

2.1.3. Grant’s Unit of Historical Studies.

Grant sees history as a purposive exercise aiming at the improvement of morals through the revival of Christian religion. Morals appear in his thought as a key to all contemporary problems either in India, in the Company’s administration or, in Britain. In this regard, all his interests, commercial, political, economic, religious and social, seem to be combined within the improvement of contemporary morals through the revival and introduction of Christianity. However, Grant takes the hurdles created by the Company for the missions as a challenge and wants to remove them. His Observations appear to be a polemical argument to a sense of the importance of the Company’s role in the propagation of Christianity.

An apology for the Christian missions in India was the central focus of Grant’s observations. Therefore, his focus remains on the issues highlighting the need of the introduction of Christianity in India. For that, Hindu people seem to be targeted as a huge population whereas Muslims were a small minority in India for Grant. Therefore, Muslims do not form the central theme of Grants’ observations. His attitude towards the Muslims

---

seems to be antithetic in the sense that on the one hand, he considers Islam and Hinduism equally superstitious and, on the other hand, he seems to be annoyed by the strong Muslim reaction to the challenges to their religion. As a whole he does not differentiate between the Hindus and the Muslims which creates a view that for Grant there was nothing to create a conflict between the Hindus and the Muslims. As his concern was the introduction of Christianity in India, therefore, he sees the strength of the British rule, amelioration of administration and good terms with the indigenous people in the Christian context which was formed by his contemporary movement for the evangelisation, Clapham Sect, colonial commercial imperial motives and the latest developments in the western thought especially the concept of the superiority of the west.

2.2. Grant's Observations.

Charles Grant saw the moral, political, religious and commercial justification of the British East India Company's trade monopoly and rule in India, in the introduction of Christianity in India. Therefore, he supported all missionary activities in India as well as in Britain. However, the Company's administration was dominated by the view that missionary activities could be harmful for the growth of the British commerce. In this perspective, it was Grant's earnest desire to influence the Company's policy in favour of missionary activities. After his return from India to England in 1790, he spent almost all his time to promote this cause. For that purpose, Grant planned to bring into written form his observations on Indian affairs, discussing all the matters of the East India Company's concern in relation to the introduction of Christianity in India and present these observations to Henry Dundas, Director of the Company's Board of Control. In this perspective Charles Grant's Observations On the State Of Society Among The Asiatic Subjects Of Great Britain, Particularly With Respect to Morals; and On The Means Of Improving it was compiled chiefly in 1792 as a statement of arguments for the role of the Company for the propagation of Christianity among the Asiatic subjects especially among Indians. These observations had a very strong support of the evangelicals. Although the Observations remained a constant source of strength for missionary arguments, it was unable to play its role in the formation of the Company's policy at the renewal of the Charter. It was incorporated as appendix to Extracts From Transactions of Society For the Promotion Of Christian Knowledge, London, in 1795. In 1797 Grant addressed the Court of Directors of the East India Company with
revised *Observations*. The issue of missionary activity in India remained under discussion till 1813, when the permission for missionary activities in the Company’s territories was granted. During all this period, Grant’s *Observations* remained a very strong source of arguments in favour of the missions. The permission for Missionary activities had been considered as a success of Grant’s arguments. His *Observations* were circulated widely to seek support for the missionary cause. The publication of the *Observations* by the order of the House of Commons as a document working behind the Charter of 1813 by itself was a great tribute to Charles Grant’s genius and efforts for the cause of Christianity in India.\(^{36}\)

Charles Grant was of the view that the Company’s rule in India was the necessity of the time. However, this rule was always at stake due the immoral character of the Indian people. So to justify the Company’s rule in India and make it permanent, a sort of radical moral, religious and social change was necessary which could only be possible through the introduction of Christianity. In this way, Charles Grant advocated a sort of moral imperialism in India.

### 2.3. *Observations* on the State of Morals in India.

Charles Grant writes on the state of India to a “foregone conclusion”.\(^{37}\) Constructing his arguments on his personal experience and on the opinions of those writers, who had attempted to justify the corruption, cruelties and excesses of the westerners, especially, of the servants of the East India Company,\(^ {38}\) Grant refutes all sympathetic depictions of Indian society, particularly, of William Jones’.\(^ {39}\) Grant associates India with Hinduism and believes that the depiction of “Hinduism as a model of goodness and virtue” was not an attempt to subvert the cause of the missions, rather it was an anti-Christian European philosophers’

---

\(^{36}\) *Observations* was printed in *Parliamentary Papers, 1812-1813*, X, Paper 282, pp.1-112, also in 1831-32, VIII, paper, 734, General Appendix No. 1, pp.3-92.

\(^{37}\) Grewal, *Muslim*, p. 66.

\(^{38}\) His references are mostly from the writings of Bernier (1760), Srafton (1759), Governor Holwell (1760), Lord Clive (1765), Hastings (1772), John Shore (1783), John Macpherson (1785), Lord Cornwallis (1990) and Roche (1789). However, his quotation on Indian morals and despotism are taken from Luke Srafton’s *Reflections on the Government of Indostan*, London, 1770, who had helped Grant in seeking his first appointment in the Company’s services. Srafton has been considered a hot-tempered man who had always advocated violent measures against Indian, although assessing Hinduism in complementary ways.

\(^{39}\) Charles Grant, *op. cit.*, p. 85.
attack on Christian revelation.\textsuperscript{40} He also refutes the view that India has a strong civilization; hence, it was impossible to establish a permanent empire in India.\textsuperscript{41}

Charles Grant had the darkest picture of the India society. "Abandoned selfishness" appears to Grant the distinguished mark of Hindu character and Indian society, which was in a universal state of degeneration, depravity and degraded humiliation. All the evils, Grant see widespread among the Hindus to a surprising degree. Administration of justice could never be trusted to the natives. Natural affection of parents was lacking. Parents sold their children. Men were bound by no moral restraint while women were in a state of servitude and semi imprisonment.\textsuperscript{42} Due to this immorality, Hindus failed to produce effective provision against foreign invasions.

For Grant, all these evils were the product of the religion of the people. The people of India had been prosperous and reasonably civilized before Hinduism. It was not any inborn cause of the weakness and degeneration of Hindu society. It was the despotic nature of Hinduism, its failure to teach virtue and its positive encouragement to immorality, which was the cause of the degeneration of Indian society. This relation between religion and degeneration appears to be the most significant argument in his book.\textsuperscript{43}

Grant concludes that this immorality based on religious belief was the root of widespread disorder in India. For the permanence of the British rule in India, a radical social change was necessary which could be possible only through the introduction of Christianity.

2.4. Grant's Treatment of Indian Muslims.

The treatment Grant had applied to the Hindus, he also applied to the Indian Muslims. "His unqualified condemnation of Hindu India should not mislead one to infer that his attitude towards the Muslim past in India was essentially different." His judgment on the Indo-Muslims was equally harsh.\textsuperscript{44} Grant treats Indian Muslims in two ways. On the one hand, he deals with the Muslims in the same way as he deals with the Hindus. On the other hand, he considers the Muslims as a political elite of India. However, in both the cases, he

\textsuperscript{40} Ibid., p. 31.
\textsuperscript{41} Ibid., p. 76.
\textsuperscript{42} Ibid., pp. 25-29.
\textsuperscript{43} Ibid., pp. 60-66.
\textsuperscript{44} Grewal, Muslim, p. 67
seems to be depicting the Muslims not very different from the Hindus, but worse than the Hindu immoralities, supported by political power.\(^{45}\)

Charles Grant develops his arguments on the basis of two geo-religious realities: European and Indian as Christians and Hindus,\(^{46}\) and Muslims seem to have no separate identity in this understanding. So, in spite of an intention to save the souls of the Muslims, the Muslims seem to be treated from a distance, to a secondary place and in a way depicting the Muslims as more immoral than the Hindus.\(^{47}\) Grant writes:

> The Mohammedans who are mixed with them [Hindus], may in regard to manners and morals, often be comprehended under the same observation, but something distinct shall afterwards be subjoined concerning them...\(^{48}\)

Grant considers the Muslims a racial group of warriors of Tartar origin who had mixed in “considerable number with the former inhabitants of all the countries subdued by their arms in Hindostan”. However, Grant refutes the view that Hindus have derived any improvement from the Muslims. For Grant, the Muslims had “contributed their share to the general evils in India”. On the basis of the numerical strength of the Hindus, he concludes that:

> They may therefore be considered rather as constituting an accession, than as giving them a character to the mass. The vices, however, of the Mohammedans and Hindus, are so homogenous that in stating their effects, it is not inaccurate to speak of both classes under the description of one collective body into which they are now formed.\(^{49}\)

Grant depicts the Muslims as proud, fierce, lawless and superstitious who were “rendered by success more proud, sanguinary, sensual and bigoted”. The Muslim government was a violent despotism, breaking through all the restraints of morals, practicing oppression, atrocities and cruelties. Grant sees perfidy among the Muslims “more signal than the Hindus”. He sees Muslim rule in India as a divine punishment for the immoral Hindus in the form of “successive treacheries, assassinations and usurpation”.\(^{50}\) Although the commerce and details of finances were left to the Hindus, they were despised and insulted. Grant tries to prove this argument through the evidences from his contemporary Muslim governments.

\(^{43}\) Charles Grant, op. cit., p. 26.
\(^{46}\) Ibid., p. 30.
\(^{47}\) The view seems to be a common one among the evangelical missionaries in India. All the analytical studies on British attitude towards India depict a view of marginal treatment of Muslims. See for a detail of the Evangelical views K.A. Ballhatchet, “Some aspects of Historical writings on India By Protestant Christian Missionaries During the Nineteenth and Twentieth centuries”, in C.H. Philips, ed., Historians of India Pakistan and Ceylon, London, 1967, p. 344-356.
\(^{49}\) Ibid., p.39.
\(^{50}\) Ibid., p.39.
However, he sees a change in the character of the Muslims in the areas where their authority was subverted. But even in those areas Grant sees Muslims “bolder” in the exercise of evils than the Hindus.\footnote{Ibid., p.39.}

Grant seems to be unwilling to treat Muslims as a religious community separate from the Hindus. Acceptance of the Muslims in any way better than the Hindus could divide the attention of the policy makers. Simultaneously, by declaring the Muslims same as Hindus, Grant seems to be strengthening his arguments in favour of missionary activities and stressing the need of radical social change for both the communities.

\textbf{2.5. Comparison of Muslim and British Rule.}

Although Grant condemns the Muslim rule as foreign and atrocious to the natives of India, his assessment seems favourable in comparison to the British rule. He seems to be of the view that foreign rule in India was just because Hindus were unable to make effectual provisions against foreign invasions and, in this perspective, the Muslim rule was the result of the degeneration of the Hindus. It was clear to Grant that the Muslim rule was not a cause of the degeneration of the Hindus. In this way, Grant justifies the foreign rule in India to which the East India Company had succeeded after the Muslims.

However, Grant maintains that the British rule in India had remained unsuccessful in dispersing the prosperity among the Indian people compared to the period of the Mughuls. He accepts that the house of Timur had ameliorated the government of India. He takes the prosperity of India under Aurangzeb as a model and wants to assess later developments on this model. However, he believes that India was prosperous under native rulers even during the most disastrous times than under the company’s administration at any time in India. “The country and the people were not in so good a condition as that in which we found them”.\footnote{Ibid., p.36.} Bengal was infact in a much better state under the last two regular Mughul viceroys, Murshid Kuli Khan and Shuja Khan.\footnote{Ibid., p.27.} For Grant, this was due to the drainage of wealth from India to Europe. Under the Mughuls, “even the rapacious exactions went again into circulation and tribute formerly paid to Delhi ... was little felt. But tribute paid to us extract every year a large portion of the produce [products] of that country without the least interest”.\footnote{Ibid., p.37.}
In this way, Grant, by placing the Hindus and the Muslims in same cart, seems to be stressing the need of a universal radical social change on political ground in India. Grant tries to justify the foreign rule; he also depicts the Muslim ruling elite in the state of the same depravity as that of the Hindus. Relating the disastrous political environment to the immorality prevailing in India, Grant attaches cause of social change with the strength and permanence of the British rule. In the same way, Grant by his criticism of the British rule, draws the moral that Britain owes a debt to India and “how that debt could be paid --- by promoting western education in the English language, thus weakening the ‘fabrics of falsehood’ and facilitating the spread of Christianity”.55 Through these arguments he confirms his opinion that “the communication of Christianity to the natives of our possessions in the East” was a way for the strength, permanence and progress of British dominion.


By the initiation of Grant’s view for the role of the Company in the Evangelisation of India, there began a series of apologetic writings to influence the British public opinion as well as the company’s policies. In these apologetic writings, William Tenant adopted an argument different from that of Grant’s. Grant had accepted the exploitations of the company in India and was seeking the compensation for Indians in the evangelisation. Tenant refused to accept the view of the exploitations of Indians by the company. He was of the opinion that the Company’s rule was ever best in India. However, he declared evangelisation of India indispensable for the permanence of the British rule in India.

3.1. William Tennant (1758-1813).

Although not very famous, William Tennant has been taken as a ‘preacher Willie’56 and a very staunch advocate of missionary activity in India. He spent only a few years in India; however, his observations on Indian affairs were considered worth to the extent that won him

---

55 K.A. Ballhatchet, op. cit., p.345.
56 The Burns Encyclopaedia, William Tennant.
the Buchanan Prize for the writings contributing to the intellectual cause of Christian missions and a Doctorate in mission theology.57

3.1.1. Setting of Tennant’s thought.

Born in a Scottish family, the Tennants were known for their nationalist and Evangelical view, and William Tennant was brought up in a very traditional way. His brother James Tennant was a very good friend of the famous Scottish poet Robert Burns.58 Educated in a traditional system, William Tennant emerged as religious and evangelical, devoted all his energies to the cause of preaching and became known as “Preacher Willie” in the family. In the last decade of the eighteenth century, under the evangelists’ influence, he set sail for India and served about seven years on a temporary post of Chaplain of British Indian Bengal Army at Burhanpur from 1788 to 1795.59 In 1795, his services were terminated, probably due to his Evangelical zeal, which the East India Company was taking as a threat to its commercial monopoly. He may have got his services confirmed, had he contacted Charles Grant in London, but it seems that he had no contacts with the Company’s Evangelical hierarchy at London. Although he submitted a petition for the renewal of his services in 1797, but inspite of his being only and experienced candidate against a vacant seat of Chaplain, he was not allowed to avail the opportunity.60 His return home in 1803 seems to be an indication of his disappointment of winning employment under the Company as well as for missionary activities under the Company’s rule in India. He returned to Scotland with a commitment to create public awareness for the need of Evangelisation in India and wrote two books in this context, which won the Buchanan Prize and a Degree of Doctorate for him.61

The purpose of his writings was to express his views, on the basis of his Indian experience, on the issues of the failure of Christian missions in India and to lay down some “suggestions for improvement of the natives through the introduction of western institutions”, especially, Christianity. In this perspective, Tennant wants to guide the

57 Tennant, Thought, p. vi.
58 Robert Burns wrote the history of the family in a poetic way for the brother of William Tennant, James Tennant under the title of “Epistle to James Tennant” which is published in The Burns Encyclopaedia. James Tennant and William Tennant. The Encyclopaedia consists mainly of the history of Scottish houses and is available on line.
59 The Company’s Chaplain records at India Office Library, London had no record of William Tennant’s services. However his memorandum for his reappointment against a vacant seat of Chaplain to the Company’s high official is quoted by Henry Barry Hyde, Parochial Annals of Bengal, Calcutta, 1901, p. 258
60 Ibid., p. 251.
61 University of Glasgow granted him a degree of Doctor of Divinity for his work.
missionary institution so that “the application to practice must be safe, if not useful, in forwarding the benevolent intentions” of these excellent institutions.\^62 Although taking the then modern western developments as a result of Christian reformation, William Tennant does not equate the modern developments with Christianisation and still stressed the need of Christianisation of India. He stresses the need in social, political, commercial, colonial, cultural and administrative terms. He divides his arguments in sections called ‘stricture’\^63 in which he takes one issue in every section and tries to analyse through a comparative methodology, with a predetermined view of the superiority of the Britain over the world. He stresses conversion of heathens to Protestant Christianity in view of its importance for the strength of the British Empire.

3.1.2. Tennant’s Concept of History.

In Tennant’s thought, History and experience appear to be one providing lessons to mankind. Tennant sees the history of the world in terms of a predetermined progress of human society “coincide[d] with the intimations of scriptures”, like St. Augustine’s City of God.\^64 The growth and spread of knowledge seem to be his criterion to evaluate the progress of human society, which seems to him to be spreading through a “more enlarged intercourse between the different nations of the world”.\^65 However, Christianity appears in his thought as synonymous with knowledge and civilization and by the spread of Christianity, he evaluates the progress of knowledge and civilization. In this perspective, for Tennant, the process of history depicts a gradual “down fall of pagan system” and rise of Christianity in the form of the growth and expansion of Christian “common wealth” since the last few centuries before current times.\^66 The “high attainments of antiquity” seem worthless to Tennant as compared to the achievements of modern civilization, which he identifies in its relation to Christianity.\^67 Therefore, Tennant’s civilization evolves around the religion and morals and he sees the worth of character and role of rulers in society in their relation with the religion and morals. Common people appear to him mere disciples of ruling or religious leadership;

\^62 Tennant, Thought, p. vi.
\^64 Tennant, Thought, pp. 200-201.
\^65 Ibid., p. 201.
\^66 Ibid., p. 200.
\^67 Ibid., pp. 200-201.
therefore, he seems to advocating the unity of religious and political purpose and leadership to support the cause of the British Empire as well as Christianisation of the world. He believes that a religious harmony among the subjects and rulers could bring peace in society and stabilization in political and administrative system.

3.1.3. Tennant’s Unit of Historical Studies.

As an evangelist, Tennant wanted to Christianise India. In this regard, his aim was to convince the British public as well as authorities that mere political and commercial success was not enough for the strength of the British Indian Empire. The strength of the empire lay in the spread of Christian religion. So, a comparison of Hindu, Muslim and British impact on Indian society appears to be his basic focus, although attached to the apology for promoting Christianity in India. He studies the state of animal husbandry, products, trade, commerce, administration, territorial limits, people’s attachment with the ruling authorities, religious liberties, development and revenues in British India and concludes that India was far better and developed under the British rule than under the Muslim rule. However, he does not takes this success as a source of permanence of the British rule in India and thus studies the way to prolong or make the British rule permanent in India. In this perspective he discusses the role of religion in the strength of colonial rule and almost comes to the same conclusion, as was that of Ibn Khaldun. Religion, Empire and political economy, especially, agricultural, appear to be his central focus.68

Tennant’s primary purpose was to strengthen the British Empire by means of Christianisation. Therefore Muslim India does not form the core of Tennant’s thought. However, his view seems sympathetic to the Muslims in a sense that he treats the Muslim rule in India as one of the leading promoters of prosperity among the subject people through a systematic administration. The picture of a prosperous subject people indicates good terms between the Muslim rulers and the Hindu subjects which, Tennant believes to be the result of sound administration. However, Tennant’s construction of thought seems to be developed by his contemporary evangelical movement as well as historicism, nationalism and colonial motives.

68 Asiatic Annual Register, 1802. Tennant. Also quoted in “Review of Dr. William Tennant’s Indian Recreations”, Edinburgh Review, Vol. IV, 1804, p. 314
3.2. Indian Situation.

Tennant seems to be wary about the spread of the thoughts of the French Revolution in India challenging the British supremacy and increasing the influence of the French. Tipu, the sultan of Mysore, seems to him a major exponent of French influence as well as the key figure to establish a confederacy to stop the growth of British power.\(^{69}\) Tennant rejects the view that comforts of millions of colonized people were injured under the British rule. He sees a visible progress of natives in knowledge, wealth and happiness under the British.\(^{70}\) However Tennant sees the “oriental character and manner”, “inveterate prejudices of the Asiatics” and “their habitual and natural indolence of mind” as hurdles in their progress along with the prejudices of the westerners working for them.\(^{71}\) He criticizes the “artificial and unnatural division of people” in India, especially, among Hindus and “ingenuity of man”.\(^{72}\) This criticism extends to their means of subsistence, agriculture, commerce and system of government. He declares Indian society backward and rude as compared to the British, even under the Muslims. He sees the system of Indian government shaken by the expansion of British Indian Empire and by the Company’s monopoly.\(^{73}\)

Tennant takes the improvement of the province of Bengal as important as that of Middlesex and Dublin. To “preserve India and England together” was the most important task for Tennant, which could be achieved through the preservation of the rights of Indian subjects with regard to personal rights and civil liberties.\(^{74}\)

3.3. Tennant’s Understanding of Muslim India.

Tennant’s understanding of Muslim India appears to be a continuity of traditional evangelical view of the Muslim society and politics. He takes Muslim India as a model of relations between the Hindus and the non-Hindus. He tries to derive principles for the British-Indian relations in the perspective of Indo-Muslim relations, in different ways such as economic, religious and social. He rejects the view that by the unlimited migration of Englishmen, mother country will be depopulated, while the minds of the natives will be alienated by the disrespect, which the European settlers will show to the religion and customs.

\(^{69}\) Tennant, *Thought*, p. 16-17.


\(^{74}\) *Ibid.*, pp. 303-5
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of the country. He negates the view through the interpretation of history of India under the Muslims and tries to generate the view that Muslims, instead of respecting the Hindus, did every thing in their power to show their detestation for the worship and their contempt for the feelings of the inhabitants and maintained an unlimited control over the Hindus for many centuries. However, he is of the opinion that the effects of the Muslim conquests must have blunted the feelings and moderated the prejudices of the Hindus. He identifies such impacts of "Islamism" in the African countries also.

Tennant takes Muslims as a religious community and seems to be taking this foundation as the cause of their success and wants a place for Christian religious devotees in the policymaking. He writes: "By the effects of the Muslim missions, customs of Islamism were adopted and a great degree of comparative civilization and security were introduced on the laws of Quran...". In this perspective, he advocates a harsh policy to reform and convert the Indians. However, Akbar appears to be an exception of this policy:

The reign of Akbar was distinguished by a degree of tolerance altogether uncommon under Mohammedan [Muslim] government. That monarch revered as "Augustus of Asia", not only afforded equal protection to the adherents of every sect, but discovered a strong inclination to become acquainted with the peculiar tenets of Christian doctrines.

As a whole, Tennant presents all oriental system including Islam, as full of defects and devoid of morality. However, he emphasised the adoption of the religio-political policy of the Muslims, inspite of its defects on the ground that sound Christian morality along with the benefits of European developments will contribute to the strength of the British Empire.

3.4. Comparison of Indian State and Society under Mughuls and British.

Tennant compares the Indian state and society to draw inferences for evaluation of British rule in India and for the future policy suggestions. He compares the state of commerce, trade, products, communal relations, happiness and administrative efficiency under the Mughuls with that of the British. Tennant applies Patton's Principles of Asiatic Monarchies and Volney's statements regarding the Turkish Sultans, identifying them as

75 Ibid., p.327.
76 Tennant, Recreations, Vol. III, p. 337.
77 Ibid., Vol. III, p.234.
79 Patton, Principles of Asiatic Monarchies, Politically and Historically Investigated and Contrasted with those of the Monarchies of Europe, Shewing the Dangerous Tendency of Confounding them in the Administration of Affairs of India, London, 1801.
stationary, semi-barbarous, absolute powers, suppression and tyranny to the Indo-Muslim rule. He criticises the absence of check and balance, deficiency in affording the protection to people and loss of virtue and spirit due to the despotism in the Mughul Empire. However, he accepts that the regulations of the empire might be excellent.\textsuperscript{81}

Tennant shows his surprise at the extent of the Mughul Empire and on its prosperous state,\textsuperscript{82} despite the fact that the Indians have "never raised to the character of commercial people".\textsuperscript{83} Taking natives and Hindus synonyms for each other and Muslims as foreigners, he confesses that under the Mughuls, the natives (Hindus) were living a prosperous life. He discusses the property, security, land revenue system, judicial system, police system and such problems in details and confesses that they were in a better state under the Great Mughuls.

However, Tennant finds the seeds of the destruction of the Mughul Empire in its structure. There was a sort of political instability, warfare and destruction of social and political system during the later period of the Mughuls. The princes and administrators were promoting lawlessness and contributing a greater share in the violence.\textsuperscript{84} This state of affairs had become worse because of divine punishment in the form of natural plights such as famines and diseases.\textsuperscript{85}

Discussing the extent of those calamities, which the native provinces had suffered from their subjugation by the British, Tennant rejects the view.\textsuperscript{86} He is of the opinion that the Mughuls and the British were on good terms with each other. Their government was based on a liberal and humane treatment of the natives and was founded on the principle of benefit and mutual affection rather than force or fear.\textsuperscript{87} He tries to prove that subjugation by a civilized nation was a blessing for Indians. Conquests were an historical phenomenon producing positive effect on semi-barbarous nations and, in this regard, Indians were in better conditions under the British. However, he stresses the need of making the Indians civilized.\textsuperscript{88}

\textsuperscript{80} C.F. Volney, The Ruin, or A Survey of the Revolutions of the Empire, 1r, by James Marshal, Otley, 2000.
\textsuperscript{81} Tennant, Recreations, Vol. III, pp.70-80.
\textsuperscript{82} Ibid., Vol. III, pp. 168-169.
\textsuperscript{83} Ibid., Vol. III, pp.68.
\textsuperscript{86} Ibid., Vol. III, p.125.
\textsuperscript{87} Ibid., Vol. III, pp. 37-39.
\textsuperscript{88} Ibid., Vol. III, p.167.
land, land revenue assessment and collection was more moderate, the sum of money collected in terms of revenue was increased even more than the collection of revenues during the reign of Akbar. Judicial, military and administrative structure was more improved than the time of Akbar. The corruption and defects were being resolved through a permanent administration.\textsuperscript{89} The British restored consistency, efficiency, devotion, patience and law and order in the society.

Tennant also defends the relations between the Indian states and the British Empire. Contrary to his views about the Mughuls, he considers the Indian princes very hostile to their people and to the British and, in this regard, he justifies the overthrow of Tipu Sultan.\textsuperscript{90}

Tennant shows his contradiction with the views of Charles Grant regarding the British rule in India. Grant had advocated the introduction of Christianity as a compensation of the British commercial exploits in India. Tennant does not agree with this view. He finds the conditions better under the British. However, his logic for the introduction of Christianity appears to be a little different from Grant.


Christianity and Islam have a long tradition of scholastic and polemical interaction.\textsuperscript{91} All aspects of ideological as well as practical theology, especially, the nature of scripture, the character of the prophets and epistemological construction of religion, have been the issues of discourse between the two religions.\textsuperscript{92} The tradition seems to be at its peak during the late middle ages. However, challenges of rationalism and the enlightenment pacified this pure

\textsuperscript{89} \textit{Ibid.}, Vol. III, pp. 80-103.
\textsuperscript{90} \textit{Ibid.}, Vol. III, p. 9.
\textsuperscript{91} For a view of the history of the issue see Avril A. Powell, \textit{op. cit.}, Chapter 1, pp. 6-42. Also See Glory E. Dharmaraj, \textit{Christianity and Islam: A Missiological Encounter}, Delhi, 1999.
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scholastic and polemical tradition of debate. However after a short time, by the nineteenth century, it again became a powerful and active tool for Christian missionary activity. It was Henry Martyn who revived this tradition. Educationalists and polemical missionaries such as Duff and Pfander later adopted the same logic. Henry Martyn determined the relations between language and religion, especially, between Arabic, Persian and Hindustani languages and Islam. Considering the Muslim creed as a challenge to his own religious belief, Martyn defended Christianity and attacked Islam.


Henry Martyn has a very prominent place in the history of modern Christian missions. He has been considered “the first modern missionary” and “Apostle to the Mohammedans”. He has also been taken as “the first uncompromising Evangelical”, and “confessor of the faith”. Although much criticized for his intention to revive the medieval culture of scholasticism and polemics, oral as well as written (Munazara), he has been considered as a “saint and scholar”, “in dialogue with truth”. He is placed among the “five pioneering missionaries” of modern times by modern historians of the Christian missions. Avril A. Powell writes about his influence:

His direct influence was very slight, and was seemingly unrecorded in any contemporary Muslim sources. Yet Martyn’s ... polemical Persian tracts on Islam ... were to have important effects on the interaction between missionaries and Muslims, which would occur in the region more than twenty years after his own death.

4.1.1. Setting of Martyn’s Thought.

- Henry Martyn lived a short life of thirty-two years, only six years of which were spent in India. However, he won fame for his devotion to the cause of Christian missions in these
years. Martyn’s mind was set for evangelical work by his contemporary environment, family, education and employment. Born in a poor religious family of Truro, Cornwall, Henry Martyn was brought up in an environment of Methodists and Evangelical movements for Christian revival at home as well abroad. His sister, influenced by the Wesleyan revivalist activity, inculcated a religious instinct in his mind and heart that was later boosted by his missionary schooling and after that, by his education at Oxford as well as at Cambridge. Cambridge, at the end of the eighteenth century, had become a centre for the evangelical revival, under the influence of Charles Simeon (1759-1836). So, Martyn diverted all his attention to “eternal soul”, devoted himself to God’s services and preaching of the gospel for the salvation of eternal soul and gave up the worldly life. He became prone to a habit of “self-denial” and “self-examination”, which he considered guidance from “infinite wisdom”. However, a conflict between self-humility as a human being and self-superiority as a Christian emerged as a permanent part of his thought. Inspite of his aptitude for classics, and intention to seek an academic or legal career, his concentration on mathematics led him “to accept and to pursue the evidential and rational types of arguments”, which he used in his encounter with the Ulema of Persia. However, “the religion of the heart was certainly firmly buttressed by the conclusions of a powerful mind”.

Martyn had intended to solve his financial problems with the help of London based Simeonians.

Although the East India Company had a negative attitude toward missionaries at that time, he sought a career as Chaplain in the Company’s services to achieve his missionary ends, with the help of Charles Grant. He learned Hindustani (later called Urdu), Persian and

---

105 Places in Scotland.
106 See for the details of the movements, John Tulloch’s, *Movements of Religious Thought in Britain During the Nineteenth Century*, London, 1885. Also see Brilioth Yngve’s *The Anglican Revival*, London, 1925.
107 Clinton Bennett, op. cit., p. 47.
112 Ibid., Vol. I, p. 201.
113 A.A. Powell, op. cit., p. 90.
114 Charles Simon was an evangelist professor at Cambridge. His followers include William Wilberforce (1795-1833), Hannah Moore (1745-1833), Charles Grant (1746–1823) and John Venn (1759-1813)
Arabic languages for that purpose. Therefore, Henry Martyn had a polemical purpose in his writings.

4.1.2. Martyn’s Concept of History.

Martyn had a belief in the “universal history”\textsuperscript{115} in the form of “Will of God”. In this way he sees the work of God in every instance of the universe.\textsuperscript{116} Believing in the truth of Christianity and Bible, life was just a delusion for Martyn, thus, history too was a delusion since it was a depiction of life through which God “testifies hatred of sin in this world”.\textsuperscript{117} Therefore, life after death was the target of Martyn activities. He condemned the deists’ philosophical view of the mortality of God and soul.\textsuperscript{118} He had no place for history in his system as a work of worldly pleasures full of human ambitions.\textsuperscript{119} History appeared to him a work aiming to establish the supremacy of divine precepts in the world, which could provide salvation in the life hereafter.

Religion was the perfect representation of civilization for Martyn and on this scale; there was only one civilization in the world for Martyn. Language was the prime source for the communication of the source of civilization as well as religion. Therefore, he appreciates the administrators and rulers working for the propagation and spread of religion. Religion was a source of strength for empire. Martyn observes that common people were devoid of religion and morals. Therefore, it was the duty of the rulers as well as religious leadership to impart Christian knowledge to the people, to make the common people civilized. However, he is always critical of the worldly motives of the rulers.

4.1.3. Martyn’s Unit of Historical Studies.

Christian religion appears to be Martyn’s central focus and thus adherence and spread of Christian religion his primary aim and basic unit of studies. Henry Martyn was basically poor in historical studies. He never published any of his writings during his lifetime. However, all his writings, including journals and letters\textsuperscript{120} and his Persian tracts, translated into English,\textsuperscript{121} were published post-humously, and were received very warmly as a saintly-symbol of religious devotion and the evangelical zeal. In his journals and letters, his concern remained

\textsuperscript{115} Wilberforce, \textit{op. cit.}, Vol. I, p.38.
\textsuperscript{117} \textit{Ibid.}, Vol. I, p.38.
\textsuperscript{118} \textit{Ibid.} Vol. I, p.50
\textsuperscript{119} \textit{Ibid.}, see his expressions for the year 1803.
\textsuperscript{120} Wilberforce edited his \textit{Journals and Letters}, which were published during more than six times until 1830.
\textsuperscript{121} Samuel Lee, \textit{op. cit.}
confined to his devotion to attain the Christian model of personal character and on his work for the evangelisation of the Muslims. However, his Persian Tract focused on the defence of Christianity and attack on Islam. His central themes appear to be Prophethood, Scripture, and nature of religious belief. As Henry Martyn had no inclination towards worldly affairs, all his discussion and arguments seem confined to epistemology or to the concept of salvation in life after death. He was linked with history through the antiquity of religion and scripture and measures the society on the foundations of its religion in the remote past. These concepts and perceptions represent his unit of historical studies.

In this perspective Islam, appears to be the central focus of Martyn’s writings as an energetic and potent rival of Christianity, having a long history of intercourse, conflict and resistance to Christianity. So his attitude towards Islam and the Muslims seems to be antithetic. Keeping up the Muslims’ love for their religion, he takes for granted a sort of conflict between the Muslims and the Hindus. Martyn considers Hindu reaction against Christianity as the reflection of the Hindu-Muslim controversy. Therefore Muslims’ attitude rather resistance to Christian religion, means, methods and sources of the conversion of the Muslims and Muslims response to the missionary logic and arguments were basic issues for Martyn. However, all these issues were constructed on Martyn’s English education as well as on the emerging colonial, commercial, nationalistic and evangelical movements of contemporary Europe.

4.2. Martyn’s Perception of Indian Muslims.

Henry Martyn’s perception of Islam can be derived from his Letters and Journals. However, concept of Islamic religion, scripture and the Prophet (PBUH), in the polemical form, is the central theme of his Persian Tracts. His understanding of Indian Muslims was based on a number of his perceptions: First, he viewed the Indian Muslims in continuity with his perception of the East, Asiatic and Hindu people and morals. Second, Martyn identifies “Hindustani” language as the language of Indian Muslims, closely associated with Persian language, thus connecting Indian Muslims with the Persian cultural, ethnic and imperial tradition. Third, Muslim religious arguments from Quran in Arabic language appear to Martyn a link between Indo-Islamic and Eastern Arabic-Islamic tradition. Fourth, Indian Muslims’ resistance and counter-attack on the logic of Christian missions were creating a
sort of challenge for Martyn’s theological mind. All these factors seem to be contributing in his perception of Indian Muslims, Islam and his focus on Islam for the evangelical activities.

4.3. Indian Morals.

Henry Martyn divides the world into two rival factions, one representing his Western or European or Christians\textsuperscript{122} or English “self”, as symbol of morality and civilization and “other”, East\textsuperscript{123} or Asiatic\textsuperscript{124} or heathens or Indians, as symbols of immoral and uncivilized. He came to India with a perception to evangelise the natives, commonly understood as Hindus, on the model of his mentor, Charles Grant. While travelling, he had gone through a number of English writings on India, depicting Muslims as imperial rulers and Hindus as humiliated subjects. Henry Martyn came in India without any distinction of Hindus and Muslim.\textsuperscript{125} He had also discussed Indian affairs with Wilberforce.\textsuperscript{126} He was very critical of Jones’ sympathetic placement of Hindu society to a level of civilization.\textsuperscript{127} Brahmins were “very exact and careful in the worship of Devil” in his view. However, Martyn confessed that India was a “land of plenty and peace” and there was a “universal tranquillity”.\textsuperscript{128} He believed that common people were angels as compared to the Brahmins. He observes Brahmins as “people processed by Satan, like the idols”. They worship without any understanding.\textsuperscript{129} He concluded that the Indians were devoid of religion, heretics, heathens and immoral. Martyn applies this understanding of India to the Muslims. The “Eastern Blockhead”, the “dull Rubbi” the “formal Arabian” and the “feeble Indian” all appear to Martyn one and the same.\textsuperscript{130} Simultaneously, he placed the Quran by the Ramayana and harshly criticized both.\textsuperscript{131} In this perspective, the Muslims and Islam seem to have no special place in Martyn’s initial understanding and plan of missionary work.

\textsuperscript{122} Wilberforce, \textit{op. cit.}, Vol. II, pp. 38-39
\textsuperscript{123} Ibid., Vol. II, p. 296, letter to David Brown, dated April 19, 1810.
\textsuperscript{124} Ibid., Vol. II, p. 332, letter to Lydia dated Feb. 4, 1811.
\textsuperscript{125} He got opportunity of several meetings with Charles Grant before his arrival in India and personally collected information on the state of India other than his \textit{Observations}. One such meeting was held between the two on 26\textsuperscript{th} of January, 1804, another on May 8, 1805. See Wilberforce, \textit{op. cit.}, Vol. I, p.86.
\textsuperscript{126} Martyn met Wilberforce on March 1, 1805 and again in May. See Wilberforce, \textit{op. cit.}, Vol. I, pp.86, 236.
\textsuperscript{128} Ibid., Vol. I, letter to Lydia dated July, 30, 1806.
\textsuperscript{129} Ibid., Vol. I, P. 139; Also see Martyn’s letter to his brother dated, Jan. 4, 1808.
\textsuperscript{130} Ibid., Vol. II, p. 249, letter to Dr. Corrie, dated July 31, 1809.
\textsuperscript{131} Clinton Bennett, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 58.
4.4. Martyn’s Shift of Focus to Indian Muslims and Islam.

Martyn as an evangelist was keenly interested in the preaching of Gospel to the heathens, especially Hindus, as advised by his mentor Charles Grant. Inspite of some preliminary readings on Islam and expecting conversion from Hinduism, he had planned to “strike at the heart of Hinduism”.\(^{132}\) He was interested in his appointment at a centre of Hindu pilgrims and learning. However, after his arrival in India, the focus of his interest was shifted to the Muslims and Islam. He comments on the issue in his journal:

> The thought of the Mohammedans and heathens [Hindus] lies very heavy upon my mind. The former... I seem to think are consigned to me by God, because nobody preaches in Hindostam [Hindustani].\(^{133}\)

Martyn’s perception of Muslim influence in India, Indo-Muslim relations with the Middle Eastern nation through Persian and Arabic languages and Islamic religion seem to be three basic reasons of shift of his attention to Indian Muslims and Islam.

4.4.1. Hindustani Language and Muslim Community.

Although during the latter half of the nineteenth century, Urdu language had emerged as the language of Muslim community, yet, Martyn can be taken as the first observer identifying Hindustani language as the language of Indian Muslims and its relations with Persian. Therefore, modern researchers have identified his Hindustani translation as Urdu,\(^{134}\) which has been identified as the language of Indian Muslims.\(^{135}\) This identification made Hindustani language instrumental in the shift of Martyn’s attention to Indian Muslims and subsequently to Persian and Arabic languages and Islam. Martyn had assumed his missionary activity on the view that Hindustani was the lingua franca of India and Bengali was the language of the areas North-Eastern India. However, association of Hindustani with the Muslims changed his mind and he devoted his energies to the conversion of the Muslim.\(^{136}\)

4.4.2. Relation of Hindostani Language and Indian Muslims with Persian and Arabic.

Martyn’s understanding of association of Hindustani language with Indian Muslims led him to discover its relations with Persian language and relation of Persian language with


\(^{134}\) For example see Dr. Avril A. Powell, op. cit., p.89; and Clinton Bennett, op. cit., p. 59.

\(^{135}\) See details of Urdu-Hindi Controversy.
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Arabic. Martyn finds a common linkage between the languages of the Muslim world, developing a sense of unity in the Muslim community and he wished to address all the Muslim community through the linguistic skill. He assumed the task of addressing the Muslim community through the translation of Gospel into Persian.

Later he more clearly identified a very close relation between Persian and Hindustani.

Martyn was totally unsatisfied with the earlier attempts of translation of the Gospel into Hindustani. However, during the process of translation, he came to know that Hindustani could not be understood without a proper knowledge of Persian.

In this perspective Martyn takes Hindustani and Persian as one and was determined to translate Gospel into Persian, which he considered a link with Persia, too. Martyn’s Persian studies led him to identify a close link between Persian and Arabic in the form of mutual influences since the Arab conquest of Persia. Martyn sees Arabic influence even on the classics of Persian literature. He points out that even the Gulistan of Sadi, written six hundred years ago has nearly as much Arabic as Persian and since that time Arabic has been continually flowing into Persian language. Martyn concludes that an Arabic translation of the Gospel was needed to influence the Muslim mind.

In this way by developing an affinity and relation between Hindustani, Persian and Arabic, Martyn was planning to address the whole Muslim community, west of India to Tunis and Morocco.

4.4.3. Muslim Challenge to Christian Morality and Missionary Logic.

Martyn-Muslim contacts were strengthened by the challenges posed by the Indian Muslims to the logic of Christian missions and by a view of the extension of evangelisation mission to Persia and Arabia.

---

139 Martyn Journals and letters for the year 1806 to 1809 are full of his narration of his devotion to the task of translation. See Wilberforce, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 81, Letter to Dr Corrie dated June 15, 1807.
140 Ibid., p. 235. In his letter to Dr Brown dated Feb. 4, 1809, Martyn wrote: “Meer Sheer Ullee’s Ali’s Hindustani is to my eyes hideous. A translation in his style would be the most useless thing imaginable, for his Hindustani is only Persian spoilt and every one who is scholar enough to understand it will certainly prefer to read the Persian Gospel”. On the same subject in his letter to Dr Corrie dated March 20, 1809 he wrote: “Read translation into Hindustani. Sentence after sentence were not understood till the Persian was read. It was a satisfaction to see that how plain the Persian was to them, so that this Persian will probably appear to be the first useful translation in modern times”. He wrote to Dr Brown on 28 March, 1809: “Last week we began the correction of Hindustani translation...I was amazed and mortified at observing that reference was to the Persian for every verse, in order to understand the Hindustani. It was however a consolation to find that from Persian they [panel of translators] caught the meaning of it instantly, always expressing their admiration of the plainness of their translation.”
141 Ibid., Vol. II, Letter to Dr Brown dated Sep. 29, 1809.
Martyn takes Muslims as a challenging community, very bigoted, enthusiastic, and devoted votaries to Islam, with a belief in the superiority of Islam over Christianity, equipped with philosophical, eschatological, and rational arguments.

In the resistance to the Christian logic of mission, Muslims not only appear as defenders of their own religious belief, but also posed serious questions to the logic of Christian theology. Martyn was very impressed by the strength of the logic and argument of the Muslim scholars that he was forced to reconsider his own religious belief, rather than seeking converts among the Muslims. In this perspective Martyn’s concentration on Islam was his personal response to the challenges posed by the Muslims to his own person and his missionary efforts. The missionary researchers are of the opinion that the subject matter of the debates and discourses was medieval in contents. It became a challenge because of Martyn’s ignorance of the classical debate among the Christians and the Muslims. Commenting on one such debate between Martyn and Muslim Munshee, Clinton Bennett writes:

What is interesting about this conversation is both its rehearsal of the traditional points of disputes between Muslims and Christians, which appear to have been novel to Martyn and Martyn’s consequent willingness to learn.142

Martyn had come to India with a sense of superiority of Europe over all others, however, the questions posed by the Muslims were so striking that after a debate Martyn was forced to write in his Journal:

The man argued and asked his questions seemingly in earnest, and another new impression was left upon my mind; namely these men are not fools; and that ingenuity and clearness of reasoning are not confined to England. I seem to feel that these descendants of Ham are as dear to God as the haughty sons of Japheth...143

Although Martyn “never had a heart to converse with ... [the Muslim Munshee] about Mohammedanism [Islam]”144 and Munshee’s “contemptuous rejection” of Christianity had “a tendency to despirit [disspirit]” Martyn’s temper,145 he was ready to meet this challenge later. His proposal of preaching among the Muslims was supported by the other missionaries working in India, who were reluctant to preach among the Muslims, on the same ground, keeping in mind the long history of Christian-Muslim debate. The acceptance of this

---

142 Clinton Bennett, op. cit., p. 59.
144 His Journals and Letters of 1807 represent his reluctance to converse with the Muslim on theological debate. See Wilberforce, op. cit., Vol. II, p.42.
challenge by Martyn seems to be strengthened by his understanding that the Muslims were annoyed by the moral discrepancies on the part of the rational Westerners or Catholic Christians. Muslims feel themselves better than these so called civilized Christians. Even his own fellow Christian converted from Islam was critical of British morality. 146 Martyn was also critical of the morality of native Christians as well as Europeans. 147 These understandings in the perspective of Martyn’s study of the English translation of the Quran by Sale along with discourses, 148 written in a manner which was considered sympathetic to the Muslim view, 149 were posing challenge to Martyn that the cultural, intellectual, moral and religious level of the Muslims was apparently better than that of the Christians. 150 So, he seems compelled to treat the Muslims on the same level as Catholics and nominal Protestants, “under the same delusion”. 151

On the same assumption, Martyn feels Muslims a hurdle in the propagation of Christianity among the Hindus because of the common Semitic origin of religious history of the Muslims and the Christians. Hindus had a long history of conflict with the Muslims and similarly, the conflict between the Christians and the Muslims were converting Hindu-Muslim conflict, to a Hindu-Christian conflict. In this perspective, he seems to be taking the revival of Christian Muslim legacy of debate to highlight the difference between Islam and Christianity, thus trying to remove the view of connection between Islam and Christianity. However, Martyn responded to the Muslim challenge through his Persian Tracts.

4.5. Martyn’s Persian Tract.

Henry Martyn systematically expressed his views on the discourse between Christianity and Islam in his Persian Tracts, which were post-humously, published by S. Lee in 1824. Although these tracts were compiled during Martyn’s visit to Persia as a result of a series of his encounters with the Persian Muslim scholars, however the context, subject matter and arguments of the debate were already set by Martyn’s Indo-Muslim experiences. 152 Martyn

---

147 Ibid., Vol. I, p. 241. Martyn has expressed his grief over the condition of Christian in India on a number of occasions in his Journals and Letters.
148 Ibid., Vol. I, see his journal of voyage to India.
149 Avril A. Powell, op. cit., p. 91.
151 Abridged Memoirs of Henry Martyn, Cork, 1821, p. 13
152 Wilberforce, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 57. In his letter to Corrie dated May 4, 1807, Martyn informs him about his preparation to “assault this great Mohammedan Imaan [Imam]” by reading Quran and preparing notes.
had experienced polemical encounters with his Muslim Munshees, and between a Muslim convert to Christianity and the Muslim Religious Scholars. Martyn had an intention to put to pen these issues of debate. His aim was to introduce and defend the truth of Christian religion in three ways: First, defence of Christian religion and scripture as a revealed religion; Second, an attack on Islam and Third, Justification of the need of a revealed religion against Sufis (Deists) arguments.

4.5.1. Martyn’s Defence of Christianity.

Muslims had launched three basic questions against Martyn’s propagation of Christianity, which could be traced back to the earlier encounters between Christianity and Islam. First that original form of the Christian scripture has been destroyed, thus it’s revealed nature has been annihilated. Second that the Christians has altered the sacred concept of the Unity of God with that of Trinity and, in this respect, Christianity has lost its original form and thus need not to be followed. Third that Christian scripture itself prophesied the coming of a Prophet (who had come in the name of Mohammed (PBUH) and thus following of Christianity has lost its meaning.

Martyn rules out the question of the destruction of Christian scripture. He tries to assert that the concept of Trinity was not destroying the concept of Unity of God and to prove that there was no prophesy for the coming of a Prophet after the Christ. In this perspective, Christ was the last prophet for Martyn.

4.5.2. Martyn’s Attack on Islam.

In his debates with the Muslims, Martyn focused on three aspects against Islam in response to three questions launched against Christianity: the Prophet, his miracles and the Quran. On the basis of his criticism of Islamic law he believes that it is reasonable to declare

---

13 Wilberforce, op cit., Vol. II, p. 232. A number of such debates occur between Sabat, an Arab Muslim convert to Christianity, who came to India about the same time when Martyn was in India and worked to translate the Gospel into Arabic. His encounters with the natives of Patna are considered symbolic in the early phase of colonial Christian mission in India. Martyn has discussed the matter in his Journals and Letters. See Corrie’s letter to Brown, in

14 In his first tract Martyn explained the truth of Christian religion, in the Second Tract he posed serious questions on the nature of Islamic Prophet, Scripture and Religion and in the Third he wrote the “Venity of Soffe System, and on the Truth of the Religion of Moses and Jesus”.

15 In his Journal Martyn writes that a Mohammedan has “nothing to find fault in Christianity, but the divinity of Christ”. Martyn takes it the only cause of learned Mohammedans’ contempt to Christianity. See Wilberforce, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 186.

that Islam itself is not a revealed religion. There was no need of a new religion and, in this regard, the claim of Mohammed as a prophet was unnecessary. He argues that the system of rewards in Islam was not suitable to human psyche. He concludes that Islamic religion needs proof to assert its truth while the spread of Christianity; inspite of its unworldly teachings was a clear proof of the truth of Christianity.\footnote{157} However, Martyn neglects the causes of the rapid spread of Islam.

Martyn launches a severe attack on the character of the prophet (SAW). He tries to prove that character of the Prophet (SAW) was nothing different from a common man, full of ambitions for sensual pleasure in the form of marriages, power and rule. In this perspective, he sees the spread of Islam as a work of power of rule or sword.\footnote{158}

The Muslim presentation of the Quran as a miracle in Arabic language as a proof of truth of Islam leads Martyn to attack the very basis of the linguistic skill of the Arabs.\footnote{159} He refuses to accept that the Arab society at the verge of Islam, had any significant level of linguistic understanding. They were unable to determine the nature of a literary work. In this way, he concludes that Arab judgment on the Quran as a miracle of Arabic language was not acceptable and thus rejects the Quran as a scripture. By this analysis of the linguistic conditions of ancient Arab society, Martyn challenges the long established tradition in which Quran has been considered a proof of the revealed nature of Islamic religion.

Martyn was of the opinion that the Muslim argument to prove the truth of Islam comes out of the Quran.\footnote{160} Therefore, he challenges the integrity of the Quran and its revealed or divine status and thus refuses to accept the revealed nature of Islam. For Martyn, every religion focuses the life after death and Islam was incapable of promoting salvation of mankind in the world hereafter. Thus his Christianity appears to be the only source of salvation in this world as well as in the world here after.

In this perspective, Martyn's criticism of Sufis in his third Tract seems to be an indication that Martyn, after all accepts Islam as a Unitarian religion. He criticizes pantheistic views of

\footnote{157} These arguments were developed by Martyn, during his stay in India. His Journal and letters contain a heavy repetition of these arguments. However these arguments found their organized form in his Persian Tracts. See his First and Third tract in Samuel Lee, \textit{op. cit.} Also see Wilberforce, \textit{op. cit.}, Vol. II, p. 120 and Martyn's letter to associated clergy dated April 6, 1807 in Wilberforce, \textit{op. cit.}, Vol. II, p. 43.


\footnote{159} This attitude can be seen in his Journals and Letters as well as in Tracts. See Wilberforce, \textit{op. cit.}, Vol. II, p. 23 and Samuel Lee, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 104f.

Sufis and considers them as the promoters of immoral practices. In this perspective, Martyn equalizes Sufis to Deist of the west, having no sense of religion, indulged in philosophy and rational thoughts. He never associates Sufis to Islam but to Deistic philosophy and sees the decline of divine religion in the practices of the Sufis. In this way, he seems to justify his failure to convince the philosophers of Persia to the truth of Christian religion.  

As Hindustani, Persian and Arabic languages were paving the way of Martyn’s inroad in Muslim society and Islamic religion, his earlier contacts with the Muslims and a scenario of polemical debate were reviving medieval controversy among the Christians and Muslims. Although his works were published posthumously, they became very popular among the next generation of polemical missionaries and were much praised by the generations immediately after his time.

4. Missionary Cause of Social Change: Alexander Duff-
Language, Literature and Social Change.

Believing in his contemporary interpretations of the Indian manners, morals and history, Alexander Duff traced the causes of Indian degeneration in the languages and literature taught to Indians. He was of the opinion that the literature of the Indians, either in Sanskrit or Arabic, developed and preserved the absurdities and superstitions of religions. In this regard, Duff was aiming at the replacement of Indian manners, morals and religion with the western ones, best represented in English. As literature creeps in the mind through education, language as its medium, Duff stressed the need of the education of the Indian through an enlightened Christian-western literature in English.

5.1. Alexander Duff (1806-1878).

Alexander Duff has been taken as “the prince of Evangelicals”, a “classic product of the mainstream rational Calvinists”, modern Prophet and a devoted missionary after the first quarter of the nineteenth century. He not only established missionary educational

---

institutions in India, but also contributed a lot to the fund raising activities in Britain, for the promotion of Church of Scotland's General Assembly institutions' missionary work in India. He visited India, Britain and America as a legendary figure, working for the promotion of the Christian knowledge. He presented India and Indian manners to stimulate the Christian people to contribute for the missions. For his systematic narration of the need of the propagation of Christianity in India, Duff was awarded an honorary degree of Doctorate. He was much praised for his distinguished attainments in general and theological literature, his profound knowledge of human nature, his most enlarged views of social relations of man and his desire to promote human happiness by the diffusion of Christian truth in connection with the useful learning.

5.1.1. Setting of Duff's Thought.

Born in an age of evangelism, Duff was brought up by evangelical parents. Although a poor farm tenant by profession, the religious zeal and hopes attached to the future of his child, inspired Duff's father to provide him with high quality education of the time, both religious and secular, based on the tradition of Scottish enlightenment and contemporary evangelical revival. Duff had an "impetuous spirit" and spiritual dreams with an anti-rational attitude. At the age of fifteen, in 1821, Duff joined the St. Andrews University with an "enlightened" view of Christianity. The combination of Christian belief and Scottish enlightenment was best assimilated in Duff's mind through the utilitarian and associationist philosophy which the contemporary Christian clergy and missions had began to utilize for the propagation of Christian religion. The force of his theological courses of study at St. Andrews, especially, classical languages, literature and logical, moral and natural philosophy, strongly directed him to evangelicalism by the efforts of Thomas Chalmers. In his understanding Christianity was strengthened as a sole representation of right in the world, which was best represented in the modern rational western institutions. However, he was against revolutionary ideas and reformed bills in his contemporary politics.

The spread of the Protestant Christian religion in the form of Western civilization and institutions was the sole end of a true Christian for Duff. This aim could best be achieved

---

164 Marischal College of Aberdeen, Scotland awarded him the Degree in November 1835.
167 A.A. Millar, op. cit., p. 152
through a systematic method based on the view that understanding was, primarily, an association of Ideas and this association could best be developed through a system of education based on chosen literature. In this perspective, his selection as a pioneer missionary for the Church of Scotland’s Indian educational mission, under the guidance of Chalmers, diverted all the potential of his thought to India. He had a very strong agreement with the depiction of deteriorated state of Indian morals and manners by his contemporary missionaries such as Grant and Martyn, and very devotedly applied his enlightened associationist evangelicalism for the amelioration of Indian situation. Duff worked for Indian missions for more than thirty years and left India in 1857. After his departure from India, he remained attached to the missionary activities in America, Canada and South East Africa, again spending the years between 1858 and 1863 in India.\(^{168}\) However, India remained “ever uppermost” in Duff’s mind.\(^{169}\) He had good terms with the British Indian bureaucracy in India and with the other missions, especially, John Kaye and John Clark Marshman.\(^{170}\) He edited newspapers such as Calcutta Review and Friends of India in the mid-Forties.\(^{171}\) During his stay in India, he visited Europe for several times to collect the funds for Indian missions. His writings on India were, primarily, his speeches delivered to the church gatherings, for the fund raising campaigns. Although believing in the “principle of spiritual and civil liberty” in religion,\(^{172}\) his writings represent his apology for the Christian missions and their methods. By this time, a long history of oriental studies had come into existence. However, his speeches, especially published in the form of India and Indian Missions, were taken as of “historical value” and left a deep impact on the minds of the Scottish people.\(^{173}\) Duff lost his library and personal documents three times while travelling to India or Britain. So, his published writings appear to be the only source for the understanding of his thought.\(^{174}\) On the basis of his published speeches, he was granted the degree of D.D.\(^{175}\) and was later appointed on Dr. Chalmers’ chair at St. Andrews. His writings primarily focus the need for the evangelisation in the perspective of grave depravity of Indian morals. The cause

\(^{168}\) Smith, *Duff*, Vol. I, chapter XXII, XXV and XXVI.


\(^{171}\) W. Pirrie Duff, *op. cit.*, p. 16.


\(^{174}\) W. Pirrie Duff, *op. cit.*, p.5.

\(^{175}\) Doctor of Divinity.
of this depravity was Indian religions promoted by Sanskrit, Arabic and Persian literature. The depravity could be redressed through the introduction of Christianity to the Indian people embodied in the form of modern western literature through English language. In this regard, Duff’s writings had a purposive background with an apology for the Christian missions.

5.1.2. Duff’s Concept of History.

As a staunch propagator of Christianity, Duff had a very strong belief in the divine providential view of history. He was propagating an analogy between history and providence.\(^{176}\) For Duff, history was a fulfilment of a “grand design” of divine plan.\(^{177}\) All truth was one and Christianity had everything to gain and nothing to lose.\(^{178}\) He believed Christians to be “truly blessed people having an intelligible message of peace and goodwill for every man, in every place and for all tribes, people and nations.\(^{179}\) Understanding the history as a dialectical process, Duff believed that divine providence would always win this, which he identified with the spread of Christianity. Duff saw in history a certainty of the over ruling purpose of God, and of the infinite value of the human soul and the obligation of God’s servants to serve his fellow men.\(^{180}\) In this perspective, if on the one hand, he saw Judaism, Islam and Hinduism as enemies of right,\(^{181}\) on the other hand, he claimed Christian righteousness for Protestants and is inclined to identify Catholics with the opposite camp.\(^{182}\) However, he looked at history as a higher branch of learning in the form of civil, and sacred as well as natural science and placed it as equal to Philosophy and Logic.\(^{183}\) Therefore, he measures the civilization on this scale. Rulers do not appear to have any important role in his cause, rather common people and capitalists seem to be deserving a place of contributors to the cause of God, civilization and humanity in Duff’s thought through their financial contributions to the churches as well as missions. However, religious leadership appears to be the soul farmer of the moral, civil and religious system of society as well as civilization.

\(^{176}\) Duff, India, p. 331.
\(^{177}\) Ibid., p. 410.
\(^{181}\) Duff, India, pp. 371-2.
\(^{182}\) Ibid., p. 331; Smith, Duff, Vol. II, p. 437.
\(^{183}\) A.A. Millar, op. cit., p. 34.
and he criticises the Hindu and the Muslim religious leadership for their failure to combat the problems of the indigenous people as well as for the promotion of superstitions.

5.1.3. Duff's Unit of Historical Studies.

Duff as a missionary was aiming at the conversion of Hindus and Muslims to Christianity. His focus remained on the apology for the missions and missionary method. In this perspective religion and morals emerge as his unit of historical studies. However, as he believes in the associationist and utilitarian logic, he sees the fusion of religion and morals through language and literature. Although focusing the current society, he sees the development of morals, language and literature in the historical perspective. In the same way, representing modern development in the form of the embodiment of divine providence, Duff depicts religious perception as an historical and progressive phenomenon, fulfilling divine providence.

Duff's work appears to be an apology for Indian mission. Therefore, Missions and their target, Hinduism forms the centre of his interest. Islam and the Muslim do not form any significant place in the setting of his works. He deals with Islam as a sub-subject. His attitude towards Islam seems to be antithetic in the sense that he does not differentiate between the pagans and Muslims and also harshly criticises Islamic belief and polity. This attitude seems to be based on the concept of European superiority over the orient in all walks of life, especially in religion, modern institutions and latest scientific and technical developments.

5.2. Duff's Understanding of Indian Situation.

Duff came to India with a predetermined understanding of the Indian religions and morals that was being propagated by Charles Grant and James Mill. Focusing the view of the similarity of the Hindus and the Muslims in religion, morals and superstitions, Duff assigned Muslims a place a little bit better than Hindus on the political and cultural front. On the romantic model, he confessed that Indians were a civilized people in the remote past, when westerners were barbarian.\textsuperscript{184} In his speeches, which were published as a primary historical testimonial for the understanding of Indian situation, his focus remained on the grave depravity of Indian morals,\textsuperscript{185} based on the superstitious Indian religions, without any

\textsuperscript{184} Duff, \textit{India}, p. 537.
\textsuperscript{185} For example see Alexander Duff, \textit{Speech Delivered in Exeter Hall}, Edinburgh, 1837.
demarcation between the pagan and revealed religions and on the current superiority of Europeans.

...[T]hrough ignorance, prejudice, habit and early association, the noblest truth may be merged into most detestable errors — the most marvellous facts into mythological fables, when the most sublime theism may be transmitted into an atheistic Pantheism, the sublimest doctrines into the growling forms of idolatrous beliefs and the purest practices into the enslaving round of degrading superstitions.\(^6\)

For his exaggerations, his contemporary churchmen criticized Duff. Some of them even challenged his own religious status on this ground. In his speeches, Indians appear to be a species not better than the animals.\(^7\) Thuggee, murders and executions appear to Duff major symbols of Indian barbarianism.\(^8\)

Duff discusses the cause of these grave Indian conditions into two theories:

First: that it had arisen solely because of misgovernment, from the grindling tyranny of a despotism, so intense and unmitigated that if compared with it theocracy of Peters and Pauls of Russia may be called liberty and license.

Second: the revenue and financial system of India was at the bottom of all evils. It alone had generated the state of “moral degeneration”.\(^9\)

Duff criticized the growth of “vicious Orientalism” at large.\(^10\) He was of the opinion that an aggressive policy against Hinduism and Islam by all the protestant missions was the necessity of the time. However, assault should be in the form of reforms on western model. For that, he appreciated Bentinck’s policy.\(^11\) On this understanding, by the 1835, Baptist Missionaries and Scottish missionaries harshly attacked Hinduism and Islam in every possible way.\(^12\)

5.3. Placement of Indian Muslims.

Without differentiating between the Brahmans and the Muslims Duff blames Muslims and Hindus alike of polytheism, pantheism, idolatry, Deism, philosophy and Sufism and

---

\(^6\) Duff, *India*, p. 324.

\(^7\) Alexander Duff, *Female Education in India* Being the Substance of an Address of the Scottish Ladies Association in Connection with the Church of Scotland, For Promotion of Female Education in India. Edinburgh, 1839, passim.

\(^8\) A.A. Millar, *op. cit.*, p. 32; Also see, Alexander Duff, *Bombay in April, 1840*, Edinburgh, 1840.
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equally condemns all these.193 However the Muslim law of apostasy, which prevents their conversion to Christianity, disappointed him.194 Duff’s historical consciousness of Muslim India was confined to Mughul India. However, he associated Mughul rule with the growth of “power, wealth and wisdom” of Muslim-Arab supremacy from Eastern to Western seas.195 The Muslims were invaders in India and Duff compares them with Vandals of Europe.196 He criticizes the “aggressiveness of Islam”. Muslims appear to him as a community that loves anarchy and hates peace, law and order. He considers, on the romantic model, Muslims as destroyers of Indian soil and civilization.197 However, he admits that the achievements of the Indian Muslims were more prominent not only than the “Dravadic Brahmins” but also than the “Saracens”. That is why Brahmins associated themselves with the Mughuls. He finds the grandeur of Muslims in the form of Muslim architectural remains in India. In this perspective, he appreciates the mosques, gardens, palaces, mausoleums and magnificent gateways built by the Indian Muslims. He appreciates the beauty of Lucknow before 1857.198 He sees the base of the grandeur and glory of Ghazni on the riches of India.199 He makes the growth and expansion of Mughul rule in India as a model for the growth and expansion of the British rule.200 Duff, through a study of earlier contacts between Westerners and India at the time of Akbar, and referring to Akbar as a foreigner Muslim, who introduces Persian language in the court and administration, and ruled over Hindu population, tries to justify the British rule and introduction of English language in India.201 He was of the opinion that the Muslims, and not the Hindus were taking the British as a challenge. By dethroning the Muslims, the British had increased their unquenchable hate, which was the source of “the unaccountable idiosyncrasies of the last hundred years”202 for Duff, based on the religious

193 This condemnation and corollary is a common feature of Duff’s writing and its initial form can be found in the early Evangelical works. However Henry Martyn categorically combined all these aspects and condemned all equally. See for details Duff, India, passim; Alexander Duff, Bombay in 1840, Edinburgh, 1840.
194 A.A. Millar, op cit., p. 63.
195 Duff, India, p. 4.
196 Duff, Rebellion, p. 378
197 Duff, India, p. 32.
198 Ibid., p. 21;
199 Ibid., p. 6.
200 Ibid., p. 38.
201 Duff represents this view throughout his writings from India and Indian Mission 1839 to his last writings in 1876. See Duff, India, passim; Duff, Rebellion, passim. A.A. Millar, op. cit., pp. 29-31.
202 Duff, Rebellion, p. 312.
concept and practice of war against Kaffirs (Non-believers). On the other hand the glorious monuments and the linear succession of mightiest monarchs from Akbar to Aurangzeb “has united to stimulate and perpetuate every Muslim mind”. In this perspective Duff saw the minds of the Muslims fertile for the revolt against the British Crown. However, he sees the solution of this problem in the enlisting of the services of the Muslims. Duff analyses the 1857 crisis as a war against Christianity, planned and executed with religious bigotry and fanaticism of the Muslims and strengthened by the intrigues of the “fallen dynasties and depressed nobility” and by the common Muslims and Hindus love of anarchy. He concludes that disturbances of 1857 occurred in the areas where there was concentration of Muslim population. Although Duff accepted that 1857 crisis was originated among the army personnel, he stresses its Muslim base due to the reason that its command centres were actually the centres of Muslim power. By laying all the blame on the Muslims, Duff seems to be defending missionaries against the charges of being the core cause of the 1857 crisis. He argues that missionary emphasis remained on the Hindus and if it was the cause of the crisis then Hindus should have participated in the war rather than the Muslims. Therefore, he concludes that it was based on the politico-religious culture of Islam.

5.4. Amelioration of Indian Situation.

Duff relates all criticism on Indian morals with self-assertion of right and wrong. After a harsh criticism at home on his Indian activities, he wrote a “vindication” in which he justified his activities in India. He creates similarities between the European “Gentiles and

---

203 Ibid., p.178.
205 Duff, Rebellion, p.117.
206 Ibid., p. 179.
207 Ibid., pp. 300-301.
208 Duff, India, p. 5; Also see Duff, Rebellion, pp. 94,267.
209 Duff, Rebellion, p.73.
210 Ibid., p.29. In his letters to his friends Duff tried to laid the blame of the war of Independence solely on the Muslims through his personal observations.
211 See Alexander Duff, The Mutual Duties and Responsibilities of Pastor and People, Edinburgh, 1836. His self-criticism became more acute after the war of Independence when he criticized very harshly the activities of non-protestant Christians in India. See Alexander Duff, The Jesuits: Their Origin and Order, Morality and Practices, Suppression and Restoration, Edinburgh, 1858. This sort of criticism can also be found in Alexander Duff’s preface to William M. Hetherington, The Apologetics of Christian Faith, Edinburgh, 1867.
 Indians” and by declaring India “our own” tries to prove that it was Britain’s duty to ameliorate the Indian situation.\(^{212}\)

Duff saw the amelioration of Indian situation in the introduction of western institutions such as representative government, free institutions, municipal rights and political privileges which will raise the Indian society to a scale of civilization, comfort and earthly felicity. He takes such rights as a “greatest temporal good” which could become a real and lasting consequent good.\(^{213}\) However, this could be introduced by bringing a change in the Indian mind through the evangelisation\(^{214}\) and through the introduction of western education. In this perspective, he discusses schemes of educational, economic, social and political reforms in India.

5.5. Religion, Literature and Curriculum.

Duff sees the Indian scheme of religious faith and polity, imposed on the mind of people through education, as the instrumental cause in originating and perpetuating the past and present extraordinary condition of the people of India.\(^{215}\) On the associationist and utilitarian model, Duff associates the formation of mind, working behind human action, with education. Education depends on curriculum based on a selected literature. He sees two usages of literature: for literary, scientific and research purpose and as a “sole nursery of intellect, morals and religion”\(^{216}\). Duff sees the formation of literature and development of curriculum inseparably combined with faith, and its doctrines, precepts and evidences, with a view of the practical regulation of life and conduct. Religion was in this perspective not merely the foundation upon which the superstructure of all useful knowledge was established, but also the animating spirit to action of man.\(^{217}\)

In this perspective, Duff sees the working of religion, both Hinduism and Islam, behind the Indians’ mind, developed through literature and curriculum based on barbarian religions, which were the “master principle” in moulding the character, opinions, and practices of the

\(^{212}\) Alexander Duff, *Vindication of the Church of Scotland’s India Mission*, Edinburgh, 1837, pp. 26-51; Also see Alexander Duff, *Church of Scotland’s India Mission*, Edinburgh, 1835.

\(^{213}\) *Duff, India*, p. 261.

\(^{214}\) The discussion is also carried in Alexander Duff, *India and Its Evangelisation, Young Men Christian Association Twelve Lectures*, London, 1851.

\(^{215}\) *Duff, India*, p. 40.

\(^{216}\) *Duff, English*, p. 32.

\(^{217}\) A.A. Millar, *op. cit.*, p. 34.
people.\textsuperscript{218} As he considers Hinduism and Islam devoid and destitute of universal truth, reasoning, moral and religious evidence, science and physical truth,\textsuperscript{219} he sees all these elements absent from the Hindu as well as Islamic literature and, in this way, from educational curriculum. Inspite of accepting the existence of occasional truths, beauties and excellencies, he takes oriental literature "false in principle", "erroneous in fact" and "injurious in moral tendency".\textsuperscript{220} He criticizes Firdawsi’s presentation of court of Ghazni in this perspective.\textsuperscript{221}

This view of the oriental literature leads Duff towards his criticism of the Quran as a basic representation of Muslim literature, which is read throughout the Muslim world from Gibraltar to Malacca.\textsuperscript{222} In the perspective of the teachings of the Quran, he finds the Muslim mind proficient in the metaphysics, and destitute of "physical dogmata [dogma]".\textsuperscript{223} He feels that the Indian mind taught extravagant legends, worse superstitions and falsehood without neutrality.\textsuperscript{224} Duff concludes that physical truth and divine ordinance can not be at difference with each other and identifies the difference between physical truth or science and the Muslim religious literature, especially in the Quran, as a proof for the justification of Christian labels on Islam and the prophet (PBUH). He writes:

In India all the systems of education are regarded as sacred based on Divine authority in the book. All of these are thickly interspersed with glaring errors, consequently, it is impossible for young men to complete a course of 'high English education' without discovering that the truth of our history, chronology and science generally come into constant and fatal collision with the opposing errors in their own system.\textsuperscript{225}

He believes that Indian youth was very brilliant but was being destroyed by this sort of literature, and by the introduction of European literature they could be civilized in religion, morals and institutions.\textsuperscript{226} As Western literature was based on Christian religion, so Christianity was the sole cause of the regeneration and renaissance of western society.\textsuperscript{227} He

\textsuperscript{218} Duff, India, p. 39.
\textsuperscript{219} Duff, English, P.34.
\textsuperscript{220} Ibid., p. 32
\textsuperscript{221} Ibid., p. 32
\textsuperscript{222} Alexander Duff, \textit{Farewell Address On the Subject of Church of Scotland's India Mission being the Substance of a Speech delivered Before the General Assembly of The Church on Thursdays, The 23rd March, 1839}, Edinburgh, 1839, p. 28.
\textsuperscript{223} Duff, India, pp. 540-567.
\textsuperscript{224} Duff, English, p.34
\textsuperscript{225} Ibid., p. 38
\textsuperscript{226} Duff, India, pp. 533, 567.
\textsuperscript{227} William Stewart, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 18.
shows his satisfaction over the declining state of Islam, as he considers it as a synonym for “error”.\textsuperscript{228}

Duff believes that the task of the regeneration of Indian society could be achieved through the introduction of a system of education based on an international language, which was English.\textsuperscript{229}

\subsection*{5.6. Language and Education.}

Duff sees language as a source to preserve literature and, as such, all the stores of civilization. In this capacity, language plays a basic role in the preservation of religion and morals as well as in “moulding the national feelings and habits” of the people.\textsuperscript{230} Duff visualizes the role of education to be more profound in social change, with a language “fraught with superior stores of knowledge”.\textsuperscript{231} Duff sees the extent, the strength and perpetuity of the Arab dominion in Walid’s\textsuperscript{232} decree by which the language of the Quran was declared “the universal language of the Muslims”. He identifies the same process among the Romans who “set themselves the task of ‘Romanizing’ their conquests,\textsuperscript{233} and the Mughuls in India who strengthened their dominion by Personizing India. Persian languages became the languages of “religion, of literature, of government, and generally of common life”.\textsuperscript{234} In this way, Duff justifies the Act of 1837 and its introduction of English language in India. Duff tries to strengthen his stand by the view that the Oriental languages, especially Indian languages,\textsuperscript{235} are “dead language”\textsuperscript{236} and contain false evidences. On the contrary, English language was more “fraught” with the seeds of truth in every province of literature, science and religion than the languages of Arabia, Persia or India.\textsuperscript{237} So, he depreciates the

\textsuperscript{228} Alexander Duff, Farewell Address On the Subject of Church of Scotland’s India Mission being the Substance of a Speech delivered Before the General Assembly of The Church on Thursday, The 23rd March, 1839, Edinburgh, 1839, p. 28
\textsuperscript{229} William Stewart, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 18.
\textsuperscript{230} Duff, \textit{English}, p. 27
\textsuperscript{231} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 27.
\textsuperscript{232} Walid bin Abd al-Malik is famous for the conquests and consolidation of the Arabic Empire under the Umayyad at the beginning of 8th century A.D.
\textsuperscript{233} Duff, \textit{English}, p. 27
\textsuperscript{234} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 27-28.
\textsuperscript{235} Duff takes Sanskrit and Arabic as religious languages and Persian as cultural and official language.
\textsuperscript{236} Duff, \textit{English}, pp. 32,37.
\textsuperscript{237} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 28.
encouragement of native languages, and rejects all sort of criticism on the introduction of English language.\textsuperscript{238}

Alexander Duff, very soon after his arrival in India, had found a body of Anglicans against Orientalists to support and materialize his cause, method and opinion. These were officials with Euro-centric view of India, having sympathy with the missionaries' activity although not missionaries in the real sense. Most prominent among them were Traveley, Macaulay, John Kaye and John Clark Marshman. Duff not only began to circulate his views among the Indo-British authorities, but also got influence in the formation of government policies. Traveley's educational report and Macaulay's minute, as well as Kaye's support for mission and policies of Marshman's \textit{Friends of India} were at large influenced by Duff's view in the 1840s. All these proved to be "missionaries' great ally" in British Indian policy decisions.\textsuperscript{239} Even in 1854, Duff appeared before the British Parliamentery commission to present his views on the educational reforms in India and he influenced the commission's report to a great extent.\textsuperscript{240} During his stay in India, he was satisfied with the growth of English language and its role in the religious change in India.\textsuperscript{241}

However, after the 1857 crisis, a change in his attitude appears to be visible which is similar to the general mood of the British society. Centre of his missionary activities began to expand in four continents: Europe, Asia, Africa and America. He had a hope of a renaissance among the Hindus on the western model;\textsuperscript{242} however, his treatment of Muslims became harsher as he laid all the blame of 1857 crisis on the Muslims.\textsuperscript{243} He very strongly condemned the anti-conversion laws of the Ottoman Empire and even criticized the British governments' relations with the Ottomans on this ground.\textsuperscript{244}

\textsuperscript{238} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 23
\textsuperscript{240} A.A. Millar, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 167; William Stewart, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 16.
\textsuperscript{243} Duff, \textit{Rebellion}, passim.
\textsuperscript{244} Smith, \textit{Duff}, p.312-313.

The East India Company's servants' zeal and chaplains' missionary activities had always developed collaboration between the British Indian government and the Christian missionaries. Missionaries needed to cooperate with the company, which ruled India in order to maintain a presence in India. Therefore, the missionaries continued to maintain favourable relations with the employees of the company who were sympathetic, at a personal level, to the missionary activities. However, the rise of the utilitarians in the Indian administration and Scottish missionaries' focus on modern Western education as a tool of social change strengthened these relations. Missionaries joined hands with the East India Company administration for the cause of social change and administration with the missionaries for the cause of conversion to Christianity. J. W. Kaye was one among the administrators who devoted himself to the cause of mission. Duff established close relations with the administration. However this collaboration can best be analysed in the works of John Clark Marshman.


John Clark Marshman has been taken as a missionary, a journalist, an historian, and a loyal servant of the East India Company. He has been much praised for his work in India as well as in Britain, especially, for the propagation of Christianity as well as for the defence of Christian missions and the East India Company's administration and policies. His life span, spent in India, covers the entire period of our study and can be taken as a case for the study of changes in the Christian missionary method and logic in India. Marshman defended the Baptist missions throughout his life, promoted missionary work through journalism, developed good terms with the administration of the Company and joined the Company's services to strengthen the cause of the mission, developed a collaboration with the other missions and the missionary officials, adopted the modern education as a tool of conversion and tried to make the missions independent of financial problems by launching a missionary business. He established a college, ran a number of newspapers in vernacular and English languages, and established first paper mill in India. Marshman can be taken as a synthesis of missionary discourse as well as the discourse of the other three schools on the issues of
administration, method of social change, government-missionaries relations and on the perception of Indo-Muslim history. Although involved in varied activities, Marshman concentrated on history as a potent field of his interest. On the one hand, he settled a number of issues in historiographic debate and, on the other hand, practically made Indian history an educational discipline.245

6.1.1. Setting of John Clark Marshman’s Thought.

Born in an age of the evangelicalism at the end of the eighteenth century, John Clark Marshman came to India at the age of five in 1799 with his parents, Joshua Marshman and Hannah, for missionary work.246 He was brought up and educated under the Serampore missionaries in his father’s schools. As Serampore was a centre of missionary activities in the early nineteenth century, John Clark Marshman came under guidance of all contemporary missionaries visiting Serampore.247 However, William Ward248 and William Carey249 were his chief mentors. At the age of fifteen, John Clark Marshman joined the missionary works with his family, especially in vernacular education. At that time the Serampore mission was facing some crucial problems in its relations with the Company’s government and in financial matters. Joshua Marshman had adopted a policy to maintain good terms with the company and to establish independent financial sources for the mission. For that, he launched a series of newspapers to serve the dual purpose of propagation of Christianity and financial help of the mission.250 On the same principle, he established a paper mill. For his contacts with the government and his financial activities, Joshua Marshman was harshly criticised by

---


248 William Ward wrote extensively on Indian affairs. However he wrote first history of Hindus. In 1811 Ward published his *Account of the Writings, Religion and Manners of the Hindoos: Including Translations from their Principal Works*, Four Volumes, Serampore, 1811. From 1817 to 1820 he published *View of the History, Literature and Religion of the Hindoos: Including a Minute Description of the manners and Customs and translations from their Principal Works* from Serampore.

249 William Carey was the friend of Joshua Marshman. He also wrote on a variety of issues with Joshua and John Marshman. However his Evangelical views were best presented in his *An Enquiry into the Obligations of Christians to use the means for the Conversion of the Heathens in which the Religious state of Different nations of the World. The Success of Former Undertakings and the Practicability of Further Undertakings are Considered*, Leicester, 1792.

250 In this perspective in 1818 he launched two Bengali newspapers, *Din Durshan* and *Samachar Darpan*. Later he launched *Friend of India*. 
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the Baptist Missionary Society. However John Clark Marshman had a complete agreement with the means and methods of his father. He not only defended the steps taken by his father, but also followed his line of action. After the death of his father in 1837, John Clark Marshman joined the Company’s services to strengthen the missionary-government relations and strengthened his relation with the missionary officials such as John William Kaye. Influenced by Duff, Marshman focused on education and diverted his attention from vernacular to English language and literature. Although some of the researchers are of the opinion that since this time, Marshman was engaged in his official activities and had left the missionary work as well as journalistic activities, however, his personal letters show his close concern with both the activities. Under the influence of Duff and Bentinck, Marshman was converted to an Anglican, having a complete faith in the superiority of Western civilization, embodied in the English literature. On Duff’s model Western civilization was an embodiment of Christian religion for Marshman. The question of social change in India, he attached with education. However, he was confirmed that it could not be worthwhile without a break of indigenous mind from his historical tradition. So, with the support of Bentinck and Duff, Marshman focused on history. After the completion of History of India in 1842 he joined the Company’s services as a Bengali translator. He visited Europe in 1819 and 1853 and finally left India in 1855 to play an influential role in the formation of British Indian policies at home. He was willing to have a seat in the British Parliament to influence the government policies, but failed in his several successive attempts. In this perspective, his writings have a variety of interests: moral, purposive, apologetic and policy oriented.

6.1.2. Marshman’s Concept of History.

John Clark Marshman had a traditional Christian purposive view of history. He saw history in a linear progression as a fulfilment of divine plan. Passing through different phases, Marshman was visualizing the triumph of Christianity in the form of Western civilization. He divided history into ancient, medieval and modern periods. However, he was less interested in any modern movement except that of the spread of Christianity and measured the modern history in this perspective. Marshman assigns a very important place

---

251 A Brief History of the Statesman with which The Friend of India is Incorporated, Calcutta, 1947, p. 5.
252 Ibid., Also see Dictionary of National Biography.
to history in his educational criterion and, in this way, in his theory of social change. He was the first to write a history for the Indian school students, based on primary sources, and records. For that purpose, he left all other assignments. This importance to history shows that for Marshman history was the most important tool of social change, which depicts divine plan also. In this perspective, he seems to be assigning history a place of an educational discipline.

Marshman combines evangelicals' religious criterion, romanticists' literary and antiquarian criterion and utilitarians' philosophical, historical and institutional criterion of the status of civilization; however, religion seems to be central focus of Marshman’s writings. He depicts a deep-rooted religious bias even in the most secular matters. Therefore, he believes in the propagation of Christianity by all possible means. Religion and empire appear to be co-partners in Marshman’s understanding of society and civilization. Marshman assigns the task of creating coherence between the two to the rulers and administration and evaluates the success and failure of the rulers and administration on this criterion. However, common people seem to have no place in Marshman’s system of thought other than to face the cruelties and suppression of the rulers and customs. Simultaneously, religious leadership seems silent in Marshman’s system of thought.

6.1.3. Marshman’s Unit of Historical Studies.

Marshman had four-dimensional interest in his work, throughout his life: journalistic, apologetic, historical and official. In his journalistic activities his concern remained for day-to-day activities and events. In this form, he found a forum to criticize the indigenous society, culture and religion. His newspapers were criticized for their role in developing a religious hatred among the natives against the British, which was considered the main cause of the 1857 crisis.254

Marshman was always defending the Serampore mission. The early defence of the mission came in 1820s and after 1857, he wrote extensively in defence of the missionary activities especially at Serampore. He tried to point out that missionaries were not only working for the spread of Christianity but also for the strength of the British rule.255

---

254 In this regard his newspaper “Friend of India” has been criticized for injuring the religious feelings of the natives. It was due to these religious feelings that Muslims and Hindus waged war against the British.

255 His early work was Reply of Marshman to the Attack of M. Buckingham on the Serampore Missionaries, London, 1826. He also reviewed the issue which was published in Eustace Carey, Supplement to the
In his official capacity, he collected record of rules, regulations and laws and edited government gazettes to facilitate the government officials.\textsuperscript{256}

However, all his interests seem to be closely associated with history. History was his basic concern and he had left other works to his colleagues from time to time to complete his histories. He wrote histories in two phases. In 1830s, he wrote a history for the school children.\textsuperscript{257} He also wrote a history of Bengal.\textsuperscript{258} In the 1860s, he wrote for the university students and won a place as an historian. In his historical narrations, his focus remained on the history of civilization. Civilization based on religious faith was his unit of historical studies such as Hindu, Muslim and Christian. After 1857, in a history written for the university students, he replaced the Christians with the British.\textsuperscript{259} However, his criterion to analyse the status of a civilization varies from civilization to civilization. He criticizes Hindus for their superstitious and mythological religious belief system. He condemns the Muslims’ religious bigotry, war skills and despotism. However, in case of Christian or British, his focus remains on reforms, brought in social and political structure, by the Christians or the British. This interest can also be identified in his collection of laws for indigenous people as local laws had been considered as the symbols of ancient civilization. Marshman places man’s role in the development of civilizations at the top. He discusses

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}


\textsuperscript{257} This history was published several times. Its Bengali translation was published in 1842.

\textsuperscript{258} J.C. Marshman, \textit{Outline of the History of Bengal Compiled for the Use of Youth in India}, Fifth ed., Serampore, 1844.

\textsuperscript{259} The change was not much deviation from traditional view of Christian civilization. The Scottish missionaries had developed the view that western civilization and Christian were one and the same. Marshman was much impressed by a Scottish Alexander Duff and this change seems to be just another side of the same coin in Marshman’s thought.
history in terms of prominent contributors. However, his focus remains on dynastic politics except that of the British period. This trend takes biographical form in his two works published after 1857 crisis. However, in his work for the university students his focus remains on the British period.

Although Marshman’s central focus was British Indian, Marshman assigns a considerable place to the Muslims in his legal works and in his school history written before 1857.

His attitude seems romantic towards the Hindus and antithetic towards the Muslims on the same model. He depicts the Indian history as a struggle between the Hindus and the Muslims for power and liberties. As Marshman was a missionary and a civil servant at a time, therefore, he seems to be serving the dual purpose of depiction of Indian religions as immoral as well as of providing guidelines for the administration of the British India. This attitude seems to be based on colonialism, nationalism and evangelicalism tinged with historicism.

### 6.2. Marshman’s History of India for School Children.

In his efforts for the education of the natives of India, Marshman had come to two conclusions after the arrival of Duff, Bentinck and Macaulay in India. First that education of the natives in the local languages was useless. In this conclusion, he was in complete agreement with Duff that local languages were the languages of false religions. In this way, he seems to be accepting the theories of Henry Martyn and Alexander Duff on the relations of language and religion. Second that history could be a more useful instrument for the reformation of Indian society on Christian or Western model. In this perspective, under the patronage of William Bentinck and support of Alexander Duff, Marshman planned to write a History of India for School Children, which was compiled and published in 1842.

Marshman was of the opinion that a school history should have “historical accuracy” and “simplicity of style”. He also stressed the need of the utilization of primary sources for the writing of such a history. So he collected a vast quantity of original sources, records and secondary sources written in English from Jones to Mackenzie and H.H. Wilson. Marshman chose civilization as his basic unit of historical studies; however, religion was the

---

260 History of Serampore mission and Havelock.
261 J.C. Marshman, The History of India from Remote Antiquity to the Accession of the Mughal Dynasty, Compiled for the Use of Schools, Calcutta, 1842.
262 Ibid., preface.
base of his concept of civilization. In this regard, he divides Indian history into three successive periods of dominance of religions: Hindu, Muslim and Christian.

6.2.1. Marshman’s Hindu Period of Indian History.

Marshman’s view of Hindu period was based on the utilitarian understanding and the missionary outlook of India. He rejected the romantic view of the civilized status of the ancient Indians and even rejected the view that the Hinduism was an Indian religion. On the contrary, he accepted Mill’s view on ancient India: barbarian, destitute of historical sense, astrological and mythological. 263 He also rejected the claims of antiquity of Indian mythology. Rather he advocates a view that these claims were initiated by the “cunning priests to keep the “ignorant people” under their power. 264

Discussing the origin of Hinduism, Marshman argues that neither Brahmins were original inhabitants of India nor Hinduism was the religion and Sanskrit was the language of ancient India. It was poured in by the conquerors coming from the West. 265 In this way, Marshman seems to be trying to break the affiliation of local population with Hinduism and prepare them to accept another foreign religion in the form of Christianity. In the same way, Marshman tries to prove that Hindu sovereignty had never been paramount over all India at any time in history. It had been limited only to North of India. 266 Marshman wants to break the myth of Hinduism in Indian mind. In the same way, he rejects the view of the similarity of Christ and Krishna. Marshman sees the rise of Krishna in early Muslim period. In Marshman’s conclusion, India emerges as a land of wars from Mahabharta to the present day, subjugated by foreign races. 267 It was still in the same state, which was narrated by Herodotus. 268 However, Marshman optimistically sees the future of Christianity in the marriages of Hindu Rajas with the Christian ladies.

6.2.2 Marshman’s Muslim Period of Indian History.

Marshman views the Muslim period of Indian history in the same way as was viewed by James Mill. However he differs with Mill on Hindu-Muslim relations. He assigns the Muslims a place better than the Hindus in their historical sense. He begins Muslim period
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from the time of Mahmud’s invasion of India, neglects the earlier period and comes to the close of Sultanate period, again leaving Mughul period untouched. For Marshman, Muslims, as continuation of the series of foreign invaders of India from the west, were “more ferocious” than any of earlier conqueror. The spread of Islam itself was owing to the “agency of sword”. The Muslims proved themselves “most deadly foe” of the natives and poured “a stream of desolation on India”.\(^{269}\) For Marshman, the Muslim conquest of India was the continuation of that spirit of power, war and conquest, which was initiated by the Prophet (SAW) of Islam through its creed. It was the part of the plan of the establishment of a “universal monarchy through out the world” under the Muslim votaries, which could be established through a “crusade against the civil and religious liberties of mankind”. In this perspective, Marshman sees India as a target for the Muslim conquests since the time of the second caliph of Islam.\(^{270}\) However, Marshman depicts a grave and hateful resistance to the Muslims by the native people and princes through out the Muslim period. In this way he tries to generate and revive the hatred of native people against the Muslims.\(^{271}\)

Marshman, after discussing the legitimacy of the house of Ghazni on western model, presents Mahmud’s invasion of India as a part of the crusade launched by the prophet (PBUH). Marshman depicts the Muslim rule and Hindu-Muslim relations after Mehmud on the model of romanticist,\(^{272}\) as grave enemies of the life, property and religion of Hindus. Although while discussing the Hindu period, Marshman was of the opinion that the Hindu society was stagnant since the time of Herodotus, but in his discussion on the Muslim rule he blames the Muslims for the destruction of the grandeur of the Hindus. Regarding the Hindu period, he rejects the romanticists’ views, but on the Muslim period, he levies same charges as the romanticists against the Muslims.\(^{273}\)

Marshman ascribes the Muslim conquest of India to the internal differences of the natives and their inability to resist the foreign foes. He sees all the efforts of the native Hindus ending in failure against the Muslims. However, he depicts the subjugation of Bengal by the
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Muslims during the reign of Aibak as the most disgraceful event of Indian history.\footnote{Ibid., p. 123.} He attaches all romantic stories to this conquest. Rest of the history of India under the Muslims he presents in two ways: first as Muslims struggle to make the Hindus slaves and second as the struggle within Muslim nobility for power. However, Marshman appreciates the Muslim rulers' taste for arts and literature.

*Marshman seems to be depicting Jingize Khan as the successor of the Muslims and sees the legacy of the Muslim tradition of war and conquests in the Mughuls. However he does not deal with the Mughul period of Indian history. His neglect of the Mughul period seems to be a significant issue in the education of Indian history. At that time a nominal Mughul rule and the romance of its power was still alive in the minds of the native people. Inspite of continuous propagation of the advantages of the British rule, the Mughul rule was still a model even for the British administrators and, in this way, the teaching of the Mughul history could produce negative opinion about the nature of the British rule. In this regard, it seems an intentional attempt by Marshman to keep the Mughul period out of syllabus.\footnote{J.C. Marshman, *Outline of the History of Bengal Compiled for the Use of Youth in India*, Fifth ed., Serampore, 1844.} However, he covered this period in his regional history of Bengal.\footnote{Ibid.}

6.2.3. Marshman's Christian Period of Indian History.

Instead of dealing with the Mughuls, Marshman diverts his attention to the new Christian-Indian contacts. By the arrival of Portuguese in \textit{India}, *Marshman sees the modern history of Christianity in India and depicts its paramount status under the sovereignty of the British. He deals this period as a period of introduction of divine good in India. He takes it as a period of reform and benefits for the natives of India. He presents Christian powers as liberators of natives from the Muslim tyranny, suppression and despotism.

6.2.4. Marshman's History of Bengal.

On the same model of History of India, Marshman wrote his History of Bengal for the school children.\footnote{Ibid.} For Marshman it was a most important work. However, he followed the same pattern. Denouncing the antiquity of the native history, like Charles Stewart, he focused
the Muslim period. He extended his criticism of Muslim rule from the earlier rulers to Siraj al
Dawla and tried to justify the British rule as the best for the good of Bengali people.

6.3. Marshman’s “How Wars Arise in India”.

By the late 1840s, British had begun a policy of aggrandizement in India, resulting in a
series of wars all over India and Burma. This policy was much criticised by the British
politicians as well as intellectuals. Marshman wrote a booklet to prove these wars just and
necessary.\footnote{J.C. Marshman, \textit{How wars Arise in India}, London, 1853.} He defended the British Indian policy very strongly. At that time Marshman
was in England and this booklet was written for the British public. He tried to convey that the
British functionaries in the East were facing crucial problems and what they were doing was
to strengthen the British Empire. He tried to prove that the wars were initiated by the native
powers, which were devoid of any sort of political religious morality. The Eastern states were
despotie. There system was different from the European and, in this way, they could not be
treated on the western model.\footnote{Ibid., p. 21.} They were inferior and it was the duty of the British to make
them civilized. He argues that victory of Plassy broke the Muslim power in Bengal and
strengthened the British power. He sees the Burmese wars, too, in the context of maintaining
the supremacy of the British. He argues that the measures, which were adopted by the
British, were not more immoral and unjust than the measures of the Asian despots and were
according to the “science of oriental government”.\footnote{Ibid., p. 44.}

Although Marshman had written this booklet before the crises of 1857, it became
important to release the charges of generating unrest among the Indian population, against
the missionaries and against his newspaper, as this was considered a pre-cautionary analysis
of Indian situation.

6.4. Marshman’s History for University Students.

After the transfer of British rule from the Company to the Crown in 1858, Marshman was
requested to write a history of India for the university students of India. In 1863, he published
his history for the university students with two significant changes: Marshman extended the
scope of his history to the Mughul period of Indian history and replaced the Christian period
with the British period. Its main focus was on the British period with one chapter on Hindus
and six on the Muslim period. In 1867 its revised edition was published in three volumes with a focus on the British period and the same was reprinted in 1871. However, in an abridged edition of 1876, the space allotted to the Muslim period was "abbreviated [sic] to make room for a fuller narrative of the progress of British power in which Queen's Indian subjects were supposed to be interested".

In these histories, Muslims were depicted in the way they were narrated in school history. However, among the Mughuls, Babar, Humayun and Akbar are praised for their liberality to establish good relations with the Hindus. On the other hand Aurangzeb was criticized for his bigotry and Deccan policy. However he accepts that it was Aurangzeb who brought the whole of India under one government.

His understanding of the Indian Muslims seem to be influenced by the 1857 crisis in these histories. He had already written How Wars Arise in India in 1853. In these histories, Marshman tries to prove that Muslims were a warrior community. Only one among the Hindu communities, Marathas had challenged the British, while Muslims were continuously resisting the British rule. In this regard, he refers to the movements of Syed Ahmed and Titu Mir in the frontier areas and Bengal.

In this way, Marshman seems to be combining the traditions of all existing schools, focusing missionary purposes. He closes the issues of language, religion and education by his practical verdict of writing a history in English for the Indian youth. In his depiction Muslims were a foreign force replaced by the British. However, he takes British or western as synonym for the Christian and, in this way, his historiography had missionary motives in its core. As the British Indian Government sponsored these histories, so it also seems to be an official policy.

7. Conclusion.

The British missionary historiography of Muslim India during the period under study presents a systematic evolution in the means, method, subject matter, and approaches to
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missionary understanding of history. Historiography not only appears to be in transition but also appears an efficient tool for the system of arguments being developed to propagate the religious change in the form of evangelisation in India. Following the deductive method, missionary historiography indicates a break from the eighteenth century tradition of contemporary political historiography. Its focus seems to be on the moral and religious aspects of society and depicts a very strong sense of Christian righteousness and infidels' immorality. These histories except that of Marshman, were written for the British people and not for the natives of India. The purpose of these histories was to influence the East India Company’s policies in India in its relations with the government at home. For that the role of government and politics in the elevation of morals and manners of people seems to be unanimously accepted. However, missionary historiography had not taken its disciplined form till the time of John Clark Marshman. Before Marshman history was dealt with in the observations, journals, letters, memoirs or reports, based on oral testimony, by the missionaries. The written sources of Muslim India are mostly neglected. However not a single history written by the missionaries dealing, solely with the Muslims, can be found.

Missionary historiography presents a very strong sense of evolution. Evolution of government-missionaries relations, evolution in the contemporary schools of thought, socio-political environment and missionaries' mutual relations seem to be influencing the development of missionary historiography. Appointment of Henry Martyn and 1813 Act seems to be a success of Charles Grants' plea for the support of missionary activities by the Company’s administration. Thus Duff and Marshman appear to be two good examples of government-missionary collaboration.

A strong sense of unity in the development of British missionaries’ historiography is evident which seems to present missionaries as a school having close contact and mutual impacts. It seems to be moving from apology for the evangelisation to strategy and policy for the evangelisation. Grant had focused on the government’s role for the evangelisation as a moral duty of the British, Tennant focused on the Christianisation as a tool for the permanence of the British rule. Martyn found a close relation between language and religion. In this background, Duff seems to be applying Martyn’s theory to a method for evangelisation in the form of introduction of English language. Marshman introduces history as an educational discipline in English language. In this way, British historiography
represents a systematic evolution in its core, bringing all missionary sense of history to one, taking it's disciplined and logical end and form by 1857.

Missionary historiography seems to be influencing and being influenced by its contemporary schools. At the end of the eighteenth century, a romantic view was dominating the missionary historiography. They were focusing indigenous languages for the propagation of Christianity. Although a strong sense of the superiority of the Christian West always prevailed on the minds of the missionaries, the utilitarian influence seems to be combining missionary moral with utilitarian material philosophy. Missionaries seem to be deriving the understanding of Muslim India from the romanticists and collaborating with the utilitarians on the concept of Hindu India. However, the concept of unity of West and the Christian civilization seems to be developing a consensus among the schools for the role of the Empire in the social change in the colonies.

In this perspective Hinduism appears as a central focus of the missionaries. The Muslims are dealt with from a distance and only one missionary focused on Islam, due to the lessons of a long history of Christian-Muslim contact. They are treated as foreigners and imperial rulers of India. Missionaries seem to be depicting and promoting a strong sense of Hindu-Muslim differences. And through a method of comparison between Muslim and British rule, missionaries seem to be trying to depict Christian rule better and more benevolent than the Muslims.

As a whole, Muslims were not the basic concern for the missionaries. They were hopeless about the Muslim conversion to Christianity, so, they had almost neglected the Muslims in historiography and treated them from a margin of distance.
Chapter Seventh:

Summary and Conclusion

British historiography of Muslim India (1800-1857) has a very important place in the study of Indo-Muslim history, British attitude towards the Indo-Muslims, understanding of Euro-British historical tradition and in the understanding of now current identities and conflicts in South Asia. It depicts a vast arena of concepts, modules, premises, problems, technicalities, theories and issues, which form the core of current perceptions and misperceptions related to the area. Being the masters of India, the British historiographic views have been projected as most authentic and valuable contribution to the understanding of Indian civilization. Although the British understanding of Indian geography seems to be going through a radical change with the growth of British imperialism, yet the early nineteenth century British concept of India can be applied to the understanding of Modern South Asia.

Although Muslim historical literature in the form of biographies, chronicles, political history, contemporary history, travelogues and administrative rules, with a moral purposive background provided the antecedents to the British, yet, British historiography during the period was influenced largely by the Euro-British intellectual tradition, either contemporary or historical, e.g. renaissance, reformation, scientific revolution, enlightenment, and the early nineteenth century trends in the European thought.

European Renaissance influenced the core of historiographic structure. Renaissance elevated language, literature, mythology, philosophy and arts to a level of ideal symbols of the rise of civilizations which became the foundation of the nineteenth century European romance of antiquity, literature, philosophy and revival of religion. The standards of civilization, language, literature, arts and philosophy can best be placed as legacy of renaissance to the modern European world. In this perspective, whereas Sir William Jones was devoted to language and literature, William Robertson and Thomas Maurice’s ideal was antiquity. Whereas Charles Grant focused the revival and spread of Christianity, Mill’s focus was philosophised history. Whereas utilitarians idealized a change or Westernisation, Europeanization, or Anglicisation and the missionaries idealized the Christianisation of the
world, the romanticists idealized the cultural and civilizational diversities and natural growth of the societies and civilizations, all as a continuity of renaissance trends.

The influence of Reformation and Counter-Reformation confirmed the renaissance cause of revival and reform in Christianity through history and historiography. A tendency of a strong criticism of existing religion can be traced as a root cause for the growth of the study of political, social and cultural institutions through history in historiography. However, skepticism seems to be the central force working behind the development of historiographical methods and scientific revolution seems to be providing the basic techniques for modern historiography.

The enlightenment's "intellectual chaos" and resultant multi-spheric historiography proved itself an immediate predecessor to the modern European trends of historical thought. Its emphasis on nature opened the ways for the study of human environment and ecology. Focus on man diverted all the emphasis of historical writings from "history as an act of God", to history as a philosophy taught by examples from human past experiences. The enlightenment opened the non-Western world to the Europeans and expanded the sphere of their observations. There began an attitude of tolerance to all forms of knowledge and techniques. The concept of "diversity in the Universe" in the form of races, cultures, species, nations, and abstract ideas such as human will, passions and pleasure became the part of historiography. Histories of law, institutions, education and histories of contemporary state and society were focused on. The concept of superiority of Western or European world over the rest, and westernization or Europeanization of the world, without doubt, can be taken as a legacy of enlightenment to the west. However, the influence of enlightenment on the missionaries seems to be more interesting. Missionaries seem to be equally influenced by the enlightenment concept of diversity in the universe and superiority of the West.

In spite of the fact that the British analysts see the British Indian historians as "individual guerrillas", the British historical writings seem closely associated with or rather representing the western intellectual tradition. In this tradition, Orientalism was the key to Indian studies and colonialism the purpose of historiography. India was being seen through a Western, British superior ruling "self" as an Eastern, Indian, inferior ruled "other". The British superiority was based on a number of intellectual factors and practical forces.
Primarily, the trends, thought and attitude of British historians of Muslim India were determined by the European and British tradition of enlightenment. However, liberalism, historicism, orientalism, colonialism, industrial revolution and nationalism were the main forces influencing the Indo-British tradition of historical thought, during the first half of the nineteenth century. The premises and hypothesis related to these trends were emerging, sometimes in conflict, and sometimes in association with each other as supplements, complements, substitutes or compromise. Among them, three intellectual forces were highly influential in the British understanding of History: liberalism, historicism and orientalism.

Liberalism was founded on the enlightened concept of liberty and was struggling for the cause of human liberties, religious tolerance, government by consent, personal and economic freedom, secularism, constitutionalism, democracy, freedom of expression and right of self-rule. Its influence seems visible from French revolution to the unification of Italy and Germany. Simultaneously historicism was emerging as a tendency to solve the current issues and predict the future philosophically on the experiences of past. In this perspective all aspects of life were being seen in the light of past and, Orientalism was collecting all in one, other than the west.

Simultaneously, colonialism, industrial revolution and nationalism were the forces working behind the practical purposes of British historiography. Colonialism as a tendency to colonize the distinct lands for commercial and agricultural exploits and historiography was being used as an apology for colonialism. In the same way, industrial revolution was providing impetus to colonialism and nationalism providing new models to historical understanding.

All these trends were contributing to the emergence of four major schools of Euro-British thought, which became identical in the British historiography of Muslim India: oriental romanticists, ethno-regional romanticists, utilitarians and missionaries. Although clear cut demarcation among the schools is not possible, yet they show their distinction from each other with an overlapping of views in coordination or in contest. However, their treatment of Muslim India make them clearly distinctive from each other. Each school was going through an evolutionary change, not only within itself, but with mutual influences to other.
The oriental romanticists saw the orient a land of wonders and presented India as a unity of culture and civilization distinct from that of Europe. The oriental romance was, primarily, based on the romance of Greek classics. The romanticists romanticised the concept of India in the ancient classical literature as a land of wonders and riches and as an ancient centre of civilization, parallel to Greek. Indian philosophy was considered to had attained a high level of civilization. This Indian romance was boosted by the rise of new Europe, classicism and orientalism. Although enlightenment was a movement of rationalism, yet, it promoted the romance of diversity and distinction of Indian culture and civilization, along with the strength and worth of its political system. Therefore the nineteenth century Indian romanticism was based on a classical view of Indian antiquity, pre-colonial missionaries and travellers' vision of Indian society and pre-nineteenth century enlightened-romantic philosophy. Although India had always occupied a considerable place in western thought, the modern Indian romance was the outcome of the late eighteenth century Romantic Movement against extreme contemporary rationalism. The romanticism focused on antiquity, literature, passions and diverse and distinct aspects of nature of man, society, culture, civilization and universe, contrary to the rational focus on contemporary state and society. The romanticists seem to be more concerned with the people and passions than institutions and constitutions. Their source of pleasure and inspiration seems to be the diversity of language, cultures, races, rituals and religions, having a tradition from antiquity. The romanticism promoted such trends for the understanding of western civilization, and also applied these parameters to the understanding of the Orient, thus gave birth to the orientalism. In this perspective, it was the "Oriental Romanticism". This system of thought was developed and strengthened by Sir William Jones, who almost made romanticism a synonym for "Indology" and has been considered a pre-cursor to the modern Indian romance and the father of Indian nationalism. However, oriental romanticism shows an evolutionary process of change in the historiographical perspective of the British in the backdrop of colonial Indian administrative problems. The first generation of romanticists saw India as the land of Hindu civilization. Thereafter, the romanticists blamed the Muslims for the destruction and degeneration of the Hindu civilization. The school soon developed as the advocates of a theory of natural progress and change, advising a cautious policy for India against the evangelical and utilitarian advocacy of radical social change. In the last phase, facing loss of influence in Indian affairs, the
romanticist historians seem to argue in favour of the establishment of an Anglo-Indian society and seeking a compromise with the utilitarians and the missionaries. However, by the 1840s, the India had become synonymous for the Hindu and an extreme romanticism, attaching all prevailing evils to the Muslim rule in India, was dominating the Indian scene. It is concluded that in the early nineteenth century romanticism was at its height but by the propagation of utilitarian theory, its influence began to decline and in the later period it was merely a defence against and compromise with the utilitarians and evangelicals. Extreme romanticism was a reaction to the utilitarian and evangelical views.

Sir William Jones' classical and oriental education inculcated a romance of language, literature, ancient classics and races in his mind which became his unit of historical studies. The revival of imperialism and colonialism towards the orient attracted Jones' attention towards the oriental studies and developed a liking for geographical, linguistic and cultural diversities and belief in the promotion of "universal humanitarian values". Jones saw history in the form of rise and fall of civilizations, embodied in arts, crafts, literature and institutions evident in racial mythology. Jones had a strong belief in the wisdom and strength of the ancient religions and moral system, although a great believer in Christianity. Human progress appears to be a result of the interchange of belief system, sources, institutions, mythology and literature among the civilizations. Jones saw the relations between mythology, religion and rituals, religion and its observation as the foundation of customary law supported by history. Therefore, Islam appears to be devoid of classical tradition for Jones and did not form the central part of his thought.

Jones' career from 1770 to 1783 has been termed as that of an Orientalist and his career from 1784 to his death in 1794 he has been termed as an Indologist.

As an orientalist Jones rejected the view of the inferiority of the orient and insisted that understanding of the European renaissance was impossible without the study of oriental history. He stressed on the similarities between ancient Indian and European civilizations. His oriental interest brought him in contact with different areas of potential Muslim influence: Central Asia, Arabia, Persia and India. He considered ancient Arabic society as the "perfect society" and appreciated his "exalted virtues" and nomadic life and literature. However, he remains reluctant to accept the contribution of Islam to the progress of human civilization. Jones was impressed by the Persian language and literature and considered
Persia as "the finest part of Asia". He saw the development of Persian civilization in the development of Persian language. However, he seems to posing a negative question about the promotion of literature under the auspices of Islam.

Jones' "Indology" was devoted to 'Hinduism'. Although he had planned to write on a number of issues related to the Muslims and translated a number of works on the Muslim jurisprudence, yet, he almost neglected the Muslim India due to his romantic lending towards ancients classical relations between ancient India and Greek world, relations between Sanskrit and Greek language and because of his perception of Muslims as a foreign, imperial race. In the administrative affairs, he admits that the Muslim rulers recognized the authority of the Hindu law and the Muslim sovereigns were not despots. If despots they were much enlightened. However he focused on the elevation of ancient India as a centre of splendid civilization. Therefore, he advises the company that Indians should be governed according to their own law which was Hindu law for Jones.

William Jones and romance of ancient India created by Asiatic society was considered in a huge difference with the contemporary Hindu society. The contemporary Indian society was considered far behind the civilized status by the evangelicals and utilitarians Thomas Maurice took up the cause of interpretation of the difference in two ways. On the one hand, Maurice elaborately explained the civilized status of India through its comparison with the prominent ancient civilizations and their achievements for humanity and, on the other hand, he laid all blames of the destruction of ancient Indian civilization and degeneration of the contemporary Indian society on the Muslims and condemned the Indian Muslims' in this perspective. Islam appears, in his understanding, an imperial religion and he saw the Muslim rule in India in continuation with the Arab-Muslim empire. Plundering was the purpose of Muslim conquests with a religious bigotry. The spread of Islam appears to Maurice a political contribution to religion. In this way he tried to defend Hinduism against the enlightened and utilitarian approach.

However, this approach was strongly criticized by the missionaries and the utilitarians. Malcolm responded to the challenge in administrative terms. He adopted the utilitarian unit of historical studies of contemporary history and focused on the administrative problems. Taking India as a "continent", he stressed on the acceptance of the status of the Indian Muslims in Indian affairs and in the British policy, instead of
dealing with India solely as a Hindu country. He appreciated the Muslim administration and law especially with regard to civil rights. It was Mountstuart Elphinstone who took up the case, systematically. During the third and fourth decades of nineteenth century, the British administration was sharply divided in their perception of Indian history and people. Romanticists and utilitarians were criticizing each other on the issue of the placement of Indians on the scale of civilization. For romanticists, Indians had developed a highly civilized society and, for the utilitarians and the missionaries, Indians were immoral and savage entities. The Muslims were far better than the Indians. In this perspective Elphinstone tried to harmonize the two views in favour of the romantic school on the model of Maurice. However he distinguished the Muslim rule from Indo-Muslim rule. Pre-Mughul period of Indian history appears to be the period of Muslim imperialism in India. From the time of Akbar he sees the growth of an Indo-Muslim nation and a “whole Indian nation” as the outcome of the Hindus-Muslims interaction which was a great contribution to the Indian civilization on the part of the Muslims.

The romance of India, which was being harmonized by Elphinstone’s school, with the reformists, missionaries and utilitarians, was strongly resisted by the antiquarian and cultural romanticists such as Sleeman, Elliot and H. H. Wilson in the fourth and fifth decades of the nineteenth century. Missionaries had already targeted Islam and the Muslims. In this perspective, Islam and the Muslims seem to be the under harsh criticism. Sleeman tried to associate all the evils of the Hindu religion and morality to the Muslim rule and, in this way, tried to present Muslim as an evil force.

Oriental romanticists’ historiography, India as well as Muslim India, under goes an evolutionary change during the period under discussion. It represents the change not only in the western romantic thought but also the change of issues, problems, concerns and motives in India as well as in the British Indian aspirations and policy. The contemporary rival schools of thought especially missionary and utilitarian further aggravated it. Jones had initiated the romantic vision in the late eighteenth century with a view to focus on the understanding of Indian culture and religion to provide justice to the people of India. In his understanding India appears a land of the Hindus. Thus Jones was unable to assign Muslims any proper place except that of a non-indigenous religious community and his concern was just to provide the Muslims justice according to their
own religious laws under the British administration. Otherwise, Jones was interested in the racial and cultural orientations of the people. In this way, romanticists' dissociated themselves from the enlightened focus on Muslim India.

The Indian romance diverted the attention of the romanticists towards antiquity, race and literature. The dialectics between contemporary and ancient and between the enlightened and romantic, led the romanticists toward the ancient Hindus against the Muslims. Accepting the indigenous character of the Hindus and exotic character of the Muslims, Jones' neglect of Muslim India seems to be replaced by Thomas Maurice. The conflict between ancient Indian romance and imperial motives seems to be at its peak in Maurice's historiography. Maurice blamed the Muslims for the degeneration of the Hindu civilization as foreign imperial power. Although Malcolm and Elphinstone try to assign the Indian Muslim a place among the indigenous people, their treatment seems to be an attempt to undermine their separate character as a community of nations. Their views appear to be an attempt to merge the Hindu civilization with utilitarians' Muslim civilization. The utilitarians had assigned Muslim civilization a better place than the Hindus and by eliminating the distinction between the two and, by combining the two civilizations, they seem to be trying to reject the utilitarian criticism of Hinduism. These trends seem at their extreme in Sleeman. He not only defends Hinduism but also criticizes Islam and the Muslims and tries to prove that the evils of Hinduism were a result of its interaction with Islam.

The romanticists looked at Islam and Indian Muslims with an antithetic view. By treating them as a foreign community or by merging them into the Hindus, they seem to be curbing the identity of Indian Muslims. The attempt to harmonise romanticism with utilitarianism also aim to the glorification of Hinduism. Although during the early years, romanticists had a thorough support of the missionaries on the policy matters, the trend seems to be replaced after the rise of utilitarianism and the arrival of Scottish missionaries in India. After the 1820s, the concept of the superiority of the western civilization dominated the British mind which remained operative until the 1840s. After 1840 a wave against the Muslims again seems to be reviving the romance of Hinduism. Therefore, between 1820 and 1840s the romantic issues can be seen focused on the
contemporary or comparative problems and methods, reviving the Hindu rituals and religious culture afterwards.

The theories of British treatment of India as "self and other" seem to be positively traced from the majority of the romantic writings, especially literary. The divisions still exist in the debate on the Indian identities. However, Malcolm and Elphinstone's differentiation between the Indian "civilization" and Indian "nations" seems to be laying foundation of a new school of Ethno-Regional Orientalists that treated the Indian identities separately.

The romantic historiography had imperial administrative motives. As the Muslims were the ruling elite; and majority population was Hindu, so by a sympathetic view of Hinduism, the British seem to be seeking the popular support of the Hindus against their rival Muslim power. Simultaneously, under the modern concept of nationalism, they wanted to set an administration according to the national traits of the subject people.

The Ethno-regional romanticists advocated a variety of culture, races and nations in India, emerging, especially, during the Muslim rule such as Hindus, Marathas, Rajputs, and Sikhs, having indigenous character. The ethno-regional romanticists concluded that these groups presented anti-imperial forces, reacting against the Muslim imperialism and they never accepted the dominance of any ruler in spite of all-powerful suppression.

Emerging out of enlightened romantic trends of the late eighteenth century nationalism, and their contemporary problem of imperial administration, the Ethno-Regional romanticists' historiography of Muslim India during the first half of the nineteenth century represented an identical school of thought in politics as well as in historiography and imperial administration. Primarily, differentiating between civilization and nation, the Ethno-Regional romanticists accepted the civilized status of India. However, they negated the concept of a civilization based on one nation and identified a nations-based civilization. Their concept of Indian nations presents an evolution identical with the growth of the British power in India. With the expansion of the British imperial power, the British came into contact with the new areas and identified the national status of different ethnic groups. Primarily, Ethno-Regional romanticists grasped the territorial or ethnic identity. Ethno-Regional romanticists writings on Bengal, South India, Marathas, Rajputs and Sikhs cover almost all prominent areas of
India and amply indicate their understanding of the problem of nationality and identity in the British India.

The Ethno-Regional romanticists differed with Elphinstone and Malcolm's concept of the unity of ten nations under one Indian civilization. They were impressed by the native traditions of the areas where they served for a long time and applied the western principles of identity and nationality to the Indian ethnic and territorial identities. Under the pressure of administrative and intellectual developments of the time, they synthesized the conflict of Indian cultures and western civilization to solve administrative problems.

Inspite of the fact that the ethno-Regional romanticists accept the oriental romanticists' view of the civilized status of the Indian society, they consider the foreign races as the major contributors to the Indian civilization on the pattern of the utilitarians. Stewart presented a picture of strong Muslim influence in Bengal throughout the known history. For Stewart the Bengalis were a nation who were unable to govern themselves throughout the history. Therefore, a foreign rule was necessary for the Bengali and, in this perspective, the Muslim rule has contributed a lot to peace, prosperity and strength of the nation. However, he considers this Bengali nation primarily as the followers of Hindu religion. He saw a prominent role played by the Mughuls in the rise of the Hindus in the affairs of politics in Bengal. Simultaneously, Bengal has been an important part of the Mughul Empire because of its commercial and economic strength. Same importance he assigns to Bengal in the British Empire. Mark Wilks tried to write a philosophical history on Scottish pattern and addressed the issues of legitimacy, balance of power, property rights and reforms in details. South India represented a historico-geographical identity for Wilks strengthened by Hindu religious uniformity. He accepts the romantic view of the Hindu civilization, yet, he emphasised the contemporary issues under the influence of Scottish historians. His history was an apology for the British rule. South India in spite of its division into a number of states, represents a strong sense of unity on the basis of religion which provides the area a separate identity. It had never been under the Muslim rule before the time of Hyder Ali and Tipu Sultan. Although the Hindus of South India did never potentially contribute to the state of Indian civilization, yet, Wilks saw its contribution in the defence of Hinduism against the Muslim imperialism. In this perspective, he considered Mysore a legitimate separate Hindu state, authority of which was usurped by the Muslims. Therefore, Wilks considers the overthrow of
the Muslim dynasty of Mysore a legitimate act and presents it as the British contribution to
the defence of indigenous Hindus. Duff paints Marathas very black. He applies the utilitarian
view of Hindu civilization to the Marathas and considered them savage, and plunderers. His
focus remains on the political and military aspects. However, he traces the rise of Marathas
in the Muslim conquest of Deccan. Polite Muslim administration and Maratha-Muslim
political collaboration, seem to Duff, the main cause of the rise of the community. Therefore,
during the declining state of the Mughul empire, the Marathas claimed the succession to the
Muslims. In this perspective, Duff justifies the British policy against the Marathas as defence
of the native petty states, which were left helpless by the Muslims to the Maratha savagery.

On the same model, James Tod identifies a great resistance as well as contribution on
the part of Rajputs to the strength of the Mughul power. He appreciates Akbar and
depreciates Aurangzeb for their Rajput policy. However he idealized the Rajput chivalry and
compared them with the medieval Europe. Cunningham considered Rajputs and Jats as
foreign races. However, he sees the rise of Sikhism as a result of age long interaction
between Islam and Hinduism. Although he considers Sikhism as an ideal representation of
Christianity in principles, yet, the relation between Islam and Christianity does not mark any
distinction in Cunningham’s thought.

It is clear that none of the Ethno-Regional romanticists deals with the Indian Muslims
as a separate nation on the level of foreign races of Jats or Rajputs as their concept of
nationality seems sharply identical with races and region and Muslims religion has claimed
its identity, independent of ethnicity and regionality. However Ethno-Regional romanticists
appreciate the contribution of the Indian Muslims to the Indian civilization. In their attempt
to understand the Indian society, they seem to be focusing the regional realities and thus
trying to derive more unbiased results to utilize them for the British Indian administration.
Stewart and Duff seem to be appreciating the moderate approach towards the Bengalis and
the Marathas: They see the strength of the Muslim rule in the moderate laws of the
government, participation of indigenous population in the state administration and in the
moderate religious policy. Simultaneously, the Hindu-Muslim relations are depicted as
moderate and the contribution of Indian Muslims to the arts and architecture is appreciated.
Cunningham depicts the most important relation of Islam with the indigenous population in
the form of Sikh religion.
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Emerging out of the continuity of the historiography of enlightenment’s rational and man-centred trends, against the extreme romantic focus on literature and antiquity, utilitarianism seems to be taking the form of a school in philosophy and historiography during the period under discussion. Contemporary history, philosophy, and institutions of state and society, appear to be utilitarians’ major concern with a motto of “maximum happiness for a maximum number of people”. Utilitarians seem to be fighting the battle of thought in Indian historiography.

The Utilitarian historiography of Muslim India represents an evolution, not only in the understanding of Indian Muslims but, also, in the development of utilitarian philosophy. The followers of enlightened thought provided utilitarians a link between the enlightened trends of Indian historiography and a focus on the Muslim period of Indian historiography, in an age of romanticism. However, the substance of utilitarian understanding seems to be emerging against the romantic literary antiquarianism and taking the form of dialectics between romanticism and utilitarianism. In this perspective, Hinduism appears to be the field of dialectics, developing utilitarians’ breach from the enlightened focus on Muslim India. As the dialectics was on the issue of superiority of civilizational status of a society, to prove the superiority and utility of the western civilization, utilitarians seem to be even rejecting the Gibbonian placement of Muslim civilization as the successor of the Roman civilization. Their concern with the Muslim India was to prove that the status of Hindu society is very low on the scale of civilization and that foreign rule was a must for Indians as it was under the Muslims. So, Muslims are depicted as a symbol of authority and power, a need of Indian people, in the utilitarian historiography of Muslim India.

In the 1820s, the concept of utility of social institutions and replacement of inactive institutions with new useful ones, became the focus of utilitarian school of thought. Mill tried to establish an authoritarian state to act as the force working behind the radical social change. In the thirties, education and behavioural change became the focus, advocated by the liberal Macaulay. The later part of the period under review was occupied by paternalism, advocating a compromise with indigenous institutions, culture and customs. The utilitarian school dominated the intellectual scene of Britain and India for two decades (twenties and thirties of the nineteenth century).
In this evolutionary process, at the end of the eighteenth century, when ancient Indian romance was in full wings, Francis Gladwin continued the trends developed during the age enlightenment in India. He focused on the Muslims as political and cultural community and on Persian language as intellectual, cultural, administrative and public language. However his approach was non-philosophical.

It was James Mill who systematically narrated the history of India on utilitarian logic and philosophised the Indian history. Combating the challenges of liberalism and romanticism, and criticising the nature of Hindu state society and religion. Mill was the only philosopher-cum-historian in the utilitarian historiography of India. All others seem to be either filling the gap between enlightenment and romanticism or following Mill’s paradigm in historiography. Mill considered the Muslim culture and administration slightly better than those of the Hindus. However, he tried to prove that western institutions were more useful than those of the Muslim, thus concluded that western institutions should be introduced in India to make the Indians civilized. He refused to accept the indigenous status of Indian Muslims and considered them foreign rulers to justify the British rule in India and for the claim of succession to the Muslim power.

The same concept seems to be followed by Macaulay, with a slightly positive view of the Muslim religion, by comparing it with the Catholics. Macaulay accepted almost all conclusions of James Mill. He strongly supported the case for social change and introduction of western institutions, and even English language. However, his concern with the Indian Muslims was based on the view that the Muslims have so many similarities with the Christians and, especially, with the Catholics and that the Muslims were the ruling elite and an influential community of India. So, he concluded that in the British policy matters the Muslim should be given proper weightage and even support.

On the basis of these ideas, Edward Thornton defended the utilitarian view about the Muslims. Instead of proving that the Hindus were savages, he argues that the Muslims have their own place and they need to be defended through government policies. Rejecting the romantic view that the Muslim rule was the significant cause of the degeneration of the Hindu state and society, Thornton highlighted that Muslims’ rule was not a cause of the degeneration, rather, Hinduism was the cause of the degeneration among the Indian Muslims.
and contemporary Muslim revivalist movement against the influence of Hinduism on Islam were the proof of his thesis.

The controversy seems to be solved by William Erskine's paternalistic view of the Mughul rule. However, Erskine raised the primary logical question of British Indian administration with a plea to synthesize the two views in favour of western ideals. Erskine argued that Mughul Muslim rule was paternalistic. The Mughuls preserved the indigenous political and social culture in combination with their amendments on Persian models, in this way, harmonized the Indo-Muslim state with indigenous society. However the plea seem to be the British Indian policy to deal with the Muslims. The views seem to be indicating a progress in the utilitarian philosophy. Emerging out of rational aspects of the enlightenment, utility of authority was the major theme of James Mill's History of British India which is tinged with liberal ideals and Whig political philosophy in Macaulay's thought. However, in Thornton and Erskine it was confined to administrative problems.

Contrary to the views of C. A. Bayly and Javed Majeed, utilitarian thought seems to be very influential in Indian administrative policies after 1820. Unlike the romanticists, the utilitarians won a thorough support of the missionaries on the issues and methods of social change and on the issue of the role of government in bringing about a radical change in India with a complete harmony on the view of the superiority and utility of western civilization. Simultaneously, the gradual change in the British Indian policy was always in favour of the utilitarian view on India, except on the status of the Indian Muslims. Although utilitarians failed to combat the romantic view of ancient India, they left a marvellous impact on the policy of social change in India. As the Muslims were never their concern, so, on this issue, their impact could not be considered worthwhile.

The missionaries were aiming at the Christianisation of the Indians. The formal contact of Missionaries with India had begun by the advancement of the Portuguese commercial and navigational interests in the coastal areas of Indian Ocean. However, the development of British commercial interests provided the British missionaries the opportunity to initiate their ventures in India. The British East India Company, initially, resisted the strength of missionary work in India due to a fear of reaction by the indigenous population which could be harmful to their commercial interests. In this perspective, at the end of eighteenth century, the strength of missionary activity and argument seems to be determined by an "apology for
promoting Christianity" in India. Through this activity, the missionaries can be found trying hard to seek support from within the administrative circles of the East India Company for the missionary work. Their main argument appears to be the immoral state of Indian society. Both the Hindus and the Muslims must be reformed in radical ways by an introduction of Christian religion, through the support of the government. However, by the end of first quarter of the nineteenth century, they joined hands with the utilitarians and the liberals for social change. They launched an attack against the Muslims in the forties and fifties. In the last decades of the period (1840 to 1857) the missionaries' activities dominated the Indian scene. In this phase even the British bureaucracy joined hands with the missionaries.

The British missionary historiography of Muslim India during the period under study presents a systematic evolution in the means, method, subject matter, and approaches to the missionary understanding of history. Historiography not only appears to be in transition but also appears an efficient tool for the system of arguments being developed to propagate the religious change in the form of evangelisation in India. Following the deductive method, missionary historiography indicates a breach from the eighteenth century tradition of contemporary political historiography. Its focus seems to be on the moral and religious aspects of society and depicts a very strong sense of Christian righteousness and infidels' immorality. These histories, except that of Marshman, were written for the British people and not for the natives of India. The purpose of these histories was to influence the East India Company's policies in India in its relations with the government at home. However, the role of government and politics in the elevation of morals and manners of people seems to be unanimously accepted. However, missionary historiography had not taken its disciplined form till the time of John Clark Marshman. Before Marshman history, was dealt with in the observations, journals, letters, memoirs or reports, based on oral testimony, by the missionaries. The written sources of Muslim India were mostly neglected. However, not a single history written by the missionaries dealing solely with the Muslims can be found.

Evolution of government-missionaries' relations, evolution in the contemporary schools of thought, socio-political environment and missionaries mutual relations seem to be influencing the development of missionary historiography during the period under discussion. Appointment of Henry Martyn and 1813 Act seem to be a success of Charles Grants' plea for the support of missionary activities by the Company's administration. Thus
Duff and Marshman appear to be two good examples of government-missionary collaboration.

A strong sense of unity in the development of British missionaries historiography is evident which seems to be presenting missionaries as a school having close contact and mutual impact. It seems to be moving from apology for the evangelisation to strategy and policy for evangelisation. Grant had focused on the role of government for evangelisation as a moral duty of the British. Grant refuted all sympathetic depictions of India by the romanticists and painted the darkest picture of India. Grant associated India with Hinduism and Indian Muslims were worse than the Hindus for Grant. On the other hand, he was of the opinion that the British were drawing wealth out of India and exploitation should be compensated through the introduction of Christianity in India. William Tennant focused on the Christianisation as a tool for the permanence of the British rule. He adopted an argument different from Grant. Tenant refused to accept the view of the exploitations of Indians by the company. He was of the opinion that the Company's rule was ever best in India. However he declared evangelisation of India indispensable for the permanence of the British rule in India.

Henry Martyn approached the issue in a different way. Rather than pleading a role of the company for evangelisation, Martyn came into direct polemical conflict with the Muslims. Christianity and Islam have a long tradition of scholastic and polemical interaction. All aspects of ideological as well as practical theology, especially the nature of scripture, the character of the prophets and epistemological construction of religion had been the issues of debate between the two religions. The tradition was at its peak during the late middle ages. However, challenges of rationalism and enlightenment pacified this pure scholastic and polemical tradition of debate. After a short time, by the nineteenth century, it again became a powerful and active tool for Christian missionary activity. It was Henry Martyn who revived this tradition. Educationalists and polemical missionaries such as Duff and Pfander later adopted the same logic. Henry Martyn measured the relations between language and religion, especially between Arabic, Persian and Hindustani languages and Islam. Considering Muslim creed as a challenge to his own religious belief, Martyn defended Christianity and attacked Islam. In this background, Duff seems to be applying Martyn's theory to a procedure for evangelisation in the form of introduction of English language. Believing in his contemporary interpretations of the Indian manners, morals and history, Alexander Duff
traced the causes of Indian degeneration in the languages and literature taught to the Indians. He was of the opinion that the literature of Indians, either in Sanskrit or Arabic, developed and preserved the absurdities and superstitions of religions. In this regard, Duff was aiming at the replacement of Indian manners, morals and religion with western ones, best represented in English. As the literature creeps in the mind through education, language as its medium, Duff stressed the need of the education of the Indian through an enlightened Christian-western literature in English.

The East India Company's servants' zeal and chaplains' missionary activities had always developed collaboration between the British Indian government and the Christian missionaries. Missionaries needed to cooperate with the company which ruled India in order to maintain a presence in India. Therefore, the missionaries continued to maintain favourable relations with the employees of the company who were sympathetic, at a personal level, to the missionary activities. However, it was the rise of the utilitarians in the Indian administration and Scottish missionaries focus on modern Western education, as a tool of social change, which strengthened these relations. Missionaries joined hands with the East India Company administration for the cause of social change and administration with the missionaries for the cause of conversion of Indians to Christianity. J. W. Kaye one among the administrators devoted himself for the cause of mission. Duff established close relations with the administration. However, this collaboration can best be analysed in the works of John Clark Marshman. Marshman introduced history as an educational discipline in English language, thus closed the issue of language and education. Marshman criticized the Hindus on utilitarian model, the Muslims on extreme romanticists model and presented the rise of British power as the triumph of Christianity. The adoption of his book for schools and later assigning him the writing of a history of India for the university students, seem to be present a government policy and influence and use of history for administrative dialectics. In his history the Muslims were a foreign force replaced by the British for better results.

In this way British historiography represents a systematic evolution in its core, bringing all missionary sense of history to one. In this way missionary sense of history seems to be taking it disciplined and logical end and form by 1857. Missionary historiography seems to be influencing and being influenced by its contemporary schools. At the end of the eighteenth century, a romantic view was dominating the
missionary historiography. They were focusing on indigenous languages for the propagation of Christianity. Although a strong sense of the superiority of Christian West always prevailed over the minds of the missionaries, the utilitarians influence seems to be combining missionary moral with utilitarian material philosophy. Missionaries seem to be deriving the understanding of Muslim India from the romanticists and collaborating with the utilitarians on the concept of Hindu India. However, the concept of unity of the west and the Christian civilization seem to be developing a consensus among the schools for the role of Empire in bringing social change in the colonies.

In this perspective, Hinduism appears as a central focus of the missionaries. The Muslims are dealt with from a distance and only one missionary focused on Islam, due to the lessons of a long history of Christian-Muslim contact. They are treated as foreigners and imperial rulers of India. Missionaries seem to be depicting and promoting a strong sense of Hindu-Muslim differences. And through a method of comparison between the Muslim and the British rule, the missionaries seem to be trying to depict Christian rule better and more benevolent than the Muslims rule. As a whole, the Muslims were not the basic concern for the missionaries. They were hopeless about the Muslim conversion to Christianity, so, they almost neglected the Muslims in historiography and treated them from a margin of distance.

The British historiography of Muslim India during the period 1800-1857 was, by and large, subject to the European intellectual trends and schools of thought. By the beginning of the nineteenth century, a number of intellectual and practical forces coming out of continuity of, or reaction against, the enlightened trends such as liberalism, historicism, orientalism, colonialism, industrial revolution and nationalism influenced the process of the development of British historiography of Muslim India. The British historical writings came out of and reflected then contemporary issues of British Indian concern in the colonial scenario as well as in the internal administration. It had a purposive prospect in the form of a policy-oriented moral apology. Coming out of the late eighteenth century orientalism, the British historiography of Muslim India during the first half of the nineteenth century originated from the British home criticism of the East India Company’s Indian imperial administration and quest for the solution of the problems of colonial India on the western model. Thus it had two-fold purposes: it was an apology for the colonial policy on the one hand and aimed at influencing the process of British Indian policy making, on the other hand. It seems
dominated by the British Indian administrators' works. Although the British historians viewed India on the western model, yet colonial commercial interests promoted by the Industrial Revolution seem to be subjugating Orientalism, liberal ideals and nationalism. However, historicism seems to be operative for the justification of imperial rule in India through out the history and for the solution of problem of imperial Indian administration which developed British interest in the history of Indo-Muslim Empire. In this perspective Wishwanathan, F. G. Hutchins and Ralph J. Crane’s treatment of British writings as “the Masks of Conquests”, “the Illusion of Permanence” and apologies seem to be fair analyses.

The Euro-centrism seems to be an instrument of the British apologetic historiography that led the British historians to adopt a method of “self” and “other” approach to the understanding of Indian history. In this perspective, Edward Said, Asish Nandy, Daud Ali, and others of similar views have rightly observed the British historians identification of the “self” and “other” as two distinct identities in the form of the East and the West, Orient and Occident, Europe and Asia, Britain and India, and “historical” and “ahistorical” as superiors and inferiors. The ‘other’ appears to be one and seems not to be converted in “others” in the logic of British apologetic historiography.

Gayan Prakash, Frykenberg, Geoffrey A. Oddie see the “other” in the British historical writings in the emergence of geo-religious identity of India in the form of Hinduism. Thus India seems synonym for Hinduism in the nineteenth century construction of British understanding of Muslim India. As a result the Muslims emerge in Indian understanding as:

First, a foreign minority ruling race having their origin in Arabic, Persian and Turkish territories.

Second, an imperial power ruling India which was being replaced by the British and thus a rival of the British.

Third, a religious community resisting the western imperialism as well as ideals and religion, alike in India.

In this perspective the perception of the Muslims as an imperial power with a “historical” sense resisting British superiority seem to be challenging the British interest in India. Therefore, they seem to be consciously sidelining the Muslims, for elevating a new identity of India, in the form of the principles and practices of the Hindus, who were ruled under the Muslims and the British alike. This was the “other” of British historians and central focus of
British historiography. The Muslims seem to be treated from a distance with foreign imperial identity. All the British historiographic premises, models, criterions, problems, technicalities, theories, issues, perceptions and misperception seem to be based on this understanding.

However, British historians show a sort of difference of opinion on the issues related to the imperial Indian administration and apology for the British rule in India. On these issues, they do not seem to be working like "individual guerrillas in the jungle". Their views seem to be based on the western intellectual model, identified in the form of four schools of thought: Oriental Romanticists, Ethno-Regional Romanticist, Utilitarians and Missionaries.

A clear-cut demarcation between these schools is not possible. The schools seem to be going through an evolutionary process, influencing each other and thus culminating in a dialectical process on the issues of concern. However, they can clearly be demarcated on the issues of the criteria for the assessment of the place of a civilization in the human history, especially, of the Muslims or the Indo-Muslims civilization. The civilization appears to be their basic criterion for the study of human history and all the schools seem to be adopting the religion-base criterion for the study of Indo-Muslim history. Although their criteria to evaluate the status of civilization differ from each other, yet the approach of all the schools seem to be antithetic to the Muslims, considering Muslims as foreign imperial power. In this way, oriental romanticists' criterion for the evaluation of the civilization appears to be ancient language and literature which sideline the Muslims as anti-mythological religion. Ethno-regional romanticists focus of lingual-racial and geographical-cultural understanding, of identities come into conflict with the Muslim religious identities. Simultaneously utilitarians' then contemporary tools of rationalism, new thought and institutions, considered Muslims a medieval form of civilization, inferior even to Greek-Romans. On the contrary, missionaries had a long tradition of conflict with the Muslims and disliking for Islam. In this perspective, their "self" and "other" approach, along with the criterion for the evaluation of a civilization, block the way of the British perception of a tri-civilization geographical unit in the form of the British "self" and two "others": the Hindus and the Muslims, which is now
adopted by Susan Bayly for Christians and Muslims\textsuperscript{1} and Javeed Alam for a "composite culture".\textsuperscript{2}

Again the British seem fail to differentiate between "civilization" and "nation" at that stage. They seem to be intermingling the vast concept of civilization with a unit of cultural, linguistic, historical or religious identity, to justify and facilitate the imperial rule as well as administration. Although ethno-regional romanticists tried to differentiate between the "civilization" and "nation", which seem to be harshly suppressed and ignored, not only by the contemporary administrators, but also by the later historians, motivated by the civilization-base nation. Although Elphinstone marked the Indo-Muslims as an Indian nation, yet none of his patronized ethno-regional romanticists focused on the Muslims for his studies, which depicts the true consideration of Elphinstone.

The British historiography during the period covered almost every subject relevant to the understanding of Indian state and society. However, the emphasis of the subjects shifted, from time to time, in their relations with administrative problems and policy issues. These problems and issues also depict the evolution within the schools and in the structure of British historiography. The period under study begins when romanticism was at its peak against enlightenment, with Jones' focus on mythology and literature. Its early phase was dominated by just an exploration and identification of classical heritage of ancient civilizations. It almost neglected the medieval and modern developments of Islam in the world, as well as in India. The resistance of enlightened writers such as Francis Gladwin, to the approach and criticism of ancient civilizations by missionaries, led to the defence of ancient Hindu civilization. The problem of difference between the depiction of ancient Hinduism and contemporary state of Hindu society seems to be resolved through a more focused and elaborated study of ancient India and with laying the blame of degeneration of the Hindus on the Muslims. During this period of higher romantic influence, missionaries strongly opposed the romantic depiction of ancient India. However, romanticists argued that Indian affairs should be settled according to the native tradition. The Muslims had followed the same approach.

However, with the rise of utilitarianism and evangelicalism, in the third decade of the nineteenth century, the concept of non-civilized and immoral status of India grew more rapidly, with a plea for social reform in the Indian society, with the initiative of the government. Although the missionaries refused to differentiate between the Muslims and the Hindus, yet the utilitarian Mill, Macaulay and Thornton assigned the Muslims a place better than the Hindus. Thornton even launched a counter attack on the romanticists by blaming the Hinduism for the degeneration of the Muslim society. The challenge led to the acceptance of a place of Muslims in the oriental romanticists understanding of Indian history, especially, by John Malcolm and Mountstuart Elphinstone. However, the utilitarian and evangelicals’ plea for the introduction of radical social change on the model of western institutions gave birth to a new school of thought, ethno-regional romanticists, more strongly resisting the utilitarians universal approach, patronized by the oriental romanticists.

However, by the forties and fifties of the nineteenth century the romantic school again gains a rise and utilitarians seem to be seeking a compromise with the romanticists. Erskine’s view that Muslim government had a paternalistic model for the administration of Hindu India, therefore, British should treat the Hindus on the same model, led to an overall assertion of the sympathy with the Hindus resulting in the attack on Islam and the Muslims by the romanticists and missionaries. The assertion of indigenous identities on the part of ethno-regional romanticists strengthened the romantic view a lot. In order to seek the support for the conversion of the Hindus, the missionaries joined hands with the administration against the Muslims. In this evolutionary process, history gained the status of an educational discipline. However, the result seems to be the depiction of the Muslims and Islam in worse terms than ever.

In this evolution, the early nineteenth century was dominated by the romantic thought. During the 1820s and 1830s utilitarianism dominated the Indian scene. Two decades preceding the war of independence of 1857, show the rise of missionary thought. Romanticists and utilitarians seem to be, at a stage, in mutual compromise, with the missionaries. In this way, the rise of missionary logic for Christianisation of the Indian Muslims was the outcome of the long process of evolution of British historiography of Muslim India. William Muir, J.C. Marshall, John W. Kaye are the examples of this rise.
This anti-Muslim trend of two decades of pre-war of independence period seems to continue even after the war of independence. Elliot and Dowson, William Muir and W.W. Hunter seem to be the continuation of romanticists-Missionaries union against the Muslims. Simultaneously, the view that the 1857 crisis was the out come of the British attitude toward the Muslims seems to be gaining weightage in this perspective.

The dialectics between the pro-Hindu romanticists and pro-Muslim utilitarians seems to be clearly visible in the Indian administrative scenario after 1857. It seems to be based on the attempts to influence the British Indian policy. The two schools seem to be patronizing the Hindus and the Muslims, especially, serving for the company and under their patronage, the two communities seem to becoming rivals of each other, especially on the issues of educational curriculum and language.  

The British treatment of the Muslims seems to be determining the Muslim attitude towards the Hindus and the British during the period and after. The religious understanding of Indian history and the emergence of Indian identity in the name of Hinduism, and propagation of this understanding and identity on the part of imperial rulers and their attempts to replace these identities with the Christians, created a sense of resistance to the Christian imperialism and a sense of revival of Islam in the Muslim mind. That is what Francis Robinson calls as the ‘Religious Change and the Self in Muslim South Asia’. This resistance appeared, on the one hand, in the form of Muslim religious movements during the period and after and, on the other hand, in the form of intellectual response in terms of historiography. It was an apology for the defence of history of Muslim culture and civilization. In this perspective, the British historiography, following the path of the British policy, was a tool to degrade the Muslim community, and to promote the cause of the west and Christianity. It was the attack and the attempt that created a sense of insecurity of

---


6 Aslam Syed, op. cit.
religion and culture among the Indian Muslims, resulting in the rise of Muslim nationalism in India.

However the British treatment left a lasting impact on the Indo-Muslim self-understanding and their response to the colonial imperial challenges. Their historiography emerged out of an apology or on the base of the identities developed by the colonial masters. They adopted the same modes, units of historical studies, criterions, models, premises, theories, techniques and even structures, either to follow or to respond, which were developed or adopted by the British.7

In this perspective, the present study fulfils the need of a general understanding of the British historiography of the Muslim India during the first half of the nineteenth century. In spite of responding to the core of historiographic issues, it brings to light a vast subject of issue yet to be explored. A focused study of individual historians methods and views can bring to light some subtle understanding, not possible in the general studies. Simultaneously, a vast field of issues such as British unit of historical studies, evolution of British understanding of Indian historical geography, British criterions to assess the place of civilization and racial-religious historical composition of Indian society seem to be worth the research and can develop a more solid understanding of our current issues and identities linked with imperial past.
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