Chapter 3

Reluctant Fathers

If we are not able to contrive some method of governing India well which will not of necessity become the means of governing Great Britain ill, a ground is laid for their eternal separation, but none for sacrificing the people of that country to our constitution.

—Edmund Burke

This statement made by Burke, in 1788 before Parliament was perhaps the closest Britons had come in that century to at least a consideration of relinquishing Empire as a solution to the problems caused by imperial expansion. In 1775, speaking with regard to the American colonies, Burke himself had remarked that one of the alternatives suggested had been that of "giving up the colonies, but it met so slight a reception that I do not think myself obliged to dwell a great while upon it." Even though the Indian and the American contexts were widely separated much must still have happened between 1775 and 1783 to render possible a public statement that there were circumstances under which the giving up of imperial domination could be a practical possibility. It is of course true that Burke's main concern here is with the fear that the Indian connection may lead to Britain being governed ill—the fear of “Nabobism”. However, it is worth noting that, generally speaking, nearly all British commentators on India of this period—Indologists or Anglicists, Conservatives or Utilitarians—usually concurred on the perpetuity, or at least the very long life of Empire. Even later writers like Macaulay who took the possible ending of Empire into consideration set that event in the dim and distant future. Under these circumstances, Burke's assumption that "governing well" was a necessary part of
the right to govern, without which Empire ought not to be continued and that Indians should not be "sacrificed" to the British Constitution attains considerable significance. His very use of the term "sacrificed" instead of "salvaged" or "saved" marks a perspective, which, however, tentatively took the Indian side of affairs into consideration.

The notion of abandoning Empire is somewhat of an exception in Burke's discourse, let alone in the Conservative policy as a whole. Indeed, Burke qualifies his assertion immediately with the statement that "I am, however, far from being persuaded that any such incompatibility, of interest does in fact exist. On the contrary, I am certain that every means effectual to preserve India from oppression is a guard to preserve the British Constitution from its worst corruption" (Burke 1963: 369). However, it is valid to keep the fact that such a concept—giving up of Empire—had been tentatively articulated by an arch Conservative at the background of an analysis of the Conservative and Indological discourse on India.

In this chapter, the "Indian" writings of Edmund Burke and the noted Indologist Sir William Jones are examined in some detail. References are also made to certain statements of Warren Hastings—official patron of early Indological studies and also target of Burke's vehement accusations of despotism and corruption—and to some other Indologists whose works were published in the Asiatic Researches. Emphasis is laid on the fact that just as many Utilitarian reformers and Evangelists failed in maintaining logical coherence in their vituperations on India, the Conservatives and Indologists who avowedly eulogised Ancient India while supporting Empire could not erect a flawless rhetorical edifice either. By the very nature of their overtly "pro-Indian" stand, the gaps perceived in this discourse are mostly of a nature that could simplistically be referred to as "anti-Indian". More important than the nature of these contradictions is the fact that they internally fragment Conservative/Indological discourse from inside. But though rendered vulnerable to easy rhetorical deconstruction the discourse retains its potential for pragmatic application and practical success.
Edmund Burke is today regarded as one of the most important patriarchs of modern Conservatism. Anthony Quinton indicates his importance with the remark that one can define "the Conservativeness of a position in terms of its closeness to the convictions of Burke" (quoted in Carnall 1989: 76). The fact that Burke functioned as the very embodiment of Consen'ative philosophy is quite significant from the perspective of his deep involvement in Indian affairs also. Respect for tradition, and a conviction that—as Burke puts it in Reflections on the Revolution in France—"in what we improve, we are never wholly new" (Burke 1963: 439) were hall-marks of the Conservative tradition. The Conservatives therefore, supported by Indological research, strenuously opposed the Anglicisation of India. Conservative suspicion of rootless innovation as such was a strong factor in Burke's demand for the preservation of Indian institutions. "I feel an insuperable reluctance in giving my hand to destroy any established institution of government upon a theory, however, plausible it may be" (Burke 1963: 372). Once Indological research had demonstrated that India did have traditions worth considering, the Conservatives were at hand to argue that these traditions should not be swept aside.

In relation to Indian affairs, Burke is chiefly remembered as the most ardent prosecutor in the impeachment of the Governor-General Warren Hastings. The valorisation of this particular role is understandable when we consider that more than three quarters of Burke's writings on India consist of speeches made during the impeachment. However, Burke's relation with India cannot just be confined to the impeachment. The Ninth Report on the Affairs of India presented before the British parliament in 1783 was written by Burke, and in it he strongly advocated reform of the East India Company's government of its Indian territories. Most of the 1783 East India Bill, which sought to regulate the affairs of the Company was authored by Burke and he defended it in a famous speech in the House of Commons on December 1, 1783.

Rather ironically, Burke's initial involvement with India was seen in attitudes favourable to the East India Company. In 1767 and 1773, he defended the Company from ministerial supervision. Indeed, he was thought of as so well disposed to the Company that an offer was made to him to be Chairman of a committee of supervisors appointed by
the Company to go out to India and reorganise the administration. Ultimately Burke rejected this offer, but it is still significant to note that he figured among the number of prominent figures who were offered or solicited Indian Employment. Closer examination of Indian affairs led Burke in 1783 to conclude that there were great abuses in the Company's administration of India. From this period he urged Parliamentary control more vehemently than he had ever opposed ministerial supervision, maintaining his stand even against initial accusations of opportunism and inconsistency.

In the *Ninth Report* (June 25, 1783) itself, Burke flatly stated that the East India Company had followed "principles of policy and courses of conduct by which the natives of all ranks and orders were reduced to a state of depression and misery" (1963: 341). He was firmly against Anglicisation and condemned all attempts to "administer justice in the remotest part of Hindostan as if it was a province of Great Britain" (1963: 346). Even in purely pragmatic terms, he insists that "the prosperity of the natives must be previously secured, before any profit whatsoever from them is attempted" (1963: 355).

While defending the 1783 East India Bill Burke speaks in detail of the responsibility entailed by Empire. This doctrine as expounded by the Conservative Burke is both similar to and different from the "civilising mission" of imperialism as spread by the Reformers and the Evangelists. The similarities between these attitudes will be considered in due course, the present emphasis on the differences they displayed.

Burke did urge reform most zealously, but it was reform of the British system that he demanded, not of Indian entities. India, he argued, was already civilised:

> This multitude of men does not consist of an abject and barbarous populace; much less of gangs of savages.... But of a people for ages civilised and *cultivated*—*cultivated* by all the arts of polished life while we were yet in the woods.

(Burke 1963: 374)

This is Burke's fullest articulation of the theme of a pre-colonially civilised India, to which he returns again and again during the course of his impeachment speeches. In governing such a nation, the first care of the British should be, Burke argued, not to
overthrow, but to preserve the existing institutions and the second to tactfully employ the instruments made available ready made to their hands by Indian tradition.

Even among the Conservatives who argued for Indian culture and the continuance of Indian institutions, Burke was regarded as somewhat singular for his personal sympathy towards Indians. Will Burke, Edmund Burke's cousin who had held office in India found Burke's Indian sympathies quite incomprehensible. He wrote to Burke's son that he could not "for the soul of me, feel as Edmund does about the Black primates" (quoted in Carnall 1989: 64). Burke himself was only too aware that such attitudes were unfortunately wide spread among his contemporaries. One of his constant complaints was with regard to the lack of sympathy of the British public for the Indian natives. He draws analogies of India with certain European situations in the hope that "India might be approximated in order to awaken something of sympathy for the unfortunate natives, of which I am afraid we are not perfectly susceptible whilst we look at this very remote object through a false and cloudy medium" (Burke 1963: 375).

Burke seems to have felt that he was standing as a defender of humanism against what he saw as the prevailing tide of a subtle racism. He vehemently asserts in a letter that he has "no party in the business [the impeachment] but among a set of people who have none of your roses and lilies in their faces, but who are the images of the great pattern as you and I. I know what I am doing, whether the white people like it or not" (quoted in Carnall 1989: 64). However, under the effect of Burke's comparatively liberal rhetoric, we should not lose sight of the fact that if well carried out, he considered paternalistic imperialism not only as justified, but also as desirable.

In his opening speech during the impeachment, Burke takes the concept of Britain's paternalistic responsibility to her Indian subjects as the keynote. Earlier on, in his defence of the East India Bill, Burke had already stated that "it is our protection that destroys India" (1963: 376). He accused England of abdicating her responsibilities in India:

Every other conqueror of every other description has left some monument either of state or of beneficence behind him. Were we to be driven out of India today, nothing would remain to tell that it had been possessed during the
inglorious period of our domination by anything better than
the orang-outang [sic] or the tiger.

(Burke 1963:377)

Amidst any amount of rhetoric Burke still makes the commercial basis of
Britain's imperial enterprise very clear. He refers to the East India Company as "a state in
the guise of a merchant" (1963: 394)—notably, not the other way around. In the Ninth
Report, he had gone so far as to state that "If it can be proved that the Company have
acted wisely, prudently and frugally as merchants, I shall pass by the whole mass of their
enormities as statesmen" (1963: 380). He proceeds to demonstrate at length that not even
as merchants have the East India Company acted in a successful or commendable
fashion.

Very importantly, Burke also firmly opposes the concept of Oriental despotism,
on which much of Hastings' defence was based and which indeed had sustained many
past and future appropriations of India:

He [Hastings] pleads that he did govern on arbitrary and
despotic, and as he supposes, Oriental principles, he lays it
down as a rule that despotism is the genuine constitution of
India. But nothing is more false than that despotism is the
real constitution of any country in Asia... It is certainly not
true of any Mohammedan constitution.... That the people
of Asia have no laws, rights or liberty is a doctrine that
wickedly is sought to be here disseminated through this
country. But I again assert that every Mohammedan
government is by its principles a government of

(Burke 1963: 396-99)

This was a proposition of singular importance, considering that one of the most
fixed stereotypes with regard to the East was that of Oriental Despotism. Indological
studies join hands with Conservatism here, as Burke refers to his personal study of the
Koran and texts of Mohammedan jurisprudence (translated by Indologist scholars) as the
basis for his arguments. Burke opposes this knowledge as a corrective to Hastings' "man-
on-the-spot" arguments.

After he has disproved, to his own satisfaction, the truth-value claims of a theory
of Oriental despotism, Burke proceeds to make his pleas for India, based on a concept of
universal, "natural" laws, principles and values. An inherent invalidity of arbitrary power and the fundamental nature of value based laws were the cardinal tenets of Burke's argument. In general and all encompassing terms, he asserts that Hastings' claims to arbitrary power were null and void. From this perspective, Burke also takes strong exception to what he describes as Hastings' concept of "geographical morality". The defence for Hastings had indicated that actions in Asia do not always bear the same meanings that they would bear in Europe. Burke repudiates this argument forcefully:

My Lords, we positively deny that principle.... The laws of morality are the same everywhere and there is no action ... of extortion, of peculation, of bribery and of oppression in England, that it is not an act of bribery, extortion, peculation and oppression in Europe, Asia, Africa and all the world over.

(Burke 1963: 395-96)

Burke insists upon the achievements of Indian Culture and the significance of the laws they had codified at a time when Britons were unlettered and uncivilised. He shows the courage of his convictions by declaring that far from being "inferior beings" the Indians were as much, if not more, sensitive, refined, as worthy of respect, as the English gentry. He proceeds to illustrate this comparison by asserting that the "situation in which an English citizen of Mr. Hastings' description should domineer over the vizier of the Mughal Emperor and give the law to the first persons in his dominions" was as unthinkable as "the Lords of England having their property seized by a delegate from Lucknow and their pedigree being tried by any court of Adawlet in Hindostan" (1963: 413).

Such a comparison between Indian and British gentry, institutions and customs which insisted on their essential equality is indeed commendable. If on occasion, Burke does refer to the "native rabble," we should perhaps place more emphasis on the second word and regard it as but a further extension of his Conservatism which insisted on traditional rights and entrenched privileges. At least towards a native elite, towards the "better class of natives, Burke was liberally disposed in his avowed stance. He deserves
full credit for openly asserting that Indians were not to be treated as some strange species, but were equal members of the human race with undeniable rights and privileges.

Such then is the generally accepted picture of Burke in relation to Indian affairs—the Conservative defender of established traditions, the liberal humanist spokesman of the rights of a racial Other and the staunch opponent of corruption and oppression. There is a great deal of factual evidence for this picture, but it is not a complete portrayal, nor does it tell the whole truth. Several aspects of Burke's (admittedly powerful) rhetoric have been overlooked or bypassed in constructing such a portrait. Nor do these aspects belong to a class which demand a great deal of textual excavation to be brought out. They exist side by side with Burke's well known and oft quoted statements, within the same speeches and writings. If we regard the generally accepted version of Burke as a coherent text, these aspects appear as the gaps in that text—and, ironically, they provide the space required for the rhetorical maneuvering needed to make the overt portrayal practicable.

Primarily, these "gaps" consist of certain essentialisations of India and Indians, which certainly merit the appellation of ethnocentric if not racist. They are all the more significant inasmuch as they are allowed to enter the discourse, even though their effect on a surface level is to reduce the force and validity of the central argument. Of secondary importance is a certain "Anxiety of Empire" (to borrow Nigel Leask's phrase) in Burke, a fear that the Indian connection would shatter the fabric of British society. This aspect is here examined first, before the more complex area of Burke's stereotypings of India is analysed.

In many parts of Burke's writings, we can trace manifestations of a fear that corruption, disease and "filth" (all somehow associated with India) would be let loose on Britain's shores resulting in anarchy and chaos. As an ardent Conservative, nothing could be more repugnant to Burke than the idea of the corrupt *nouveaux riche* Englishmen from India eroding the traditional foundations of British society. This fear of empire in Burke has of course been noticed and studied before. What has not been much considered is the way in which a slippage in Burke's discourse laid the responsibility of India related British corruption not on the corrupt officials but on India itself—a classic instance of blaming the victim.
In his "Second Letter to Sir Hercules Languishe on the Catholic Question," Burke lists out the principles of Protestant Ascendancy in Ireland, Jacobinism being the worst (quoted in Carnall 1989: 58). In another letter written a year later, Indianism had advanced up the scale of infamy and replaced Jacobinism as the greatest evil. "Our government and our laws are beset by two different enemies which are sapping its foundations—Indianism and Jacobinism. Of these, I am sure, that the first is the hardest to deal with and the worst by far" (quoted in Carnall 1989: 59). By "Indianism" Burke obviously meant a corrupt and oppressive system of government in India, with Warren Hastings as the presiding evil genius and which was in imminent danger of spilling over into the sacred precincts of the British metropolis.

Interestingly, apart from a few central characters—of whom, Hastings was the prime example for Burke—who were inherently corrupt, Burke regarded the British administrators of India as more ignorant than evil intentioned.\(^1\) Significantly jeopardizing his own case against Hastings, Burke fervently argued that there was inborn corruption in India among the natives which automatically corrupted young and inexperienced administrators sent from Britain:

\[
\text{The banyan extorts, robs, plunders and then gives him [the British administrator] just what share of the spoil he pleases to ... while we are here boasting of the British power in the East, we are in perhaps more than half our service nothing but the inferior, miserable instruments of the tyranny which the lowest part of the natives of India exercise.}
\]

\[(1987: 134)\]

This note of "inscrutable Orientals" cleverly manipulating unsuspecting and well intentioned British officers for their own ends has been sounded in fiction often enough. But Burke here presents it as fact—the vivid description given by Burke of the blandishments of a Debi Singh whom Hastings was accused of favouring could have fitted perfectly into an Evangelical script intended to whip up missionary fervour against

---

\(^1\) I do not think that any man sent out to India is sent with an ill purpose or goes out with bad intentions. No, I think the young men who go there are fair and faithful representations of the people of the same age—uncorrupted, but corruptible from their age as we all are" (Burke 1963: 413-414).

Said points out that even this youth was not a matter of chance, but involved a policy decision that the rulers should be constantly seem as "vigorous, rational, ever youthful and alert" (1978: 42).
India. Debi Singh is described as the "great magician" who entices his British employers with the "torpid blandishments of Asia" and watches his chance to carry "points of shameful enormity" with the "duped young men, rather careless and inexperienced than intentionally corrupt" (Burke 1987: 178).

Many of those who heard Burke may have wondered what exactly Hastings was being accused of, when the natives themselves were so irredeemably corrupt and vicious. These inconsistencies may be explained away as rhetorical necessities, perhaps. That is, Burke extols Indians when he needs to condemn Hastings and degrades them when the intention is to condemn Hastings' native allies. But the overwhelming fear that the administration of India could prove self-destructive for Britain points to a dread in Burke of India itself as a terrifying and unknown entity, the Other, in fact, with which Britain was not equipped to cope.

In a lengthy passage, Burke sets forth his fear that the foundations of Britain's polity and society, indeed the very fibre of national character itself would end up being destroyed because of her Indian connection. At this point, India is not regarded sympathetically as a country which had to be protected as she was suffering the excesses of a corrupt administration, but as an active principle which in itself was the root cause of the corruption. The prosecution of Hastings is referred to as "a great censorial prosecution for the purpose of preserving the manners, characteristics and virtues of the people of England" (1987: 448). The British people, says Burke, are in danger of giving up their characteristic virtues to "become a nation of liars, concealers, forgers and dissemblers, in one word, a people of Banyans" [sic] (1987: 449). This paranoia reaches its apothesis when he claims that: "Today, the Commons of Great Britain prosecute the delinquents of India. Tomorrow, the delinquents of India may be the Commons of Great Britain" (1987: 450). Of course, a Conservative Burke has nothing bad to say about the Aristocracy, Indian or British. But his comments on the Banias and the rabble are scathing indeed.

Burke's professed empathy for the Indians becomes very suspect indeed, when we consider the fact that his worst fear was that Britons may turn into a "people of Banyans".
Surely it is not possible to display such ill concealed contempt for a people while totally subscribing to the rhetorical eulogies and sympathy simultaneously bestowed on them.

It now remains to examine certain fundamentally prejudiced generalisations of India and Indians which make their appearance in Burke's rhetoric on a reasonably regular basis. The fact that Indian accomplices are less easily detected than white men is attributed by Burke to this reason: "The Banyan escapes in the night of his complexion" (1987: I 36). The Hindus are referred to as "the aboriginal people of India who are the softest in their manners of any of the human race, approaching almost to feminine tenderness ... these people are of all nations the most unalliable [sic] to any other part of mankind (1987: I 43). The dark, feminine and unsociable Hindu is one of the most enduring stereotypes of Orientalism, and Burke's avowed liberality does not function as enough reason to gloss over the fact that he did subscribe to the stereotype.

Burke's long dissection of the "essential character of any Hindu Banyan" is astonishing in its all encompassing sweep. It can be compared with, in fact even identified with Macaulay's racist sneer at Hindus in general and Bengalis in particular. It is surprising that such an accomplished orator as Burke did not realize the weakening effect such damaging descriptions could have on his own case against Hastings. The description:

My Lords, a Gentoo Banyan is a little lower, a little more penurious, a little more exacting, a little more cunning and a little more money making than a Jew.... There is not a Jew that is so crafty, so much an usurer, so skillful to turn money to profit and so resolved not to give any money but for a profit as a Gentoo broker of the class I have mentioned.

(1987: II 393)

The Jew and the "Gentoo" are placed firmly within the pigeon holes created for them and there is no display of relativism or even tolerance to alleviate this effect.

Burke also enforces the concept of the never ending, never changing tenacity of "ancient" India. "The Indians held on in an uniform tenor for a duration commensurate to all the empires with which history has made us acquainted, and they still exist in a green old age, with all the reverence of antiquity and with all the passion they have against
novelty and change” (Burke 1987: II 47). It is particularly self-defeating to argue for the unchanging and unchangeable nature of India, when the whole of one’s argument is built up around the proposal that devastating changes have been brought about there. This is in fact an excellent illustration of the historicising and also simultaneously naturalising paradox on which the Orientalist archive seems to have precariously balanced itself.

In the course of Burke’s eloquence, distinctions are pointed out between the “essential” natures of “white men” and “natives”. It must be recorded to Burke’s credit that his essentialisations of his countrymen are by no means totally approving. However, that still does not validate statements on human nature couched in absolute terms, which admit of no exceptions:

The white men are loose and licentious, they are apt to have resentments and to be bold in revenging them. The black men are very secret and mysterious; they are not apt to have very quick resentments, they have not the same liberty and boldness of Europeans and they have fears too for themselves...

(1987: II 135)

This statement serves to establish the Britons and the Indians almost as polar opposites by nature, a situation which renders even understanding well nigh impossible. Even more startling is it to see Burke endorsing in advance the view Kipling was later to formulate about the meeting of the races. After all his pleading for equal and dignified treatment for the Indians, it is unexpected to find Burke suddenly asserting, with great eloquence that “never the twain shall meet.” He does not envisage, at this point even the exception provided by Kipling, or a benevolent ruler-ruled relationship or the tentative fellowship proposed by E. M. Forster, but insists that the only possible relation between these races was one based on money and money alone:

I do not suppose either generosity, friendship or even communication can exist between white men and black; no, their colours are not more averse than their characters and tempers ... It is a money dealing and a money dealing only that can exist between them. ... There is no friendship between these people, when black men give money to a white man, it is a bribe and when money is given to a black man, he is only a sharer in infamous profits.

(my emphasis; 1987: II 430)
Burke envisages a situation where friendship or fellowship are myths; and the racial gulf unbridgeable. He stands revealed as implicated in the "imperfect sympathy" he accuses the administrators of displaying towards India. Indeed, what understanding—except perhaps that of rhetoric or of so called "objective" treatises—is possible in relation to a people, with whom, despite a shared humanity, fellowship is not just difficult, but insistently impossible?

During the later speeches of the impeachment, Burke moves very far away from his early declaration that there were conditions under which a cessation of Empire should be contemplated. At this stage Burke clearly asserts the political principle of long possession conferring legitimacy. "There is a sacred veil to be drawn around the beginnings of all governments. Ours in India had an origin like those which time has sanctified by obscurity" (1987: II 60). We have indeed come full circle here, the imperial mission now has the legitimacy to continue.

It has been indicated in the previous chapter that in the final analysis, different strands of ideologies combined together to ensure that the Empire could continue. The emphasis here is not on the fact that the Conservative doctrine also contributed to Empire—that is now accepted without much contradiction. The aspect foregrounded is the internal inconsistency between what subscribers to the ideology—here represented by Burke—avowed that they were saying and what they actually said. And these inconsistencies, with hindsight show us a rhetorical weakening—albeit a paradoxical one as at the moment of use, they made the rhetoric possible.

The discourse of Conservatism in its fractured form may resemble Utilitarian or Reformist principles to some extent. But, as will be shown in the following chapter, the discourse of Utilitarianism itself was not free from these inconsistencies. The question therefore is not so much that of a resemblance or divergence between the various discourses, as that whether the separate strands were able to maintain logical coherence within themselves, and remain at least rhetorically moored to their acknowledged basic principles. As far as the case of philosophical Conservatism—represented by Burke, as related to India—is conceived, we may conclude that its tenets were more often than not
self contradictory and even mutually exclusive. What we see in Burke's speeches is an extremely complicated attempt to balance the conservative principle of respect for tradition anywhere, with tacit support for the imperial project and a covert conviction of European—at least of all "good" Europeans’—superiority. Of course, this intellectual balancing was very necessary—pure conservatism could not support empire and pure mercenary colonialism could not attack corruption. A perfect example of logical inconsistency, even incongruity, functioning for an emotional and practical advantage is to be seen at this juncture.

It remains to be seen if the discourse of Indological scholarship—which was one of the staunchest allies of Conservatism—was any more logical in its stances. The next section of this chapter examines this area, with special emphasis on the works of Sir William Jones—probably the Indologist par excellence. References are also made to other well known contemporary Indologists—Charles Wilkins, H.T. Colebroke and H.H. Wilson, as well as to "missionary Orientalists" like William Ward and Carey. The focus will be on how the Indologist discourse, obviously intended to know more about India, and if possible to improve its image, despite some success in these areas, in a way dug its own grave by narrowing the bounds of its subject and subjected itself to render service for the cause of Imperialism. Though the avowed link of most Indology was with Conservatism, it can be seen that Reformism and Utilitarianism were able to trace the gaps in its rhetoric and to co-opt these to their own purposes. None of this is intended to detract from the Herculean labour or immense scholarship of many Indologists. But as Jones himself admits "pure" scholarship (supposing that chimera to possess a fleeting existence) was impossible "among Europeans resident in India, where every individual is a man of business in the civil or military state" (Asiatic Researches: I i) (from now on referred to as AR in parenthetical references).
It is my ambition to know India better than any other European ever knew it.

--Sir William Jones

Born on 28th September 1746, William Jones had exhibited signs of an extraordinary capacity for linguistic and literary activity from an early age. At fifteen, he had published poems in Greek and he translated the Persian poet Hafiz into English verse at sixteen. In 1768, he translated the Persian History of Nadirshah and produced a Persian Grammar in 1771. Before he left England for India in 1783, Jones was already proficient in Arabic, Hebrew and Persian, he was "also a poet, a jurist, a polyhistor, a classicist and an indefatigable scholar" (Said 1978: 77).

The rise of Jones' fame as a linguist and Orientalist coincided with the extension of the East India Company's commercial activities in India into political and administrative ones. Jones, a lawyer by profession, represented an ideal combination of the legal expertise and linguistic competence required to cope with the increasing complexities of Indian administration. Not surprisingly, he was offered a judgeship in India and accepting it, arrived in Bengal in 1783.

There can be no doubt that Jones looked forward with a scholar's keen interest to his tenure in India. His memorandum entitled "The Objects of Enquiry during my Residence in Asia" (Jones 1976: I 97) consisting of sixteen items with regard to practically every branch of knowledge is a sufficient indication of this. However, we are not to suppose that a quixotic idealism bereft of practical considerations led Jones to India. Indeed he avows quite candidly that he must be "twenty years in England before I can save as much as in India, I might easily in five or six" (Jones 1976: I 33). An assessment of Jones' complex motives, ranging from the desire for knowledge, altruism and that for profit can be fairly constructed based on his letter (March 17, 1782) to Burke, where he expresses his eagerness to go to India, to mitigate the misery of Indians, to purchase oriental books and manuscripts and to earn enough to live independently in England (Jones 1976: 45).
The period when Jones arrived in India was remarkably appropriate for the evolution of Indological studies into a vigorous academic discipline. Raymond Schwab remarks that "the decisive period in Indian studies began with the arrival of English civil servants in Calcutta around 1780, who, supported by the Governor Warren Hastings began an extraordinary undertaking" (1984: 33). The demands of administration required a heightened awareness of India, the Governor was firmly traditionalist and opposed to Anglicisation and the Civil service included erudite linguists and scholars like Wilkins and Colebrooke. The stage was set for the crystallisation of individual discourses on India into an academic field. "Fact finding teams were now encouraged, which could provide conclusive results more quickly, than individual efforts, however talented" (Schwab 1984: 33). An initial step in this direction was taken with the organisation of the Asiatic Society in Bengal on January 15, 1784. Jones was the moving and sustaining spirit behind this undertaking, for which reason, and for his numerous individual research contributions, he has been called the "Father of Indology".

As it was resolved to conduct the Asiatic Society on the pattern of the Royal Society at London, of which the King was patron, the Governor-General Hastings and his Councillors were formally requested to accept the role of patrons. A favourable answer was returned in due course.

It is interesting to note the connections Jones, the founder of the Society had with both Hastings and his chief accuser, Burke. As Hastings "seemed, in his private station the first liberal promoter of useful knowledge in Bengal, and especially in Persian and Sanskrit literature" (AR: I v), he was requested to accept the title of President of the Asiatic Society. Hastings declined in a letter where he acknowledged the offer as an honour conferred on him. He also recommended Jones as the best President, as "the Gentleman whose genius formed the institution and is most capable of conducting it to the attainment of the great and splendid functions of the foundation" (AR: I vi). In addition to these initial contacts, Hastings maintained a close relationship with the Society, and with Indological studies, by sending interesting information when it came his way and by writing the Preface for Wilkins' translation of the Bhagvat Geetha.
With Burke, Jones had maintained a friendly relationship in England and Burke had assisted Jones in his thwarted attempt to enter Parliament. Even before he had set foot in India, Jones was recognized as a high authority on that country and Burke inviting him to discuss the Bengal Bill, wrote in 1782: "The natives of the East, to whose literature you have done so much justice are particularly under your protection for their rights" (quoted in Mukherjee 1987: 45). As far as an interest in the traditions of India and their preservation are concerned we are able to trace similarities between Burke and Hastings—though Hastings was the better informed and Burke the more passionate.

In the first four volumes of the * Asiatic Researches* (the official organ of the Asiatic Society, which started publication in 1788) the vast majority of articles consist of Jones famous Anniversary Discourses and other essays. The widely varying interest indicated by the topics considered in these works show the extreme catholicity of Jones' taste. As Schwab remarks: "Jones was interested in everything, uncovering and compiling information in many fields. Indian chronology, literature, music, fauna and flora. He discovered and guided others to the summits of poetry and philosophy, though the study of local law, alone seemed to him entirely serious" (1984: 36).

In his "Preliminary Discourse" delivered to the Society, Jones expressed his great delight in finding himself among so vast an *unexplored* field as "Asia, which has ever been esteemed the nurse of sciences, the inventress of delightful and useful arts, the scene of glorious actions, fertile in the productions of human genius, abounding in natural wonders, and infinitely diversified in the forms of religion and government in the laws, manners, customs and languages as well as in the features and complexions of men" (AR: I vi). The scholar's eagerness and curiosity to launch into this unexplored field and acquire knowledge is almost palpable. The question of whether "any number of learned natives are to be enrolled as members of the Society" is raised in this issue, but is left to be resolved after further discussions. After these introductory remarks, the discourse is concerned with the orthography of Asiatic words. Jones evolves a system for transliterating Sanskrit characters which has not fallen into disuse even today. In the "Second Anniversary Discourse" (AR: I 335-342) Asia is presented as a handmaid to a sovereign Europe, but it is nonetheless stressed that Asiatics should not be condemned, "from whose researches into nature, works of art and inventions of fancy, many valuable
hints may be derived for our own improvement and also advantage" (AR: I 336). A
general survey of Indian literature and Indian progress in the various sciences is
undertaken in this discourse.

The "Third Anniversary Discourse", titled "On the Hindus" and the next few
discourses deal with different people of Asia—the Hindus, the Chinese, Arabs and
Tartars etc. For present purposes (in relation to India) the discourse on the Hindus is the
most significant. Here, Jones pays a compliment to the structure of the Sanskrit language
"The Sanskrit, whatever be its antiquity, is of a wonderful structure, more perfect than the
Greek, more copious than the Latin and more exquisitely refined than either, yet ... no
philologist could examine them all three without believing them to have sprung from
some common source, which perhaps no longer exists" (AR: I 349).

This interest in establishing "common sources" is a primary concern of Jones.
This will be examined later in greater detail. He also puts forward the argument that the
Hindus were from early ages a "commercial people" no matter how sedentary they
appear at the present moment, and also quotes Greek writers to the effect that the
"Indians were the wisest of nations" (AR: I 353).

Three "inventions"—"the method of instructing through apologues, the decimal
scale and the game of chess”—are specifically laid to the Hindus' credit and Hindu
literature is also commended, with "their lighter poems" being "lively and elegant, their
epics, magnificent and sublime in the extreme" (AR: I 354). The general conclusion
drawn is that "nor can we reasonably doubt how degenerate and abased so ever the
Hindus may now appear, that in some early age they were splendid in arts and arms,
happy in government, wise in legislation and eminent in various knowledges" (AR I:
347). Much more remains to be said about this positing of a "Golden Age" but at present,
it is sufficient to remark that such a concession was made to the now "abased Hindu".

The Eleventh (and final) Anniversary Discourse (AR: IV 151-57) deals with "The
Philosophy of the Asiatics". Here Jones remarks that more of a successful research than
expected could be carried out in fragments of ancient Indian literature. He also expresses
a hope that Hindu philosophy may be made available through accepted translations since
"one correct version of any celebrated Hindu work would be of greater value than all the
dissertations or essays that could be composed on the same subject" (AR: IV 154). Jones discusses the doctrine of the Vedanta on the existence of matter and asserts that as a system based on purest devotion, "nothing could be further removed from impiety" (AR: IV 155). He adds that many of the moral principles found in the Gospels can be found in the Hindu scriptures also, and that even part of the Newtonian concepts can be found in the Vedas and the Sufi texts. The expression in Indian scriptures of an all powerful spirit which is addressed in "pious and sublime terms" is commended heartily through parallels with Western doctrines.

Apart from the Anniversary Discourses, Jones also published in the Asiatic Researches, essays, among others on Indian chronology, Gods, music, plants and mystical poetry. In the essay entitled "On the Gods of Greece, Italy and India" an attempt is made to draw parallels between deities worshipped in all three countries. Jones delves deep into mythology and fable to identify the members of the pantheons with each other, mainly based on similarity of names (sometimes forced) and one primary attribute in each case. He provides eloquent descriptions of Hindu divinities which were to have considerable circulation among his contemporary Romantic poets; Shelley being a prime example. While advancing parallels between the Gods, Jones leaves the question of influence undecided: "which was the original system and which the copy, I will not presume to decide .... neither the Asiatic nor the European system has any simplicity and both are so complex, not to say absurd; however, internalised with the beautiful and the sublime, that the honour, such as it is, of the invention cannot be allotted to either with tolerable certainty" (AR: I 229).

The Indian zodiac is credited with original development as not borrowed either from the Arabs or the Greeks (AR: II 228). The Hindu musical modes are analysed in detail in an essay which attempts a comparison between the tonal systems of Indian and Western music (AR: III 55-93). Jones' somewhat bowdlerized translation of the Gita Govinda is appended to an essay on the "Mystical Poetry of the Persians and the Hindus" (AR: III 165).

Apart from these works published in the Asiatic Researches; Jones' translation of Kalidasa's Shakuntala (Sacontala in Jones' version) and the Manu Smriti are of primary
significance. The translation of *Shakuntala* was published in 1789 and was reprinted five times between 1790 and 1807, while the *Laws of Manu* (also known as *The Institutes of Hindu Law*) was posthumously published in 1794 and was reprinted several times in London and Calcutta. Jones primarily considered himself as a legislator and he intended the translation of *Manu* to be his most important work. This work was a prominent landmark in the legal administration of British India. It made it clear to the West that Indians did have a code of law, which to some extent gave the lie to the absolutist theories of Oriental Despotism then being circulated. However, the work was not used as much as Jones had hoped and much practical significance it might have had was soon swept away in the rising tide of Anglicisation.

The effect of the *Shakuntala* was much more dramatic. Schwab refers to a 'Shakuntala era' (1984: 37) in the whole of Europe, especially in Germany following Georg Forster's immensely popular translation of Jones' work. It is interesting to note that (unlike Hastings in his preface to Wilkin's *Geetha*) Jones does not indulge in any special pleading for Indian literature. He admits in his Preface that his judgement was based on personal taste; but refers to Kalidasa as the "Shakespeare" of India and feels that the play can stand up to a judgement based on individual and intrinsic merit (1976: XII 369). Jones obviously appreciated the literary merit of the *Shakuntala* but also commended its "decorum" which he sees as the result of a highly complex and well developed civilization:

> Whatever the age when drama was first introduced in India, it was carried to great perfection in the first century before Christ when Vikramaditya gave his encouragement to poets, philosophers and mathematicians at a time when Britons were unlettered and unpolished as the army of Hanumant.

(1976: XII 368)

As has been noted earlier, this concept of a highly civilised India flourishing in its Golden Age when Britain was "yet in the woods" was introduced to great effect by Burke

---

2 Hastings wishes to "prescribe bounds for the latitude of criticism" and in estimating an Indian text excludes all rules drawn from European sources. He wants the allowance of "obscurity, absurdity, barbarous habits and perverted morality" (quoted in Gauri Viswanathan 1989: 121).
also. Schwab refers to the "double effect" of Shakuntala, whereby "Europe, thirsty for a golden age could fabricate the notion of a primitive India" and at the same time "the eighteenth century, with its fantastic taste for taste" could be sufficiently reassured by the classical graces of the *Shakuntala* (1984: 59-60).

The other works of Jones which deserve mention from an Indian perspective include his early poems "The Palace of Fortune" (the framework of which is clearly reflected in Shelley's *Queen Mab*) which is set in Tibet and has references to India. Jones also translated an *Upanishad* (the Isavasyam), Kalidasa's descriptive poem *Ritusamhara* (translated as "The Seasons") and wrote a story poem "The Enchanted Fruit" based on an episode from the *Mahabharatha*.

Also significant are Jones' "Charges to the Grand Jury of Calcutta" (6 in all) in his professional capacity as a Judge. In these, Jones usually expresses the idea that the Indians were to be ruled by their own laws; administered of course by British officials. "The British subjects should be governed by British laws and the natives indulged in their own prejudices" (1976: VIII 19) he says, and later on states that Britain is obliged to give the natives "personal security and every reasonable indulgence to their harmless prejudices, conciliate their affection and promote their industry so as to render our dominion over them a national benefit" (1976: VIII. 21).

Finally, special mention needs to be made of Jones' *Hindu Hymns* addressed to several Hindu deities, which make use of Indian terms, settings, myths and even philosophy. According to John Drew, it was a concern not just with Indian imagery, but with the mystical philosophy which pervades that imagery which encouraged Jones to write his Hymns to the Indian deities (Drew 1987: 55). It is possible that Jones did not finally regard himself as a poet and would be critical of attempts to regard his poetical output as among his significant contribution to Indology. His biographer, Lord Teignmouth, testifies to this when he quotes Jones to the effect that: "The Hymns on the Hindu mythology, the translated poems and even the highly influential *Shakuntala* were considered as the "lighter productions, elegant amusements of his leisure hours, of which it would be unbecoming to speak in a style of importance which he himself did not attach to them" (Jones 1976: x). However, as Schwab points out, Jones was as famous in
England for his original poetry as for his introduction of India" (Schwab 1976: 195). Contemporary poets read him both as a poet and an Orientalist as is revealed by the commentaries and foot notes to the works of Shelley, Southey and to a lesser extent, Byron. From this perspective we are justified in considering the _Hymns_ as worthy of examination.

Jones had a notion (rather misplaced as it turned out) that Indian imagery and specifically Hindu terms would serve to revitalise the arsenal of English poetic imagery. In the "Argument" prefixed to the "Hymn to Camadeo" Jones proudly claims that "He has at least twenty three names, most of which are introduced in the Hymn" (1976: XIII 236). It is not only the names of Hindu Gods but of the local flora also that Jones employs in this Hymn to create an exotic ambience:

Strong 'Champa' rich in _od'rous_ gold
Warm 'Amer' _mus'd_ in heavenly mould
Dry "Nagkeser" in silver smiling
Hot 'kiticum' our sense begwiling
And last to kindle fierce the scorching flame
Laveshift, which the Gods 'Bela' name.

(1976: XIII 238-239)

In the long argument prefixed to the "Two Hymns to Prakriti" Jones undertakes a study of the poetic art in India till Kalidasa, summarizes the _Kumara Sambhava_ on which these Hymns are based and explains at length the concept of the female divinity as martial power and fecundity in Hindu mythology (1976: XIII 242-49). The "Hymn to Indra" and the "Hymn to Lakshmi" incorporate many legends from the _Bhagavatha—_ those of Goverdhan, _Sudama_ and Kaliya for instance. Indian terms are heavily scattered throughout these poems. Quite probably this could have had an effect entirely opposite to that intended by the author. At any rate, the trend of using Indian words was not adopted to any great extent by later poets, not even by those who acknowledge a deep debt to Jones for their Indian material.

Indeed, John Drew bestows lavish praise on the "Hymn to Narayena" which he calls the "most successful of the Hymns" (1987: 58). It is interesting to note that Jones' greatest success in communicating Indian philosophy through verse comes in the
concluding lines of this one poem in which he divests himself as much as possible of external, exotic, "Indian" trappings, and sticks to general concepts:

Hence! Vanish from my sight:
Delusive pictures! Unsubstantial shows!
My soul absorb'd one only being knows
Of all perceptions one abundant source
Whence every object every moment flows
Suns hence derive their force
Hence planets learn their course;
But Suns and fading worlds I view no more
God only I perceive, God only I adore.

(1976: XIII 308-309)

Obviously, any study of Indology cannot afford to neglect William Jones. We also have his own testimony that his time in India was time well spent—in terms of benefits both for himself and for the natives:

Having nothing to fear from India and much to enjoy in it, I shall make a sacrifice whenever I leave it . . . I have twice as much money as I want and am conscious of doing very great and extensive good to many millions of native Indians who took up to me not as their judge only, but as their legislator.

(quoted in Mukherjee 1987: 11)

Also, despite his firm conviction that the Mosaic Code was the standard by which all History should be judged, Jones did demonstrate, more than most contemporaries, an ability to appreciate Indian mythology, at least as literature and on those (very few) occasions where he did feel that the Christian theology could be bettered he expresses his view clearly:

I am not a Hindu, but I hold the doctrine of the Hindus concerning a future state to be incomparably more rational, more pious and more likely to deter men from vice than horrid opinions inculcated by the Christians on punishment without end.

(quoted in Mukherjee 1987: 172)

Keeping in mind his undoubted erudition, painstaking nature and avowedly benign intentions, it is quite easy to conclude from the information so far considered that Jones' discourse with regard to India was one of unfragmented scholarship. That,
however, would not be a conclusion which gives a clear picture. It remains to be seen in the light of certain other aspects of Jones' work, whether his discourse was well put together or carried the seeds of its own disintegration.

A suitable starting point for this examination would be a letter dated February 27, 1786, that Jones wrote to Macpherson which almost reveals two distinct personalities—the man with a racial phobia as opposed to the scholarly Indologist.

> I was unable to pay my Munshi and my physician and was forced to borrow (for the first time in my life) and what was worse. I was forced to borrow from a black man and it was like touching a snake or the South American eel.

(my emphasis; 1976: II 79)

One does not expect such a crude statement from someone who had composed voluminous paeans to Indian culture; but the statement exists in black and white. In a way, this contradiction illustrates the rigidity of the mental barrier most Indologists exerted between the glories of "ancient India" and the contemporary India they actually had to live in.

S.N. Mukherjee comments that Jones exhibited the typical British dilemma of reconciling privately held liberal views with the public role of upholding the authoritarian British regime in India (1987: 4). After the earlier quoted comment, in a letter obviously originally intended to be private, a few doubts do arise about even "privately held liberal views". However, considering both liberalism and imperialism in the political sphere, Mukherjee's statement is of significance. After circulating an extremely controversial pamphlet upholding "liberty" in England, Jones wrote to Lord Ashburton on April 2, 1783 that:

> As to the doctrines in that tract, I shall certainly not preach them to the Indians who must and will be governed by absolute power.

(quoted in Mukherjee 1987: 7)

In yet another letter addressed to "a friend at the Bar" Jones writes:

> Millions in India are so wedded to their inveterate prejudices and habits that if liberty could be forced on them
by Britain, it would make them as miserable as the cruellest despotism.

(quoted in Mukherjee 1987: 8)

Such attitudes are to be found not only in letters, but also in his "public" works. In his "Tenth Anniversary Discourse"—"On Asiatic History: Civil and Natural," Jones writes:

In these Indian territories which providence has thrown into the arms of Great Britain, for their protection and welfare, the religion, manners and laws of the natives preclude even the idea of political freedom.

(my emphasis; AR: IV xiii)

The notion of Empire being providentially decreed for Britain, Britain's paternalistic responsibility and the natives' own situation "naturally" co-operating with imperialism—all these concepts are neatly integrated into the above statement. The implication of course, is that Britain would be only too willing to "give" liberty if possible, but since that option is precluded, she may as well derive what benefit she can from existing conditions.

Ancient India may have been glorious and cultured, as Jones himself has emphasised. But, he also asserts in unequivocal terms that "Oriental Despotism" had rendered the least progress totally impossible.

He [any European observer] could not but remark the constant effect of despotism in benumbing and debasing all those faculties which distinguish men from the herd that grazes, and to that cause, impute the decided inferiority of most Asiatic nations to those in Europe, who are blest with happier governments.

(AR: IV xx)

The stereotype of "Oriental Despotism" is employed here, not as a mere theoretical statement, but as a practical aid and acceptable justification for British profit. Immediately after commenting on the "fact" of Oriental Despotism, and the obstacle it poses to liberty, Jones adds:

Our country derives essential benefit from the diligence of a placid and submissive people who multiply with such rapidity even after the ravages of famine.
One gets the feeling that certain zoological specimens are under discussion rather than human beings. The "placidity" and the patient nature of the Indian, their unchecked (and in this instance, useful) fecundity are the Orientalist stereotypes are present in strength. They contribute to the clear statement that Empire can, should and would continue.

"Taste" is distributed on a geographical basis as can be seen in Jones' remark that "we may decide on the whole that reason and taste are the general prerogatives of European minds, while the Asiatics have soared to greater heights in the sphere of imagination" (1976: III 16-17). And if this appears merely a neutral statement of perceived fact, it would be as well to bear in mind the association of rationality with scientific progress and taste with correctness. Imagination, despite the 'Romantic' praise showered on it, was not reckoned as a very helpful attribute in politics or government which decided the trends of imperialism. Political freedom precluded in India, rationality and taste both European prerogatives—it is possible that at an idea level Jones was indulging in the "geographical morality" Burke accused Hastings of practicing. At any rate, despite his undoubted scholarship and liberal orientation in British politics, Jones is not in any doubt about which emerges the victor in any comparison of primary value between Asia and Europe:

whoever travels in Asia especially if he be conversant with the literature of the countries through which he passes, must naturally remark the superiority of European talents.

(my emphasis; AR: I 336)

Rationality and taste have already been granted in superior measure to Europe. Now that literature—the one field where imagination could count as prominent has also been placed there, India is left with very little indeed.

Jones frequently asserts that his only concern, even in religious matters is with the "truth". So, it is very convenient indeed, that the "truth" which all his research invariably uncovers tends to confirm Christian Revelation. In the "Tenth Anniversary Discourse" Jones roundly declares:
We cannot surely deem it an inconsiderable advantage that all our historical researches have confirmed the Mosaic accounts of the primitive world, and our testimony on that subject ought to have the greater weight, because, if the result of our observations had been totally different, we should nevertheless have published them, not indeed with equal pleasure, but with equal confidence, for truth is mighty and whatever be its consequences, must always prevail.

(AR: IV: xiii)

This eloquent avowal presupposes an even handed method of investigating which unfortunately has proved to be a chimera. The claims of Christian Revelation are reiterated, while the opposing system is subjected to analysis, mensuration, querying and speculation. The very possibility of the supernatural or even of the extraordinary is ruled out, in the discussion of the Indian system while it is accepted in relation to Christian accounts.

If we remove the difficulty by admitting miracles, we must cease to reason and may as well believe at once whatever the Brahmans choose to tell us.

(AR: II 93)

Attempts to disprove the accuracy of Hindu chronology occupy a great deal of Jones' attention. A major part of an essay on chronology is devoted to mathematical speculation (as any pronouncement on pre-historical periods must necessarily be) to show that the “Cal-Yug” could not have started as early as the Brahmans said it did. The underlying purpose is clearly to make Hindu myths conform—in some way, through some Procrustean process if necessary—to Old Testament accounts. In the same breath as it were, Jones asserts that "myths are absurd in civil history" and supports as "fact" the Biblical account of the flood.

Yet another concern of Jones, which practically amounts to an obsession, is to draw parallels between Indian and European "pagan" cultures as well as with Biblical entities. Parallels drawn between Bali/Babel and Hiranyakashipu/Nimrod exemplify the latter tendency, while analogies between Rama/Dionysous and Hanuman's army/Satyrs
illustrate the former. Adi Manu (Adim) is supposed to be derived from Adam (and Manu himself from Noah) while the reverse possibility is never even taken into consideration.

In the "Third Anniversary Discourse" Jones insists that "we now live among the adorers of those Gods, those very deities who were worshipped under different names in Old Greece and Italy and among the professors of those philosophical tenets which the Ionic and Attican writers had illustrated with all the beauties of their melodious tongue" (AR: I 350). We can observe an Aryanisation/Europeanisation of India going on beneath this discourse. The intention is by no means a simple Universalism; since contemporary India is excluded from the discussion. The discourse self contradictorily stresses both the unbroken and unchanging tradition of India" and the vast gulf between "the degenerate and abased" contemporary Hindus and their ancestors who flourished in some distant golden age (AR: I 347).

The attempt was to incorporate Indian culture also into British heritage, by tracing it back to a Greek original, and also by finding Biblical roots for the myths. This would naturally serve as a meta-justification of imperialism since Britain would only be reclaiming a part of her own heritage. As Romila Thapar remarks ancient Indian civilisation was perceived less as the Asiatic roots of a modern European civilisation than "almost as a lost ring of European culture" (1968: 319). This enabled ancient India to function as a sort of Utopia, which through Jones himself would help to invigorate European culture.

In addition, the exclusion of contemporary India from the discourse enabled the Indologists to present as their “gift”—the gift of history—the knowledge of India's greatness to Indians themselves. Imperialism was doubly justified, because in the first instance, the imperialists were only reclaiming their own past and in the second the natives had lost touch with their own roots which could be bestowed on them only by the European researcher/administrator. Drawing a veil over the history of India between the Vedic Age and the Age of Imperialism, the Indologists propagated "a teleology that sought to erase History" (Tharu and Lalitha 1991: 145). As Jenny Sharpe remarks "In the Historical example of India, sympathy and identity are equally constitutive of Orientalist
discourse as hostility and alterity” (1993: 38). The East does not have to be the Other to be subjugated; exaggerated attempts to make it the Same can be equally responsible for colonialism and imperial aggression.

Jones, indeed makes no secret of the fact that he was primarily an administrator employed by the Company and that he expected his researches to benefit his employers and his country in clear economic terms. In the Second Anniversary Discourse, he urges the study of Indian history and resources because

We have a near interest in knowing all former modes of ruling these inestimable provinces on the prosperity of which so much of our national welfare and individual benefit seems to depend ... the natural productions of these territories, especially in the vegetable and mineral systems are momentous objects of research to not only an imperial but which is a character of equal dignity, a commercial people.

(original emphasis; AR: I 337)

The same concept is urged in the preface to the translation of the Manusmriti. Tolerance for Indian laws is urged; not because they possess any intrinsic merit, but because they enable the best form of peaceful government which could contribute most to the political and economic profit of Britain:

Whatever opinion may be formed of Manu and his laws in a country happily enlightened by sound philosophy and the only true revelation, it must be remembered that these laws are actually revered as the word of the Most High by nations of the greatest importance to the political and commercial interests of Europe and particularly by many millions of Hindu subjects, whose well directed industry would add largely to the wealth of Britain.

(my emphasis; 1976: VIII 89-90)

This motif of "being useful to Britain" is not restricted to legal or historical study alone but even to mythology, fable and poetry; as can be seen in the preface to the "Hymn to Lakshmi":
We may be inclined perhaps to think that the wild fables of idolaters are not worth knowing and that we may be satisfied with misspending our time in learning the Pagan theology of Old Greece and Rome, but we must consider, that the allegories contained in the "Hymn to Lakshmi" constitute, at this moment the prevailing religion of a most extensive and celebrated Empire and are devoutly believed by many millions whose industry adds to the lusture of Great Britain and whose manners are so interwoven with their religious opinions, who nearly affect all Europeans who reside among them.

(1976: XIII. 290)

On the whole, Jones' scholarship contributed immensely and evidently intentionally to letting Britain "know" more about India, ostensibly so that her rule could be rendered "better"—in effect stronger and securer.

The concept of furthering Empire, to Britain's undoubted profit, but avowedly to the greater benefit of the natives themselves is seen even in Jones original poetic compositions, the Hindu Hymns. The "Hymn to Surya" contains a very self assured portrait of the poet as the western scholar who retrieves and purifies the linguistic and ethical treasures of Ancient India, which the degenerate contemporary natives had "lost". Jones, in this Hymn requests the Sun to answer those who enquire about the poet's identity:

Say "From the bosom of yon silver isle
Where skies more softly smile
He came, and lisping our celestial tongue
Though not from Brahma sprung
Draws Orient knowledge from its foundations pure
Through Caves obstructed long and paths too long obscure.

(1976: XIII. 286)

The "Hymn to Lakshmi" contains an obtruding reference to the glory and benevolence of the Empire:

Oh! Bid the patient Hindu rise and live.
Now stretch'd o'er ocean's vast from happier isles
He sees the wand of Empire, not the rod.
So shall their victors; mild with virtuous pride
To many a cherish'd, grateful race endear'd
With tempered love be feared.

(1976: XIII. 98-99)

This idea is carried even further in the "Hymn to Lakshmi". The argument describes the Hymn as "feigned to have been the work of a Brahmin in an early antiquity, who by a prophetic spirit, discerns the toleration, and equity of the British Government, and concludes with a prayer for its peaceful duration under good laws well administered" (1976: XIII 322). The Hymn concludes:

Nor frown, dread Goddess on a peerless race
With liberal heart and martial rage
Wafted from colder isles remote
As they preserve our laws and bid our terror cease,
So be their darling laws preserved in wealth,
in joy, in peace

(my emphasis; 1976: XIII. 333)

By this anachronistic master stroke, a representative of ancient India itself is brought on stage to declare the glory of Empire to his own descendents. It is the Indian's own law which the British administer, but it is the British administrator who puts an end to Indian "terror". Even in Jones' more "literary" productions therefore, we can see an articulation of a theory of establishment and preservation of Empire—and moreover one where the interests of the natives were made to appear identical with those of the imperialists. As Edward Said remarks in Orientalism Jones closed down large vistas "clarifying, tabulating, comparing" (1978: 77). There is no attempt here to detract from Jones' scholarly achievements or from his contributions to "knowledge" about India, but the more that knowledge increased, the more domesticated, and more governable did India become. Knowledge in this imperial context functioned as a tool of Government. Indologist scholarship exemplified by Jones "not only described India as something that was in need of good government, but also restructured it as something that was governable" (my emphasis; Tharu and Lalitha 1991: 50).
At this point, some attention must be paid to works of a few other prominent Indologist scholars to illustrate their similarities or otherwise in connection with the analysis conducted here on Jones' works. It has to be kept in mind that many like Wilkins, Colebrooke and Hayman, who followed Jones' legacy of scholarship and the group exemplified by William Ward, Carey and Marshman who openly used whatever their research unearthed to launch polemics against India, both figure under the title of "Indologists".

William Ward was shocked by the "idolatry and heathenish" practices he saw in India and devoted his two volume *History* to combating and decrying these practices. One of his blatant chapter headings speaks for itself—"Brahminical Fraud Detected"—and this is a good example of the general tenor of his works. Ward's scholarship was questioned today by scholars like Colebrooke; but his picture of India in desperate need of reform which necessitated Empire was as much a part of Indological research/discourse as the more scholarly works of Jones or Wilkins. Also, while the clergyman Ward is immensely worried about the souls of the Hindus and keen on their mental and moral improvement," he does not forget to repeat Jones' argument that such steps would be greatly to Britain's interest:

> But let Hindosthan receive that higher civilisation she needs, that cultivation of which she is capable; let European literature be transfused into all her languages, and then the ocean from the parts of Britain to India will be covered by our merchant vessels.

*(1817: II 73)*

Charles Wilkins' contribution to the *Asiatic Researches* are mainly translations; his major achievement of course, was the translation of the *Bhagavat Geetha*. Wilkins, in fact, seems to make considerable efforts to keep his pieces "descriptive" and in a similar way, Colebrooke attempts to "set forth without comment" *(1976: 76)* his descriptions of the ceremonies, philosophies and literature of the Hindus. However, it needs to be emphasized, that given its immense evocative and creative power, description can no
longer be considered a value neutral activity. Even in his elaborate accounts, very often commendatory of Hindu philosophy, Colebrooke reinforces the stereotypes of the "apathetic" and "secretive" Hindus (1976: 258). Classifications such as "absurd exaggerations", "fanatical work", "unmeaning work" and "indecent practices" are scattered through the body of his essays. Colebrooke also follows Jones' path in trying to identify the sources of Indian and Greek philosophy; a proceeding also seen in Horace Hayman Wilson's *Hindu Fiction* which represents Hindu stories as "being derived from the spurious Gospels" (1979: 76).

The work of Wilson and Colebrooke also indicate the tendency pointed out by Said in *Orientalism* where "the Orientalist is required to present the Orient by a series of representative fragments, fragments republished, explicated, annotated and surrounded by still more fragments" (1978: 128). The focus is on the "anthology, the chrestomathy, the tableau, the survey of general principles" (Said 1978: 125) which textualise the orient and offer it up to Western scholars and the administrators. The Indologists stood between India and the West, but their role was effaced and what they presented was accepted as India. When the *presentation* encouraged imperialism, the interpretation was that *India* encouraged, in fact, demanded imperialism.

Only at one point does William Jones fleetingly consider the possibility that Empire need not be an unmixed blessing. Interestingly, even this is from Britain's perspective; (India's welfare being inextricably linked with Empire) and is an expression of what Nigel Leask has called an "Anxiety of Empire". In his formal "Charge to the Grand Jury" delivered on June 9, 1792, Jones worries about British officials returning to Britain with a contempt for British institutions, inculcated by Indian conceptions and remarks:

If Asia corrupts Britons to not care for British laws; later ages may comment with cause: "It had been happy for us if our dominion had never been established in Asia". (1976: VII 71)

---

3 This is clearly brought out by Aijaz Ahmed when he explains the ideological strategies located behind so called objective description. "Description is never cognitively or ideologically neutral, ... description has been central in the colonising discourses ... and through a monstrous machinery of description, these discourses were able to classify and also to ideologically master colonial subjects (1994: 99).
The Conservative discourse on India, and the Indological discourse closely connected to it were avowedly "pro-Indian". At least that was the major criticism levelled against them by Utilitarians, Reformers and Evangelists. However, I have attempted to demonstrate that these discourses could not be tied down under any clear "pro" or "anti" labels. They contributed in no small measure to the rhetoric of Empire and thereby stand self-exposed as fragmented entities which cannot claim any distinction of being either monolithic or seamless. Burke was the defender of India against abuses, Jones was the archetypal Indological scholar. Yet, despite their concern for India, Empire had to continue. So, India had to be presented as needing British rule. Any aspersions cast on India for this purpose, could be taken as altruistic and objective, since after all they were voiced by people concerned about India. In this fashion the fragmented rhetoric made existence possible with a reasonably clear conscience.

The next chapter attempts an analysis of the Utilitarian discourse on India (represented by James Mill) with the intention of seeing if that rhetoric of domination stands the test of logical coherence any better that the Conservative or Indological texts.