

Fozia Umar\* Misbah Umar\*\*

***Raison D'etre of the British Rule in India: Role of The Orientalist Scholarship***

Abstract

*The present paper explains the relationship of knowledge production and power with special reference to British government in India and patronization of orientalist scholarship. It explores the portrayal of Muslims and their rule in the orientalist texts and the implications of Orientalist's construction of 'the other' in the identity formation of Indians and in the polity of British India. It argues that the writings of British administrator cum historians like Elliot and Dowson were aimed at delegitimizing the Indian Muslim rulers who had preceded the British. The agenda driven knowledge production by the orientalist scholars also facilitated the imperial interests for providing a legitimacy of British rule in India.*

**Keyword:** Orientalism, *raison d'etre*, utilitarianism, Henry Miers Elliot and John Dowson.

Orientalist scholarship includes works and research of the orientalists about the orient or the East. Orientalism as a discourse gained eminence with the publication of *Orientalism* (1978) by Edward W. Said (1935-2003). In his book, Said delineated it as a Eurocentric approach to define the East through prejudiced European lens. The Orient (East) is explained in binary opposition to the Occident (West). The Orient is represented in orientalist scholarship as 'the other', which is weak, inferior, feminine, superstitious, tyrannical and impotent, quite opposite to the Occident which is strong, superior, masculine, rational, scientific and powerful.<sup>1</sup> This concept of 'othering' is created by Gayatri Spivak, who is a critic of Orientalism. The Orient is not just a geographical expression but a historiographical approach in which stereotypes about people of the East are constructed by the orientalists. Their particular focus is on criticizing the Muslims and Islam.

---

\* Dr. Fozia Umar, Lecturer, Department of History, Allama Iqbal Open University, Islamabad.

\*\* Dr. Misbah Umar, Assistant Professor, Department of History, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad.

The demise of Mughals and along with lack of cohesive political structure and absence of collective resistance against imperial hegemony left India relatively accessible to the British Imperial supremacy.<sup>2</sup> When the British imperialism in India started gaining roots, efforts were made by the colonizers to justify their presence and rule. Many efforts were made during rule of the Company and Crown to make the people of India feel obedient and inferior and create the *raison d'etre* of British rule. Apart from administration and legislation, Orientalist historians and administrator-cum-historians were one of many forces at work to create imperial legitimacy for the people of India as well as for the people at home. The portrayal of Indians and Indian Civilization in orientalist literature is primitive, cannibal and backward as opposed to the Western superiority and supremacy. The tool of writing and talking was one of the effective methods to assert British supremacy and distort the memory of Indian past.

The orientalist historians in general and the administrator-cum-historians in particular, feared the Muslims from whom they had seized the crown. It was central for them to criticize the past ones (Muslim rulers) and represent 'the other' (Muslims) as cruel and unjust. None of the orientalists accepted the status of Muslims as civilized and represented their 'self' as civilized nation with a moral burden of civilizing the other civilizations. They aimed at strengthening the imperial rule in India and desired to westernize the Indian society that suits their interest. The orientalist scholarship explains the relationship of knowledge production and power with special reference to British government, which patronized the orientalists to produce knowledge that suits their interests. This episteme of knowledge portrayed the Muslim rule as the mirror image of the enlightened West.

## **1. Orientalist Historiography in India: An Overview**

The orientalist historiography about India went through various phases from genesis to maturity as examined below.

### **1.1 Origin and Development of the Orientalist Historiography in India**

The British came to India as the traders but over the period of time they consolidated their position and started taking interest in the economic, religious, social and political affairs of India. The scholar-administrators of English East India Company were encouraged to learn oriental languages and patronage was given to those who were interested in the study of Indology.<sup>3</sup> Though the early Orientalists have contributed in Indology but their writings reflected that they were overwhelmed with the superiority of white race over the coloured ones. The later orientalists came up with the idea of white men's right to rule. They assumed the static character of Indian society.<sup>4</sup> Some of these Orientalist historians of British India were professionally trained historians while many of them were the administrator-cum-historians.

### **1.2 Major School of Thoughts in Orientalist Scholarship on India**

By the turn of the nineteenth century, following four tendencies had emerged;<sup>5</sup>

### **1.2.1 Oriental Romance:**

The Oriental Romanticists had recognised the civilized status of Indian society's cultural achievements and were eager for its preservation. They advocated policy of non-interference and non-intervention in Indian civilization.

### **1.2.2 Ethno-regional Romance**

The Ethno-regional Romanticists had emphasized on assortment of Indian cultures, defining India as a continent or subcontinent, populated by diverse communities and nations sharing similar civilization.

### **1.2.3 Utilitarianism**

This was the novel socio-political reformist school, examining the socio-political institutions through the notion of 'utility' of institutions for the society based on the 'principles of happiness'. They asserted that European civilization was superior than the Indian civilization and acknowledged White man's burden of civilizing the world.

### **1.2.4 Missionaries**

The supremacy of Christianity was realized by the Missionary School as in European Imperialism. They presented European empire-building as a divine proof of the virtue of Christianity and aimed at Christianizing the India.

The last of the two schools not only portrayed India as inferior and weak, but also influenced major trend in writing History and scheme of periodization for Indian history. At times the criterion of periodizing history is consciously or unconsciously politically driven.<sup>6</sup> In the case of Orientalist, it was also politically driven to reshape the memories of Indian according to their wishes. They divided the periodization of Indian History into Hindu Period, Muslim Period and British Period. William Jones's writings inculcated the notion of a Hindu and a Muslim India in Indian historiographical tradition.<sup>7</sup> Following that, in 1817, James Mills *The History of British India* which solidified the periodization into "Hindu, Mohammedan and British India".<sup>8</sup>

## **1.3 Renowned Orientalists on India**

Robert Orme ( 1728-1801), Francis Gladwin (1745-1812), William Jones (1746-1794), Henry Thomas Colebrooke (1765-1837), Charles Wilkins (1749-1836), James Mill (1773-1836), Mounstuart Elphinstone (1779-1859), Jame Grand Duff (1789-1858), James Tod (1782-1835), W.W. Hunter (1840-1900), V.A. Smith (1843-1920), Henry Miers Elliot (1808-1853) and John Dowson (1820-1881) are some of renowned orientalist who wrote about India.

## **1.4 Henry Miers Elliot and John Dowson**

The present paper attempts an appraisal of the works of Elliot and Dowson in the portrayal of the Indians with reference to the knowledge produced by the power and it's how this construction of the orient later on provided the justification of British rule in India.

#### **1.4.1 Elliot and Dowson: Biographical Sketches**

Sir Henry Miers Elliot (March 01, 1808-December 30, 1853) was an English public office holder and historian who spent twenty-six years in India with East India Company. <sup>9</sup> Under the Governor-General ships of Henry Harding, James Broun-Ramsay, and Lord Dalhousie he reached to the position of Foreign Secretary. Elliot arrived in India in October 1827 and lived in Calcutta at Fort William until May 1828 (and acquired proficiency in Persian and Arabic).<sup>10</sup> His academic capability in oriental languages and classics along with inculcated in him the interest in the Orient.<sup>11</sup> He held various important positions in India. His assignments in the revenue and foreign departments had a significant impact on the content of his Indian studies. His appointment helped him in accessing the significant official documents and many other sources related to Indian history and Indian administration. Professor John Dowson, a professor of Hindustani at the University College, London,<sup>12</sup> after the death of Elliot edited and arranged the *History of India as Told by its Own Historians*.

#### **1.4.2 Major works of Henry Mier Elliot on India**

Henry Elliot published the first volume of his *Supplement to the Glossary of Indian Terms* in 1846.<sup>13</sup> His primary historical book on India *Bibliographical Index to the Historians of Muhammedan India* was available in 1849.<sup>14</sup> His brief work on the Arabs in Sind *Appendix to the Arabs in Sind, Vol. III, Part I of the Historians of India* was released four years later. During 1866-77, John Dowson edited, organised, and finished the magnum work *History of India as Told by its Own Historians* (8 vols.), with which Elliot's name has since been synonymous.

### **2. *History of India as Told by its Own Historians*: Case Study of an Orientalist Work**

*History of India as Told by its Own Historians* is a representative example to understand the structure, the construction and the diffusion of "oriental" knowledge in mid-nineteenth century colonist rule. It is revealing of differentiated relation between "natives" and English officials as "subjects" of knowledge production.

#### **2.1 *History of India as Told by its Own Historians*: An Introduction**

This work covered Indian history from 1206 till the decline of the Mughals. It contains the select passages of Persian chronicles; these long passages were chosen by Elliot, keeping in mind to facilitate the later orientalist in reconstructing the Indian history. He fancied the study to be, '... useful depositories of knowledge from which the labour and diligence of succeeding scholars may extract materials

for the creation of a better and more solid structure'.<sup>15</sup> His work was highly regarded by British historians of the period and thereafter. According to H. G. Keene, Elliot & Dowson 'revolutionises our knowledge of the subject'.<sup>16</sup> Stanley Lane-Poole considered it as 'an invaluable and priceless source' which 'no modern historian of India can afford to neglect'.<sup>17</sup> The 'magnificent' effort, as writes Lane Poole, 'for the first time establishes the history of India during the Mohammedan period on sure and trustworthy foundations'.<sup>18</sup>

## 2.2 Portrayal of Muslim Rulers in Elliot and Dowson's Work

Elliot and Dowson's work served as the foundation for subsequent studies on Muslim history. The careful examination of this work reveals that that Elliot's choices were strongly prejudiced, with the goal of emphasising the 'achievements' and 'goodness' of British rule while depicting Muslims negatively. This resulted in an extremely skewed perspective of Muslim history, with the British seen as deliverers of the Indian people from Muslim oppression.<sup>19</sup> He himself claimed that it would 'make our native subjects more sensible of the immense advantages accruing to them under the mildness and equity of our rule'.<sup>20</sup>

### 2.2.1 Muslim Rule as Tyrannical

Elliot portrayed the Muslim rule in India as despotic and tyrannical. For him the 'truth' was that the 'common people' of India during Muslim rule were 'plunged into the lowest depths of wretchedness and despondency'.<sup>21</sup> He claims, Muslim rulers in India seldom considered their subjects' 'happiness and comfort', who were predominantly Hindus.<sup>22</sup> His portrayal of Muslim rule is despotic and 'injurious' for the non-Muslims. For Elliot and many of his contemporaries, India was primarily a Hindu region.<sup>23</sup>

Elliot depicted Muslim reign in mediaeval India in the darkest colours in his original Preface<sup>24</sup> to *History of India as Told by its Own Historian*. He portrayed Muslim rule as,

...fountains of justice are corrupted; that the state revenues are never collected without violence and outrage; that villages are burnt, and their inhabitants mutilated or sold into slavery; that the officials, so far from affording protection, are themselves the chief robbers and usurpers; that parasites and eunuchs revel in the spoil of plundered provinces; and that the poor find no redress against the oppressor's wrong and proud man's contumely.<sup>25</sup>

### 2.2.2 Imposition of Islamic Law on Hindus

The Orientalist historians assumed that the under the Muslim rule in India, the governing single law was *Shariah* and the Muslim rulers adopted the policy of intolerance and persecution towards the Hindus. Elliot states that because of their religious persecution at the hands of the Muslim Sultans, thousands of Hindus were killed; the majority of them were those who had disputes with the Muslims.<sup>26</sup> Elliot held that the contemporary historiographical works of the Delhi Sultanate were subjective and biased, and did not tell the truth.<sup>27</sup> However, this difficulty might have been resolved if the writings of the Hindu of the time were available,

but unfortunately they could not write under the rule of the Muslims.<sup>28</sup> Orientalist portrayed Muslim rule as 'rigid and narrow minded religious orthodoxy'.<sup>29</sup> Whereas the real picture is evident from Sultan Alauddin Khalji's belief that the politics had nothing to do with religion. The punishments inflicted on the offenders of the state, especially in the reigns of Sultan Balban (r. 1266–1287), Alauddun Khalji (r. 1296-1316) and Muhammad bin Tughluq (r. 1325–51) were un-Islamic.<sup>30</sup>

### **2.2.3 Maltreatment of the Hindu Subjects**

According to Elliot, Muslim monarchs oppressed Hindus and deprived them of religious liberty. They resorted to more discriminatory approach than simple bans on Hindu holidays; they mistreated Hindus vehemently. According to him,

...of general prohibitions against processions, worship, and ablutions, and of other intolerant measures, of idols mutilated, of temples razed, of forcible conversions and marriages, of proscriptions and confiscations, of murders and massacres, and of the sensuality and drunkenness of the tyrants who enjoined them...<sup>31</sup>.

He elucidates on the tyrannical character of Muslim governance in Sindh for the Hindus. 'To the Hindus', Elliot states, 'the public tribunals were only the means of extortion and forcible conversions, as they had proved themselves to be to the very latest period of Muhammadan domination in Sind'.<sup>32</sup> He outlines many limitations forced on their people by Muslim sovereigns and concludes that 'there was, and could be, no sympathy between the conquerors and the conquered'.<sup>33</sup> While the sources indicate that many taxes levied during Sultanate period were illegal and at the closing of the fourteenth century Sultan Firuz Tughluq abolished taxes.<sup>34</sup>

## **3. History of India as Told by its own Historians: A Critique**

### **3.1 Select Empirical Evidence in Translated Passages/Extracts**

K.A. Nizami's indepth investigation of the sources and ideology at work in the primary review of Indo-Muslim history by British colonial academia revealed that Muslim rule was purposely depicted as gloomy age by Elliot and John Dowson. Nizami not only concentrated on significant cultural and religious individuals who had been concealed by the colonial obsession with dynastic history, but he also presented critical standpoints on how India's British colonial overlords had twisted history.<sup>35</sup> The passages were carefully selected by Elliot, this cautious selection of passages helped him in glorifying the British image and he presented the blurred vision of history of India. However, for a balanced view of pre-British India, *malfuzat* serve as an alternate version of history, but Elliot ignored using them. According to K.M. Ashraf, the work of Elliot and Dowson contained beyond a catalogue of war and endless slaughter.

### **3.2 Literal Translation**

Another lens through which Said's concept of Orientalism may be studied is translation as a representation method. Translation as representation focuses on an

enquiry whether translation primarily is a portrayal of the other, or is it a more complex relationship where self-representation to the other is the focus? *The History of India, as Told by Its Own Historians* by Elliot and Dowson comprises of the translations of select extracts of medieval Persian chronicles. Therefore, is characterized by the biased selection of sources and select passages/paragraphs that helped in serving the purpose of the colonial rulers in India by portraying the Muslims as invaders and intolerant towards the Hindus. This multi-volume work is a classic example to study translation as a form of representation and analyze the relationship between the ruler and the ruled. Another limitation in the translated texts of Persian chronicles is that the translation is made too literal, either purposefully or due to lack of language comprehension. The metaphors, the hyperboles and figurative expressions of the original language were transferred into a foreign language, with a completely different genius and idiom. Numerous mistakes were committed due to defective reading of manuscripts, thus Professor Hodivala had to bring out a bulky volume to correct these errors.<sup>36</sup> Elliot and Dowson have also 'blurred one's historical perspective', according to Nizami.<sup>37</sup> Francis Robinson is of the view that Elliott and Dowson's work '... should always be read with Peter Hardy's *Historians of Medieval India* (Delhi, 1997) to hand'.<sup>38</sup>

### 3.3 India as a Mirror Image of the West

Elliot represented the British as the deliverers of 'the long-oppressed race' (Hindus) from 'the tyranny of its former masters', in contrast to the Muslims rulers as the 'oppressors'.<sup>39</sup> He contrasted 'the mild and equitable' rule of the British with the 'oppressive nature of the rule of their predecessors'. He asserted that under British rule the Indians enjoyed 'the highest degree of personal liberty, and many more personal privileges than were ever conceded to a conquered nation' than to the Muslim masters.<sup>40</sup> Elliot point out how 'expedient' it is that the 'darker side of Muslim rule 'should be often brought back to remembrance' to silent 'the inhabitants of modern India as well as our clamorous demagogues at home'. Elliot fantasised modernity and justice brought by the British as opposed to the backwardness and unjust of Muslim rule.

Elliot's claim may be demonstrated by contrasting a rosy picture of British successes with a gloomy one of Indo-Muslim rule. That Elliot's goal in contrasting the achievements of British and Muslim rulers of India was to assert the superiority of British rule. Elliot says,

It would be an interesting subject to compare the amount of revenue registered in Akbar's time and our own. If we collect an equal amount it may be argued that they were both cash rents. What should be done is to prove from old histories or travels where procurable that certain spots which are now sheets of cultivation were then and afterwards barren jungles... The result would be to prove that the land in cultivation on which our assessment is levied is three times as much as that cultivated in Akbar's time-though the amount collected may nearly be the same.<sup>41</sup>

### 3.4 Agenda driven Knowledge Production

K. M. Ashraf concluded in 1960 that the prologue was convincing evidence not only of Elliot's politically driven study, but also of his involvement in a British scheme to 'divide and rule' following post 1858 events.<sup>42</sup> Elliot, the then Foreign Secretary to the Government of India, was tasked with implementing imperialist policies to the subject of historical studies, writes K.M. Ashraf. Ashraf critiqued and asserts, 'the entry of foreign imperialism in the field of our politics and our cultural life, our historical studies ceased to be an 'intellectual gymnastic' and after 1857 were systematically subjected to wilful distortion'.<sup>43</sup>

Richard Eaton is of the view that modern-day Hindu nationalists have 'selectively used' Elliot and Dowson's 'selective translations' in their attempts to disparage pre-modern Muslim rulers. He writes,

... Elliot, keen to contrast what he understood as the justice and efficiency of British rule with the cruelty and despotism of the Muslim rulers who had preceded that rule, was anything but sympathetic to the 'Muhammadan' period of Indian history ... [He noted] the far greater benefits that Englishmen had brought to Indians in a mere half-century than Muslims had brought in five centuries ... Elliot's motives for delegitimizing the Indo-Muslim rulers who had preceded English rule are thus quite clear.<sup>44</sup>

Elliot's reasons for delegitimizing the Indo-Muslim sovereigns who preceded English authority are evident. The prominent historian Mohammad Habib observed the destructive impact that this interpretation of pre-modern Indian history had on following generations. He commented,

The peaceful Indian Mussalman, descended beyond doubt from Hindu ancestors, was dressed up in the garb of a foreign barbarian, as a breaker of temples, and an eater of beef, and declared to be a military colonist in the land where he had lived for about thirty or forty centuries....The result of it is seen in the communalistic atmosphere of India Today.<sup>45</sup>

The British imperialists translated Indian classics to get acquainted with the Indian subjects in order to establish hegemony and effective domination.<sup>46</sup> The translational strategies become an effective tool to legitimize colonizer's incursion in any colony. What and how is translated is a product of the colonizer's desire to represent, reject, or obliterate the colonial existence in order to retain political, economic, and ideological supremacy.<sup>47</sup> Translation, as a system of representation, provides another lens through which one may examine Edward Said's concept of Orientalism (colonizer/colonized relations) and observe the intricacies and implications that can arise when people reinforce and/or subvert these 'relations of power.'<sup>48</sup> Orientalism provides a useful way of conceptualizing translation and its place in colonial endeavours.<sup>49</sup> Gauri Viswanathan further contends that the colonial enterprise and translation essentially performed to feed certain portrayals of the British to their colonial subjects in India in order to construct the image of the compassionate and unprejudiced British governance.<sup>50</sup>

## Notes

---

<sup>1</sup> For details see, Edward W. Said. *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient* (London: Routledge, 1978).



<sup>2</sup>Nabanita Sengupta. "British Imperialism and the Politics of Translation: Texts from, and from Beyond, the Empire." *Translation Today*. Vol. 2 No. 1 (Mar. 2005): 185.

<sup>3</sup>E. Sreedharan. *A Textbook of Historiography: 500 BC to AD 2000* (New Delhi: Orient Longman, 2004), 388.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., 399.

<sup>5</sup>Muhammad Shafique, "British Historiography of Muslim India, 1800-57," (Unpublished PhD diss., Department of History, Bahauddin Zikariya University, Multan, 2005), 21-22.

<sup>6</sup>Tanvir Anjum. "Temporal Divides: A Critical Review of the Major Schemes of Periodization in Indian History." *Journal of Social Sciences*. Vol. I, No. 1(July 2004):34.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., 43.

<sup>8</sup>James Mill, *The History of British India*, ed. H. H. Wilson, 10 Vols., London, 1858 cited in Ibid.

<sup>9</sup>Tripta Wahi. "Henry Miers Elliot: A Reappraisal." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*. No. 1 (1990): 64-70.

<sup>10</sup>*Registers of the Hon. E.I. Co.'s Bengal Civil Servants, 1790-1842* (Calcutta, 1844), p. xliii cited in Ibid., 65.

<sup>11</sup>Peter Penner. "Elliot, Sir Henry Miers (1808–1853)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (London: Oxford University Press, 2006.

<sup>12</sup>Sreedharan, *A Textbook of Historiography*, 408.

<sup>13</sup>H. M. Elliot, and John Dowson. *The History of India as Told by its Own Historians: The Muhammadan Period*, vol. I. (London: Trubner & Co., 1867), xxix.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid.

<sup>15</sup>*Bibliographical Index*, Preface, pp. viii-ix quoted in Wahi, "Henry Miers Elliot," 71.

<sup>16</sup>*A Sketch of the History of India*, p. xviii cited in Ibid., 66.

<sup>17</sup>*Medieval India Under Mohammedan Rule (A.D. 712-1764,)* (London: T Fisher Unwin,1906), p. vi cited in Ibid., 66.

<sup>18</sup>Stanley Lane-Poole's article on H. M. Elliot in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, Vol. XVIII (1889), p. 258 cited in in Ibid., 66.

<sup>19</sup>H. M. Elliot and Dowson, *The History of India as Told by Its Own Historians*, 08 vols (London, 1867-77, reprinted Allahabad, 1972). For a convincing critique of this work see M. Habib's introduction to a reprint of *The History of India*, vol.2, reprinted in his collected works, K. A. Nizami (ed.), *Politics and Society of the Medieval Period*, vol.1 (Delhi, 1974).

<sup>20</sup>Elliot and Dowson, *The History of India*, xxii.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., xxi.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid.

<sup>23</sup>J. S. Grewal, *Muslim Rule in India: The Assessment of British Historians* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970), 171.

<sup>24</sup>This Preface, published in 1849, and reproduced in the first volume of Dowson's edition of Elliot's material, *The History of India as Told by its Own Historians*, published in 1867, has aroused much comment among twentieth century historians of medieval India. The preface was printed in 1867 under the title 'The original Preface' (namely to *The Bibliographical Index*) without it being specifically mentioned, however, that it was a reproduction of the preface written by Elliot in either 1847 or 1848 for his *Bibliographical Index*, cited in Wahi, "Henry Miers Elliot," 77.

<sup>25</sup>Elliot and Dowson, *The History of India*, xxx.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., xxi.

<sup>27</sup>Tehmina Noreen, "Orientalist Construction of the State in the 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Century India: An Appraisal," (M.Phil diss., Department of History, Quaid-i-Azam University Islamabad, 2010), 27.

<sup>28</sup>Elliot and Dowson, *The History of India*, xxi.

<sup>29</sup>J. E. Carpenter, *Theism in Medieval India* (London: Williams & Norgate, 1921), 235.

<sup>30</sup>Khalid Ahmad Nizami, *Salatin-i-Delhi kay Mazhabi Rujhanat* (Delhi: Nadwat-al-Musannifin, 1958), 60.

<sup>31</sup>Elliot and Dowson, *The History of India*, xxi.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., 478.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid., 478-79.

<sup>34</sup> Shams Siraj Afif, *Tarikh-i-Firuz Shahi*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn. Urdu trans. Muhammad Fida Ali Talib (Karachi:Nafees Academy, 1965), 257.

<sup>35</sup> For details see, Khaliq Ahmad Nizami, *Supplement to Elliot & Dowson's History of India* (vols. 2-3, Delhi: Idarah-i Adabiyat-i Delli, 1981).

<sup>36</sup> For details see, *Studies in Indo-Muslim History: A Critical Commentary on Elliot and Dowson's History of India as Told by its Own Historians* (reprinted: Lahore: Islamic Book Service, 1979).

<sup>37</sup> Elliot & Dowson, Vol. II, reprinted with (a) Introduction by Prof. M. Habib; (b) Commentary by the late Prof. S. H. Hodivala, (c) Supplement by Khaliq Ahmad Nizami (Aligarh, 1952), p. 764, cited in Wahi, "Henry Miers Elliot," 64.

<sup>38</sup> Francis Robinson. *Islam in South Asia: Oxford Bibliographies Online Research Guide* (London: Oxford University Press, 2010), 11.

<sup>39</sup> Elliot and Dowson, *The History of India*, xix.

<sup>40</sup> Elliot and Dowson, *The History of India*, xxi.

<sup>41</sup> Elliot Papers, MSS. Eur. F. 57, p. 110, IOL., quoted in Wahi, "Henry Miers Elliot," 82.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, 77.

<sup>43</sup> Proceedings of the Indian History Congress, Twenty-third Session (Aligarh, 1960) (Calcutta,1961), pp. 144-5, cited in *Ibid.*, 78.

<sup>44</sup> Richard M. Eaton, "Temple Desecration and Indo-Muslim States", in David Gilmartin and Bruce B. Lawrence., *Beyond Turk and Hindu: Rethinking Religious Identities in Islamicate South Asia* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2000), 246-47.

<sup>45</sup> For details see, K. A. Nizami, ed., *Politics and Society during the Early Medieval Period: Collected Works of Professor Mohammad Habib*, 2 vols. (New Delhi: People's Publishing House, 1974).

<sup>46</sup> Nabanita Sengupta, "British Imperialism and the Politics of Translation: Texts from, and from Beyond, the Empire," *Translation Today*. Vol. 2 No. 1 (Mar. 2005): 186.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, 192.

<sup>48</sup> Emily Larocque, "Translating Representations: Orientalism in the Colonial Indian Province of Bengal (1770s-1830s)," *Constellations* 3 /1(2012): 4.

<sup>49</sup> Larocque, "Translating Representations," 31.

<sup>50</sup> Gauri Viswanathan, "Currying Favor: The Politics of British Educational and Cultural Policy in India, 1813-1854," *Social Text* (Autumn 1988), 86.