THE HENRY SWEET SOCIETY

BULLETIN

Issue No. 46-47, November 2006

1 Contents

3 Editor's Note (Nicola McLelland)

5 Guest Editorial: Colonialism and Linguistic Thought (Rachael Gilmour)

ARTICLES

7 **Special Section: Colonialism and Linguistic Thought**

7 The bad habit: *Hobson-Jobson*: British Indian glossaries, and intimations of mortality (Javed Majeed)

23 Law, economics and cultural hegemony: the triumph of English and the loss of Irish in Ireland (Tony Crowley)

43 **General Section**

43 De l'importance de l'alphabet kabarde pour l'évolution de la phonologie (Elena Simonato)

51 Abstracts of Papers Presented at the 2006 Henry Sweet Society Colloquium

REVIEWS AND BOOK INFORMATION

65 Comenius' *Novissima linguarum methodus*, translated (Werner Hüllen)

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

67 Books & Pamphlets / Journals / Articles & Reviews (ed. David Cram)

NEWS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

70 The Henry Sweet Society for the History of Linguistic Ideas – Minutes from the AGM, Cambridge, 2005

72 The Henry Sweet Society for the History of Linguistic Ideas – Minutes from the AGM, Sheffield, 2006

74 Treasurer's Report, 2005

77 2006 Henry Sweet Society Colloquium Sheffield – Conference Report (Graham Pointon)

79 News of Conferences and Calls for Papers

87 Call for Submissions: The Third Vivien Law Prize in the History of Linguistic Ideas

89 News of Members

95 Style Sheet for the *Bulletin of the Henry Sweet Society for the History of Linguistic Ideas*

99 Reminder – Subscription renewals for 2007

EDITOR'S NOTE

This Bulletin must begin with an apology for its delayed publication. As you will see, this issue is in part a themed one (see Rachael Gilmour's guest editorial on Colonialism and Linguistic Thought below), and a decision was taken last year to produce a single double-issue, to allow more time for its preparation. Also early last year, our editor Dr Therese Lindström Tiedemann expressed her wish to hand on the Editorship. The Bulletin has been in the capable hands of Therese since the end of 2003, and in that time she has done much to streamline the submission and review of contributions and to professionalize the formatting according to a detailed style guide. Over the same period, Therese has also managed to complete her PhD, marry, have a daughter, and begin her academic career first in Uppsala, then in Groningen, where she has seen her teaching commitments increase over the past year or so. We congratulate Therese warmly on combining so many activities successfully, but her gain is our loss, as her commitments no longer permit her to carry on the Editorship of the Bulletin.

The handover of the Editorship has taken some time to settle, with the result that this Bulletin (whose production down to the last few details is still entirely the hard work of Therese) is only reaching you now. The good news, however, is that we plan to publish the next Bulletin in May 2007 as usual, so that the next issue will be following hard on the heels of this one. As the incoming editor, I am extremely grateful to Therese for the excellent state in which she has left matters, thus making my job a great deal easier. (Incidentally, I will in turn be handing over the role of Treasurer and Membership Secretary in due course to Rachael Gilmour).

Perhaps not surprisingly, given the long gap between Bulletins this time, there is a good deal of information in the News and Announcements section. There are several Conference announcements to which your attention is drawn. On a sombre note, we reflect on the lives of two highly dedicated and prominent scholars in the field of history of linguistics: Klaus Dutz and Peter Schmitter, both of whom died in 2006. Both had a long association with the Society and will be greatly missed, both personally and professionally. Finally, please note the call for submissions for the Vivien Law prize, open to current doctoral students or those who have completed a doctorate in the past five years – we look forward to receiving your submissions!

Dr Nicola McLelland, Nottingham

GUEST EDITORIAL

Colonialism and linguistic thought

In this, a special section of the special November double issue of the *Bulletin*, it is my pleasure to introduce two substantial essays addressing the relationship between colonialism (in both cases British colonialism) and linguistic thought. The first, by Javed Majeed, addresses developments in Anglo-Indian glossaries in the last years of the British East India Company. The second, by Tony Crowley, explores the history of linguistic ideas in Ireland under British rule, and the legal, economic, and cultural factors underlying the shift from Gaelic to English. Their inclusion in the *Bulletin* appears particularly timely in light of the invitation made by Peter Burke in the Lesley Sieffert Lecture at the HSS Colloquium in September to consider the interdisciplinary possibilities of our field. As those who were present will remember, Peter's lecture raised a great deal of interest and debate throughout the rest of the Colloquium, as to how to foster communication with (for example) historians, literary scholars, psychologists, anthropologists, or historians of science. In light of this discussion, the essays that follow represent, among other things, an insight into one particularly exciting and significant interdisciplinary intersection, between colonial studies and the history of linguistic thought.

Javed Majeed's article, an examination of *Hobson-Jobson* alongside other Anglo-Indian glossaries of the early-19th century, shows how this text can be read as a particularly revealing mode of self-definition or 'auto-ethnography' on the part of employees of the East India Company in its dying days. In so doing, this essay also sheds light on a corpus of linguistic representation developing apart from, although connected to, nineteenth-century metropolitan shifts in the production of glossaries and dictionaries. This essay forms part of an ongoing wider project, funded by the British Academy, and will undoubtedly be of great interest to many *Bulletin* readers. Among other things, the project examines the development of Anglo-Indian alongside Urdu glossaries in this period, and explores the ways in which both Indian and British glossary-writers deployed and wrangled with conventions of linguistic analysis coming from the European and Urdu traditions.

Tony Crowley's contribution, meanwhile, turns to the protracted struggle over English versus Gaelic in colonial Ireland. His essay, offering a detailed and ambitious historical view of the question, illuminates the way in which language politics and 'linguistic ideas' intersected with each other, serving as objects of ideological and personal struggle between linguists, legislators, nationalists, and ordinary speakers of the languages in question. This essay builds on Tony's long-standing research interest in language and colonialism in Ireland, most recently represented in *Wars of Words: The Politics of Language in Ireland 1537-2004* (Oxford University Press, 2005). While these two contributions, in their very different emphases, give a great sense of the diversity of work being done in the field, there are also important synergies between them; not least in the attention they pay to anxieties about acculturation and assimilation on the part of British colonizers, played out – as Crowley in particular emphasizes – most significantly in the field of language. More generally, both essays

serve as timely reminders of the impact of 'linguistic ideas' far beyond the academy, as well as of the need to situate debates about language within their historical, cultural, and political contexts.

Rachael Gilmour, London
Contact details: r.h.gilmour@qmul.ac.uk

"The bad habit": *Hobson-Jobson*, British Indian glossaries, and intimations of mortality

Javed Majeed
Queen Mary, University of London

1. Introduction[1]

This essay examines the Anglo-Indian glossary, *Hobson-Jobson* (1886), in relation to other important glossaries compiled by British officials and scholars in nineteenth-century India, namely T.T. Roberts' *An Indian Glossary* (1800), Charles Wilkins' *Glossary to the Fifth Report from the Select Committee appointed to enquire into the present State of the Affairs of the East India Company* (1813), and H.H. Wilson's *A Glossary of Judicial and Revenue Terms* (1855). On the basis of the differences between these glossaries and *Hobson-Jobson*, I argue that latter needs to be seen as an 'autoethnographic' text that expressed the defining anxieties of the British in India in general, and of a specific group of British officials in particular.

2. "The bad habit"

The four glossaries mentioned above share a common concern to explicate terms and phrases from Indian languages that had passed into the English language as used by the British in India. As such, these glossaries need to be distinguished from the development by the British during the 1770s to 1820s of a scholarly and pedagogical apparatus for learning Indian languages themselves. In the project to make the acquisition of a working knowledge of Indian languages possible for British officials, Indian languages were re-presented in European terms as dictionaries, translations, and manuals (Cohn, 1985: 282-99). In addition, the East India Company established institutions such as Fort William College in Calcutta in 1800, partly to formalise the teaching of these languages to British officials (Kopf, 1969: Chs. 5-6). My concern here, however, is not with this apparatus for learning Indian languages but with the glossaries of what might be called British-Indian English as it was used in India. These glossaries were necessitated by the processes of dialogue and exchange between English and Indian languages from the late eighteenth century onwards. By the time Roberts' *An Indian Glossary* appeared in 1800, this variant of English had become so well-established in India that he complained:

> When I perused a newspaper, that source of necessary information, wherein are frequently inserted very interesting accounts of various occurrences, which men

[1] I am grateful to the British Academy for appointing me to a two-year Research Leave fellowship which made the research for this paper possible.

> search for with avidity; or when I looked into works of the authors, who treated of the manners, customs, trade, culture, & c. of the people [of India], amongst whom it was my present lot to reside, my not understanding a number of the particular terms which were made use of, left me, when I had finished, as much uninformed as before I began" (Roberts, 1800: preface, no pagination).

In part, this linguistic situation arose because the East India Company sought to legitimise itself through indigenous idioms in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and, as an Indian power, it built upon the administrative and revenue systems of its Mughal predecessors. This included a reliance on the administrative terms and language of the Mughal empire, which was Persian (Bayly, 1988:14-16, 45-78; Cohn, 1985: 287). Persian continued to be used as the language of the courts in British territories in India until 1837, when English replaced it. Once English stabilised as the language of administration by the late 1830s, Persian terms were less evident in the East India Company Regulations, although they and terms from other Indian languages continued to have a presence (Majeed, 1992: 18-25). This is testified to by Wilson's *Glossary* of 1855, which refers to how the documents of the East India Company "from the earliest to the most recent dates, [have] been thickly studded with terms adopted from the vernacular languages of the country, and commonly inserted without any explanation of their purport" (Wilson, 1855: i).

Partly because of this lack of any gloss as to the meaning of distinctive terms in Company documents, both Wilson and Wilkins point to necessary gaps in their knowledge. The latter acknowledges that "Many words in this Glossary could not be traced to their origin; and a few occur in the Report and Appendix, which will not be found in the Glossary, because, neither their etymology, nor their technical application, could be satisfactorily explained" (Wilkins, 1813: iv). Hence the note of uncertainty in even those entries that represent key administrative or legal terms, such as "Amanut Dufter" (ibid.: 6). Wilson admits that not only might it be "difficult or impossible to discover exact equivalents for the native words in English", but the vagaries of the transliteration of Indian words into "an English dress" make it "always difficult, sometimes impossible, to identify them" (Wilson, 1855: ii, v-vi). These difficulties, however, are again suggestive of how well entrenched British Indian English had become; it is as if those who used it amongst themselves had a kind of 'native' competence in it, which obviated both the need to explain the terms which they habitually used with each other, and any desire to understand the roots of the words they were in the habit of employing on a daily basis. A sense of the density of this language and its self-referring character is conveyed by the glossaries, which are not always successful in translating terms into standard English. For example, Wilkins' explication for the term "Mocuddimy" [i.e, moqaddamī], reads: "What relates to a Mocuddim. The russoom or share of each Ryot's produce received by the Moccudim, an article of the neakdarry: also the nancar or allowance to village collectors or Mocuddims of such villages as pay rents immediately to the khalsa, being an article of the muscorat" (Wilkins, 1813: 29; for other examples of this kind, see the entries "Mofussil", "Muscoorat", "Muscoory", and "Nuzzeranah Moccurrery", ibid.: 29, 32-34).

The processes of interaction between English and Indian languages are also key to Henry Yule's and A.C. Burnell's *Hobson-Jobson: The Anglo-Indian Dictionary* (1886). In his Preface Yule refers to the Anglo-Indian "bad habit of interlarding English with Hindustani phrases", which, in part at least, the work attempts to explicate (Yule & Burnell, 1996: xx). He likens the glossary to "a double-columned edifice" (ibid.: 7), referring here to its joint authorship, as well as its double columns on each page, but the simile is also apt in indicating how the glossary requires both the source and target languages to hold its structure together. However, there are some general differences between *Hobson-Jobson* and the glossaries referred to above. In the 'Introductory Remarks' Yule mentions the preceding glossaries compiled by Roberts, Wilkins, and Wilson, as "being of a kind purely technical, intended to facilitate the comprehension of official documents by the explanation of terms used in the Revenue department, or in other branches of Indian administration". As Yule points out, *Hobson-Jobson* also contains a large number of these administrative terms (ibid.: xv-xvi). However, as we shall see below, many of these are explicated in a different way from the preceding glossaries, while *Hobson-Jobson* also contains administrative terms that are not derived from any interaction with Indian languages. These include 'Factor', 'Factory', 'Law Officer', 'Writer', 'Settlement', and 'Regulation', which although in common English use, had all acquired distinctive connotations in British India. None of these terms make an appearance in the preceding glossaries, which focus exclusively on words derived from Indian languages. Furthermore, *Hobson-Jobson* also gives additional, colloquial meanings for some of the administrative terms that the preceding glossaries contain. While all four glossaries include the terms 'Mufti' and 'Diwan', unlike the other glossaries, *Hobson-Jobson* glosses the first as also a slang phrase in the army, meaning plain clothes, and the second, amongst other things, as a collection of poems by a particular poet (ibid.: 593-4, 309-11). *Hobson-Jobson* also gives additional information about the socio-cultural life of Anglo-Indians under entries for administrative terms. Under "Mofussil", for example, the authors refer to a "clever, free-and-easy newspaper" called *The Mofussilite*, which was started at Meerut in 1845 (ibid.: 570). It is clear, then, that *Hobson-Jobson* aims to be a more comprehensive glossary of Anglo-Indian English, giving additional meanings and information for such terms. This is also reflected in its inclusion of slang terms, such as "Rum-Johnny", "Sammy", "Red-dog", "Summer Head" (under "Sombrero") and "Hobson-Jobson", to mention just a few. In some cases, under the entry for a term, its transformation into a colloquialism is also mentioned, as when under "Allahabad" the authors tell us how this place name became the "Isle o' bats" for English soldiers (ibid.: 773-4, 883, 758, 851, 419-20, 12-13).

Thus, *Hobson-Jobson* is a glossary not only of the official jargon of British India, but also of the wider spectrum of English used by the British there. Its attempt to be comprehensive is clear in its subtitle, "The Anglo-Indian dictionary", where the use of the word 'dictionary' is indicative of its ambitious scope in contrast to preceding glossaries. It does also have one dictionary-like feature that sets it apart from these glossaries; for each entry it gives citations from texts illustrating the usages of the word being explicated. These pretensions to the status of a dictionary suggest that as far as its authors are concerned, on one level at least, they see Anglo-Indian English as a language in its own right, rather than as a dialect only (however, see

below where I discuss the text's unstable self-image). Taking into account the references to the distinctive customs of Anglo-Indians, such as "Pig-Sticking", "White Jacket", and "Beer-drinking" (ibid.: 709-10, 969-70, 80), as well as distinctive aspects of its diet (see the entry for "Kedgeree", ibid.: 476-77), *Hobson-Jobson* can be read as the autoethnography of a group of people, located in a specific territory, with their own distinctive language, customs, diet, knowledge, and preoccupations. Above all, though, it is expressive of this group's defining anxieties and its cultural predicament in India.

3. The fear of assimilation

These anxieties centred on what British imperialist writers saw as the dangers of being 'assimilated' into India. This fear is clearly expressed when the ancient Roman Empire was contrasted with the British Empire (Majeed, 1999). Both James Bryce in *The ancient Roman empire and the British empire in India* (1914) and C.R. Lucas in *Greater Rome and Greater Britain* (1912) depicted the eventual extension of Roman citizenship to all imperial subjects as a process of 'assimilation' and 'fusion' of Roman and non-Roman groups. In contrast to this both authors emphasized that a similar process of assimilation was not possible in India. A 'fusion' of the conquering and conquered "seems to be forbidden by climate and by the disparity of character and of civilization, as well as by the antagonism of colour and religion" (Bryce, 1914: 68-9, 59-62; see also Lucas, 1912: 129-30).

Other influential writers also expressed these anxieties about the possible loss of identity in parts of the empire in the late nineteenth century. In *The Expansion of England* (1883), Seeley drew a distinction between India and the settler colonies of the British Empire, which focussed on the question of 'assimilation' and 'fusion'. He argued that the "colonial" empire fulfilled "fundamental conditions of stability", because it was held together by three ties, namely "community of race, community of religion, community of interest". This was in contrast to the "alien race and religion" of India. Hence the "Greater Britain" of the future would be based on the colonies, rather than the Indian empire, which unlike the colonies, "vastly increases our dangers and responsibilities" (Seeley, 1931: 15). While most British colonies offered "unbounded scope for new settlement" because they were "empty", in India "the English nation is but an imperceptible drop in the ocean of an Asiatic population" (ibid.: 54). The problem that India represents is that of "subject or rival nationalities" which cannot be "perfectly assimilated" and so remain a cause of weakness and danger (ibid.: 55).

This fear of assimilation was central to British self-perceptions in India. Kenneth Ballhatchet has pointed out in his classic study *Race, sex and class under the Raj* that 'the preservation of social distance [between British and Indians was] essential to the maintenance of structures of power and authority' in British India (Ballhatchet, 1980: vii). Unlike imperial elites elsewhere, the British official class in India never became a creolised elite. The almost universal expectation of the British in India was not to settle there but to return to Britain after completing their period of service (Marshall, 1993). It was for this reason that Eurasians were regarded by British

officialdom with such unease, as they threatened to bridge the gap between the ruling British elite and Indians (Ballhatchet, 1980: 4, 96-122). The category of 'race' was used to construct the defining differences between colonizer and colonized in British India, and it was also implicated in maintaining the distance between ruler and ruled upon which the preservation of imperial prestige and authority was seen to depend.

Hobson-Jobson expressed these defining anxieties about 'assimilation' and 'fusion'. On the whole, the glosses on the entries in *Hobson-Jobson* are lengthy and leisurely, in keeping with a work which was sometimes humorously playful (for example, see the entry for "The Benighted", Yule & Burnell, 1996: 86), and alive to the colourfulness of slang and its parodic twists (see the examples given above). At other points, the glossary is relaxingly open in foregoing "any attempt at comprehensive definition" (See the entry for "Cutcha", ibid.: 287). However, the entry under "Home" is startling in its brevity and clarity: "In Anglo-Indian and colonial speech this means England" (ibid.: 421). The terse finality here suggests a core component of self-belief that cannot be compromised, as well as a fear of the creolisation that might occur should this definition of "home" be given up. The unstable self-image of *Hobson-Jobson* might in part be related to this definition of "home". We have already seen that *Hobson-Jobson* refers to itself as a dictionary rather than a glossary. The editor of the second edition William Crooke, himself a British official, also refers to it as a dictionary in his preface (ibid.: xi). As I suggested above, this almost elevates British Indian English to the status of a language in its own right. This possible difference in matters of language from speakers at "home" is also indicated in some of the entries, for example "Afghan", where Yule refers to how the way "Afghanistan" is mispronounced in England is "painful to an Anglo-Indian ear" (ibid.: 7). Yet at other points, Yule refers to *Hobson-Jobson* as a "Glossary" of "Anglo-Indian argot" (ibid.: ix, x). It is as though the assumption of the mantle of a language rather than an argot smacks too much of a full linguistic separation from England.

For this reason, Yule is careful to tie the Anglo-Indian argot to common English and to forestall any clash with it. Thus, he makes special mention of the "interchange of communications" between himself and Murray, the editor of the "great English Dictionary", which accounts for "a few cases in which the passages cited in both works are the same" (ibid.: ix-x). Moreover, *Hobson-Jobson* is also preoccupied with the dangers of assimilation into India. Yule stresses that the glossary deals with "Oriental words" which have been "highly assimilated" to the "English vernacular" (ibid.: ix). This evades the reverse possibility, namely of English being assimilated into Indian languages. Such a reverse assimilation would, perhaps, be too much like 'going native'. This possibility is touched upon twice, but it is always couched in disparaging terms, as when "Pigeon English" is described as a "vile jargon", and "Butler-English" is glossed as the "singular dialect" of a socially inferior group, namely "native servants in the Madras Presidency" (ibid.: 709, 133-34). Yet even the assimilation of Oriental words into English has the perilous possibility of a reverse assimilation in disguise. Words "long since fully assimilated" might have "originated in adoption of an Indian word, or the modification of an Indian proper name", so that "long assimilation" does not guarantee complete incorporation. Yule also writes of how:

> Words of Indian origin have been insinuating themselves into English ever since the end of the reign of Elizabeth and the beginning of that of King James, when such terms as *calico*, *chintz*, and *gingham* had already effected a lodgement in English warehouses and shops, and were lying in wait for entrance into English literature. Such outlandish guests grew more frequent 120 years ago, when, soon after the middle of the last century, the numbers of Englishmen in the Indian services, civil and military, expanded with the great acquisition of dominion then made by the Company; and we meet them in vastly greater abundance now (ibid.: xv-xvi).

The diction and content of this opening passage of Yule's 'Introductory Remarks' is revealing in some obvious as well as less obvious ways. Clearly words such as "lying in wait", "lodgement" and "insinuating" suggest dangerous, underhand processes, originating in exotic and imperial spaces abroad, which might undermine English domesticity and its language and literature from within. There is a genealogy to these worries about the impact of imperialism abroad on the English at home, which began with Edmund Burke's concerns about how 'despotic' rule abroad might undermine the time-honoured freedoms of Englishmen at home (Majeed, 1992: 8-9). Such concerns about the corrupting effects of imperialism also found expression in some of the sensationalist novels of the nineteenth century, of which Wilkie Collins' *The Moonstone* (1868) is a prime example. However, as a member of the Anglo-Indian official elite, Yule is articulating another concern here, namely that Anglo-Indians, simply by virtue of being Anglo-Indians, might be the unwitting purveyors of these "insinuating" processes, conveying "outlandish guests" back to England without meaning to. As he says, "A certain percentage of such words have been carried to England by the constant reflux to their native shore of Anglo-Indians, who in some degree imbue with their notions and phraseology the circles from which they had gone forth" (Yule & Burnell, 1996: xvi).

There is, then, a general tension at work in *Hobson-Jobson*, between the determination not to be creolised culturally and the use of a creolised argot for the conduct of everyday affairs in the subcontinent. This tension is expressed in its wavering self-image as both dictionary and glossary, at once separate from England and yet irreversibly tied to it. The term 'Anglo-Indian' itself suggests some of this tension, the hyphen simultaneously bringing together and separating 'Anglo' and 'Indian'. Metcalf has identified the central strand of British ideologies of the Raj in terms of the construction of differences between themselves and Indians alongside the search for shared origins and resemblances (Metcalf, 1995). The Indo-European family of languages was an obvious example of this, since it was seen to point to the shared origins of the British and Indians as Aryan 'races' (Trautmann, 1997). The entry under "Aryan" in *Hobson-Jobson* is illuminating in this context, beginning by glossing the term as "including all the races…which speak languages belonging to the same family as Sanskrit", but ending with the disavowing qualification that "the connection which evidently exists between the several languages as Aryan cannot be regarded…as warranting an assumption of identity of race in all the peoples who speak them" (Yule & Burnell, 1996: 37-8). Once again, we see the tension between the

creolised linguistic identity of Anglo-Indians, here suggesting a deep-seated affinity with Indians as "Aryans", and the ethnic and cultural components that have to be safeguarded against creolisation, so that any "assumption of identity" is forestalled.

4. Intimations of mortality

However, while *Hobson-Jobson* expresses the anxieties the British had about their identity in India, it also distinguishes between two distinct types of British in India, based on the kind of language they speak. When Yule describes the "bad habit of interlarding English with Hindustani phrases" among Anglo-Indians, he refers to how this often excited the "just wrath of high English officials, not accustomed to it from their youth" (ibid.: xx). This marks a distinction between those who have spent the entirety of their careers in India, and those who have not. The former group has its own defining dialect, which reflects its distinctive identity. This once again reinforces the autoethnographic dimension of *Hobson-Jobson*, as a glossary compiled by members of a distinctive group to display their peculiar slang to others who do not belong to that group, and to whom it might seem strange and exclusive. But more specifically, *Hobson-Jobson* is an autoethnography of East India Company servants in particular. This becomes clear in a number of ways.

First, there is an apologetic and defensive tone to Yule's prefatory remarks which suggests insecurity about the social standing of the Anglo-Indian elite within British society. We have already seen that Yule refers to the way senior officials disapproved of the "bad habit" of Anglo-Indians mixing Hindustani with English. When describing the high assimilation of Oriental words into the English vernacular, he suggests that this might have been done "by vulgar lips" (ibid.: ix), as if the processes of linguistic exchange which the glossary documents lack proper decorum and social propriety. The Anglo-Indian argot might itself be "vulgar" in some way. This self-consciousness about the possible vulgarity of Anglo-Indians can be traced back to the disdain in late eighteenth-century England for the returned, newly enriched servants of the East India Company. Many of these officials acquired what were seen as the ostentatious habits of the Indian landed gentry, and hence were disapprovingly labelled "nabobs". There was also some resentment at their intrusion in local affairs. Added to this was considerable unease at the existence of a class of "adventurers" and the means they used to acquire their fortunes until the reforms of Warren Hastings in the early 1770s (Spear, 1963: 32-33, 37; Marshall, 1965: xvi-xvii). In addition, George III's attempt to reassert the rights of the Crown in the 1780s had provoked a constitutional crisis, in which the East India Company was an important player, because of the immense field of patronage that it offered. Returning 'Nabobs' used part of their wealth to buy Parliamentary seats. This represented a direct threat to landed and aristocratic interests by the new 'monied' interest (Musselwhite, 1982: 231). Furthermore, East India Company rule in India was associated with a succession of scandals in late eighteenth century Britain, which culminated in the impeachment of Warren Hastings in 1787 by the House of Commons (Dirks, 2006). Not surprisingly, there were a number of literary texts that satirised the returning East India Company

servant as vulgar, with social pretensions above his proper station. These included Samuel Foote's play *The Nabobs* (1768) and some of Thackeray's novels, such as *Vanity Fair* (1847-8) and *The Newcomes* (1853-5). Yule's suggestion of the vulgarity of his group's argot thus reflects an unease about his group's social standing in British society in general. It also explains why, although it includes slang terms, *Hobson-Jobson* sometimes tries to distance itself from these colloquialisms, as for example under the term "Black" denoting the "natives of India", which is used only by the "lower class of Europeans" (Yule & Burnell, 1996: 97), or when "Pigeon English" is stigmatised as a "vile jargon", thereby implicitly distinguishing its vileness from Anglo-Indian English.

Secondly, as we have seen, Yule likens the text to "a double-columned edifice" (ibid.: vii). He makes clear that this edifice is a monument to his collaborator Arthur Burnell, who died before the project was completed, and who originated the idea of the Anglo-Indian dictionary. Yule also refers to a number of other "dear friends" who passed away before the dictionary was printed (ibid.: vii-viii). Mortality and decline are in fact the unifying themes of Yule's introductory remarks to his Anglo-Indian glossary. And, given that the glossary deals with an argot that is formed through processes of dialogue and exchange between languages, including translation, it is perhaps worthwhile considering how for Walter Benjamin translation is intertwined with questions of mortality. Developing his insight that translation bestows an after-life on the source text (Benjamin, 1992), we could suggest that this 'after-life' reminds translators and authors of their own limitations as mortal beings. Texts and languages can renew themselves in ways in which we, as embodied beings, cannot.

But there are other specific reasons why Yule might be preoccupied with death in his preface to *Hobson-Jobson*. In many ways, the glossary is the autoethnography of a group that is on the point of demise. Yule belonged to the last generation of a cadre of East India Company servants who served in India. Historians have discussed their tightly knit and interconnected social groups, the distinctiveness of family traditions of service, and the defining education of East India Company servants, all of which contributed to their esprit de corps (Cohn, 1987). Yule himself joined the East India Company's Military College at Addiscombe in 1837 and was appointed to the Bengal Engineers in 1840. His father, Major William Yule, and his two brothers, also served in India. However, by the time *Hobson-Jobson* appeared, the East India Company was no longer in existence, having been abolished when the Crown assumed direct responsibility for the government of India following the Indian Rebellion of 1857-8. Even before this abolition, the system of nominating East India Company servants had been discontinued. Previously, the Company's Court of Directors patronised appointments to the Company's service and nominations to its training colleges, but in 1853 Parliament decided that future recruitment should be by open competition. In 1856 the first open competition through examination was held (O'Malley, 1965: Chs 1-3). East India Company servants remained in place until the 1870s, when those selected through open competition had enough seniority to begin to rise in the bureaucracy (Cohn, 1987: 521).

The exclusive nature of East India Company servants as a group in British society was evident to political commentators at the time. John Stuart Mill defended its traditions of administration as being based on a local knowledge of India acquired

through long periods of service there. Mill also defended the system of patronage and nominations by arguing that East India Company servants, as a group set apart from other groups in British society, "are generally unconnected with the influential classes" in Britain and are "out of the range of Parliamentary influence". This, he argued, guaranteed some degree of integrity. It meant that policy in India was not subject to the vagaries of British public opinion, which, he suggested, would be the case should parliament assume direct responsibility for the governance of India (Mill, 1852: 33, 37-39). Yule, then, belonged to a group that was on the point of demise, calumniated by many as corrupt and inward looking, praised by some as being the best government India could have (ibid.: 33-37). So it is not surprising that Yule's prefatory remarks to *Hobson-Jobson* are elegiac in tone. His glossary is suffused with the sense of the passing of a distinctive era in the British government of India, as the last remaining members of the East India Company's service, and its distinctive argot, pass quietly away.

Even the title of the glossary is a testimony to decline; Yule mentions that the phrase "Hobson-Jobson" is "now rare and moribund" in "Anglo-Indian *argot*" (Yule & Burnell, 1996: ix), so that the glossary is named after a phrase that is no longer in circulation. In addition, the glosses on some of the customs referred to, such as "Beer-Drinking" and "White Jacket", make it clear that they are no longer extant. More importantly, though, decline as "corruption" is central to *Hobson-Jobson* in a number of ways. In his *Glossary to the Fifth Report*, Charles Wilkins refers to how inconsistent methods of transliteration from Indian languages into English leads to many variants of the same term occurring in the Roman script in official documents, and consequently to much confusion. He goes on to say: "In collecting and arranging the words herein to be explained, it hence became necessary that they should be exhibited under their various spellings, however incorrect, just as they appear in the *printed* Report and Appendix; but in order to remedy the evil above complained of, an attempt has been made to trace each word to it's [sic] source, to exhibit it in it's [sic] genuine character, as far as Types could be procured for that purpose, and to convey it's [sic] true pronunciation in the Italic character" (Wilkins, 1813: iii). Thus, after the term for each entry, he lists the word in its original script, followed by a more precise transliteration of the term with diacritics. Wilson, for his part, spends much of his Preface fulminating against the inconsistent methods of transliteration that cause so much confusion in official documents, to the extent that "native words…in public documents are much more frequently wrong than right – corrupt and blundering misrepresentations of the original". He aims to "shew what the words ought to be" so that "the corruptions are grouped around the correct form" (Wilson, 1855: xix). Thus, all his entries are listed according to a precise transliteration of an Indian term, followed by the term in its original script, and then, prefaced with the adverb "corruptly", its erroneous variants. However, since the reader may not know the "correct form" of a word, his glossary also has an index, arranged alphabetically, in which will be "found whatever term may be desiderated, whether corrupt or not" (ibid.: xix).

Hobson-Jobson, like these other glossaries, is acutely aware of linguistic corruption as the change of a word from its original condition to one of incorrectness or deterioration. It forcefully expresses this awareness, and at the same time articulates

its fear of assimilation, when Yule refers to terms that are "corruptions, more or less violent, of Oriental words and phrases which have put on an English mask" (Yule & Burnell, 1996: xxi). However, it differs from these two glossaries in one important respect, in that it makes little attempt to counter this "corruption". First, it never gives the word being glossed in its original script. Secondly, unlike Wilson, all the entries are listed under the "corrupt" form with a more precise transliteration added in brackets. The centrality of a sense of decline is evident in another way too, in relation to the glosses on the titles of high-ranking Indians. Here "corruption" takes on a wider socio-political connotation. Whereas Roberts in his glossary gives a straightforward explication of titles such as "Baboo", "Bahauder" (also listed separately as "Behauder"), "Beebee", and "Vizeer" (Roberts, 1800), Yule and Burnell add a sense of corruption to their glosses. Under "Beebee" (originally signifying a lady of high rank) they open their explication with "On the principle of degradation of titles which is so general, this word in application to European ladies has been superseded by the hybrids *Mem-Sahib*, or *Madam-Sahib*, though it is often applied to European maid-servants or other Englishwomen of that rank of life". There is another explicit reference to this "principle" in the explication of "Vizier", which ends with the assertion that "as most titles degenerate, *Wazir* [originally a minister in a government] has in Spain become *alguazil*, 'a constable'". Under the entry for "Daroga" they note that "it is the tendency of official titles, as of denominations of coin, to descend in value" (ibid.: 78, 967, 297). The glosses on other titles also show this concern with the degeneration and corruption of titles. The explication of the title "Baboo" traces its changing sense from a term of respect to one of disparagement, while that of "Bahaddur" outlines its use as a title of honour conferred by the Mughal emperor to that in "Anglo-Indian colloquial parlance" of a "haughty or pompous personage, exercising his brief authority with a strong sense of his own importance" (ibid.: 44, 48-9; see also the entry for "Nabob", which refers to its general uses as "a corruption" of Nawāb, ibid.: 610).

Thus, the tone and content of *Hobson-Jobson* are expressive of decline and degeneration, reflecting the demise of the East India Company. This might also explain why the glossary does not appear to subscribe to the ideology of progress that was so often used to justify British rule in India (Mill, 1858). It does not take advantage of some entries, such as "Suttee" or "Thug", to extol the progressive virtues of British rule in stamping out these practices (For which see Mani, 1985; Singha, 1998 respectively). This sense of decline and elegy is evident in one other way too. Many of the glosses in *Hobson-Jobson* contain historical narratives about the rise and development of East India Company rule, which are not found in the other three glossaries under consideration here. In the case of Roberts there is a positive absence of historical narrative. Entries for the names of Mughal emperors contain no dates, so, for example, "Akbar" is simply glossed as "the comparative of kobir, great-the name of a Mughal emperor", and "Baber" as "the name of an Indian emperor" (see also the entries for "Aurengzebe", "Jehaun Geer", "Averroes", "Avicenna", and "Nour Jehan" in Roberts, 1800). In some ways, Roberts aims for a synchronic understanding of words in the Anglo-Indian lexicon, and tries to achieve a command of their signification in relation to each other in everyday usage. This is in contrast to *Hobson-Jobson*, which is burdened with a historical and archival consciousness, in part

exhibited through its illustrations of the words glossed from documents and texts. But it is also clear in other ways. Thus, whereas Roberts glosses "Pergunna" simply as "a district", under "Pergunnah" and "Pergunnahs, The Twenty-Four", *Hobson-Jobson* tries to capture the historical resonance of this term as part of the shift of the Company from a mercantile operation to a territorial power with responsibilities for land-revenue in 1757-58. (Yule & Burnell, 1996: 698-99). Wilkins has a very short explication of the term, as does Wilson, who does, however, list its derivative compounds (Wilkins, 1813: 36; Wilson, 1855: 402). This historical consciousness is also evident in the explication for "Adawlut" in *Hobson-Jobson*, which amounts to a history of the judiciary in British India, in contrast to Roberts who glosses it simply as "a court of judicature for the trial of causes respecting property" (Yule & Burnell, 1996: 4-6; Roberts 1800). Wilkins is similarly brief, while Wilson gives more details of the division of these courts, but again there is no historical narrative as such in his explication (Wilkins, 1813: 5; Wilson, 1855: 8). The same is true for the entry "Cazee" in *Hobson-Jobson*, which stretches over four columns, relating the development of the East India Company's legal administration, while Roberts and Wilkins give a minimal explication of the term (Yule & Burnell 1996: 177-180; Roberts 1800, Wilkins 1813: 11). Wilson pays more attention to technical details than Roberts or Wilkins, but there is little historical narrative; instead, references to the relevant East India Company regulations are listed (Wilson, 1855: 272). As mentioned above, *Hobson-Jobson* includes entries such as "Supreme Court", "Law Officer", "Regulation", and "Settlement", which the other glossaries do not have. In each of these entries, Yule and Burnell also take the opportunity to relate a historical narrative of aspects of the East India Company state in India (Yule & Burnell, 1996: 873, 510-12, 758, 813; see also "Piece-Goods", which is in Roberts, but is very briefly explicated). As authors of *Hobson-Jobson*, then, Yule and Burnell are autoethnographers and historians of a group in decline, hence the recapitulatory mode of the glossary, which summarises a history that is no longer ongoing or extant. But there is one more aspect to the elegiac tone of *Hobson-Jobson*, which relates to the significance of its distinctive title.

5. Strangers in the East

Yule sees English in the Indian subcontinent as the most recent example of the languages of "foreigners in the East" interacting with Indian languages. The first example of this is Arabic, whose incorporation of words of Indian origin have "in one way or other become part of the heritage of all succeeding foreigners in the East" (ibid.: xvii). This genealogy of strangers in India includes not just the Arabs but also the Portuguese, "who bequeathed a large number of expressions to the European nations who have followed, and in great part superseded them" (ibid.: xviii). In fact, Yule discusses in some detail how "our Anglo-Indian colloquialisms, even if eventually traceable to native sources […] have come to us through a Portuguese medium, and often bear traces of having passed through that alembic" (ibid.: xix). The British are not just strangers in India, their estrangement is such that even the interaction between their language and Indian languages is mediated and refracted through the languages of preceding strangers.

By constructing a genealogy of strangers in India, *Hobson-Jobson* reinforces the status of Anglo-Indians as "foreigners in the East". Above all, these foreigners include Muslims, such as the Arabs mentioned above, as well as "our Mahommedan predecessors" from whom "we adopted into partial colloquial use an immense number of terms" (ibid.: xx). Alex Padamsee has suggested that the British constructed Muslims as 'strangers' in India and that this reflected their own sense of their perilous position in the subcontinent (Padamsee, 2005: Chs 10 and 11). The position of Muslims in India as a minority community was later to be central to imperial policy decisions with regard to the question of political representation (Robinson, 1974: Ch. 4). The possible ambivalent identification with Muslims as "foreigners" is also suggested by Yule's Preface, when he aligns Anglo-Indian English with Urdu: "It is curious to note that several of our most common adoptions are due to what may be called the Oordoo or 'Camp' language, being terms which the hosts of Chinghiz brought from the steppes of North Eastern Asia". He then gives an example of a remark which might have been heard at "an Anglo-Indian mess-table some thirty years ago" and "perhaps might be heard still", that exemplifies this tying together of Urdu and English in the Anglo-Indian argot. In a phrase resonant with the fear of and attraction to exotic creolisation, he concludes "each of the outlandish terms embraced in it came from the depths of Mongolia in the thirteenth century" (Yule & Burnell, 1996: xx). In this startling image, the convivial familiarity of the Anglo-Indian mess table is intertwined with the outlandishness of Mongolia through language. The possible tie between Anglo-Indians and Indian Muslims extends even to their diet. Under the entry for "Curry", the authors comment that "it is possible […] the kind of curry used by Europeans and Mahommedans is not of purely Indian origin, but has come down from the spiced cookery of medieval Europe and Western Asia" (ibid.: 281).

However, *Hobson-Jobson* forges a more specific tie with a distinctive group of Indian Muslims, rather than Indian Muslims in general. This is evident in the title of the text itself. The entry for 'Hobson-Jobson' explains the term as the "Anglo-Saxon version of the wailings of the Mahommedans as they beat their breasts in the procession of the Moharram – 'Ya Hasan! Ya Hosain!'" (ibid.: 419). Muharram commemorates the martyrdom of al-Ḥusayn, the grandson of the Prophet Muhammad, and the son of Ali, in Karbala in 680 A.D. It might be described as a 'passion play' that commemorates death and martyrdom. Moreover, the recital of elegiac poetry (*marsīya*) plays an important role in the festival of Muharram (for an account of Muharram in nineteenth-century India, see Cole, 1988: Ch. 4). Thus, the title of the glossary reinforces its preoccupation with mortality and demise, and evokes the elegiac nature of the glossary as a whole. But more importantly for our purposes here, Muharram is a specifically Shī'a festival, and its annual enactment rehearses the differences between Shī'as and the majority Sunnī community within Islam. Around the time *Hobson-Jobson* was published, it is estimated that Shī'as accounted for only 3% of Muslims in north India, while Muslims as a whole were approximately 10% of the population in that region (ibid.: 73, interpreting the 1891 census). The title of the glossary, then, suggests not only identification with a minority community within India, but a minority community within that community. The autoethnographic dimension of the glossary comes to the fore here, evoking a sense of being a minority

twice over within the Indian subcontinent. This is reinforced also by the contents of *Hobson-Jobson*. The first edition has entries for "Sheeah", "Mohurrum" and "Tazeea" (*ta'ziya* refers to the passion play re-enacting the suffering and death of al-Ḥusayn, as well as his bier and mausoleum which is carried in procession), but no entry for Sunnī, the latter being added to the second edition by William Crooke (Yule & Burnell, 1996: 824-5, 574, 904-5). Moreover, the characterisation of "Tazeea" as a "mystery-play" adds to this sense of identification, suggesting a point of contact between popular practices in Christianity in the past and this key Shī'a festival. It is not surprising, then, that Yule describes the term 'Hobson-Jobson' as "typical" of the "most highly assimilated class of Anglo-Indian argot", which makes it a "concise alternative title for the Glossary" (ibid.: 419). What this "assimilation" suggests is a confluence between two sets of "foreigners in the East", which militates against any assimilation into India itself. The double reinforcement of being a minority also suggests a determination to hold onto that status, in order to forestall any possibilities of being creolised.

There are other reasons for this identification in *Hobson-Jobson* with the Shī'a community in India. First, rather like the East India Company itself, as a political power the Shī'a community emerged as a successor state to the Mughal empire. The Shī'a state in Awadh in north India was annexed in 1856 by the East India Company (Cole, 1988), but the latter, as we have seen, was itself abolished in 1858. Thus, the rise and fall of Awadh paralleled that of the East India Company state. Secondly, as we have seen, the British state in India sought to legitimise itself in a variety of ways, from invoking Indian idioms of rule, to calling upon the ideology of progress. The title of *Hobson-Jobson* alludes to the question of the legitimacy not just of its own power, but all political power per se. The term Shī'a comes from Shī'at 'Alī, or the party or partisans of 'Alī, the son-in-law and cousin of Muhammad, who was killed in 661 when trying to maintain his authority as the fourth Caliph. The Shī'ites developed into a religious movement that denied the legitimacy of all succeeding Caliphs. Moreover, they also developed a strong metaphysical and political tradition that denied the justness of all temporal rule, by formulating the notion of the Imām. As *Hobson-Jobson* tells us, "Sheeah" refers to those who "venerate Ali, and regard the Imams his descendants as the true successors of the Caliphate" (Yule & Burnell, 1996: 825). The concept of the Hidden Imam, and the formulation of the doctrine of occultation (*ghayba*) are key here. These refer to the belief that the twelfth Imam entered occultation in 940, and without him all temporal rule is marked by injustice. Only with his reappearance can the ideal just state be established. For Shī'ism, the doctrine of the Imamate barred the legitimacy of any temporal ruler (Arjomand, 1984; Encyclopaedia *of Islam*).

The title of *Hobson-Jobson*, then, evokes questions of political legitimacy, by referring to a tradition of metaphysical and spiritual disquiet about all forms of temporal rule. This question is also raised when Yule reflects upon the text's own genealogy as a genre of writing. He argues that previously glossaries of "Indian and other foreign words, in use among Europeans in the East" tended to be appendices to travel narratives. It was "the prolonged excitement created in England, a hundred years since, by the impeachment of Hastings and kindred matters, [that] led to the publication of several glossaries as independent works" (Yule & Burnell, 1996: xv). The genesis of the British Indian glossary as an independent work, in other words, lay

in the impeachment of Warren Hastings before the House of Lords in 1788 on twenty charges of "High Crimes and Misdemeanours" (For details of these, see Marshall, 1965: xiv-xv). These charges raised fundamental questions about the legitimacy and justness of British rule in India, and Hastings' subsequent trial generated a huge amount of publicity about these issues. Musselwhite has argued that as the trial dragged on until 1795, it touched practically every major figure of the period. It also became entangled with questions about the place of Britain in the world, providing "a unique opportunity for the loss of America, the French Revolution, and the Constitutional Crisis to be worked out in effigy" (Musselwhite, 1982: 226, 239). Above all, the trial was a spectacle; as Marshall has put it, it was "one of the most spectacular crises of conscience through which an imperial power has ever passed" (Marshall, 1965: 180). Musselwhite has pointed to the theatricality of the trial, for example in Sheridan's performance for the prosecution, which became something of a "celebrated act". Both Edmund Burke and Sheridan managed to collapse at critical moments in their expositions with the ladies in the audience also fainting at the right places. The trial provided many occasions for lurid colours and bravura effects, pandering to a public hungry for sensation and "ever more exotic outrage" (Musselwhite, 1982: 235-6). This, then, is another way in which *Hobson-Jobson* is entangled with questions of legitimacy; as a genre, it originated in a spectacular crisis of conscience about British rule in India. Moreover, this crisis was, like the public rituals of Muharram, a piece of theatre, a set of performances, that raised fundamental questions about justice, violence, and political power.

6. Conclusion

Far from being expressive of a sense of colonial mastery over the subcontinent, *Hobson-Jobson* articulated the defining anxieties of the British in India. In particular, its character as the autoethnography of a group in decline explains its elegiac tone and content. Its title resonates, in a cross-cultural idiom, with concerns about the legitimacy of political power. It also expresses the strategy of aligning the British with other "foreigners" in India as permanently estranged minorities. Linguistically creolised in their everyday dealings in the subcontinent, but culturally and socially distant from Indian society, *Hobson-Jobson* articulates the forbidden longing of Anglo-Indians to be part of the subcontinent, which was given its best expression in the major literary work of the Anglo-Indian canon, Rudyard Kipling's *Kim* (1901) (Majeed, 2005). The pathos, then, of *Hobson-Jobson* is the pathos of a group longing to be creolised and yet determined to remain as 'unnative' as possible. It is this which makes *Hobson-Jobson* such a distinctive work.

References

Arjomand, S.A. 1984. *The Shadow of God and the Hidden Imam. Religion, Political Order, and Societal Change in Shi'ite Iran from the Beginning to 1890*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ballhatchet, K. 1980. *Race, Sex and Class under the Raj: Imperial Attitudes and Policies and their Critics 1793-1905*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson.

Bayly, C.A. 1988. *Indian Society and the Making of the British Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bryce, James. 1914. *The Ancient Roman Empire and the British Empire in India*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Burnell, A.C. See Yule, Henry.

Cohn, B.S. 1985. 'The Command of Language and the Language of Command.' In: *Subaltern Studies 4. Writings on South Asian History and Society*. Ed. by Ranajit Guha, Delhi: Oxford University Press. 276-329.

Cohn, B.S. 1987. 'The Recruitment and Training of British Civil Servants in India, 1600-1860.' In: *An Anthropologist among the Historians and other Essays*. Delhi: Oxford University Press. 500-53.

Cole, J.R.I. 1988. *Roots of North Indian Shī'ism in Iran and Iraq. Religion and State in Awadh, 1722-1859*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Dirks, Nicholas. 2006. *The Scandal of Empire: India and the Creation of Imperial Britain.* Cambridge, Mass. & London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition. 1960 onwards. Leiden: Brill.

Kopf, David. 1969. *British Orientalism and the Bengal Renaissance. The Dynamics of Indian Modernization 1773-1835.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Lucas, C.P. 1912. *Greater Rome and Greater Britain*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Majeed, J. 1992. *Ungoverned Imaginings. James Mill's 'The History of British India' and Orientalism*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Majeed, J. 1995. '"The jargon of Indostan": An Exploration of Jargon in Urdu and East India Company English.' In: *Languages and Jargons. Towards a Social History of Language*. Ed. by Peter Burke & Roy Porter, Oxford: Polity Press. 182-205.

Majeed, J. 1999. 'Comparativism and references to Rome in British imperial attitudes to India'. In: *Roman Presences. Receptions of Rome in European Culture 1789-1945*. Ed. by Catharine Edwards, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 88-109.

Majeed, J. 2005. 'Bathos, Architecture and Knowing India: E.M. Forster's *A Passage to India* and Nineteenth-Century British Ethnology and the Romance Quest.' *Journal of Commonwealth Literature*, 40, (1): 21-36.

Mani, Lata. 1985. 'The Production of an Official Discourse on Sati in Early Nineteenth-century Bengal'. In: *Europe and its Others*. Ed. by Francis Barker et al, Colchester, University of Essex. 1: 107-27

Marshall, P.J. 1965. *The Impeachment of Warren Hastings*. London: Oxford University Press.

Marshall, P.J. 1993. 'The Whites of British India, 1780-1830: a failed colonial society?'. In: Marshall, P.J., *Trade and Conquest. Studies in the Rise of British Dominance in India*, art. xv. Aldershot: Variorum.

Metcalf, Thomas R. 1995. *Ideologies of the Raj*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mill, John Stuart. 1852 [1990]. 'The East India Company's Charter'. In: John Stuart Mill, *Writings on India*. Ed. by John M. Robson, Martin Moir & Zawahir Moir, Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 31-74.

Mill, John Stuart. 1858 [1990]. 'Memorandum of the Improvements in the Administration of India during the last Thirty Years'. In: John Stuart Mill, *Writings on India*. Ed. by John M. Robson, Martin Moir, & Zawahir Moir, Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 93-160.

Musselwhite, D.E. 1982. 'The Trial of Warren Hastings'. In: *1789: Reading Writing Revolution*. Ed. by Francis Barker et al, Colchester: University of Essex. 226-51.

O'Malley, L.S.S. 1965. *The Indian Civil Service 1601-1930*. London: Frank Cass.

Padamsee, Alex. 2005. *Representations of Indian Muslims in British Colonial Discourse*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Roberts, T.T. 1800. *An Indian Glossary, consisting of some thousand words and terms commonly used in the East Indies with full explanations of their respective meanings. Forming an useful vade mecum extremely serviceable in assisting strangers to acquire with ease and quickness the language of that country*. London: Printed for Murray and Highley, Fleet Street; Stewart, Piccadilly; and Collins, Change Alley.

Robinson, Francis. 1974. *Separatism among Indian Muslims. The Politics of the United Provinces' Muslims, 1860-1923*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Seeley, J.R. 1883 [1931]. *The Expansion of England*. London: Macmillan.

Singha, Radhika. 1998. *A Despotism of Law. Crime and Justice in early colonial India*. Calcutta: Oxford University Press.

Trautmann, T.R. 1997. *Aryans and British India*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wilkins, Charles. 1813. *Glossary to the Fifth Report from the Select Committee appointed to enquire into the present State of the Affairs of the East India Company; which Report was made on the 28th day of July, in the last Session of Parliament. House of Commons 27 April 1813*, in *The Fifth Report from the Select Committee on the Affairs of the East India Company Ordered by the House of Commons, to be printed, 28 July 1812*, separate pagination.

Wilson, H.H. 1855. *A Glossary of Judicial and Revenue Terms, and of Useful Words Occurring in Official Documents relating to the Administration of the Government of British India , from the Arabic, Persian, Hiindustani, Sanskrit, Hindi, Bengali, Uriya, Marathi, Guzarathi, Telegu, Karnata, Tamil, Malayalam, and other languages. Compiled and Published under the Authority of the Honorable Court of Directors of the East India Company.* London: W.H. Allen & co.

Yule, Henry. 1886 [1996]. *Hobson-Jobson. The Anglo-Indian Dictionary*. Ware: Wordsworth Reference.

Contact Details j.majeed@qmul.ac.uk
Dr. J. Majeed, School of English and Drama,
Queen Mary, University of London, Mile End Road,
London E1 4NS