

Antecedents, Precedents and Tradition: The Early Nineteenth Century English Historiographic Literature on India

Muhammad Shafique*

Abstract:

History and literature are two very closely associated disciplines which evolve around every aspect of life. The tradition of historiographic literature is always set by some literary antecedents and precedents. The Muslim historical literature on India formed the antecedent and European intellectual tradition formed the precedents for the tradition of the early English historiographic tradition. Although subject matter, contents, purpose and form almost seem to be the same as that of the Muslim historiographic tradition, yet, the model and philosophical conclusions were drawn on the basis of western frame-work.

Introduction: Statement of Problem.

Literature and history evolve around every aspect of life. Although modern scientific classifications have separated the two fields, yet the concern of the two approaches with human experience combines them together. History and literature come together in two ways: First that history is the part of literature, if literature is the 'use of a language for human expression'. Thus historiography is a sort of literature restricted by the evaluation of facts; second that all literature is history as history even deals with the fictions and imaginations of the people and nations. In this perspective, whatsoever may be the interpretations of the two concepts, they interact very closely with each other. In the same way, literature becomes baseless without a reference to a significant fact, even myths and fictions represents a reality of human mind and mental calibre and approaches to life. Therefore, the paper focuses on the English historiographic literature on India. The British interaction with India had begun by the time of Mughal Emperor Jahangir (1605-1627) and a lot has been written on the aspects of India in English language till the end of the eighteenth century, all by the British. However these writings were 'historical' in the form of observations but did not come into terms with the restricted discipline of historiography. These historical writings began to come into the form of historiography by the end of the eighteenth century.¹ Therefore, the paper explores the antecedent and precedents of the early English historiographic literature on India contributed by the British.

The British English tradition of historiography of India has been widely criticised for the views it has generated about Indians, either Hindus or Muslims. It had been

* Lecturer, Department of History, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan - Pakistan.

playing a vital role in the formation of public opinion at home as well as in the formation of the policy of the British East India Company. Therefore, if on the one hand it has been recognized as 'imperial literature', 'colonial historiography' or 'masks of conquests', on the other hand it has been highlighted as 'vehicle of change', 'tool of modernization' and as a commitment to 'make the world civilized'. So the evaluation of the early English historiographic literature on India, in the perspective of antecedents and precedents and the formation of the historiographic tradition becomes utmost important. The paper aims to serve this purpose.

The British tradition of historiography of India seems to be connected, on the one hand, with the pre-British tradition of historiography in India and on the other hand, with the British perception of history in general and Indian history in particular. Therefore the pre-colonial Indian tradition of historiography was antecedent and the early-colonial British tradition of historiography of India was precedent for the early English tradition of historiographic literature on India.

Antecedents for the Early English Historiographic Literature on India.

Pre-British tradition of Indian historiography is considered synonymous with medieval Muslim historiography of India². The ancient Indian society did not have a very strong sense of historiography. As a result there is a dearth of historical literature on ancient period. Hindu tradition of history was based on mythological compilations such as Vedas, Shastaras, Mahabharata, and Ramayana or on numismatical and archaeological evidences.³ Therefore, the early English historians either neglected the early history of India or tried to interpret it in fiction and mythological terms.⁴ The tradition of historiography in India began with the establishment of Muslim rule in India. The Muslims imported strong and vibrant tradition of history to India⁵ which seems to be a continuity of Arabic-Persian Muslim tradition of historiography. The Muslim historical literature was in the form of biographies, chronicles, political history, contemporary history (ma'athir), or administrative rules or in the form of travelogues. Some of it was strictly official history and some of it was politically sponsored. There was, however, a corpus of non-sponsored and unofficial historical literature as well.⁶ This tradition has been divided into Sultanate and Mughal periods of Muslim rule.

History of Sultanate period or medieval India 'meant for the historians of medieval India political history and only have meant political history'⁷ and seem to have administrative purposes. Naturally they focused on the contemporary history in terms of dynasties, individual rulers, distinguished nobles, Sufis and officials.⁸ Although their subject matter remained confined to the activities of ruling elite, matters related to wars and conquests⁹ and to the suggestions and admonitions for the rulers and ruling elite,¹⁰ yet all histories begin with a firm declaration, on the part of rulers and writers, of belief in Islam¹¹ and have contents related to cultural history.¹² However a number of poetic source, religious and mystical literature and travelogues too have been considered as great contribution to medieval historical literature. All these sources appear to be in

Persian, the cultural language of Muslim political elite who were a minority religious and ethnic ruling community in India.

The historians of Medieval Sultanate period 'critically evaluated the activities of the rulers in the light of the dictates of religion as endorsed by the 'Ulema' and the 'best practices' they themselves acknowledged'.¹³ However 'not criticizing individuals and personalities directly' but 'critically evaluating actions' along with the identification of personal belief of the people under evaluation, seem to be their guiding principle.¹⁴ In this perspective medieval historiography had a purposive outlook to strengthen the Muslim empire in India. It was a means 'to inform the Sultan, the Ulema' and the Umra' of the action of the past rulers and their consequences so that they could plan their actions and role in that light and to make the public aware of the achievements and failures of the rulers.¹⁵ This purpose attached the Muslim historians with what P. Hardy called 'general history of the Muslim World'¹⁶ and led to draw inferences and principles from history which is called 'philosophy of history'.¹⁷ This attitude was largely influenced by the religious and mystical belief system of Islam.¹⁸

The later historians whether Mughal or British adopted this 'ready made'¹⁹ tradition of medieval Muslim historiography for historical premises, techniques or evidence.²⁰ It had politico-administrative leaning, with a focus on contemporary history, with the same purpose of guidance and information for rulers and the public in the exotic Persian language of minority ruling community.²¹ Yet the Mughals brought about a big change in this tradition as a result of two centuries of freedom from external invasions and an enduring peace within the empire that provided a requisite environment for the socio-cultural advancement, economic prosperity and all round development. The Mughal rulers were fond of literary pleasures and this peace and tranquillity strengthened this attitude. They strengthened the tradition of memoirs in autobiography and biography by the members of ruling dynasty, both male and female and focused on the cultural aspects of the dynasty along with political aspects.²² However Akbar's reign provided stimuli to the innovative trends. On the one hand he promoted the culture of translation²³ which was adopted by the eighteenth century British. Simultaneously, a tradition of collection of records seems to be developing during the reign to systematize the administration of the government. Khwand Amir had already written a treatise entitle *Qanun-I-Humayuni*. Abul Fazal edited *Ain-i-Akbari* and collected his official letters under the titles of *Ruqat-i-Abul Fazal* and *Muktubat-i-Allami*. The tradition seems to be followed by the early English historians of India.²⁴ This was the beginning of a 'rational secular' tradition of Indian historiography which has been taken as a source of transformation of Mughal Empire into a nation state by a large number of modern historians, Western as well as Indian. From that time a sort of conflict in terms of dialectics between Islam and Hinduism, empire and regionalism, secularism and communalism and between orthodoxy and modernism, in the approaches to understand the Indian history, is clearly visible which seems to be inherited by the British. However a number of historians widened their scope to whole dynasties or tried to evaluate the process of history. Badaoni's *Muntakhab-ut-Tawarikh* was a

comprehensive history of India from the time of Ghaznavids to the fortieth year of Akbar's reign. A history of the Muslim world up to one thousand years of Hijra era was compiled by the orders of Akbar by Maulana Ahmad Badaoni and others. This trend of evaluation of a complete span of time culminated later in the history written by Muhammad Qasim Farishta. His *Tarikh-i-Farishta* became very popular among the generation coming after.

The same tradition seems to prevail during the later Mughal period. The emphasis of historians was either on the contemporary political history or on the religious aspects.²⁵

Precedents for the Early English Historiographic Literature on India.

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

The enlightenment introduced some powerful elements in the concept of historiography that continue to dominate the historians' mind, method and morality to date. It shifted the focus of historical narration from divine forces to the arena of human activity. Social and cultural aspects of history gradually gained popularity. History became the tool for the consolidation of human thought rather than just an element of amusement for people.²⁶ It secularised every department of human life and thought and in this way emerged as a 'crusade against Christianity' in the writings of Vico, Voltaire and Hume.²⁷ In this sense Hume's *History of England* had become a symbolic expression of rational enlightened trends.²⁸ It resembles the conflict which had emerged during the reign of Akbar in the historiography of India. In this way, by the beginning of the 19th century history had acquired a philosophy (a philosophy of history) in Europe's intellectual tradition. Montesquieu saw the history in term of a natural process and Gibbon explained it in the form of historical laws of nature. However religious spirit with a shift to new symbols continued to work in European mind.²⁹ A trend of using history for the derivation of principles and patterns of behaviour became dominant. The philosophers, theorists and politicians all applied the historical evidences for the evaluation of their premises and policies.³⁰

The French and the German romanticists seem to be widening the scope of history. Rousseau extended the understanding or role of man from men in power to common man and revived the culture of Renaissance.³¹ His focus was on the diversity of culture and civilizations in the world. Herder saw human life closely related to natural world.³² It was Kant who tried to combine enlightenment and Romanticism through his *An Idea*

for a Universal History from the Cosmopolitan Point of View published in 1784. His themes had become popular at the end of eighteenth century, which also promoted the themes of orientalism.

On this ground, the first half of the nineteenth century seems to be a place for the growth of divergent historical assumptions and premises with a widened spatial and temporal scope. German romanticists' focus on ancient Greece and Roman culture, civilization and politics alongwith languages and religion linked historical studies with the medieval times.³³ The spirit of inquiry and method of criticism began to develop new social science, which seems to be greatly influencing the tradition of early English Historiographic literature on India.

The British historiographers, during the first half of the nineteenth century seem to be following the same tradition. Politics, language, literature, laws, customs, ethics and human nature seem to be the dominant fields of interest in all schools of thought and had become burning issues. These themes alongwith the contemporary philosophical intellectual debate in Europe were generating motivations for early English Historiography of India. Three main themes seem to be dominating the mind of British historians: First was association of contemporary British society with the continuity of historical process as was presented par excellence by Hallam in his *Sketch of Europe in the Middle Ages*³⁴; Second was a tendency of writing biographical works to identify the role of man in history which seems to be done by a lot of historians and can best be seen in Carlyle's *On Heroes and Hero Worship*³⁵; and third was the presentation of religious history in a secular way as was best done by Macaulay as *History of England*.³⁶ These trends seem to be determining the approaches of the British historians.³⁷ However tradition of writing on the colonial subjects seems to be dominating during the period and *History of England* was being viewed in its relations with the British colonies.

In the tradition of historiography of colonies, America and West Indies seem to be dominating the British interest. Three example of such interests were P. Colquhoun's *A Treatise on the Wealth, Power and Resources of the British Empire in the every Quarter of the World, Including East Indies*,³⁸ Bryan Edwards' *The History, Civil and Commercial, of the British Colonies in the West Indies*³⁹ and John McGregor's *British America*.⁴⁰ However Robertson's *History of America* remained a classic on colonial history⁴¹ and after the independence of American colonies, India seems to be making the core of interest for colonial historiography.

In this tradition of European and particularly British historiography a particular vision of India seems to have emerged. A criticism of State, society and religion, identified with the Muslims, was a common practice among the authors of this school. Under the influence of Muslim historiography, however, a sense of world history had been developed among the European historians since the 15th century. The understanding of the phenomena of decline and fall of empires, states, societies and civilizations had been the most popular form of narration of history.⁴² Liberalism,⁴³ romanticism, humanitarianism and industrial revolution⁴⁴ were the forces influencing the current

stream of historical thought. In spite of all this, however, European expansionism and colonialism continued to dominate all these enlightened trends in thought and action.

The Early English Tradition of Indian Historiographic Literature.

The Muslim rule in India lasted for several centuries. In the nineteenth century the British gained complete power in India. Aiming to preserve the British interest in Eastern trade through colonial expansion, the British East India Company had begun to expand its control over the Indian states since 1757 and occupied the entire Indian subcontinent within a century. During the second half of the eighteenth centuries, the British extended their influence to local politics. The nineteenth century brought the supremacy of British power in India into sharp focus.⁴⁵ A long period of contact with India from the beginning of the eighteenth century developed the interest of British writers in the subject of Indology⁴⁶ and especially in Indian history, which was considered a part of the discipline of Indology.

The British also inherited the tradition of historiography along with government and politics from the Indian Muslims.⁴⁷ Their understanding of Indian history was confined either to contemporary political and cultural history or to 'ready made history' in the form of translation of works on Muslim period by the Muslims. Fraser's *The History of Nadir Shah* published in the 1742 was an embodiment of British interest in the contemporary Indian history.⁴⁸ Francois Bernier's *The History of the Late Revolution of the Empire of Great Mogol*⁴⁹ and Francois Catrou's *The General History of the Mogol Empire*⁵⁰ had already been translated into English in 1671 and 1695. However by the late eighteenth century they began to add to the Muslim tradition and combined it with European traditions, methods, techniques, premises, ideas and problems which were being applied or discussed in the current European intellectual community. Robert Crane is of the opinion that:

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

Being the rulers of India for a long time, the information given by the British was considered reliable and authentic. Without the images projected by them European and American intellectuals would know very little of the history of India today. Even though,

initially, other European nations such as Portuguese, Dutch, Germans and French, contributed a great deal to the knowledge in this field, yet the attitude of the English-speaking people towards India was affected largely by the British historiography.⁵¹

What Edward Said has written about the nature of Orientalism, may equally be applied to the nature of British historiography of India. The British, he felt, saw the history of India through folk tradition, observations, journey, and through fable. There were biases and interests working behind their premises. He writes: “under the general heading of the knowledge of the Orient, and within the umbrella of Western hegemony” a complex concept of the Orient emerged which was “suitable for study in academy, for display in the museum, for reconstruction on the colonial office...for instances of economic and sociological theories of development....”.⁵² Even more relevant are his comments in his concluding chapter.

Now, one of the important development in nineteenth-century Orientalism was the distillation of essential ideas about the Orient — its sensuality, its tendency to despotism, its aberrant mentality, its habits of inaccuracy, its backwardness, — into a separate and unchallenged coherence; thus for a writer to use the word Oriental was a reference for the readers sufficient to identify a specific body of information about the Orient.⁵³

British study of Indian history and the resultant emerging tradition of historiographic literature were primarily a political need⁵⁴, which later adopted the form of social and cultural history.⁵⁵ Mill⁵⁶ and Elphinstone⁵⁷ made it into a comparative study of the three civilizations. It was an active response to the problems of Indian administration. Initially it aimed to satisfy British self-interest and curiosity about India. In the nineteenth century, it became a tool to influence the government policies toward India in Britain and in the Sub-continent. In this way, primary importance in British tradition of Indian historiography was given to British Indian Empire. Its focus was the contemporary discussion in administration, in religion, in politics and in philosophy.

The first institution under the British auspices for the promotion of English language among the local people was established in 1834 at Bombay.⁵⁸ About the same time Persian language was removed from the government offices. We may deduce that British historiography of India was in fact responsible for moulding British opinion in matters relating to Indian policies. There was a very small class of locals in India (at this time) who could read and understand the English language. But there was a large British community with definite opinions on matters in India. It, therefore, makes sense that British historiography, at the beginning of the nineteenth century should be considered with reference to home consumption.⁵⁹ We could say that it was a statement by the British administration and for the British readers. What Robert Crane writes about the post War of Independence British historiography is equally applicable to the period prior to the War of Independence. He writes:

...there was a tendency among the English writers, many of whom

had been officials, to act as apologists for the government of India. As Indian nationalism developed and the nationalist attacks on the administration increased in vigor [vigour] and frequency, there was almost perceptible movement by the beleaguered British to close ranks and defend the record.⁶⁰

Perhaps it would be too harsh to say that British historiographers were apologists for the government of India. However, their works provided a justification of British expansionism and for the satisfaction of European readers and intellectuals. All schools of the British thought were in conformity with the colonial agenda. However their differences were visible on the issues of identity of Indian communities, nature of administration and British relations with and the treatment of subject people. To argue and decide on these matters European themes of thought were forming the central structure of their works. C.H. Philips, in the introduction of his famous edited book *Historians of India, Pakistan and Ceylon* writes that in the British historiography:

...Indian past, for instance, was assumed to be much the same like the European present and European categories of thought, not only in the field of history, were automatically applied. Moreover as the idea of progress became identified with the extension of European influence, throughout the world this Europocentric [Europe Centric] view became characteristic also of Western historians, generally, whatsoever their field of inquiry...⁶¹

This led to the establishment of new socio-political and philosophical schools, which not only influenced the British Indian policy but also influenced European intellectual tradition as well. This historiographic activity was influenced by a number of intellectual traditions: enlightenment⁶², romanticism, liberalism,⁶³ utilitarianism,⁶⁴ evangelicalism, etc. By the beginning of the nineteenth century, four trends were under sharp focus: oriental romance, ethno-regional romance, utilitarianism and Christian mission. Liberalism and paternalism were influencing all the four trends and traditions.

Oriental romanticists accepted the civilized status of Indian society and in this way were anxious to preserve it. They were the great arbitrators for the policy of non-interference and non-intervention in Indian society. In this regard, they were called champions of local cause. The writings of William Jones, Colebrook, Thomas Maurice and Mountstuart Elphinstone are considered the classics of the early English writings on India.

The ethno-regional romanticists focused on the diversity of Indian cultures and in this way were identifying India as a continent or subcontinent inhabited by a number of nations having a common civilization. The writings on the regions and ethno-cultural groups were the contribution of that group to the early English historiographic literature on India.

The Utilitarian was the new socio-political reformist school, analysing the socio-

political institutions through the concept of “utility” of the institutions for the society on the “principle of happiness”. They claimed the superiority of European civilization on Indian civilization. So they were the champions of the cause of importing western civilization to India. They accepted the challenge of “white men’s burden to make the world civilized”. For that, they were the advocates of radical social change in India. Mill and Macaulay were the great exponents of these schools.

The Missionary school saw the superiority of Christian religion in the form of European imperialism. They presented the European expansionism as a divine proof of the righteousness of Christian religion. So they were the propagator of Christian creed in India and wanted to Christianize the Indian society.⁶⁵

Conclusion

The early tradition of English historiographic literature on India was based on the antecedent of Muslim historiography of India. It took the purpose, contents and form from the Muslims and set its model and premises on the late eighteenth century European model of thought system. Although the early English historiographic literature took different forms, yet it was motivated by the political and imperial motives with a sense of superiority of Western especially British civilization on the rest of the world. As the nineteenth century was developing a contest of ideas among the western intellectuals, therefore early English historiographic literature on India provided a battlefield for that contest. However by the introduction of English language in India, western approach began to dominate the mind of the Indian people either Hindu or Muslims. Simultaneously, the western approach converted the early British understanding of India as Muslim India to Hindu India. The contribution of these schools of western thought need elaborated studies to understand the modern western mind make up with reference to the region now called South Asia.

References

1. See Muhammad Shafique Bhatti, ‘British Historiography of India: A Study in the Late Eighteenth Century Shift of Interest’, *Quarterly Journal of Pakistan Historical Society*, Vol. L, no. 3, July-September 2003, pp. 85-104.
2. J.S.Grewal, *Medieval India: History And Historians*, Amritsar, 1975, p.32.
3. See R. C. Majumdar, ‘Idea of History in Sanskrit Literature’ in C.H. Philips, ed., *Historians of India, Pakistan and Ceylon*, London, 1961, pp. 13-28; A.K. Narain, ‘Numismatists and Historical Writing’ in C. H. Philips, *op. cit.*, pp. 94-102. Also see James Tod, *Annals And Antiquities of Rajast’han*, Two Volumes, 1982, Vol. I, p.1-3.
4. See Muhammad Shafique Bhatti, *op. cit.*
5. C. A. Bayly, “Modern Indian Historiography”, in Machael Bentley, ed., *Companion To Historiography*, London, 1997, p.679.
6. Peter Hardy, *Historians of Medieval India*, London, 1960, *passim*.

7. *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.
8. See for example Ziya' al-din Barani, *Ta'rikh-I- Firuz Shahi*, Urdu tr. Syed Moin ul Haq, Lahore, 1969; Minhaj al Siraj,, *Tabaqat-I- Nasri*, Urdu tr. Ghulam Rasul Maher, Two volumes, Lahore, 1985; Hasan Nizami, *Ta'j-al Ma'sir*, English tr. Hasan Askari, *Patna University Journal*, 1963, pp. 49-127 and Yahya ibn Ahmad ibn 'Abdullah al-Sihri, *Ta'rikh-I- Mubarak Shahi*, Urdu tr. Aftab Asghar, Lahore, 1986.
9. P. Hardy, *op. cit.*, p. 3.
10. Ali Hamdani, *Zakherah- tal-Muluk*, Amritsar, 1905; Amir Khusrau, *Khazain al-Futuh*, English tr.M. Habib, Madras, 1931.
11. Khurram Qadir, 'Medieval Historiography of Muslim India: The Sultanate Period (1206-1451 A. D.), in *Quarterly Journal of the Pakistan Historical Society*, Vol. L, No. 3 (July-Sep. 2002.), PP.23-53, p. 25.
12. P. Hardy, *op. cit.*, pp.iv,4
13. Khurram Qadir, *op. cit.*, p. 25.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 26.
15. *Ibid.*, p.30.
16. P. Hardy, 'Some studies in Pre-Mughal Muslim Historiography', in C. H. Philips, *op. cit.*, pp. 115-127, p. 117.
17. The same type of work on a higher scale and more systematic method was being done by Ibn Khaldun in North Africa about the same time. Ziya al-din Barani's *Fatawa -I- Jahandari* has been considered as a complementary to his *Trikh -I- Firoz Shahi* same as Ibn Khaldun's *Prolegomena* and Macheivelli's *Prince* are complementary to their histories.
18. See Abdur Rashid, 'The Treatment of History by Muslim Historians in Sufi Writings', in C. H. Philips, *op. cit.*, pp. 128-138. Also see Dr. Khurram Qadir, *op. cit.* pp. 24-26.
19. R. G. Collingwood, *The Idea of History*, Oxford, 1946, p, 234. According to this theory, the essential things in history are memory and authority. History is thus believing someone else when he says that he remembers something.
20. P. Hardy, *op. cit.*, p. 7.
- 21 There are so many works written on the model of sultanate historiography such as Khond Mir's *Habibus Siyar*, and *Dastur ul Wuzra*, Abbas Khan Sarwani's *Tarikh i Sher Shahi*, Ahmad Yadgar's *Trikh i Shahi*, Harawi's *Tarikh-i- Khan Jahani*, Nizamuddin's *Tabaqat I Akbary*, Abul Fazal's *Akbarnama*, etc. For a view of the Persian language influence on Mughal historiography see Humaira Arif Dasti, 'Persian Influence on the Historiography of Mughal India', in *Journal of Research (Humanities)*, *Bahauddin Zakiriya University, Multan*, Vol. 21(2003), pp. 59-68.
22. *Tuzak-I-Babri*, *Humayun Nama* and *Tuzuk-I- Jahangiri* can be taken as examples of this tradition. See Annette Susannah Beveridge, tr., *The Babarnama*, London, 1922; *The History of Humayun (Humayun Nama)*, Oriental Translation Series-1, 1901, Indian reprint, Delhi, 1972.
23. For example Badaoni translated *Ramayna* from ancient Sanskrit to Persian and translated one half of *Mahabharta*.

24. See for a discussion on the subject Abdur Rashid, *op. cit.* pp. 128-138.
25. Mir Ghulam Hussain Tabatabai's *Siyar-ul-Mutakherin*, tr. John Briggs, 1832; Shah Waliullah's (1703-1762) writings on religious matters represent these two trends.
26. See Patrick Gardiner, ed., *Theories of History*, New York, 1959, *passim*.
27. R. G. Collingwood, *op. cit.*, pp.76-78.
28. Hume, *History of England*, London, 1785.
29. R. G. Collingwood, *op. cit.*, p.81.
30. G.P. Gooch, *History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century*, Boston, 1988, p. 8.
31. R. G. Collingwood, *op. cit.*, pp. 86-7.
32. *Ibid.*, p.89.
33. See for details G. P. Gooch, *op. cit.*, pp. 14-120.
34. See Hallam, *Sketch of Europe in the Middle Ages*, London, 1818.
35. See Thomas Carlyle, *On Heroes and Hero Worship*, London, 1928.
36. See T. B. Macaulay, *History of England*, London, 1846 .
37. Legouis and Cazamian, *History of English Literature*, n.p., 1984, pp. 1030-1041. Also see G. P. Gooch, *op. cit.*, chapter xiv and xvi.
38. Second edition, London, 1815.
39. Two Volumes, London, 1793..
40. Two Volumes, London, 1832.
41. William Robertson, *History of America*, Edinburgh, 1771.
42. One popular example of this trend is Edward Gibbon's *The History Of The Decline And Fall Of The Roman Empire*. It was published in seven volumes. First volume appeared in 1776 and last in 1788. It has been reprinted for several times.
43. For details see D.Forbes' *The Liberal Anglican Idea of History*, Cambridge, 1952.
44. For a detailed study of industrial revolution see W. Cunningham, *The Growth of English Industry and Commerce*, Cambridge, 1882
45. See for details P.E.Roberts, *History of British India Under The Company And Crown*, ed. by T.G.P. Spear, London, 1958.
46. The British interest in India was so high that they began to consider Indian state, society, religions, politics, culture, manners, customs, arts, sciences, natural resources, soil and produce a specified field of study. It was termed as Indology. Sir William Jones is taken as the Father of Indology. For details see S.N.Mukherjee's *Sir William Jones*, Cambridge, 1968, pp. 73-121.
47. Michael Bentley, ed., *op. cit.*, p.680.
48. See Fraser, *The History of Nadir Shah*, London, 1742.
49. Francois Bernier, *The History of the Late Revolution of the Empire of Great Mogol*, London, 1671.
50. Francois Catrou's *The General History of the Mogol Empire*, London, 1695.
51. Robert I. Crane, *The History of India: Its Study And Interpretation*, Washington, 1958, pp. 5-6.
52. Edward Said, *Orientalism: Western Conception Of The Orient*, London, 1985, pp.8-9.
53. *Ibid.*, p.205.
54. And early British works on Indian history were aiming at an understanding of

Indian system of state, society and religion. So it were primarily translations from the histories written by the Indian Muslims. For example Alexander Dow's *The History of Hindostan* (London, 1768-72) published in three volumes was based primarily on Muhammad Qasim Farishta's *Tarikh-I-Farishta*. Elliot & Dowson's *History of India as Told By Its Own Historians*, London, 1969 is the sole example of this trend of translating Indian history written by indigenous writers for political needs.

55. See for example Thomas Maurice's *The History Of Hindostan; Its Arts And Its Sciences*, London, 1795.
56. James Mill, *History Of British India*, 3 vols., London, 1817.
57. Mountstuart Elphinstone, *History of India*, Two Volumes., London, 1841.
58. J.S. Cotton, *Rulers Of India: Mountstuart Elphinstone*, Oxford, 1892, p.196.
59. A number of British writer seem to be focusing the interest of the British readership in Indian affairs as a motivating force working behind their literary skill. For example see Ms Meer Hasan Ali, *Observations On The Mussulmauns of India*, London, 1832.
60. Robert I. Crane, *op. cit.*, pp.6-7.
61. C.H.Philips, *op. cit.*, p.8.
62. For a detailed study of the trends developing during the enlightenment see Harold Nicolson's *The Age of Reason 1700-1789*, London, 1968.
63. The influence of English liberalism on historiography is discussed in detail by J.W.Burrow in his book *A Liberal Descent: Victorian Historians And The English Past*, cambridge, 1981.
64. See for details Eric Stokes' *The English Utilitarians and India*, Delhi, 1982.
65. Among the missionaries a number of writers contributed to the English historical literature on India. Among them Carry, William Ward, J. Marshman, John Clark Marshman, Heber, Massie, Henry Martyn and East India Company's so many servants working for the christianisation of India are well reputed. Their contibution to English Historiographic literature on India need an extended researchon academic level.