Chapter 6
Race Science Versus Sanskrit

The debate about the internal composition of the Indian people that I reviewed in chapter 5 was an ethnological issue pursued through philological means—the comparison of parallel columns of vocabulary lists—and it unfolded and expanded itself in the first half and a bit more of the nineteenth century. It was in the same period that, back in the metropole, anthropology as a discipline was taking shape. I return to Britain in this chapter, showing how the methods and preoccupations of British Indian ethnologies were central to the formation of anthropology, but how, in the end, what Nancy Stepan (1982) has named "race science" in Britain defined itself by disengaging from the tutelage of Sanskrit and Indo-Europeanist philology and putting itself in opposition to them.

British Anthropology in the Nineteenth Century

of the many contributions of George W. Stocking, Jr., to the history of anthropology in Britain (culminating in his great synthesis, *Victorian anthropology*, 1987), one of the most important for our subject is his discovery of the central role of James Cowles Prichard in the first half of the nineteenth century. Two excellent studies by Stocking are of particular help in examining the relation of the Prichardian

paradigm to the work of the British Sanskritists. "What's in a name?" (1971) traces the institutional origins of the Royal Anthropological Institute, whose founding in 1871 was effectively the beginning of British anthropology as we know it, and the introduction to his edition of the leading work of J. C. Prichard (1973) presents a masterly analysis of Prichardian anthropology.

In the first of these writings Stocking shows a developmental sequence involving four organizations: the Aborigines Protection Society, the Ethnological Society of London, the Anthropological Society of London, and the Royal Anthropological Institute. The Aborigines Protection Society was founded in 1837, a philanthropic organization with Quaker and Evangelical roots, the more scientifically oriented members of which formed the Ethnological Society of London in 1843; a breakaway group of the latter formed a rival, the Anthropological Society of London in 1863. After years of tension between the two, they united in 1871 under a new, Darwinist leadership in the Royal Anthropological Institute.

The Ethnological Society of London (ESL) tended to support monogenism, consistent with the motto of the Aborigines Protection Society whence it came: *ab uno sanguine*, "of one blood." The goal of its vision of ethnology was to demonstrate the original unity of the human race, "to fill the gap between the dispersion of the tribes of man over the earth and the first historical records of each present nation, and in doing so to tie all men together into a single ethnological family tree." The model of explanation was diffusionary and historical, the method of choice was "the comparison of languages to establish affinities between physically dissimilar groups" (Stocking 1971:372-373)— the Mosaic ethnology, in fact. This style of ethnology was that of James Cowles (1786-1848), who was the leading British ethnologist of his age, his career spanning nearly the first half of the nineteenth century, and the one who introduced the name ethnology into Britain.

The breakaway group, the Anthropological Society of London (ASL), had to some degree an overlapping membership and range of interests with its parent, the Ethnological Society of London, but its overall style was set by the preoccupations of its leader, James Hunt. Hunt was a polygenist, who strongly emphasized the differences between the races and asserted their permanence. His racial views imbibed from the notorious Robert Knox, author of a toxic book called *The races of men: A philosophical enquiry into the influence of race over the destinies of nations* (1862), and his conception of anthropology was taken from the French physical anthropologist Paul Broca, who emphasized

the connection of the physical and the psychological. It was with Prichard and the Prichardian ethnology of the ESL that Hunt picked his quarrel. In the event, the monogenetic thesis of the ESL and the polygenist antithesis of the ASL found their synthesis in the Royal Anthropological Institute, founded in 1871, which brought about a peace under the leadership, Darwinist and evolutionary, of John Lubbock.

Such was the success of the new evolutionary and Darwinist synthesis that Prichard and his works fell at length into a deep obscurity, and so complete was that darkness that Stocking rightly speaks of a blind spot. Anthropology's field Of vision in respect to its own past has all but blocked out the ethnology of the first half of the nineteenth century, finding its intellectual ancestors among the "stage" theorists of the eighteenth century and among the social evolutionists of the later nineteenth century, but with little memory for anything that fell chronologically in between, Prichard's work above all. This is an important insight, improving upon J. W. Burrow's notion of a lost generation of evolutionism between the eighteenth and late nineteenth centuries (Burrow 1966).

Consider, on the one hand, the publishing record of Prichard's now unknown works as a sign of their reception in his own day. The central item, the *Researches*, was first published in 1813 and was based upon his Latin doctoral dissertation of 1808 with its Blumenbachian title, *De generis humani varietate*. Prichard continued to revise and expand this work: A second edition in two volumes came out in 1826, a third edition in five volumes in 1836-47; a German translation was published in 1840-48; and a fourth edition, "actually a reprinting" (Stocking 1973:cxv), was issued in 1851, after Prichard's death. A single-volume summary for a wider audience, *The natural history of man*, did very well indeed: The first edition and a French translation appeared in 1843, the second edition in 1845, the third in 1848, and, after his death, the fourth, a two-volume edition, in 1855. His many other books and articles on ethnological and medical subjects (for which I direct the interested to Stocking's bibliography of Prichard [1973:cxi ff.]) include an important contribution to Celtic studies, *The eastern origin of the Celtic nations proved by a comparison of their dialects with the Sanskrit, Greek, Latin and Teutonic languages*, a full-blown piece of Indo-European comparative philology, written as a supplement to the *Researches* and published in 1831 The publishing history, however, comes to an end in the 1850s, and that is a sign of the eclipse of Prichard's reputation and also the eclipse of an ethnology led by the issues and methods of language study.

Consider, on the other hand, the structure of anthropology's own

sense of its history in the twentieth century, taking the posthumously published lectures of E. E. Evans-Pritchard (not to be confused with James Cowles Prichard) as a particularly clear example (Evans-Pritchard 1981). Each lecture takes up a different scholar; the work surveys the social theorists of eighteenth-century France (Montesquieu, Condorcet) and Scotland (Lord Kames, Adam Ferguson, John Millar), and the later nineteenth-century luminaries John McLennan, Robertson Smith, Sir. Henry Maine, E. B. Tylor, and others, but the early nineteenth century is nearly a blank, with only August Comte included as chronological connective tissue between the two sets of proto-anthropologists. J. C. Prichard is not so much as mentioned. The early nineteenth century is a black hole into which Prichard disappeared with a completeness that is astonishing in view of the preeminence of his authority and the wide readership of his works in his own lifetime. It is not just a question of the lost reputation of an individual; because the two series of ethnological thinkers mentioned above, the eighteenth-century series and the late-nineteenth-century one, are both committed to some form of a theory of social stages, the story appears to be one of very substantial continuity and progress over a long period, interrupted at best by a "lost generation" between them. But that simple story gets greatly complicated when we examine Prichard closely, for the Prichardian paradigm is rather different from both, and the story of anthropology's formative years seems, rather, to be one of Kuhnian rupture arid discontinuity.

The Prichardian Paradigm and the British Sanskritists

With the Stocking thesis as our starting point we now come to the work of this chapter, which is to probe the two contradictory relations of Prichardian ethnology to the ethnological methods of the India hands and to India as an object of ethnological study. In Prichard himself we see that the Calcutta Sanskritists play a large role in the formation of his ethnological framework, and India is central to his ethnology, but by mid-century Prichardian ethnology, represented by the younger Prichardians R. G. Latham and John Crawfurd, was at loggerheads with Sanskrit, as symbolized in the person of Friedrich Max Müller. In the work of these writers (much as in George Campbell's), although language remains the leading principle of classification at the

surface level, in fact the claims of physical features are advanced to defeat the authority of the Indo-European doctrine and of Sanskritists for ethnological classifications.

We begin with Prichard himself. Stocking's excellent guide to Prichard's references (1973) makes it easy to trace the influence of the Calcutta Sanskritists and to determine that their writings were of major import in the formation of Prichardian ethnology. *Asiatic researches* is cited repeatedly, and Stocking lists ten different authors, among whom Jones, Colebrooke, and Wilford are notable. Hamilton's anonymous review of Wilkins's Sanskrit grammar is also cited. Prichard's rather extensive reading of Indological works included other British and British Indian writers as well as Anquetil and some of the missionary writers of the older Orientalism. He also cites Jacob Bryant, the writer of *Analysis of antient mythology* which had such a pronounced effect on the formation of Jones's ethnological system, prominently and more than once. Indeed, examination of Prichard's text and references leads me to conclude that at the very heart of Prichard's interest in the Orientalist literature lay the Jones-Bryant theory of the original unity of the ancient civilized peoples—the Indians, Egyptians, Greeks, Romans, and others—as descendants of Ham. Two of the nine chapters of the *Researches* are specifically devoted to proving the unity of Indians and Egyptians. To explain the centrality of India and the new Orientalism in this curious book, it may be helpful to begin with another contemporary reaction to the Jonesean ethnology, that of an anonymous reviewer in the *Monthly review*.[1]

The reviewer lists several serious obstacles to Jones's system. The first is that Jones says nothing of where the Negroes fit into the scheme of things, "and if, by implication, we suppose them descended from the same stock as the Indians, Romans, and Goths, the difficulty is enhanced by the Indian emigrants of the same country retaining their original configuration, while the negroes have lost it" (*Monthly review* 1797:413-414). Another concerned the Curse of Ham: "The malediction of the Patriarch seems to have operated in a manner diametrically opposite to his wishes," since the sons of the reprobate Ham have taken possession of the fairest fields and richest countries of the habitable globe, the civilized parts of Europe and Asia, "while the descendants of the dutiful sons are condemned to the burning sands of Arabia [i.e., Shem], or to the inhospitable regions of frozen Tartary [i.e.,

[1]. See note 7 for chapter 1 on the identity of the author of this review.

Japhet]" (*Monthly review* 1797:414). In short, skin color stood in the way of combining the Europeans, Indians, and Egyptians with one another and, as sons of Ham, with black Africans. And while for Jones color of skin was a fairly fast-acting effect of climate, for others who assumed it to be less mutable, it was a stumbling block to the acceptance of the Hamian theory of Bryant and Jones.

Prichard, however, was drawn to the Bryant-Jones theory because he believed he saw a different way to synthesize the Biblical teaching of the unity of the human kind with the fast-growing stock of new information about human societies around the world. The three parts of his make-up were his personal religion (Quaker turned Anglican), his profession as medical doctor, and his interest in languages and in the progress of philology. These three combine in the composition of Prichardian ethnology, in which the Biblical narrative is scientifically grounded by a sustained inquiry into the relation of language and physical features. The fundamental idea of the *Researches* is that civilization and skin color covary, that the human race is descended from a single pair (Adam and Eve) who were black of skin, and that change of skin color was brought about not by climate (the more usual view) but by civilization, the effect of which, it is claimed, is to lighten the skin.

This surprising conclusion was in a sense a new reading of the Hamian theory of Bryant and Jones. Prichard's chapters on Indian-Egyptian. unity go to show that both peoples, who are taken to be the very first to become civilized, were in ancient times black Of skin and gradually became lighter, as have other civilized descendants of Ham. For the Egyptian side he cites ancient authors such as Herodotus on the black skin and woolly hair of the Egyptians and Ethiopians, whom he regards as of one race. For the Indian side he cites Wilford:

> In several parts of India the mountaineers resemble Negroes in their countenance, and in some degree in their hair, which is curled and has a tendency to wool. . . . It is reasonable to suppose that the barbarous tribes preserve most of the original character of the nation, for the first colonists were in all probability rude people. The better orders in India, as in other countries, have gradually improved by civilization, and have acquired a different aspect. . . It cannot reasonably be doubted, that a race of Negroes formerly had pre-eminence in India. (Wilford 1792; quoted in Prichard 1813:391)

Physical features combine with mythology, architecture, and other evidence set forth to prove the original unity of India and Egypt. Prichard argues that in the times of the patriarch Abraham the empire of Elam

was Indo-Persian or Hindu in character and bordered the kingdom of Egypt, so that it is no longer difficult to imagine Indians and Egyptians connected in race and origin (Prichard 1813:471).

Thus in Prichard's early ethnological synthesis the central argument is that race is a sign of civilization because civilization is the *cause* of race, and the India-Egypt connection is the hinge upon which the argument turns because it mediates between the dark-skinned savage and the fair-skinned civilized European. As Stocking remarks, however, Prichard's theory of the original negritude of the human race was not popular, and in many ways the subsequent editions of the *Researches* are marked not only by the additions of vast amounts of new ethnological data but also by a series of small retreats from the central thesis of the first edition; the cumulative effect is to reverse its direction. The most striking of these retreats is that Prichard gradually falls in with the traditional theory of climate as the cause of complexion, which he had originally set aside. In *The natural history of man*, for example, he says that the most compelling proof that the complexion of the Hindus is connected with the climate they inhabit is found among the Indians settled in the high Himalayas, some of whom are very fair, with blue eyes and auburn or red hair (Prichard 1843:169). On the other hand, Prichard now juxtaposes a fair Aryan race to the aboriginal races, all of them of different languages and distinct from the Hindus, who belong to the Indo-European or Aryan stock (1843:240). He identifies these aborigines as the Sinhalese (wrongly, since their language is Indo-European), the "Tamulian race," the mountain tribes of the Deccan, and a number of "petty barbarous tribes between the Indian and the Indo-Chinese Peninsulas" (1843:241). He inclines toward the prevailing doctrine of the unity of the Indian aborigines. It is possible, he thinks, that the "wild races in the Dekhan are allied to the Tamulian tribes" and descended "from people of that stock who refused to receive the apostles of the Hindoo theology, and of civilisation and slavery," but they are now very different from each other in moral and physical characters, "some being vigorous and finely formed, others diminutive and puny. The difference may be explained in many instances by reference to the climates and local influences under which the several tribes exist" (1843:248).

The early Prichard had assumed the unity of the Indians *inter se* and with the Egyptians and their original negritude; the late Prichard abandons the unity of the Indians and tentatively adopts the unity of the Indian aborigines, or a part of them, in opposition to a light-skinned

Hindu or Aryan race. The early Prichard adopted civilization itself, and not climate, as the cause of racial differences; the late Prichard turns automatically to climate when there is a difference of physical features to be explained. And the early Prichard had said in a note at the conclusion of the *Researches*, "This part of our scheme, and indeed the whole of it, perfectly coincides with the system of Mr. Bryant, though built entirely on different principles" (Prichard 1813:558). The later Prichard abandons Bryant and the Hamian theory that had been the source of his early attraction to Bryant—and to Jones.

Friedrich Max Müller on Aryan Brotherhood

Friedrich Max Müller was the creator of the notion of the Aryan race, and he was the most ardent and consistent advocate of the idea of the brotherhood of the Aryan peoples, more especially of the kinship between Indians and Europeans.[2] He was very well known, in India even though he never traveled there, and his friendships with Indians were important to him in his self-representations. He took up the Aryan love story and told it with verve and passion. He had a gift for public performance and for colorful expression. The highly visible position he occupied in English public life—he was *the* celebrity scholar for Sanskrit and comparative philology during the greater part of the Victorian period—makes him a central actor in the story of the attacks upon Sanskrit by race science. He became the embodiment of that which race science sought to overthrow, its Public Enemy Number One. In the latter half of his life the development of race science, both in England and on the Continent, made Max Müller regret that he had spoken of race, and he proposed a divorce, amicable if possible, between philology and ethnology.

It is difficult to capture the exact character of Max Müller's place in English public life. Perhaps I could say that he was one of the great Outsider-Insiders. Born in the tiny German duchy of Anhalt-Dessau, he studied Sanskrit with Hermann Brockhaus in Leipzig, Bopp in Berlin, and Bernouf in Paris, coming finally in 1846 to London and Oxford

[2]. Friedrich Max Müller wished people to take "Max Müller" as his last name, and this has caused endless confusion. I treat him as Max Müller, Friedrich, but his name is often listed alphabetically as Müller, Friedrich Max. There is no good solution to this problem.

to carry out the great project of his youth, the editing of the text of the *Rg Veda*. He married an English woman and he remained in Oxford to the end of his life in 1900, first as professor of modern languages and, from 1868, in a professorship of comparative philology created especially for him. The latter was a kind of consolation prize for the fact that when H. H. Wilson died and the Boden Professorship of Sanskrit became vacant, in 1860, it went after a hotly contested election to Monier Monier-Williams, who had been the Sanskrit professor at Haileybury when it was closed two years before (the same who composed the Sanskrit inscription we examined in chapter 1). The Boden Professorship had been privately endowed for the purpose of promoting the spread of Christianity by the translation of the Bible into Sanskrit. It was awarded to Monier-Williams by vote of convocation following a period of heavy lobbying, in which Max Müller's broad religious views and foreign birth worked against him even though he was much the better Sanskritist. It was a bitter defeat for him and had the effect of turning him toward comparative philology, a field in which he never became a major contributor but for which he became a most prominent and effective publicist, purveying to the English public the fruits of Continental scholarship. His lectures at the Royal Institution in 1861 and 1863 were immensely successful and were published as *Lectures on the science of language* (1861), which became a standard authority in English for the results of comparative philology. His later work on comparative mythology also has this popularizing character. Max Müller had a career of great public visibility and many, many honors, but it was built upon Oxford's exclusion of this talented and prodigiously productive Sanskritist from teaching in his own field. Max Müller was by inclination and force of circumstance a great internationalist, but he could always be seen, instead, simply, as a foreigner.

A youthful Friedrich Max Müller—not yet twenty-three—gave his maiden speech in English, after much prodding by his patron, Baron Christian Bunsen, Prussian ambassador and writer on universal history, at a session of the 1847 meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science held in Oxford. The session brought together in one room most of the figures of this chapter, for it was presided over by Prichard, then at the end of his life, and attended by "some not very friendly ethnologists" (1900:210), as Max Müller recalls in a memoir, particularly R. G. Latham and John Crawfurd, who was known by the name of "the Objector General." Prince Albert was present, drawing a large audience, which made Max Müller "fearfully nervous." In the

event, Prichard protected Max Müller "most chivalrously against the somewhat frivolous objections of certain members, who were not overly friendly towards Prince Albert, Chevalier Bunsen, and all that was called German in scholarship" (Max Müller 1901:211).

Max Müller's paper "On the relation of the Bengali to the Arian and aboriginal languages of India" (1847) takes up the central issue of British Indian ethnology. He sets out with a spirited counterattack upon the party of the English Christian missionaries in their opposition to Orientalist scholarship, and I cannot help but think that the description fits the Rev. John Stevenson (though a Sanskritist as well as a missionary) rather well:

> The hostile spirit of a party, which has been working for the last years, particularly in this country, to attack all the theories of the Sanscrit antiquarians, has chosen the modern languages of India as a weak point, in order to prove that, as they have no connexion by their grammatical system with the pretended old language of India, the Sanscrit, this sacred language itself has never exercised any real influence upon the people, just as they have tried to prove that the literature, the religion, morals and philosophy of the Brahmins have never historically existed but in the hands of some foreign intriguing priests. (1847:325)

The intent of these partisans was no doubt philanthropic, he thought, and perhaps it had the negative benefit of opposing the extreme of Indomania, which "found Brahmins as the real founders of civilization over the whole world, connected not only with the religious systems of Egypt and Greece, but even at the bottom of the Christian doctrine" (the same); here Wilford would be the leading example. Max Müller positions himself against both extremes, identifying himself, and Orientalism, with the Orientalist party and its leader, the Oxford professor of Sanskrit H. H. Wilson; that is, he reasserts the Sanskritists' position that the vernaculars of northern India, Bengali in this instance, are derived in the main from Sanskrit and are hence a part of the Indo-European family, but he invests this fact with great moral and policy significance, and adopts the Orientalist position against the Anglicists on educational policy.

The paper develops what we might call the two-race theory of Indian civilization, the two races being Cushite or Hamite or Negro, and Japhetite or Caucasian. Indians are "one great branch of the Caucasian race [not Hamians as Jones and Bryant had it], differing from other branches of the same race merely by its darker complexion" caused by the climate (1847:347). Max Müller describes a different race in the

mountainous districts of the north, however, which resembles the Negro in physical and intellectual type; the same dark race is present in the south, although the "noble stamp of the Caucasian race" is seen in the brahmins and in the great mass of the inhabitants of the Deccan. How is it that the southerners do not speak an Indo-European language (Max Müller says Indo-Germanic; he has not yet become champion of the name Aryan), but rather the Dravidian languages which, according to recent research, resemble most "the dialects spoken by the savage tribes, like the Bhillas and Gondas," thought to be of Cushite origin?

In answer to this question Max Müller unfolds the racial history of India in terms of the relations between the lighter civilized race and the darker savages. The story aims to accomplish two things at once. It aims to show that India is civilized and that its civilized Aryan invaders have not (as in the view of the hostile missionary party) become uncivilized by mingling with the dark race. Moreover, it draws from the history of relations of light and dark races within India a moral for the relations of light Britons to darker Indians in the present. The tale proceeds from North India to South India, showing differing race histories, the south being the most fruitful outcome and representing the moral of the story for Britain.

In North India, says Max Müller, when the Aryan tribes immigrated they came as a warrior people, vanquishing, destroying, and subjecting the savage and despised inhabitants of the country. "We generally find that it is the fate of the negro race, when brought into hostile contact with the Japhetic race, to be either destroyed and annihilated, or to fall into a state of slavery and degradation, from which, if at all, it recovers by the slow process of assimilation" (1847:348). Max Müller asserts that this assimilation has been accomplished in the north: The greater part vanished before the approach of the Aryans, and others were enslaved and adopted the manners, religion and language of the Aryans. "The lower classes of the Hindus consist of those aboriginal inhabitants, some continuing in a state of the utmost degradation as outcastes, but others have intellectually and physically undergone a complete regeneration, so that after three thousand years it would be difficult to trace the Sudra origin of many highly distinguished families of India" (the same). The notion that civilization brings about physical regeneration, that is, lightening of the complexion, is distinctly Prichardian.

But the Aryan conquerors of India did not settle the whole of Hindustan, Max Müller continues, leaving large tracts under the rule of aboriginal tribes, the dark race of the mountainous and afforested re-

gions of the north. The dark aboriginal race includes the peoples of the Gondwana region of Central India, whose pillage and human sacrifices had been recently suppressed by the English armies, "and it is curious to see how the [English] descendants of the same [Aryan] race, to which the first conquerors and masters of India belonged, return, after having followed the northern development of the Japhetic race to their primordial soil, to accomplish the glorious work of civilization, which had been left unfinished by their Arian brethren" (1847:349). The phrase "Aryan brethren" is Max Müller's contribution to the Orientalist love story of British India, although it was often taken in vain by its opponents.

It was in the south, however—to continue Max Müller's argument— that the civilizing process proceeded farthest, not by conquering armies but through peaceful colonization by the brahmins. In the south, the Aryans—that is, the brahmins—"followed the wiser policy of adopting themselves the language of the aboriginal people, and of conveying through its medium their knowledge and instruction to the minds of uncivilized tribes," and in so doing they refined the language and raised it to a perfection that rivals even the Sanskrit. Because of this concession to the local language there was a much more favorable assimilation between the Aryan and the aboriginal races, and the south became a bastion of brahminical science "when it was banished from the north by the intolerant Mohammedans." The story had a moral for the current rulers of India: "The beneficial influence of a higher civilization may be effectually exercised without forcing the people to give up their own language and to adopt that of their foreign conquerors, a result by which, if successful, every vital principle of an independent and natural development is necessarily destroyed" (the same). In short, the ancient history of India demonstrated the greater wisdom of the Orientalist educational policy over the Anglicist one.

The two-race theory of Indian civilization, in Max Müller's version, was meant to promote the solidarity of the two partners of empire as Aryan brethren to each other, based on the identity Japhetic = Caucasian = Aryan. Complexion thus is a malleable property, caused by. climate. Darkness of complexion, it is true, is associated with savagery in this argument. But race is not destiny; a civilizing "regeneration," moral and physical, is possible through long, preferably peaceful, association.

For the race-is-destiny view I shall turn to the ethnologists Latham and Crawfurd and their attack upon the philologists, especially Max

Müller himself. These were the "not very friendly ethnologists" Max Müller remembered at his first public performance in English. Their hostility grew as Max Müller's career developed and came to fasten upon a couple of the more vivid metaphors of his later writings, which I will now enter into the record.

Having become a professor at Oxford, Max Müller was asked to give advice to British officers engaged in the Crimean War as to how best to go about acquiring the languages of the region. The result was a short book, *Suggestions for the assistance of officers in learning the languages of the seat of war in the East* (1854b). In it he takes the opportunity to stress again the inclusive side of the Indo-European concept, and he does so in the following remarkable statement from the second edition.

> No authority could have been strong enough to persuade the Grecian army [of Alexander] that their gods and their hero-ancestors were the same as those of [the Indian] King Porus, or to convince the English soldier that the same blood was running in his veins, as in the veins of the dark Bengalese. And yet there is not an English jury now-a-days, which, after examining the hoary documents of language, would reject the claim of a common descent and a legitimate relationship between Hindu, Greek, and Teuton. Many words still live in India and in England that witnessed the first separation of the northern and southern Arians, and these are witnesses not to be shaken by any cross-examination. The terms for God, for house, for father, mother, son, daughter, for dog and cow, for heart and tears, for axe and tree, identical in all the Indo-European idioms, are like the watchwords of an army. We challenge the seeming stranger, and whether he answer with the lips of a Greek, a German, or an Indian, we recognize him as one of ourselves. Though the historian may shake his head, though the physiologist may doubt, and the poet scorn the idea, all must yield before the facts furnished by language. There was a time when the ancestors of the Celts, the Germans, the Slaves [*sic*], the Greeks and Italians, the Persians and Hindus, were living together beneath the same roof, separate from the ancestors of the Semitic and Turanian races. (Max Müller 1855:29)

This arresting image of an English jury deciding in favor of Aryan brotherhood was much talked about, for and against. Almost as memorable were his words to the same effect in his *Lectures on the science of language*:

> As sure as the six Romance dialects point to an original home of Italian shepherds on the seven hills at Rome, the Aryan languages together point to an earlier period of language, when the first ancestors of the Indians, the Persians, the Greeks, the Romans, the Slaves, the Celts, and the Germans

> were living together within the same enclosures, nay, under the same roof. . . . Before the ancestors of the Indians and Persians started for the south, and the leaders of the Greek, Roman, Celtic, Teutonic, and Slavonic colonies marched towards the shores of Europe, there was a small clan of Aryans, settled probably on the highest elevation of Central Asia, speaking a language, not yet Sanskrit or Greek or German, but containing the dialectic germs of all; a clan that had advanced to a state of agricultural civilisation; that had recognised the bonds of blood, and sanctioned the bonds of marriage; and that invoked the Giver of Light and Life in heaven by the same name which you may still hear in the temples of Benares, in the basilicas of Rome, and in our own churches and cathedrals. (1861:219-220)

It is worth adding that Max Müller continued to sound this note throughout his life, speaking out repeatedly against both anti-Semitism and the denigration of Indians by Britons· In his presidential address to the Ninth International Congress of Orientalists, toward the end of his life, he accounted it one of the great advances of Orientalism that not only had the inhabitants of India "ceased to be mere idolaters or niggers, they have been recognised as our brothers in language and thought" (1892:34). The thesis of the Aryan brotherhood of Britons and Indians was far more than a proposition of science for Max Müller; it was also an ethic.

Robert Latham and John Crawfurd Attack the Sanskritists

The attack upon Max Müller and upon the Sanskritists generally by Robert Latham and John Crawfurd is remarkable for its acrimony, and for the fact that it came from an ethnology of the Prichardian kind that was otherwise so very congenial to comparative philology. Indeed, both Latham and Crawfurd, in their very different career paths, came via philological work of their own to a language-based ethnology, but then turned *against* the Sanskritists. Crawfurd (1783-1868) spent five years in North India as an army medical officer, but he passed the greater part of his career in Southeast Asia, at Penang, Java, and Singapore and as envoy to Siam, Cochin China, and Ava, before retiring to England in 1827. He is especially known for his *Grammar and dictionary of the Malay language* (1852) and his diplomatic memoirs, quite apart from his many ethnological articles published in the journal of

the Ethnological Society of London. The stay-at-home Latham wrote on the English language and on the *Elements of comparative philology* (1862) as well as his more properly ethnological works of which the major ones are *The natural history of the varieties of man* (1850) and *Descriptive ethnology* (1859a). Both were active in the Ethnological Society of London—Crawfurd was a president—and both are leading examples of Prichardian ethnology. Between them they illustrate how the claims of race overruled the claims of language in the representative theories of the ESL, and not only in the rival Anthropological Society of London with its anti-Prichardian leadership. By mid-century the relations between philology and ethnology were in crisis.

Latham classes the populations of contemporary India as Mongoloid (Mongolidae) and not among the Japhetites (Iapetidae), which is his equivalent for the Indo-Europeans (1850). The ancient speakers of Sanskrit, then, are of a race quite different from that of the Indians proper, and his argument obliges him to minimize all connection between Sanskrit and the modern languages of India, as he does in his chapter on Sanskrit in *Elements of comparative philology* (1862:chap. 64) To this end he argues that the homeland of Sanskrit is on the eastern or southeastern border of Lithuania in the Baltic region, far from India; that none of the modern languages of India are true daughters of Sanskrit, and Sanskritic words in them may as easily be indigenous Indian loanwords; that the Devanagari script in which Sanskrit is written has no specimen older than the Muslim conquest (!); that Sanskrit has a series of true aspirates wanting in its European congeners (!) and cerebrals; that it is not proved that the brahmins, the expositors of the Sanskrit language, are the descendants of those who first spoke it as their mother tongue; and that the character of Sanskrit literature is such that it cannot have been the product of a vernacular, and thus it can have no true vernaculars as its descendants. It hardly needs saying that these "facts" are highly contentious interpretations.

Latham comes, then, to the nub of the thing, which is a portrayal of the opposing view as un-English. As against "the extreme Sanskrit scholars"—and there can be no doubt that he considered Max Müller as the type case—Latham presents himself not as an expert but as an intelligent English juryman reading the evidence by the light of common sense, "who, knowing that he is no judge, putting a wholesome distrust in the barrister, and ignoring anything which he may or may not know *aliunde*, simply looks to the evidence" and finds it "insufficient for the present." Beyond this purely negative conclusion "he is not

afraid of committing himself to the doctrine that, when philologers make the Vedas 3,000 and odd years old, and deduce the Latin and its congeners from Asia, they are wrong to, at least, a thousand miles in space, and as many years in time" (1862:619). Thus does plain English common sense triumph over the learned folly of the Sanskritist, and the fundament of that common sense, it would appear, is mere contempt for dark-skinned peoples. It is surprising to find such an argument coming from the pen of a philologist, and a Prichardian at that. It is a sign that the Prichardian paradigm is being abandoned for a "race science" view.

In Crawfurd's transformation, Prichardian ethnology finds the testimony of language and of race at odds with each other, and he jettisons the claims of language. In an 1861 article provoked by Max Müller's immensely popular lectures on the science of language, Crawfurd characterizes the "Aryan or Indo-Germanic theory" as a theory "that had its origin in Germany"—so much for Jones—"and which has since had a wide acceptance among the learned in other parts of Europe" (1861:268). According to this theory, all the nations and tribes from Bengal to Europe are of one race, the only material exception being the Arabs, Jews, and others speaking cognate (Semitic) languages. The fault of this theory, Crawfurd argues, is that it is founded on a supposed essential conformity of language and nationality "without regard to physical form or intellectual capacity" (the same). The burden of the article is to show, to the contrary, that consideration of physical form and intellectual capacity overturns the evidence of language. As in Latham, the conclusion mockingly recalls Max Müller's metaphor of the English jury:

> From the facts I have adduced in the course of this paper I must come to the conclusion that the theory which makes all the languages of Europe and Asia, from Bengal to the British Islands, however different in appearance, to have sprung from the same stock, and hence, all the people speaking them, black, swarthy, and fair, to be of one and the same race of man, is utterly groundless, and the mere dream of learned men, and perhaps even more imaginative than learned. I can by no means, then, agree with a very learned professor of Oxford, that the same blood ran in the veins of the soldiers of Alexander and Clive as in those of the Hindus whom, at the interval of two-and-twenty ages, they both scattered with the same facility. I am not prepared, like him, to believe that an English jury, unless it were a packed one of learned Orientalists, with the ingenious professor himself for its foreman, would, "After examining the hoary documents of language," admit "the claim of a common descent between Hindu, Greek, and Teuton," for that would amount to allowing that there was no differ-

> ence in the faculties of the people that produced Homer and Shakespear, and those that have produced nothing better than the authors of the Mahabharat and Ramayana; no difference between the home-keeping Hindus, who never made a foreign conquest of any kind, and the nations who discovered, conquered, and peopled a new world. (1861:285)

The vehemence and sarcasm of this rejection of Max Müller's "Aryan brethren" thesis is as notable as the contempt for Indians and Indian civilization that accompanies it. Elsewhere Crawfurd writes of the dangers of intermarriage between races widely apart on the scale of civilization (Crawfurd 1865). Evidently he believed that philology is bad for racial hygiene. The irony of this sad story is that the destruction of the authority of language comparison in ethnological classifications, and the substitutions of the claims of race science, was in great part the work of the two leading philologically pedigreed ethnologists from the Prichardian stable.

Race Science

In Crawfurd we meet the race doctrine in its strong form, that is, as the doctrine of the necessary and permanent association of different levels of intelligence with different races defined by physical form. Let us call it the doctrine of racial essentialism. In this belief, race is an inescapable doom or destiny, as the case may be.

Neither Evangelicals intent on turning Hindus into Christians, nor Utilitarians seeking to liberate Hindus from their own civilization by education in the arts and sciences of Europe, could hold to racial essentialism, for that would be to assert that the Indians were doomed to remain forever inferior; both groups were committed to a belief in the possibility of ameliorating the Indian condition. Thus the Indophobia of the Evangelicals and Utilitarians is not racial-essentialist but has to do with unflattering comparisons of Hinduism with Protestant Christianity and of Indian civilization with European. What we generally encounter in such circles, therefore, is some form of the climate doctrine as an explanation of physical features. Thus when Macaulay delivered a dissertation on the Bengali character—in terms that amount to character assassination at the level of the nation—he explains in climactic, not racial-essentialist, terms: "The Bengali lives in a vapour bath" (1835) which makes his character what it is. The doctrine of racial

essentialism of the emerging race science had to make its way against these religious and progressivist positions, but the evident weakness of climate as a cause of complexion told in its favor.

On one thing Max Müller and Crawfurd were agreed, namely that the evidence of language and the evidence of physiology were at odds with each other. Where they differed was over the respective claims of philology and physiology to govern ethnological inquiry. Underlying the difference was a difference in beliefs about the fixity or malleability of complexion and intelligence, and the relation, necessary or variable. between the two.

India was at the center of the growing quarrel between ethnology and philology or, to put it more exactly, between race science and the Sanskritists. We can picture the development of race Science in nineteenth-century Britain somewhat schematically (and more in conceptual terms than in chronology) as a movement from the extremes toward the center. At opposite extremes lay the light-skinned civilized European and the dark-skinned savage. The results of anatomical investigation of Europeans and Negroes were read not as parallel departures from simian forms (as under the tree paradigm), but as establishing the top and bottom of a progressive series of human races (as in the figure of a scale or staircase of human races), with comparable mental endowments and civilizational achievements. Thus, part one of the program of race science, so to say, was to define the extremes, and its activities lay completely outside India—in Europe on the one hand, and, on the other, in Africa, Australia, Tasmania, or wherever the elusive missing link between humans and animals might be sought. Part two of the program was to divide up the interval between the extremes into a fixed number of discrete races. The growing mass of measurements that race science made in the latter half of the nineteenth century, which was to have secured that result, made it, in fact, ever more elusive, showing continuous variation where discontinuities were looked for, and the existence of races became a faith in ideal types underlying the messiness of the actual measurements.[3]

[3]. That is the impression one gets from examining Paul Topinard's (1885) thousand pages on the scientific measurement of racial characteristics (discussed in the next chapter). Multiplication of the means of exact measurement does not result in certainty but in the need to choose a few measurements that confirm prior notions of the scale of races and eliminate others that produce results that do not conform. Race science seemed like a new key to history for its advocates, but in hindsight it appears simply to confirm prejudices rather than to uncover new and unexpected truths.

India was the critical battleground for the claims of ethnology and philology exactly because of its intermediate location, both in the scale of civilization as defined by Mill and for its variety of complexions lying between the extremes of the scale of physical types defined by race science. The Indo-European concept established a kinship between Indians and Europeans that was increasingly at odds with the search for discrete races.

The terms of the argument were radically altered in the 1860s by Darwinism and the collapse of the short six-thousand-year Biblical chronology for human history, which was due to the discovery of human remains adjacent to long-extinct animals. Now it became clear that the racial differences among humans had come about over a timescale vastly longer, measurable in the tens and hundreds of thousands of years at least, than the period in which the Indo-European languages differentiated themselves from one another and from their common ancestral language. It became clear as well that the formation of the Indo-European languages was an event that lay not near the beginning of human life, but was, in light of the newly discovered antiquity of man, comparatively recent. The effect of the suddenly expanding human timeframe was to disengage the study of race in the biological sense from the study of language. Thomas Huxley's view (1865) was that biology was now in charge of ethnological questions, philology supplying only supplementary findings over only the most recent period of human history; in any Case it was apparent that language and race had no necessary connection, since people speaking the same language might be of different races and vice-versa. Max Müller accepted this conclusion fully, and he repented of not having distinguished between racial and linguistic groups.

But if in the new intellectual climate brought about by Darwinism and the time revolution the relation between race and language was seen to be arbitrary and contingent, what then became of the claim that the same blood flowed in the veins of Clive's soldiers and the dark Bengalese? Herbert Hope Risley, who applied calipers to Bengali heads and noses, believed it possible to reconcile the Indo-European concept of a relation between Britons and Indians with the findings of physical anthropology based on its improved means of measurement (Risley 1892, 1908). He found a direct relation between the proportion of Aryan blood and the nasal index, along a gradient from the highest castes to the lowest. This assimilation of caste to race proved, as we shall see in the next chapter, very influential.

Isaac Taylor on the Aryan Race

In the meantime, let us see how the notion of the Aryan race in Britain changed as it was wrested from the hands of the Sanskritists by the anthropologists. The exposition of this issue by Isaac Taylor (not to be confused with the anthropologist E. B. Tylor), called *The origin of the Aryans; an account of the prehistoric ethnology and civilisation of Europe* (c. 1889) is exceptionally clear and telling.

Taylor thought that Max Müller, "owing to the charm of his style, to his unrivalled power of popular exposition, and to his high authority as a Sanskrit scholar," had done more than any other writer to popularize the erroneous notion that the primitive unity of Aryan speech implied a primitive unity of race. On the passage in which Max Müller says that there was a time "when the first ancestors of the Indians, the Persians, the Greeks, the Romans, the Slaves, the Celts, and the Germans were living together within the same enclosures, nay, under the same roof" (1861:219), Taylor commented, "Than this picturesque paragraph more mischievous words have seldom been uttered by a great scholar" (c.1889:3). The error was the old assumption of the philologists that relationship of languages implies relationship of race. This assumption is false on the face of it; so much so that twelve English tradesmen in a jury box (to trot out Max Müller's metaphor once again) would readily see through linguistic evidence purporting to show, like the linguistic evidence for the notion that the same blood flowed in the veins of Clive's soldiers and those of the dark Bengalese, the common descent of the Alabama Negro and the New Englander of Massachussetts (1861:6).

Where English common sense rejected the authority of the Sanskritist in matters of race, science, in the form of what we now call archaeology and physical or biological anthropology, brought new findings to its aid. The burden of Isaac Taylor's book is to popularize the new findings for an English audience, concentrating upon the prehistoric archaeology of Europe and the latest writings on race science by the French anthropologists Paul Broca and Paul Topinard and the Germans Theodor Pösche and Karl Penka.

Taylor's argument is as follows. The discoveries of prehistoric archaeology, in the vastly expanded timespan for human history that it revealed, completely undermine the older scenario of the philologist, according to which Aryan peoples migrated from Central Asia to Europe

near about the beginning of human history. Archaeology now reveals abundant evidence of a long human occupation of Europe and shows that the races of Europe were long established in the places they now occupy. Thus the question becomes, which of the four races of prehistoric Europe is the original Aryan race, whose language it imposed upon the others—for craniology has revealed that those who speak the Aryan languages are not of one race, but many. Of the four races of Europe, the Iberians were Hamitic, and the Ligurians were Euskarian (Basque); this leaves the Scandinavians and North Germans (represented by the northern dolichocephalic Row Grave race), or the Celts (the northern brachycephalic Round Barrow people). The German scholars had identified the Aryans with the Germanic long-heads, the French with the Celtic broad-heads. Taylor notes and deplores the chauvinistic element in this debate and sides with the French.

One would like to dwell on this text, rich document as it is of the new English common sense that had been building for several decades, that race is the hitherto hidden key to all of history, an idea that united people as different as Thomas Carlyle, Benjamin Disraeli, and the virulent anti-Irish race scientist Robert Knox. Before taking leave of it let us at least note how it makes of European history a double of the racial history of India:

> The Aryan invaders, few in number, who were settled on the banks of the Upper Indus, are found gradually advancing to the south and the east in continual conflict with the Dasyu or dark-skinned aborigines, who spoke a strange language, worshipped strange gods, and followed strange customs, till finally the barbarians are subdued and admitted into the Aryan state as a fourth caste, called the "blacks," or Sudras. The higher civilisation and the superior physique of the northern invaders ultimately prevailed, and they imposed their language and their creed on the subject tribes; but the purity of the race was soiled by marriage with native women, the language was infected with peculiar Dravidian sounds, and the creed with foul Dravidian worships of Siva and Kali, and the adoration of the lingam and the snake.
> The Aryanisation of Europe doubtless resembled that of India. The Aryan speech and the Aryan civilisation prevailed, but the Aryan race either disappeared or its purity was lost. (c.1889:212)

In Taylor's nimble fingers the race doctrine becomes the explanation of everything, including class (the landed gentry, for example, are Teutons, phelgmatic in temperament, dull of intellect, brave, warlike, and given to field sports and athletic exercises). The confessional geog-

raphy of Europe takes on entirely new significance, according to which dolichocephalic Protestants reject the Roman Catholicism with which they had been civilized by the brachycephalics: Some fancy stitching is needed here to show that the Presbyterian lowland Scots are actually Teutons, not Celts, and the Celtic but Protestant Welsh and Cornish have become so by political accident and "have transformed Protestantism into an emotional religion, which has inner affinities with the emotional faith of Ireland and Italy." England, on the other hand, is a rare true mixture of two races; being orthocephalic, it of course "neither Catholic nor Protestant, but Anglican" (c.1889:248).

Taylor's closing word is flung against the Sanskritists. The discoveries of the last decade have overthrown the work of the previous half-century, he says, demolishing ingenious but baseless (philological) theories of race and clearing the ground for the raising of more solid structures. "The whilom tyranny of the Sanskritists is happily overpast, and it is seen that hasty philological deductions require to be systematically checked by the conclusions of prehistoric archaeology, craniology, anthropology, geology, and common sense" (c.1889:332).

In the end, examination of Taylor's version of the meanings of the Aryan idea in late Victorian England yields an unearned increment of understanding of the formation of racist ideologies in Europe generally that was not looked for. It is not my ambition to clarify the story of the Aryan idea on the Continent, but one cannot help seeing that Taylor's reading of the current European, and especially German, scholarship captures the Aryan idea in process of becoming a politically usable and racially exclusive conception in the late nineteenth century. That is, the Aryan idea is now not merely linked to whiteness—that had been so to a degree already in the early Max Müller—but whiteness itself is now narrowed down to some conception of a small, pure, original "white" Aryan race that spread the Indo-European languages to different races in very early times. Thus the Indians came to be excluded from the Aryan concept to which they had supplied the name. That the Indians were excluded from the newly conceptualized originary Aryan race and were now no longer concerned with it was a by-product, of more importance to Britons than to other Europeans, of an argument about the underlying racial strands in the European population. This narrowing of the bounds of whiteness within Europe itself was accomplished by the archaeologists and craniologists, masters of the new race science, developing their own authority claims in *opposition* to the comparative philologists and Sanskritists.

It is only by grasping this crucial development, I believe, that we can

unpack the paradox that Aryanness came to be deployed by the Nazi regime to murderous effect not only against the Jews but also against the Gypsies—whose Indian origin and Indo-European linguistic credentials had been conclusively established by philologists and Sanskritists so long previous, and that it expressed no bond of sympathy between Germans and Slavs. The racialization of the Aryan idea made the Aryan race an exclusive group very much smaller than the Indo-European speaking population as a whole.

In the liberal United States Max Müller's theme of Aryan brotherhood fared no better. The Supreme Court decision in *U.S. v. Bhagat Singh Thind* (1923) held that a Punjabi immigrant, although an Aryan, was not a "free white person" within the meaning of the 1917 act governing naturalization, no matter what the Sanskritists and the language-led ethnologies of the experts might argue; it is common usage that determines the intent of Congress in making naturalization available to "free white persons," not the lucubrations of philologists and ethnologists.[4] In this decision the construction of "whiteness" excluded Indians in another way, by disengaging whiteness from (linguistic) Aryanness.

Against the "Tyranny of the Sanskritists"

Taken together, the British hostility to Sanskrit had two conceptually distinct sources: British Indophobia, which was essentially a developmentalist, progressivist, liberal, and non-racial-essentialist cri-

[4]. *United States v. Bhagat Singh Thind*, 202 U.S. 209-210 (1923). Mr. Justice Sutherland's opinion says, "The words of the statute are to be interpreted in accordance with the understanding of the common man from whose vocabulary they were taken. . . . It may be true that the blond Scandinavian and the brown Hindu have a common ancestor in the dim reaches of antiquity, but the average man knows perfectly well that there are unmistakable and profound differences between them today" (p. 209). The applicant claimed eligibility based on the fact that he is a high-caste Hindu born in the Panjab and is classified by certain scientific authorities as of Caucasian or Aryan race. But the term *Aryan* has to do with linguistic, not physical characteristics, and under scientific manipulation *Caucasian* has come to include far more than the common man supposes. The opinion also invokes the race-mixture theory of Indian civilization: "In the Punjab and Rajputana, while the invaders seem to have met with more success in the effort to preserve their racial purity, intermarriages did occur, producing an intermingling of the two and destroying to a greater or less degree the purity of the 'Aryan' blood" (p. 210). Thus the effect of the racialization of the Aryan theory is to deny the kinship of Indians and Europeans upon a new basis.

tique of Hindu civilization in aid of a program for the improvement of India along European lines; and race science, which theorized the English common-sense view that the Indians, whatever the Sanskritists might say, were a separate, inferior, and *unimprovable* race—in this they were often likened to the Irish by the purveyors of this way of thinking. But although conceptually distinct and logically incompatible, the two sources often combined in an unstable and volatile mixture, forming the attitude that said to the people of India, "Admire us; emulate us; become like us," then added, "but you can never be one of us."

An index of that hostility is the marginal position that Oriental-ism held in Britain throughout the nineteenth century. The teaching of Sanskrit and modern Indian languages had been institutionalized at an early date, first at the College of Fort William and then at the East India College. But it planted no roots in the universities for quite some time. The Oxford chair was established not through the initiative of the university but by a private benefaction, from James Boden in 1827, to promote the translation of the Bible into Sanskrit, and it was not filled (by H. H. Wilson) until 1832. A professorship of Sanskrit at University College, London, was held as early as 1852 by Theodor Goldstücker. Edinburgh (in 1862) and Cambridge (in 1867) created chairs of Sanskrit only after Haileybury was closed in 1858, leaving civil service training to the universities, and Edinburgh's was created by the private endowment of the noted British-Indian Sanskritist John Muir. Friedrich Max Müller pursued efforts to create a school of Oriental studies throughout his life to no effect,[5] and London University's School of Oriental and African Studies opened its doors only in 1917, when the British Indian empire had passed its zenith and had little more three decades of life remaining.

I would not wish to diminish the very real accomplishments of the

---

[5]. In an autobiography Max Müller recalls a youthful visit to Macaulay, who said that he wanted to know all Max Müller had to say on the real advantages to be derived by young Civil Service members from study of Sanskrit. Without waiting for his answer Macaulay

> began to relate his own experiences in India, dilating on the difference between a scholar and a man of business, giving a full account of his controversy while in India with men like Professor Wilson and others, who maintained that English would never become the language of India, expressing his own strong conviction to the contrary, and relating a number of anecdotes, showing that the natives learnt English far more easily than the English could ever learn Hindustani or Sanskrit. Then he branched off into some disparaging remarks about Sanskrit literature, particularly about their legal literature, entering minutely into the question of what authority could be assigned to the Laws of Manu, and of what possible use they could be in determining lawsuits between natives, ending

(Footnote continued on next page)

British Sanskritists, which were considerable. Succeeding to the brilliant opening generations of Jones, Wilkins, Colebrooke, Wilson, Prinsep, Hamilton, and Ellis were many fine scholars in British India such as A. C. Burnell, the South India hand, a man of vast learning; Robert Childers, the Pali scholar; John Muir, whose compendia of Sanskrit sources on early Indian history and social institutions served to consolidate the new theory of India's history; and the epigraphists John Faithful Fleet, Benjamin Rice, and Walter Elliot. We find others in the metro-pole whose scholarship deserves our admiration, such as E. B. Cowell, Thomas and Caroline Rhys Davids, Arthur Anthony Macdonell, and Arthur Barriedale Keith, to name a few of the several dozen British Sanskritists. Nevertheless it is striking that foreign Sanskritists played prominent and distinguished roles both in the institutions of British India (e.g., Georg Bühler, Martin Haug, Eugen Hultzsch, Franz Keilhorn, and Heinrich Lüders) and in British universities (Theodor Aufrecht and Julius Eggeling at Edinburgh, Theodor Goldstücker at U.C. London, and, of course, Friedrich Max Mül l er at Oxford). German overproduction of Sanskritists was one part of the picture; British under-production the other. In a way, Max Müller's situation was emblematic: He was allowed to represent Sanskrit, in his person, as a foreign kind of learning, but not to reproduce it on British soil by teaching it to Britons.

While the teaching of Oriental languages flourished in Europe, especially in the Germanies and in France, it limped along in Britain. So far from there being a thick institutionalized connection between Orientalism and empire, as readers of Said might be led to imagine, one could say, roughly, that the study of Sanskrit varied *inversely* with imperialism, certainly when Britain and Germany are compared. It is as if the British had been persuaded by James Mill's preposterous argument that ignorance of Indian languages was a positive aid to the formation of unclouded views on imperial policy.

(Footnote continued from previous page)
up with the usual diatribes about the untruthfulness of the natives of India, and their untrustworthiness as witnesses in a court of law. (Max Müller 1898:162)
This monologue went on for about an hour, and at the conclusion of "this so-called. conversation" Macaulay thanked Max Müller for the useful information he had given him. Max Müller reflects on the perverse disinclination of the English to support their Oriental empire with a school for teaching Oriental languages (unlike the French, Italians, Prussians, Austrians and Russians), having closed down Haileybury. He characterizes the governing attitude thus: "We can always find interpreters if we pay them well, and if we only speak loud enough the natives never fail to understand what we mean" (the same).