Persian Professor in Britain: Mirza Muhammad Ibrahim at the East India Company's College, 1826-44

Michael Herbert Fisher

Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East, Volume 21, Number 1&2, 2001, pp. 24-32 (Article)

Published by Duke University Press

Persian Professor in Britain: Mirza Muhammad Ibrahim at the East India Company's College, 1826-44

Michael H. Fisher

Persian in Imperial Contexts

Education in Persian, long the predominant language of empire in South Asia, became a powerful and disputed subject within early British imperialism. From the mid-eighteenth century onward, as Indian regional kingdoms gave way before British military and political aggressions, official educational policies and personnel reflected this shifting balance of power. Asian scholar-administrators in India and Britain taught British officials Persian as well as the cultural and administrative forms conveyed by that language. By the early nineteenth century, however, competing British cultural assertions of Orientalism and Anglicization allied to largely displace and degrade Indian professors of Persian. Still, an Iranian educator, Mirza Muhammed Ibrahim (c. 1800-1857), ventured to Britain in 1826 and earned a permanent appointment at the East India Company's College at Haileybury, where he remained until 1844. Thus, even in the heart of the British Empire, Asian professors of Persian could hold prominent, albeit contested, positions.

For centuries, Iranian scholar-officials had emigrated to India where their expertise in Persianate culture and administration secured them honored service within the Mughal Empire.[1] Networks of learned masters and madrasas taught generations of young Indian men Persian language and literature in addition to Islamic values and sciences. Further, educational institutions like Farangi Mahall and Delhi College developed innovative and integrated curricula for modernizing Persian-speaking Indian elites.[2] Such educational systems received the support of many Muslim rulers across India.

From their initial entry into India, British officers and officials immediately recognized the need to gain control over the Persian language as a tool rather than as a value system. As Cohn explains:

> The British realized that in seventeenth-century India, Persian was the crucial language for them to learn. They approached Persian as a kind of functional language, a pragmatic vehicle of communication with Indian officials and rulers through which, in a denotative fashion, they could express their requests, queries, and thoughts, and through which they could get things done. To use Persian well required highly specialized forms of knowledge....[3]

The East India Company thus wanted to make British mastery of Persian a means for British power, but it did not want its officials to accept the culture inherent in established Persianate educational traditions.

For their part, Iranian and Persianized Indian scholars sought to teach both their high cultural values and also their techniques and technologies of rule to incoming British officials and military officers. They did so not only in India, but also occasionally by traveling to Britain. Inherent in their efforts lay their conviction that Britons who accepted their values would better understand and appreciate Asians. As British military conquests established and then rapidly expanded their colonial presence from the mid-eighteenth century onward, therefore, an asymmetrical cultural conflict developed over Persian education between the incumbent—but gradually being displaced—Asian administrative elites and incoming colonizing Britons.

In India, British military and political assertions following the 1757 battle of Plassey enabled them to frame the terms of the debate over Persian education and its forms of rule as "Orientalist" versus "Anglicist."[4] Orientalist policies stressed Persian education, but also increasingly demanded British control over that education. Over time in India, Asian teachers gradually lost out against Britons for control over colonial state-sponsored Persian educational institutions. The Calcutta Madrasa (for Persian and Arabic) and the Sanskrit College in Benares, which the British colonial government established in 1781 and 1792 respectively, allowed relatively central roles for Asian teachers. Yet, Fort William College, which it established in 1800, made Asian teachers subordinates of British professors; indeed, some became hired servants of their British pupils.

Further, Anglicized policies degraded both Indian teachers and Persianate forms of knowledge in favor of Anglophone Westernized ones. Over the decades leading up to the 1830s, Anglicist policies largely came to predominate. In India, the Anglicist "triumph" was marked by Macaulay's famous 1835 "Minute on Education" and the replacement in 1837 of Persian by English as the official language of British rule.

In Britain as well during this period, British Orientalists subordinated Asian teachers institutionally, even as the advocates of Anglicist policies largely came to predominate culturally. There too, the conflict was marked by the official rejection of Indians as teachers of Persian and other Asian languages, and the consolidation of that education in British hands. The study and teaching of Asian languages and cultures persisted in British institutions of higher education, thus, largely as Orientalism. An Iranian like Mirza Muhammed Ibrahim could stand to the side in terms of British colonialism in India, although it proved harder for him to do so with respect to British imperialist assertions in Iran.

The rise to cultural hegemony of British Orientalism and Anglicization, both in India and in Britain, has been well chronicled.[5] Yet, some scholars have just begun to analyze the complex roles that Asians played in reshaping and teaching Persianate forms of knowledge, in Asia and in the West.[6] This article analyzes the career of Mirza Muhammed Ibrahim.

During his nearly two decades on the faculty at the East India Company's college at Haileybury, he taught Persian to thousands of young British officials who were being trained to rule over India. He also took a prominent and empowered position within British society. After his retirement to Iran in 1844, he taught English and Western knowledge generally to the Qajar royal family for a dozen years. He remained intermediary between Iranian and British cultures there as well. In the context of early British imperialism, his career and those of Indian professors of Persian thus reveal multiple contestations over Persian education in the metropole as well as in Asia.

Persian Teaching by Indians in Britain

From the late eighteenth century onward, British colonialism in India attracted a growing number of Indian scholars of Persian to Britain. There, they offered what they presented as accurate and authentic Persian language and cultural training directly to Britons. They explicitly contrasted their expert teaching with the derivative training then current at the hands of inexpert British "false teachers" who were outrageously charging up to a guinea and a half for each ninety-minute lesson.[7] Yet, such academies of Persian language run by Britons in Britain continued.[8]

Nevertheless, as long as British officials in India relied on Persian language diplomacy and administration, Asian teachers also found willing pupils. For example, in 1777, "Monshee Mahomet Saeed" from Bengal, advertised in London newspapers for British pupils to whom he could teach "Persian and Arabick" languages, for a fee.[9] In 1799, Mirza Abu Talib Khan (1752-1806) went to Britain in part to establish a British government-sponsored Persian-language department at Oxford or in London. After long deliberations, in 1802 the British government offered him the directorship of such a department, with an annual salary £600 (plus expenses).[10] Instead, Abu Talib chose to return to India, but other Asians would make this journey in the decades that followed.

Even as the British Government considered Abu Talib's proposal, the East India Company was developing plans for founding and controlling its own educational institutions to equip its British military officers and civil officials with the necessary Persian linguistic skills to rule India. Reflecting its internal divisions about Orientalist versus Anglicist policies, different branches of the East India Company created separate and competing educational institutions in India and Britain respectively. In Calcutta, Governor-General Wellesley established Fort William College in 1800, where recently arrived British officials would study Persian, Hindustani, and other Indian languages and cultures.[11] Here, however, the top faculty were British Orientalists, while Indians only assisted them. British students hired these Indian scholars demeaningly by the hour as tutors: "the teacher-taught relation with which the Indian teachers were familiar did not exist in the College of Fort William. It was a new relationship, that of *Sahibs* and *Munshis*, that of European officers and their servants."[12] Thus, while concentrating on Asian language teaching, this institution gave authority to Britons.

On their part, the East India Company's directors in London (especially Charles Grant, an Evangelical Christian) asserted an alternative Anglicist model of education for newly nominated British officials. They believed that what these students needed above all was moral training in British and Christian values that were fully available only in Britain.[13] So that these students should not be—or at least not appear to be—ignorant of Indian languages on their arrival in India, they should simultaneously study Asian languages (Persian, Hindustani, Arabic, Bengali, and/or Sanskrit). The directors therefore created two colleges in Britain: Haileybury in 1806 for civil servants and Addiscombe in 1809 for military cadets (north and south of London respectively). Each had a dozen or so permanent faculty at any one time. The directors simultaneously ordered Fort William College, which had proven quite expensive, reduced in size and cost, with most of its language training shifted to Britain. In 1830, Fort William College was largely closed except for use as an examination center.

Indian Faculty Members at the East India Company's Colleges

The staffing of the Asian language departments of these two colleges in Britain proved problematic and was contested. British Orientalists, mostly veterans of the East India Company's service in India, argued that they had the moral right to be handsomely employed to teach Asian languages.[14] Yet, even they recognized that for these languages, only Asian teachers could provide "that idiomatical accuracy (which never can be attained by any foreigner) so essential to such works."[15] In consequence, Haileybury and Addiscombe accepted the superior linguistic accomplishments of Asians by appointing, over the years, four Indians and then one Iranian to their faculty.

The first Indian to join the East India Company's colleges, Sheth Ghulam Hyder (1776-1823, born in Bihar), had ventured independently to London, seeking employment teaching Persian. Hearing of newly opening Haileybury College, he applied directly in 1806 "as Persian Writing Master."[16] To demonstrate his abilities, he enclosed with his unsolicited application a sample of his handwriting, using some Persian verses as his text. Although the college deemed his English barely adequate for the position, he was appointed within days. Ghulam Hyder took up his appointment at an annual salary of £200, equivalent to British junior faculty there. This was also within, but toward the top of, the scale paid to *munshis* working at Fort William College (£36 to £240 annually, far less than the £1,800 to £3,200 paid British professors of Hindustani, Persian, or Arabic there).[17] Ghulam Hyder served under Captain Charles Stewart, just appointed Professor of Persian Language at £500 annually, in what was called "the Muhammadan Division" (which included Persian, Hindustani, and Arabic)—as opposed to the "Hindoo Division" (Sanskrit and Bengali), which remained exclusively in British hands.[18]

In his pedagogy, Ghulam Hyder served much as a *munshi* would in Fort William College (or as a "native drill-master" would at an American or European university in the twenty-first century). Under his direction, the students at Haileybury copied "select passages" in Persian characters, which had been "engraved upon several copper plates of the same size, so that they may be used separately, or bound up together."[19] He also drilled and corrected them on their pronunciation. His salary eventually rose over his seventeen-year career to £350 (plus £50 house rent allowance). Despite openings in the faculty, however, he was never promoted, but rather found Europeans appointed above him.

Even before Ghulam Hyder joined the faculty, however, the East India Company's directors had been seeking to recruit language teachers directly from India. First, the directors had sent an invitation in May 1806 to Abu Talib, proposing that he return to England and take up his plan as he had advanced it a few years earlier.[20] Unfortunately, Abu Talib died in December 1806, a few days before the message could reach him.[21] Next, the East India Company's directors entrusted Fort William College to recruit (at the lowest possible salaries acceptable, they insisted) one Persian and one Hindustani *munshi*; they simultaneously ordered Fort William College to cut back drastically on its own staff and costs in deference to the new college in England.

Even with these cutbacks to the Indian staff at Fort William College, attracting a learned man to leave his family and teach in England proved difficult. Abu Talib's autobiography, and therefore his proposed salary and plans for a department under his control, were known to his peers in India.[22] After much effort, Fort William College finally found two qualified men, Maulvi Mir Abdul Ali (d. 1812) and Maulvi Mirza Khalil, willing to accept these appointments, but only by offering exactly the same substantial annual salary that Abu Talib had proposed for himself: £600 (plus expenses including free passage to and from England). This was more than double the highest salary paid a *munshi* at Fort William College. Indeed, the salary offered to each of these two appointees exceeded by £100, or twenty percent, the annual salary of the highest paid British Professors at Haileybury (including Thomas Malthus and their Professor, Stewart).[23]

Maulvi Mir Abdul Ali of Varanasi, had already worked at Fort William College as a *munshi* in the Persian Department since about 1801, but he was qualified to teach Hindustani as well.[24] Maulvi Mirza Khalil of Lucknow, was qualified to teach those two languages as well as Arabic. These two men came separately to England in 1807 and 1808 respectively, each attended by a Muslim personal servant.[25]

On their arrival, they received appointments as assistant professors, higher in status than "Writing Master" Ghulam Hyder (at three times his salary). These two Indian faculty taught the rudiments of Persian, Hindustani, and Arabic to hundreds of students each year.[26] They, along with the British professors, read out, glossed, and parsed selections in these languages to the students, who would memorize their words, as well as occasionally translate easy passages into and out of English. Thus, Abdul Ali and Mirza Khalil were comparable to the highest British faculty at the College, rather than *munshis*, in duties and in salary, if not in rank or administrative responsibilities.

While these three men socialized with each other, they also entered deeply (albeit to different degrees) into the college and into local British society. They apparently accepted in part British models for teaching their languages at the college. These Indian teachers used pedagogical methods and texts established by their British supervisors, although their respective attitudes toward punctuality and discipline sometimes differed. These Indian faculty lived in the local society as middle class professionals. Gholam Haydar and Abdul Ali soon converted to Anglican Christianity, married British women, and had children. To support their social status as professionals, however, they overspent their salaries and went deeply into debt. When they died (Abul Ali after only five years in Britain, Gholam Haydar after seventeen years there), they were buried in their parish churchyards. Their widows and children became destitute and had to appeal repeatedly to the East India Company for pensions. Overall, the social position in Britain of these Indian teachers and their personal relations with Britons there contrast strikingly with those available to men of their class as *munshis* in colonized India.

The other assistant professor, Mirza Khalil, in contrast, remained an orthodox Shi'ite Muslim. He insisted on dining on *halal* food, apart from his British colleagues and students. He evidently never married in England. In 1819, after eleven years of employment at the college, he was forced to resign suddenly in the middle of the term, after what he called an "unfortunate event," the details of which were suppressed by college authorities.[27] After negotiations with the directors, Mirza Khalil agreed to a pension of £360 annually, plus expenses for his proposed two or three-year journey via the Islamic holy lands back to India (although he appears to have stayed on in Britain until 1826).[28]

The Asian language training imparted to Haileybury students by these three men and by their British supervisors tended to be limited. Until 1814, the students did not even need to take a test in these languages, which mitigated against their treating their language training very seriously. Thereafter, the required test administered by an outside visitor apparently helped draw the students' attention to those languages. This test required students to "write the character in a fair and legible hand, thorough acquaintance with terms of grammar [and] reading, translating, and parsing an easy passage."[29] Still, while some students individually sought out and learned much from their instructors, Asian language training in general tended to be a relatively less emphasized and valued subject.[30]

With the death of two Indian faculty members and the resignation of the third, Haileybury College authorities decided that the linguistic advantages of having a "native speaker" teach British students was outweighed by the disruptive effect these Muslim Indian men had on the student's moral education. As Stewart put it in 1816: "such is the prejudice of Young Men against the Tuition of a Native of India, that only the few steady ones derive any benefit from his Lectures." Further, Stewart asserted (without providing any evidence) that Indians were incapable of attending class regularly themselves: "it is a very disagreeable part of my duty to enforce due attendance on [Mirza Khalil] and the Persian Writing Master [Ghulam Hyder]."[31] There is some evidence that the presence of these Indian faculty members and their friends also caused tension among Britons living near the college.[32]

These patterns proved similar at Addiscombe Military Seminary. Mir Hasan Ali of Lucknow, a scholar and former administrator for the East India Company and the ruler of Awadh, had come on his own to England in 1809 seeking employment as a teacher of Persian, Arabic, Hindustani, and/or Bengali.[33] He applied first for an appointment to Haileybury, but with the three Indian faculty discussed above already in place, no positions were available. Then he turned to the newly opened Addiscombe College, where in 1810 he accepted appointment on the faculty (paid £400 annually) as Assistant to the Professor of Oriental Literature, John Shakespear.[34] His duties were "teaching the Cadets to write, and the proper pronunciation of the Hindostanni and Persian Lan-

guages," its pronunciation being something Shakespear had little knowledge about.[35] He also taught cadets orthography in Persio-Arabic and Devanagari characters. On occasion, college authorities referred to him by his official title, "Assistant to the Professor of Oriental Languages," yet elsewhere, including in the same document, he had the more "native" title of "the Persian Moonshee," like Ghulam Hyder.[36] He and the Indian faculty at Haileybury met occasionally, forming something of a support group; he attended Ghulam Hyder's London wedding, for example.[37]

At Addiscombe, Mir Hasan Ali sought advancement for himself and his students through writing learning aids, using his status as a "native speaker" to try to assert the superiority of his pedagogy over that of Britons. For example, he completed in 1812 his 150 page *Grammar of the Hindoostanie Language*. Yet the college authorities turned to British Orientalists to assess his work. These Britons dismissed it as "a Literary curiosity," not worth publishing.[38]

Mir Hasan Ali suffered throughout his six-year career from the lack of recognition. His pupils paid little attention to his language training. The East India Company failed to promote him. The British climate had debilitating effects on his health. He finally resigned in 1816, receiving an annual pension from the East India Company of £120 plus a one-time gift of £205 for his voyage home.[39] Just before his departure, he married a pious Englishwoman, Biddy Tims, in March 1817; they went back to India together.[40]

After Mir Hasan Ali's departure from Addiscombe, the headmaster assured the directors that he need not be replaced by another Indian.[41] College authorities wrote with little respect for the moral fiber of Indians generally: "The Natives however are but of little consequence... for whatever may be their Abilities, the Listlessness and Indifference, peculiar to the Asiatick Character, render them incapable of making the Exertions necessary in a Teacher for maintaining due order and authority in the Class and conquering the tedium of teaching the dull and reluctant Pupil, as well as the clever and willing."[42] Thus, Addiscombe, like Haileybury, discounted the more extensive linguistic knowledge of Indian faculty members due to their allegedly inferior moral and physical character. After that, the limited teaching of Asian languages at Addiscombe was carried out by notoriously incompetent British faculty, some with no experience in Asia or, apparently, much command over Asian languages.[43]

British Termination of Indian Faculty

When, over the subsequent years, increases in numbers of students at both Addiscombe and Haileybury led their administrations to make new appointments in their oriental language departments, they exclusively appointed Europeans to these posts—with only one exception (as we will see below). They did so as a result of both Anglicist and Orientalist cultural assertions. In 1821, when the Addiscombe authorities sought an assistant for Shakespear, they recommended "an European who has been habituated to application and labour..., as the habits and general health of an Indian (in this country) are not suited to the labours of the [military] Seminary."[44] They therefore barred all Indians from that faculty.

Similarly, in 1826, Haileybury authorities likewise argued strongly against any more appointments of Indian faculty. They laid out four main objections, each revealing the Anglo-centric racism that was developing in mid-nineteenth-century Britain.[45] These attitudes correlated pseudoscientific Darwinian social theory with British imperial expansion in India. College authorities asserted four objections to Indian faculty: "1st [sic] the difference in religion, dress, customs, and manners, which has a tendency to lessen that respect on the part of the pupil towards his teachers which is indispensable to the former's improvement."[46]

Second, they argued Indian faculty had proved incapable of mastering English: "The total ignorance of the English language on the part of the Native Indian and Persian teachers, which deprives them of the power of being useful to beginners (which all the Students necessarily are) in the study of Persian and Hindostanee." This implied that no Indian would ever be capable of learning English fluently, which they considered a sine qua non for all teachers.

Third, Indian Muslims living in British society had proved deviant: "The too frequently observed irregularity, or rather immorality, of conduct in Mussulmans residing in this Country, which may be productive of the greatest inconvenience, if not the most injurious effects as to the discipline of the College." They did not explicitly add that these Indian professors' British wives and families, by their very existence, had openly displayed to their students what we would term "interracial" sexuality between Indian males and British females. This was a time when such relations were virtually forbidden in colonized India and starting to become highly charged in Britain.

Fourth, these authorities argued that Asian faculty naturally lacked the financial discipline that would have kept them from pestering the East India Company for increased income and saved their British widows from indigence:

> The inconvenience and embarrassment to which the Court of Directors are subjected, by the experienced discontent, and constantly recurring demands of Individuals of this class, arising from their habitual improvidence, and more especially by the pretensions of the family, which, in the event of death will generally be left in a destitute condition, or dependents upon the bounty of the Company.

In short, college authorities came to believe that all Indians had proven themselves unable to live up to the cultural standards required of a faculty member at Addiscombe or Haileybury and that their superior linguistic knowledge should be dispensed with, rather than risk the Anglo-centric moral education of their students.

Haileybury's Iranian Faculty Member

Following anti-Indian policies for several years, British Professors at Haileybury futilely attempted to sustain the Asian language programs on their own. By 1826, however, they conceded that the "attachment of some learned Asiatics to the College is not only conductive to the credit and respectability of the institution, but also essential to the accomplishment of one of its declared objects, the attainment of a high degree of proficiency in a few of the languages of the East."[47] As evidence, they acknowledged the clear contrast "both of pronunciation and classical attainment between the earlier Students [of Asian languages] at the College, and those of a more recent period." A compromise solution to their dilemma came in the form of Mirza Muhammed Ibrahim, an

Iranian, therefore a native Persian speaker, but without many of the negative associations then current in British minds about Indians.

Mirza Ibrahim had left Iran, reportedly due to personal conflicts with Shi'ite mullahs there.[48] Before he left Iran, a missionary, Reverend Wolfe, had promised him a teaching appointment at a proposed Christian religious college in England. But Wolfe's colleagues had failed to raise the necessary funds, leaving Mirza Ibrahim stranded in London. He then went to Sir Gore Ousely (the former British ambassador to Iran), impressing him with his morals, his knowledge of Asian languages, and his suitability for the Haileybury faculty.[49]

While the Haileybury administration appreciated Mirza Ibrahim's superior knowledge of Arabic and the Persian of Iran, he still presented two significant problems:

> 1st [sic] his total ignorance of [Hindustani] the great colloquial language, and indeed of all the other languages of India, and 2nd [sic] what may at first sight appear a most unreasonable objection, that his own native language, the Persian, which he must be supposed to write and to speak with the utmost purity and correctness, is nevertheless by no means either the written or colloquial Persian of men of business or even of education and science in India, and is further unquestionably different, both in idiom and pronunciation, from that at present taught in the College; so that the students, alternately engaged with their English and Persian instructors, might receive lessons from each counteracting the efforts of the other and thus in the end be deprived of any permanent advantage from either... the apparent improvement in Persian pronunciation which might be derived from the labors of a Native Persian in the College, would probably fail to render the English Students more intelligible by the Natives of India on his first arrival in that Country, than he may become under his present [British] Instructors.[50]

Nevertheless, given the alternative of no "native speakers" on the faculty, they concluded that he would be better than nothing, and his Persian was "unquestionably superior ... to the Person formerly employed in the College (a Native of Bengal) [Mirza Khalil]." Further, they continued, Haileybury's students did not require much Persian training anyway: "all that can be expected during the short term of residence at the College is merely an elementary knowledge...."

To recommend Mirza Ibrahim personally, he had begun to anglicize himself. He "has adopted the European Costume for the avowed purpose of acquiring knowledge, and rendering himself useful in this Country without attracting public observation which might interfere with those objects."[51] He "has commenced and made some progress in the study of the English language." Further, "he would not object to [eating in] Commons with the English Professors and Teachers, an objection which was always made by the Mussulman Natives of India, and attended probably with inconvenience and additional expense." Finally, he appeared a "young man of agreeable manners, correct demeanor, and studious habits." Thus, the college offered and he accepted a probationary appointment (at £200, the same as a recently appointed English assistant professor at the college) as Assistant to the Professor of Arabic and Persian, Reverend H. G. Keene. Mirza Ibraham proved so successful that he was tenured and promoted early, receiving a permanent appointment in the Oriental Department at £400, plus house rental allowance of £50, per annum.[52]

Mirza Ibrahim established himself as the kind of Asian faculty member that the college sought. He soon learned to speak English without an accent. His deportment and dress was that of a Briton, with only his "physiognomy" to separate him from his colleagues in appearance.[53] He also exerted the right degree of control over his unruly students through "an iron will and a vindictive temper, qualified by much latent good nature." The actual content of his teaching "had no particular merit." A former student recalled:

> He would simply hear us translate the portion of the text appointed to be prepared for the day, and would launch out into a torrent of angry invectives if anyone—especially any pupil to whom he had taken a dislike—made bad mistakes. Then, after listening to and correcting our *viva voce* translations, he would proceed to translate the passage which had to be prepared for the next day's lecture, and his utterance would be so rapid that only the best men could follow him.[54]

This, however, did not diminish his standing because the college expected little language skill from its graduates.

As did the British faculty, Mirza Ibrahim wrote books that demonstrated his expertise in Persian, established his authority as an author of learning aids, and also enhanced his income though the sale of these required texts to his students. He began by assisting the work of other faculty at Haileybury: marking the vowel-points in a collection of Persian fables designed as a teaching aid.[55] Subsequently, he himself wrote a Persian grammar (later translated into German).[56] He cotranslated liturgies, Anglican Common Prayers, and sections of the Christian Bible into Persian.[57] The Court of Directors demonstrated their trust in his confidentiality and linguistic expertise by commissioning him to translate diplomatic documents between Persian and English, to and from Indian and Iranian political emissaries.[58] He also met and socialized with visiting Indian and Iranian dignitaries, including members of the Qajar royal family, who came to England—making introductions, translating as needed, and representing their interests.[59]

In his autobiographical writings, Mirza Ibrahim represented himself as a humble "foreigner, who is under the necessity of addressing the natives of a country in their own language, [and] must throw himself upon their candid and indulgent criticism."[60] He explained that he had arrived in Britain without knowledge of English but had studied the works of "English Orientalists" in order to learn from them, in particular "that unrivalled Persian Scholar, and enlightened Patron of Persian Literature, [the late] Neil Benjamin Edmonstone, Esq." Nevertheless, he declared that he had unique skills to offer. Just as he, a "native of Persia" had difficulty with English idioms, so too even British Orientalists would miss Persian's "*colloquial phraseology* and *idiom*, its *peculiar turns of expression*, and its *various refinements* and *niceties* of diction" (his emphasis).

In the model dialogues he wrote for students to memorize, he set up his British pupils and himself as social equals:

> The parties chiefly conversing are supposed to be an English Gentleman, who has acquired a competent

> knowledge of the language of Persia, and is travelling in that country for improvement; and a native Persian friend, who has also resided long enough in England to be able to converse with facility in English. The former occasionally makes mistakes, which the latter corrects.[61]

In these practice dialogues, Mirza Ibrahim made mild mockery of some British customs. He ended his grammar with a balanced discussion about the relative merits and truth of Christianity versus Islam.

Indeed, Mirza Ibrahim was remembered fondly in Hertford for his openness to Christianity: "the translation of Isaiah into Persian, made by the Mirza for one of the religious societies, was the most faithful and spirited version of any portion of Scripture to be found in a modern language."[62] Yet, his colleagues also admired him for remaining true to his own Shi'ite religious faith, without letting it interfere with or constrain his social intercourse with Britons.

Mirza Ibrahim's social relationships with the surrounding British community were apparently unsatisfactory until he established himself as an independent householder. The initial housing arrangement that the college made for him had him living in Professor Stewart's (his supervisor's) home and dining in the college commons.[63] He soon rejected these, instead renting an independent house on Hertford Heath: "Rose Cottage."[64] Here, he installed trained singing nightingales (which he said reminded him of Isfahan). He also took an English mistress, with whom he had a son.[65] In local society, he was remembered as "a perfect Englishman in manners, language, and feeling."[66] He nearly became an early victim of modernity, however, when a steam locomotive bolted his horse, and the speeding train missed crushing him by inches.[67] As a valued member of the faculty, the college paid for at least one trip to a German spa for the sake of his health.[68]

After eighteen years on the faculty, he retired in 1844 on the grounds of weakened health—although he lived for a dozen years longer. For his work, he received a gift of £700 plus a pension of £350 per annum. Prominent Britons gave him letters of introduction to important British officials in Bombay, where he apparently visited on his voyage home.[69] He had married a European woman (reportedly Dutch) and brought her and his son to Iran with him.[70]

After Mirza Ibrahim's retirement, no further Asians were appointed to Haileybury. Indeed, college authorities complained, "too much time and attention are devoted to oriental [language] Study."[71] Thus, at both Haileybury and Addiscombe, British Orientalist scholars retained exclusive control over these Asian languages, even as British Anglicist policies reduced interest in teaching them.

The issue was not a lack of Asians available for the East India Company's colleges. In 1851, for example, Syed Abdoollah (the "Persian, Oordoo, Hindee, and English Translator to the Board of Administration for the Affairs of the Punjab") ventured to London on leave from his government post in India and applied to teach these languages at Haileybury or Addiscombe.[72] He framed his argument:

> The importance of the acquisition of the languages of the East has been dwelt upon by successive [Company] Chairmen in their excellent and instructive addresses to the students of the Colleges and it has occurred to me that perhaps the assistance of a Native of the Country who has made philology his peculiar study would not be unacceptable to the students.[73]

Neither Haileybury nor Addiscombe, however, showed any interest in his appointment.

Instead, Syed Abdoollah taught these languages privately and at colleges in the London area: at Hanwell College and also at Grove, Blackheath.[74] In March 1858, Syed Abdoollah submitted to the Court of Directors a pamphlet arguing for the establishment of an "Oriental College" in London, quite similar to Abu Talib's plan more than a half century earlier. Unlike their earlier positive, if belated response to Abu Talib, the British authorities in the mid-nineteenth century did no more than acknowledge receipt of Syed Aboolah's suggestion.[75] Instead, however, Syed Abdoollah applied for and received a position as Professor of Hindustani at University College, London, where he remained from 1859 until 1866, one of eight Asian faculty there during the late nineteenth century.[76] Nevertheless, the overwhelming forces of European Orientalism and Anglicization, and of British imperialism generally, sought to erase the authority of Asians to teach Persian and other Asian languages in Britain.

Mirza Ibrahim in the Qajar Capital

After Mirza Ibrahim returned to Tehran, he faced conflicting expectations from Iranians and the British. The Qajar royal family expected Mirza Ibrahim to provide them with English language training and also British knowledge, both in terms of Western science and also through insights into British political and diplomatic plans. The ruler, Mohammad Shah (r. 1834-48), demonstrated his trust in several ways. In 1846, he appointed Mirza Ibrahim as tutor to the Heir Apparent, Nasir al-Din Mirza, giving that prince insights based on years of experience in British society.[77] Mirza Ibrahim also had charge of supervising the food served to Mohammad Shah, even during that monarch's final illness. When Nasir al-Din Shah (r. 1848-96) succeeded to the throne, he established the Dar al Fonun in 1851 as a Westernizing institution of higher education.[78]

At the same time, the British expected Mirza Ibrahim to be loyal to them, which included passing on confidential information from the Qajar court. The British Ambassador, Justin Sheil, claimed to have

> procured his appointment as tutor to the Persian Prince Royal in hope of enabling His Royal Highness to acquire the elements of European knowledge, and of serving myself by the information which a person occupying a post so near the Heir Apparent would be able to supply.[79]

The British, after all, were paying his pension and giving him diplomatic protection.

Mirza Ibrahim could fully satisfy neither of these conflicting expectations. He evidently passed on no confidential information to the British, for which they berated him. The Qajar imperial family apparently expressed their disapproval and distrust of his loyalties by withholding his salary. When Mirza Ibrahim appealed to the British Ambassador for support in obtaining his pay from the Qajars, that Ambassador declined to intervene, as a way to punish Mirza Ibrahim because he never provided "the slightest intelligence of any value or rendered [the British] any other service." The British also resented that Mirza Ibrahim still considered himself a

gentleman equal socially to themselves, deriding Mirza Ibrahim's "complete want of tact, and to his overweening and repulsive vanity." Nevertheless, the British continued his pension until his death in 1857 and then, following some bureaucratic obstacles, granted his widow a life pension of £100 annually.[80] Further, they reportedly employed his son, John, as second scribe in the British legation in 1854.[81]

Conclusion

The careers and curricula of these Asian professors illustrate the complexity of their roles within British imperial constructions of Persian knowledge and the growing effects of Orientalism and Anglicization. On one hand, these Asian faculty held positions of authority in British colleges and society. Continuing faculty, experts in Persian, Arabic, and/or Hindustani languages and literatures, they taught about their own Asian cultures. They also wrote and translated texts on "oriental" subjects, generating grammars and other teaching aids. Their positions within these educational institutions placed them above their British pupils, not as hired servants like *munshis* in India, but as faculty with titular and pedagogic authority over them. They also stood as the first direct experience of Asia and Asians for most of their British students. Four took European wives or mistresses, women who accepted the Asian husband's name, demonstrating how their male gender and professional class standing overcame their difference by "race" in British metropolitan society at the time.

Their social and professional status in Britain thus contrasted sharply with the menial roles assigned to their colleagues by British authorities in India, including by their own former students. Persian language teachers in India often sank to the status of mere servants. British colonial officials "feminized" Indian men of their teachers' social class, and tried to enforce firm racial barriers against Indian men's social and sexual intercourse with European women there.[82] Thus, the students' experiences with individual Asian faculty members on a daily basis in England did not always accord with the increasingly colonial British conception of Indians in India.

Nevertheless, both colleges placed these Asian faculty under the administrative authority of Britons. Their Orientalist employers appropriated and gradually marginalized their expertise for education in Persian. Persian language training became a tool of British imperialism in India. Two Indian faculty resigned prematurely after frustrating careers, and two others died. College policy rejected employing Indians as faculty members thereafter.

Further, the British shift to Anglicist policies meant that Persian and other Asian languages were not highly valued by their students and institutions. British society expected the Asian professors living among them to adopt Anglican Christianity, British-style clothing and diet, the English language, and Western modes of pedagogy. Only Mirza Ibrahim, an Iranian faculty member who anglicized himself, seems to have retained an honored position in British society until his graceful retirement. His appointment had proved a way to obtain some access to Persian and its intricacies without empowering Indian faculty. Yet, he faced conflicting pressures back in Iran between his British and Qajar patrons. The careers of these Asian professors reveal patterns over control of Persian education in Britain within the context of British imperialism in Asia.

NOTES

[1] See Muzaffar Alam, "The Pursuit of Persian: Language in Mughal Politics," *Modern Asian Studies* 32, no. 2 (May 1998): 317-349.

[2] See Francis Robinson, *The 'Ulama of Farangi Mahall and Islamic Culture in South Asia* (London: C. Hurst, 2001); 'Abdulhaq, *Marhum Dihli Kalij* (Dihli: Anjuman Taraqqi-yi Urdu, Hind, 1945); and Gail Minault, "Qiran al-Sa'adain: The Dialogue between Eastern and Western Learning at the Delhi College," in *Perspectives of Mutual Encounters in South Asian History, 1760-1860*, ed. Jamal Malik (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 260-77.

[3] Bernard S. Cohn, *Colonialism and Its Forms of Knowledge* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 18.

[4] See Lynn Zastoupil and Martin Moir, eds., *The Great Indian Education Debate* (London: Curzon, 1999) and Gauri Viswanathan, *Masks of Conquest* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1989).

[5] For recent expositions of the ways British culture "constructed" India, see Nicholas B. Dirks, *Castes of Mind* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001); Ronald B. Inden, *Imagining India* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001); Martin Daunton and Rick Halpern, eds., *Empire and Others: British Encounters with Indigenous Peoples, 1600-1850* (London: University College London Press, 1999); John M. Mackenzie, "Empire and Metropolitan Cultures," in *Oxford History of the British Empire*, vol. 3, *The Nineteenth Century*, ed. Andrew Porter (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 270-293; D.A. Washbrook, "Orients and Occidents: Colonial Discourse Theory and the Historiography of the British Empire," in *Oxford History of the British Empire*, vol. 5, *Historiography*, ed. Robin W. Winks (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 596-611; Edward W. Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Knopf, 1993); and Lisa Lowe, *Critical Terrains: French and British Orientalisms* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991).

[6] See Mohamad Tavakoli-Targhi, *Refashioning Iran: Orientalism, Occidentalism, and Historiography* (New York: Palgrave, 2001); Monica M. Ringer, *Education, Religion, and the Discourse of Cultural Reform in Qajar Iran* (Costa Mesa, Calif.: Mazda Publishers, 2001); Gulfishan Khan, *Indian Muslim Perceptions of the West During the Eighteenth Century* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 1998); Partha Chatterjee, "Five Hundred Years of Fear and Love," *Economic and Political Weekly*, 33, 22 (May 30-June 5, 1998), 1330-36; Kumkum Chatterjee, "History as Self-Representation," and Michael H. Fisher, "Representations of India, the English East India Company, and Self," *Modern Asian Studies* 32, no. 4 (1998), 891-948; and Juan R. I. Cole, "Invisible Occidentalism: Eighteenth-Century Indo-Persian Constructions of the West," *Iranian Studies* 25, no. 3-4 (1992): 3-16.

[7] For repeated critiques of British self-styled experts in Persian who were teaching in Britain, see the accounts of Mirza I'tisam al Din and Mirza Abu Talib Khan. Mirza I'tisam al Din, "Shigrif Namah-i Wilayat," OR 200, British Library (hereinafter BL). This work has been translated (via Bengali) as *The Wonders of Vilayet Being the Memoir, originally in Persian, of a Visit to France and Britain in 1765 Mirza Sheikh Etesamuddin*, tr. Kaiser Haq (Leeds: Peepal Tree Press, 2001). It was earlier edited and incompletely translated into Urdu and English as *Shigurf Namah-i Velaet or Excellent Intelligence concerning Europe, being the Travels of Mirza Itesa Modeed in Great Britain and France*, tr. James Edward Alexander (London: Parbury, Allen, 1827). For a complete translation and critical edition, see Mohammad Tavakoli-Targhi (forthcoming). Mirza Abu Talib Khan, "Masir Talibi fi Bilad Afranji," MS add. 8145-47, BL. This was reprinted and edited by Hosein Khadive-Jam, *Masir Talibi* (Tehran: Islamic Revolution Publication and Educational Organization, 1974, 1983). For a much edited translation, see Abu Taleb Khan, *Travels of Mirza Abu Taleb Khan in Asia, Africa, and Europe*, tr. Charles Stewart, 2 vols. (London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, and Orme, 1810; 1814).

[8] See advertisements in *Morning Chronicle*, 29 March 1800, 4a and *European Magazine and London Review*, vol. 43 (January-June 1803), 3; and the annual *Report of the London Oriental Institution* (London: London Oriental Institution, various).

[9] *Public Advertiser*, 5 November 1777. See also Rozina Visram, *Ayahs, Lascars, and Princes* (London: Pluto, 1986), 63 and *Asians in Britain: 400 Years of History* (London: Pluto, 2002).

[10] Abu Talib, *Masir Talibi* [Persian reprint], 107-08. B/132, 10 February 1801, f. 1015, BL.

[11] Other Presidency capitals would establish similar institutions. For example, in 1812, the Company opened Fort St. George College, in Madras, for training Britons in south Indian languages and also in law.

[12] Sisir Kumar Das, *Sahibs and Munshis* (Calcutta: Orion, 1978), 108. See also David Kopf, *British Orientalism and the Bengal Renaissance* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969) and Cohn, *Colonialism*, 49ff.

[13] Report Plan for the College 26 October 1804, J/2/1, BL.

[14] Jonathan Scott, *Observations on the Oriental Department of the Hon. Company's East India College, at Hertford* (Hertford: the author, 1806).

[15] Scott, *Observations*, 10.

[16] Munshi Ghulam Hyder, letter of 15 August 1806, J/1/21, ff. 456-57, BL.

[17] Das, *Sahibs*, 12 citing Gilchrist letter 15 June 1803; Bengal Public Consultation 4 September 1808, no. 29; Letter from Bengal 8 February 1808 para. 71, 79; Home Miscellaneous Series 559, ff. 257-60, BL.

[18] See Thomas Trautmann, *Aryans and British India* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997).

[19] Order, 1 October 1806, J/2/1, BL.

[20] Public letter to Bengal 31 May 1806, F/4/212/4732, BL.

[21] Captain Baillie 19 December 1806, and Letter to the Agent at Bundelcund, 1 January 1807 Bengal Political Consultation 1 January 1807, nos. 99-100; Extract of Political Letter from Bengal 26 February 1807, F/4/212/4732, BL.

[22] In addition to Abu Talib circulating his manuscript among his peers, the *Calcutta Gazette* serialized a selective translation in its Supplement (September 1807-February 1808). Later, the Company commissioned his son to edit and publish the Persian text at Fort William College: *Masir-i Talibi*, eds. Mirza Husain Ali and Mir Qudrat Ali, (Calcutta: Fort William College, 1812). See Extract Public Letter from Bengal 9 May 1812, F/4/384/9741, BL.

[23] Memorandum on the present state of the Oriental Department at the College, Extract Public Letter to Bengal 7 September 1808, J/1/35, f. 267, BL.

[24] Public Letter from Bengal 8 February 1808, F/4/259/5665, BL.

[25] L/MAR/B/117 H; L/MAR/B/296 D. F/4/259/5665; Extract Letters from Bengal 14[24] July 1807, 25 September 1807; Letter to Bengal 21 May 1806, J/1/35, BL.

[26] In 1817, the Persian class had seventy-one students; Hindustani fifty-five; Arabic ten, for a total one hundred and thirty-six; Sanskrit had sixteen, Bengali thirty-four for a total of fifty. Stewart to College Committee 13 March 1817 J/1/32 1817, ff. 233-5, BL.

[27] Mirza Khalil to Court 20 October 1819, J/1/35, ff. 271-2; Letter of Charles Stewart to College Committee 31 July 1823, J/1/38, ff. 571-72, BL.

[28] Letter from Mirza Khalil 17 April 1820, J/1/35, ff. 304-305; College Committee Consultations 19 April 1820 and 14 June 1820; Court Consultation 14 June 1820, J/1/35, ff. 304-305; Petition of Mirza Khuleel 3 May 1826 Minutes of Court 4 April 1826, B/179, BL.

[29] Committee of College 15 February 1814, J/2/2, fol. 127, BL.

[30] Sir George Read to James Cobb, 8 August 1814, J/1/29, ff. 478-82; Letter of Charles Steward and A. Hamilton 26 November 1813, J/1/27, ff. 376-8; Parliamentary Papers (Sessionals) Lords 1852-53 (41) 30, 5738.

[31] Stewart to Taylor 7 April 1816, J/1/31, f. 213, BL.

[32] One of the "Moonshees [was] assaulted by a member of the public, who was subsequently found guilty and imprisoned," G. E. Schofield, "The Foundation and Establishment of the East India College, Hertford, 1805-17" (master's thesis, University of London Institute of Education, 1985), 71.

[33] Minutes of the Court of Directors 13 September 1809, B/149; Log of Dorsetshire, L/MAR/B/13, BL.

[34] Scott, *Observations*, ii, 7. Memorial of Meer Hasan Ali J/1/27, ff. 218-19, BL.

[35] Lutfullah wrote that on 30 May 1844 he met "John Shakespear, the author of the Hindustani Dictionary...I addressed to him a very complimentary long sentence in my own language. But, alas! I found that he could not understand me, nor could he utter a word in that language in which he had composed several very useful books." Lutfullah, *Autobiography of Lutfullah*, eds. Edward B. Eastlake and S.A.I. Tirmizi (New Delhi: International Writers' Emporium, 1985), 412.

[36] E.g., Committee of the College, Minutes 24 September 1813, L/MIL/1/10, no. 146, BL.

[37] See their wedding license, 25 January 1810, Saint Botolph's Church, Bishopsgate, London, Guildhall Library, London.

[38] Letter of Charles Stewart and A. Hamilton November 1813, J/1/27, ff. 374-76, BL.

[39] Committee of the College, Minutes, J/1/35, ff. 273-76, BL.

[40] Bishop of London, Marriage Allegations 22 March 1817, Diocese of London, Marriage Bond 22 March 1817, Westminster Archives; St. James Parish, Westminster (Picadilly) 27 March 1817, Guildhall Library. He and his British wife lived in north India for a dozen years, both in Lucknow and, when exiled from there, in the employ of the Company at Kanauj. Following his English wife's separation from him and return to England, she published an epistolary account of her life as a Christian wife in a leading Muslim family, *Observations on the Mussulmauns of India* (London: Parbury, Allen, 1832) Mir Hasan Ali subsequently married women of his own class and had descendants who worked for the East India Company.

[41] Dr. Andrew to College Committee 12 December 1816, L/MIL/1/11, no. 26A [sic], BL.

[42] Wilkins, Report on the Oriental Department J/1/19, ff. 464-5, BL.

[43] Even the chauvanistic Vibert writes about Charles Bowles, assistant and then professor of Hindustani for thirty years until 1859 (appointed literally through nepotism; he was nephew and heir of Shakespear): "When Mr. Bowles first joined as professor at Addiscombe he was but nineteen years of age, and hence hardly older than some of the senior cadets. He had never been in India, and had an unfortunately pronounced way of rendering the language." Colonel H. M. Vibart, *Addiscombe: Its Heroes and Men of Note* (Westminster: Archibald Constable, 1894), 71ff., 216-8.

[44] Letter from Andrew, enclosing one from Shakespear 25 April 1821, L/MIL/1/12, no. 40, 25, BL.

[45] See Peter van der Veer, *Imperial Encounters* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), Susan Bayly, "Race in Britain and India," in *Nation and Religion*, eds. Peter van der Veer and Harmut Lehmann (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999); Tony Ballantyne, *Orientalism and Race* (Houndmills: Palgrave, 2002); Mark Harrison, *Climates and Constitutions* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1999); Peter Robb, ed., *Concept of Race in South Asia* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).

[46] Memorandum of N. B. Edmonstone and J. Baillie to College Committee received 19 July 1826, J/2/5, ff. 279-85, BL.

[47] Edmonstone and Baillie, Memorandum to College Committee received 19 July 1826.

[48] *Hertford Mercury* 7 November 1857.

[49] Gore Ousely (also spelled Ouseley) to Committee 26 May 1826, J/2/5, f. 254, BL.

[50] Memorandum of N. B. Edmonstone and J. Baillie to College Committee received 19 July 1836, J/2/5, ff. 279-85, BL.

[51] Edmonstone and Baillie, Memorandum, ff. 279-85 and Reports of Committee of College 1826, J/2/5, ff. 279-85, BL.

[52] Minutes of Court 2 August 1826 and 1 August 1827, B/180, BL.

[53] *Hertford Mercury* 7 November 1857.

[54] Sir M. Monier-Williams, "Reminiscences" in *Memorials of Old Haileybury*, Frederick Charles Danvers, et al., (Westminster: A. Constable and Company, 1894), 73-74.

[55] James Michael, *Persian Fables from the Anwari Sooheyly of Hussein Vaiz Kashify* (London: the author, 1827).

[56] Meerza Mohammad Ibraheem, *A Grammar of the Persian Language. To which are subjoined, Several Dialogues; with an Alphabetical List of the English and Persian Terms of Grammar, and an Appendix, on the Use of Arabic Words* (London: Wm. H. Allen, 1841); *Gramatik der Lebenden Persische Sprache nach Mirza Mohammed Ibrahim's Grammar of the Persian Language* tr. H. L. Fleischer (Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus 1875).

[57] *Ishaia al Nabi* tr. Meerza Ibraheem, ed. Francis Johnson (London: Committee of the Bible Society, 1834); *Liturgiae Ecclesiae Anglicanae Partes Praecipuae: et Preces Matutinae et Vespertinae, Ordo Administrandi Coenam Domini et Ordo Baptismi Publici: In Linguam Persicam Traductae* tr. Samuel Lee and Mirza Ibrahim (London: R. Watts, 1828). Mirza Ibrahim to Court 13 October 1840, Minutes of Court 14 October 1840, B/200, f. 616, BL.

[58] Minutes of Court, 14 November 1838, 21 November 1838, B/198, BL.

[59] Karim Khan, *Siyahat Namah*, ed. 'Ibadat Barelvi (Lahore: Majlis-i Isha'at-i Makhtutat, Idarah-yi Adab o Tanqid, 1982), 201; James Baillie Fraser, *Narrative of the Residence of the Persian Princes in London, in 1835 and 1836* 2 vols. (London: Richard Bentley, 1838), vol. 1, 93ff., 109, 155, 172, 303-4; Mahomed Ibraheem letter, 23 April 1841, BL; Dyce Sombre to Solaroli 2 June 1839, *Dyce Sombre against Troup, Solaroli (Intervening) and Prinsep and the Hon. East India Company (also Intervening) in the Goods of David Octerlony Dyce Sombre, Esq., Deceased, In the Prerogative Court of Canterbury* (London: Henry Hansard, n.d.), 867.

[60] Mirza Ibrahim, *Grammar*, Preface, i-ii.

[61] Mirza Ibrahim, *Grammar*, Preface, i-ii.

[62] *Hertford Mercury* 7 November 1857.

[63] Mirza Ibrahim Memorial, J/2/7, fols 226-31; Memorandum of N. B. Edmonstone and J. Baillie to College Committee 31 July 1826, J/2/5, fols 286-89, 308-09, BL.

[64] *Pigot's Directory Hertfordshire* for 1839, 1840.

[65] Danvers, *Memorials*, 186-88.

[66] *Hertford Mercury* 7 November 1857.

[67] *Chronicle*, March 8 1844, 27-28.

[68] Minutes of Court 10 July 1839, 17 July 1839, 24 July 1839, B/198, ff. 286, 293, 326, 337, BL.

[69] For example, see his letter of introduction from Mountstuart Elphinstone, the former Governor of Bombay, F 88/126.

[70] She may have been associated with his visit to the German spa. Court Minutes 5 July 1843, 12 July 1843, 13 September 1843, B/206, ff. 294, 328, 552; Court Minutes 7 August 1844, B/208, ff. 472-73; Officiating Secretary to H. U. Addington, approved 7 August 1844, Finance and Home Papers, Z/L/F/2/13, BL.

[71] Memorandum on Haileybury Studies: Oriental Department c. 1844, MSS EUR F303/445, BL.

[72] Other Indians who proposed to teach Asian languages at Haileybury included a scholar, Joyaloo Naidoo, in 1854, and a pensioned Indian nobleman, Hafiz Sudrool Islam Khan Bahadur, in 1855. Minutes of the Court of Directors 29 March 1854, 5 April 1854, B/227, ff. 1046, 1116; Minutes of the Court 14 March 1855, 20 March 1855, B/229, ff. 980, 1008, 1019, BL.

[73] Syed Abdoollah to Court, 28 June 1853, L/P&J1/64, f. 235a, BL.

[74] Syed Abdoollah to Court, L/F/2/147; Testimonials of J. A. Emerson, Hanwell College, 5 May 1853, and W. Keiser, M.A. 4 May 1853, LP&J1/64, f. 235a, BL.

[75] Letter from Syed Abdoollah Minutes of Court of Directors 31 March 1858, B/235, BL.

[76] H. Hale Bellot, *University College London, 1826-1926* (London: University of London Press, 1929), Chart 2; Visram, *Ayahs*, 63; Rakhal Das Halder, *English Diary of an Indian Student 1861-62* (Dacca: Asutosh Library, 1903), 32, 23; Syed Ameer Ali, *Memoirs and Writings of Syed Ameer Ali* Wasti, ed. Syed Razi, (Lahore: People's Publishing House, 1968), 118-19.

[77] India Dispatch from the Secret Committee no. 1183 of 1846, National Archives of India.

[78] Ringer, *Education*, 67 ff.

[79] Memorandum of Justin Sheil 12 April 1848, FO 60/139, Public Record Office, Britain.

[80] Letter from Sir G. Clerk 19 September 1857: forwarding dispatch from H. M. Minister in Persia and reply, 30 September 1857, B/234, ff. 2004-05, 2191-92. 1003-4; Report of Finance and Home Committee 6 April 1858 and Resolution 14 April 1858, B/235, ff. 1642-43, 1723, BL.

[81] Denis Wright, *The Persians amongst the English* (London: I.B. Tauris, 1985), 92 note 81.

[82] See Mrinalini Sinha, *Colonial Masculinity* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995).