Original Article
ISSN (Online): 2582-7472

ShodhKosh: Journal of Visual and Performing Arts
February 2024 5(2), 1521–1528

ORIENTALIST SCHOLARSHIP AND EMPIRE: BRITISH INTELLECTUAL ENGAGEMENT WITH INDIA

Vaghela Sumankumar Gulabray [1], Dr. Vimal Patel [2]

[1] Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Humanities & Social Science (English), Silver Oak University, Ahmedabad, India
[2] Silver Oak University, Ahmedabad, India

ABSTRACT

This article explores the tangled and deeply ambivalent relationship between British Orientalist scholarship and the consolidation of imperial power in India from the late eighteenth to the early twentieth century, a relationship defined by a weird mix of genuine intellectual curiosity and the hard-nosed pragmatics of colonial governance. It argues that Orientalism was never a simple, monolithic project of imperial domination as is sometimes claimed; instead, it was an inherently complex, unstable, and often contradictory enterprise, a shifting set of policies and intellectual fashions that adapted to the evolving demands of ruling a vast and bewildering subcontinent. We'll look at how the early generation of "Orientalists," men like William Jones and H.T. Colebrooke, driven by a blend of Enlightenment rationalism and a romantic fascination with India's ancient past, undertook the monumental task of codifying Indian languages, laws, and religions. Their work, institutionalized through bodies like the Asiatic Society of Bengal, was absolutely indispensable for the East India Company, providing the administrative tools—the legal frameworks, the social taxonomies, the historical narratives—needed to govern a non-European society. Yet, this very act of "knowing the Orient" was fraught with paradox. The British effort to recover and enshrine what they saw as India's "ancient constitution" often resulted in the creation of a rigid, textualized, and distorted version of Indian traditions, particularly in the realm of Hindu law, which was remade in the image of English case law. At the same time, and this is the real kicker, the Orientalist "rediscovery" of India's glorious classical past—the recovery of Sanskrit classics, the deciphering of ancient inscriptions—had the completely unintended consequence of fueling a cultural and intellectual revival, most notably during the Bengal Renaissance. This newfound pride in Indian culture, directly nurtured by Orientalist scholarship, provided the intellectual and ideological ammunition for the emergence of a new middle-class national consciousness, which would eventually challenge the very foundations of the British Raj. So, while Orientalism was undeniably intertwined with the structures of empire, viewing religion and tradition as backward to justify colonial rule, its legacy was profoundly ambivalent, contributing as much to the tools of colonial control as to the seeds of anti-colonial resistance.[1][2][3][4]

Keywords: Orientalism, British Empire, India; Colonialism, William Jones, Asiatic Society of Bengal, Colonial Knowledge, Hindu Law, Bengal Renaissance, Imperial Governance, Postcolonialism, Edward Said, Indian Nationalism

DOI
10.29121/shodhkosh.v5.i2.2024.6423

Funding: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. THE EMPIRE'S STRANGE AND COMPLICATED LOVE AFFAIR WITH INDIAN KNOWLEDGE

So, let's get one thing straight from the jump: the British didn't just conquer India with guns and ships. They conquered it with books. They conquered it with grammars, dictionaries, legal codes, and historical treatises. It was an intellectual conquest that ran parallel to the military and economic one, and in many ways, it was more insidious and longer lasting. This whole sprawling, messy, and deeply problematic enterprise is what we call Orientalism—the Western study of the "Orient." And in the context of British India, it was a beast of a different color, a complicated and often contradictory affair that was less about a simple power dynamic and more like a deeply dysfunctional relationship, full of fascination, repulsion, appropriation, and a whole lot of unintended consequences. It's a story about how trying to know a place is always, always tangled up with trying to rule it.

The whole thing kicked off in the late 18th century, when a bunch of brainy British officials, judges, and doctors working for the East India Company, guys steeped in the ideals of the Enlightenment, arrived in India and were just... blown away. They found a civilization with a history as deep as Europe's, with classical languages as sophisticated as Greek and Latin, and with philosophical and legal traditions of staggering complexity. Men like Sir William Jones, a polymath jurist who founded the Asiatic Society of Bengal in 1784, weren't just cynical imperialists; they were genuinely curious. Jones famously declared that Sanskrit, "whatever be its antiquity, is of a wonderful structure; more perfect than the Greek, more copious than the Latin, and more exquisitely refined than either." This wasn't just idle praise; it was the beginning of a massive intellectual project to translate, codify, and understand India on its own terms—or so they thought. His stated aim was to rule, learn, and compare the Orient with the Occident, a dual purpose that captured the whole spirit of the enterprise.[3]

But here's the rub. This intellectual project was never just for fun. It was mission-critical for the Empire. How do you tax a people without understanding their land tenure systems? How do you administer justice without some grasp of their laws? How do you keep a diverse population from rebelling without knowing the social and religious fault lines that divide them? The knowledge produced by the Orientalists—their translations of Hindu and Muslim legal texts, their ethnographic surveys, their histories—became the scaffolding of British rule. It was a form of "Applied Orientalism," a tool of imperial governance that aimed to make Indian society legible and therefore manageable for its new European masters. It was about creating a definitive, authoritative, and textualized version of India that could be easily administered, a project that often steamrolled over the fluid, diverse, and oral traditions that had existed for centuries.[5]

And yet—and this is where the story gets really juicy—it didn't quite work out the way they planned. By digging up and celebrating India's "Golden Age," the Orientalists inadvertently gave Indian intellectuals the tools to forge a new sense of identity and pride. The "rediscovery" of India's ancient past, from the sublime poetry of Kalidasa to the political wisdom of the Arthashastra, sparked the Bengal Renaissance, a powerful intellectual and cultural movement in the 19th century. Figures like Raja Ram Mohan Roy used the very knowledge compiled by the British to argue for social and religious reform from within Hinduism, to modernize it and make it resilient against the criticisms of Christian missionaries and the more arrogant Anglicists like Macaulay, who famously claimed a "single shelf of a good European Library was worth the whole literature of India and Arabia". Later on, this cultural pride, nurtured by Orientalist scholarship, would morph into political nationalism. Leaders from Tilak to Nehru would draw on these narratives of a glorious ancient Indian past to build a case for throwing off the British yoke. It's one of history's great ironies: the knowledge created to secure an empire ended up helping to dismantle it. So this whole thing, this intellectual engagement, it wasn't a one-way street. It was a messy, collaborative, and often contentious dialogue, a space where British power and Indian agency were constantly negotiating, a process whose legacy is still being debated in the political and cultural landscape of modern India today.[4][3][5]

2. THE PIONEERS: JONES, COLEBROOKE, AND THE MAKING OF COLONIAL KNOWLEDGE

It all really began with one man: Sir William Jones. You can't talk about British Orientalism in India without talking about Jones. He was a force of nature, a genuine prodigy who arrived in Calcutta in 1783 to serve as a judge on the Supreme Court of Judicature. But his real passion wasn't law, it was languages. He was already a respected scholar in Europe, but India was his true calling. He saw himself as an explorer charting a new intellectual continent. A year after his arrival, he founded the Asiatic Society of Bengal, an institution that would become the nerve center of Orientalist

scholarship for the next century. His vision for the Society was encyclopedic: to investigate "Man and Nature; whatever is performed by the one or produced by the other" within the geographical limits of Asia. It was a breathtakingly ambitious project, grounded in the Enlightenment belief that all human knowledge could be systematically collected, classified, and understood.

Jones is most famous for his "discovery" of the link between Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin, the observation that laid the foundation for the entire field of comparative linguistics and the concept of an "Indo-European" family of languages. This was a monumental intellectual achievement. But it also had a profound, if subtle, political effect. By suggesting that Indians and Europeans were related by blood and language, stemming from a common ancestral source, it created a kind of intellectual space for a more respectful, if paternalistic, form of engagement. It positioned the British not as alien conquerors but as long-lost cousins returning to restore a shared classical heritage. This was a powerful legitimizing narrative for the early, and still insecure, British presence in India.[3]

But Jones's most important work, from the perspective of the East India Company, was in the field of law. The Company's administrators were faced with a dilemma. They had been granted the diwani (the right to collect revenue) of Bengal in 1765, which effectively made them the civil administrators of a huge territory. Under the principle of "letting the people be governed by their own laws," a policy championed by the first Governor-General, Warren Hastings, the British were committed to applying Hindu law to Hindus and Islamic law to Muslims. The problem was, they had no idea what those laws were. The legal systems they encountered were not neatly codified in books like English common law. They were a complex mixture of classical texts (shastras and the Quran), a vast body of commentaries and digests (nibandhas and fatwas), and local customs, all interpreted by scholarly pundits and qazis.

For the British, with their bureaucratic mindset, this was chaos. They needed certainty. They needed a definitive, written code. So Jones, the quintessential jurisprudent, initiated a massive project to compile a "Digest of Hindu Laws" and a similar one for Islamic law. His goal was to recover what he believed to be the "ancient constitution" of India, a pure, timeless legal system that he thought had been corrupted over time by ignorant or venal local interpreters. He viewed the differences of opinion among the pundits not as a sign of a vibrant, living legal tradition but as evidence of decay. This was a classic Enlightenment move: to brush away the messy present in search of a pure, rational, and classical past.[3]

After Jones's early death, the project was completed by Henry Thomas Colebrooke, another brilliant Sanskritist. But the entire enterprise was based on a fundamental misunderstanding. Colebrooke and Jones, trained in the English case law system, which is based on precedent and judicial interpretation, wrongly assumed that the various commentaries (samhitas) on Hindu legal texts were like legal precedents, reflecting the actual law of the land. They went about dividing these commentaries into different "schools" of law, like the Mitakshara and Dayabhaga schools, creating a rigid, hierarchical structure where none had existed before. The result was that Hindu civil law was effectively rendered as an image of European case law, frozen in time and stripped of its flexibility and regional diversity. The living, breathing tradition was replaced by a dead, textual one, created by and for the convenience of the colonial state. This act of codification was perhaps the single most significant impact of Orientalist scholarship on Indian society. It was a perfect example of how the desire to "know" and "preserve" a culture was also an act of profound transformation and control.[3]

3. THE ASIATIC SOCIETY AND THE INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF KNOWLEDGE

If William Jones was the visionary, the Asiatic Society of Bengal was the machine he built to realize that vision. Founded in Calcutta in 1784, the Society became the single most important institution for the production and dissemination of Orientalist knowledge in the world. It was a hub, a clearinghouse, a scholarly club where the British elite in India—officials, judges, soldiers, doctors—could meet, present their research, and publish their findings in the society's influential journal, Asiatick Research. This was the institutionalization of curiosity. It turned the amateur interests of a few gifted individuals into a systematic, collective enterprise.

The scope of the Society's work was vast. Its members conducted the first systematic studies of Indian botany, zoology, geology, and meteorology. They were pioneers in fields like numismatics (the study of coins) and epigraphy (the study of inscriptions), deciphering ancient scripts like Brahmi and Kharosthi, which unlocked huge swathes of early Indian history that had been completely forgotten. James Prinsep, an assay master at the Calcutta mint and the secretary of the Society, famously deciphered the edicts of the Mauryan emperor Ashoka in the 1830s, a breakthrough that fundamentally changed the understanding of India's past. This was groundbreaking work, and it's impossible to deny

the genuine scholarly contributions made by these men. They laid the foundations for many modern academic disciplines in and about India.[3]

They also took a keen interest in the vernacular languages of India. While Sanskrit was the glamour language, the key to the classical past, practical administrators needed to understand the languages people actually spoke. The Society's members, and scholars associated with institutions it inspired like the College of Fort William (founded in 1800 to train British administrators), undertook the massive task of creating the first systematic grammars and dictionaries for languages like Bengali, Hindustani, and Marathi. This was, again, a double-edged sword. On the one hand, it gave these languages a new prestige and a concrete, standardized form. On the other hand, it was an act of classification and control, a way of mapping the linguistic terrain of the subcontinent to make it more governable.[3]

But the Society was more than just a scholarly institution. It was a key site of collaboration—and contestation—between British and Indian intellectuals. While the formal membership was initially restricted to Europeans, the British Orientalists were utterly dependent on the knowledge of their Indian assistants, the pundits and maulvis who were their teachers, translators, and informants. This was a complex and often unequal partnership. The British held the power and controlled the final product—the published articles, the translations, the legal digests—but the raw material, the deep, traditional knowledge, came from Indian scholars. This collaboration was crucial to the entire Orientalist project, and it highlights the fact that colonial knowledge was not simply imposed from above but was co-produced in a complex process of negotiation.[4]

Over time, however, the intellectual climate began to change. The early generation of "Orientalists" like Jones and Colebrooke, who held Indian civilization in relatively high esteem, began to be replaced by a new breed of British official in the 19th century. These were the "Anglicists," men like Thomas Babington Macaulay, who were influenced by utilitarianism and evangelical Christianity and had nothing but contempt for Indian culture and learning. They argued that British policy should not be to support "Oriental learning" but to promote English education and Western science, to create "a class of persons, Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals, and in intellect." The famous debate between the Orientalists and the Anglicists in the 1830s, which the Anglicists won, marked a major shift in British policy. The official approach to India became much more aggressive and interventionist.[5][3]

This shift had a profound impact on the Asiatic Society and the nature of Orientalist scholarship. The focus moved away from the collaborative study of classical texts and toward more "practical" forms of knowledge, like ethnographic surveys and racial classifications, which were more directly useful for colonial governance. The paternalistic respect of the early Orientalists gave way to the racial arrogance of high imperialism. And yet, the legacy of that first, more romantic phase of Orientalism would prove to be incredibly resilient. The seeds they had planted were about to bear some very unexpected fruit.

Table 1 Key British Orientalists and Their Dual Imperial/Intellectual Impact

Orientalist Figure	Key Contribution(s)	Impact for British Empire (The Tool of Rule)	Impact for Indian Society (Unintended Consequences)
Warren Hastings (Governor-General, 1773-1785)	Patron of early Orientalism; promoted the policy of ruling Indians by their own laws.	Provided a key ideological justification for early British rule, framing it as a preservation rather than a disruption of Indian tradition.	Created the demand for the codification of Indian law, setting in motion a process that would fundamentally alter it.
Sir William Jones (Jurist & Scholar, 1746-1794)	Founded the Asiatic Society of Bengal (1784); "discovered" the Indo-European language family; initiated the digest of Hindu and Muslim law[3].	Provided the intellectual framework for understanding (and thus governing) India. His legal work was crucial for creating a predictable administrative system[3].	His celebration of Sanskrit and India's classical past sparked a sense of cultural pride. The Indo-European theory provided a link between India and Europe[3].
H.T. Colebrooke (Scholar & Administrator, 1765-1837)	Completed Jones's digest of Hindu law; wrote extensively on Hindu philosophy, grammar, and religion.	Created a definitive, textualized version of Hindu law that became the standard for colonial courts, making	Solidified a particular, Brahminical interpretation of Hinduism as the "authentic" version, marginalizing other traditions.

		civil administration more efficient and uniform[3].	
James Prinsep (Scholar & Assay Master, 1799-1840)	Deciphered the Brahmi and Kharosthi scripts, including the edicts of Emperor Ashoka.	Unlocked a vast, previously unknown chapter of Indian history, providing a deeper historical context for the territory the British now controlled.	The discovery of a glorious Mauryan, Buddhist past provided a powerful counter-narrative to colonial claims of Indian stagnation and decay.
H.H. Wilson (Scholar & Physician, 1786-1860)	Compiled the first Sanskrit-English dictionary; translated major works like the Rigveda and Vishnu Purana.	Provided essential linguistic tools for generations of British administrators and scholars needing to access Sanskrit texts for legal and administrative purposes.	Made the foundational texts of Hinduism accessible to a new, English-educated Indian audience, fueling reform movements and cultural nationalism.
Thomas Macaulay (Politician & "Anglicist," 1800-1859)	Authored the "Minute on Indian Education" (1835), which championed English over Oriental learning[5].	Shifted imperial policy towards creating a class of anglicized Indian collaborators to help administer the empire, a more direct form of cultural assimilation.	His attack on Indian culture provoked a strong defensive reaction, galvanizing Indian intellectuals to define and defend their own traditions more assertively.

4. THE UNINTENDED HARVEST: ORIENTALISM AND THE RISE OF INDIAN NATIONALISM

History is a funny thing. You set out to do one thing, and you end up doing something completely different. The British Orientalists set out to create a library of knowledge that would help them run their Indian empire more efficiently. What they ended up doing was providing the raw materials for the very ideology that would one day kick them out: Indian nationalism. It's a beautiful, messy irony. This whole process was slow, complex, and it happened in stages, but the link between the Orientalist "rediscovery" of India's past and the rise of a modern national consciousness is undeniable.[3]

The first and most important consequence was the birth of a new kind of cultural pride among the educated Indian elite, particularly in Bengal. Before the Orientalists, while there were certainly strong regional and religious identities, the idea of a single, unified "Indian" civilization with a continuous, glorious history was not a dominant concept. It was the work of Jones, Colebrooke, Prinsep, and others that provided the narrative glue to stick this idea together. By translating the classics, deciphering the inscriptions of Ashoka, and revealing the splendors of the Gupta "Golden Age," they presented a picture of India as a cradle of civilization, a place of immense philosophical and artistic achievement. For an Indian intellectual class that was being told every day by the British—especially by the later Anglicists—that their culture was backward, superstitious, and stagnant, this was a powerful antidote. It was a source of self-esteem. It was a reason to be proud of being Indian.[4][3]

This newfound pride was the engine of the Bengal Renaissance in the 19th century. Thinkers and reformers like Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Debendranath Tagore (the poet Rabindranath's father), and Ishwar Chandra Vidyasagar were all deeply engaged with the scholarship produced by the Orientalists. They didn't just passively accept it; they used it. Ram Mohan Roy, for example, used his deep knowledge of the Upanishads—a knowledge made more accessible through Orientalist translations and editions—to argue for a reformed, monotheistic Hinduism, stripping away what he saw as the corruptions of later Puranic mythology and idol worship. He was trying to revitalize Hinduism from within, to make it a rational, modern religion that could stand on an equal footing with Christianity. This was a direct response to the colonial situation, an attempt to both reform and defend Indian tradition using the very tools and categories provided by the colonizers.[4]

As the 19th century wore on, this cultural pride began to take on a more political edge. The first generation of Indian nationalists, leaders like Dadabhai Naoroji, R.C. Dutt, and later, Bal Gangadhar Tilak, all wrote extensively on India's "glorious" past. They weaponized Orientalist history. If India had been a great and prosperous civilization in the past, then its present poverty and subjugation must be the fault of British rule. R.C. Dutt, for example, used his historical

research to develop a powerful economic critique of colonialism, arguing that the British had systematically de-industrialized India and drained its wealth. This was the "drain theory," a cornerstone of early nationalist thought.

Tilak went even further. He was a brilliant Sanskrit scholar himself, and he used his interpretation of the Bhagavad Gita and other texts to argue for a more assertive, politically engaged form of Hinduism. He reinterpreted the festival of the god Ganesh and the birthday of the Maratha warrior-king Shivaji as public, nationalist celebrations, mobilizing a mass following. He, and others like him, were taking the Orientalist-constructed past and turning it into a call for political action in the present. Even a more secular nationalist like Jawaharlal Nehru, India's first Prime Minister, was deeply influenced by this historical narrative. His book, The Discovery of India, written while he was imprisoned by the British in the 1940s, is essentially a grand, sweeping story of India's long and resilient civilization, a story that owes a huge debt to the foundational work done by the 19th-century Orientalists.[3]

So, while the Orientalist project was undoubtedly motivated by imperial concerns, its impact was far from what its creators intended. It was a classic case of the "cunning of history." By trying to define and control India through knowledge, the British inadvertently gave Indians a new language and a new set of ideas with which to imagine themselves as a nation. The knowledge meant to be a tool of empire became a weapon of liberation. It was a profoundly dialectical process, where the actions of the colonizer produced the very forces that would lead to their own undoing.[3]

5. SAID'S GHOST: CRITIQUING THE CRITIQUE

You can't have a conversation about Orientalism today without talking about Edward Said. His groundbreaking 1978 book, Orientalism, completely changed the field. It was a powerful, polemical, and profoundly influential critique that argued that Western knowledge about the Middle East (and by extension, the rest of the "Orient") was not neutral or objective scholarship. Instead, Said argued, it was a discourse of power, a way of constructing the Orient as the "Other"—as irrational, despotic, feminine, and backward—in order to define the West as its opposite and thus justify colonial domination. For Said, Orientalism was a "Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient." It was inextricably linked to imperialism.

Said's critique was a thunderbolt, and its impact on academia, particularly in postcolonial studies, has been immense. It forced a generation of scholars to re-examine the political and ideological underpinnings of their disciplines. And there is no doubt that his framework has a great deal of explanatory power when looking at British India. The later, more arrogant phase of 19th-century British scholarship, with its racial hierarchies and its contempt for Indian culture, fits Said's model very well. The Anglicist project of Macaulay is almost a textbook example of the kind of Orientalist discourse Said was describing.[3]

However, many scholars have argued that applying Said's framework wholesale to the Indian context can be a bit like trying to fit a square peg into a round hole. Said himself only occasionally referred to Orientalist discourse on India, his main focus was the Middle East. And the Indian case presents some unique complexities that his model, in its original form, struggles to fully account for.[3]

One of the main criticisms is that Said's model presents Orientalism as too monolithic and one-directional. It portrays a powerful, unified West imposing its knowledge on a passive, silent East. But as we've seen, the situation in India was much more of a dialogue, albeit an unequal one. The British Orientalists were completely dependent on the knowledge of their pundit and maulvi collaborators. Colonial knowledge was co-produced. Indian intellectuals were not silent victims; they were active agents who engaged with, appropriated, and challenged Orientalist ideas from the very beginning. The Bengal Renaissance is a powerful testament to this Indian agency.[4]

Furthermore, Said's framework has difficulty accounting for the genuine intellectual curiosity and, at times, sincere admiration that characterized the early phase of British Orientalism. While we can't ignore the fact that men like William Jones were agents of empire, it also seems overly simplistic to dismiss their scholarship as nothing but a tool of domination. Jones's "wonderful structure" comment about Sanskrit doesn't sound like someone who is simply constructing an "inferior Other." The reality seems to be more complex: the early Orientalists could simultaneously be agents of empire and genuine scholars, driven by a mixture of motives that were often contradictory. Their project was, as the historian Michael Dodson puts it, "an inherently complex and unstable enterprise".[1][3]

Another key point is that the impact of Orientalism wasn't uniformly negative. While it certainly created distorted and rigid representations of Indian society, it also had the positive, if unintended, effects we've discussed: the recovery of lost histories, the standardization of vernacular languages, and the fostering of a new cultural pride that fueled

nationalism. Said's model, with its focus on the negative, disciplinary aspects of Orientalist discourse, has less room for these ambivalent and sometimes productive outcomes.[3]

Ultimately, the debate over Said's legacy in the Indian context is not about dismissing his work. His central insight—that knowledge and power are always intertwined—remains absolutely crucial. But it is about nuancing his argument. Orientalism in India was not a static, top-down project of imperial domination. It was a shifting set of policies and intellectual currents that changed over time, from the relative respect of the late 18th century to the arrogance of the late 19th. It was a site of collaboration and contestation, and its impact was deeply contradictory, creating tools for both imperial control and anti-colonial resistance. To understand this complex history, we need a framework that can hold all of these messy, conflicting truths at the same time.[3]

6. CONCLUSION: A TANGLED LEGACY OF KNOWLEDGE AND POWER

The story of British intellectual engagement with India is not a simple morality play. There are no pure heroes or cartoon villains. It's a tangled, murky, and deeply human story about the inextricable links between the thirst for knowledge and the exercise of power. The British came to India to trade, and they stayed to rule. And in order to rule a place so vast and so alien, they had to try and understand it. That effort to understand, which we call Orientalism, became one of the most ambitious intellectual projects in history, but it was a project that was compromised from its very inception by its connection to the machinery of empire.

The Orientalists were not a single, unified bloc. The romantic scholars of the late 18th century, with their genuine admiration for India's classical past, were a world away from the smug Anglicists of the mid-19th century, who saw Indian culture as something to be swept away. The entire enterprise was a shifting, contradictory set of ideas and policies that adapted to the changing needs of the colonial state. It was never a one-way street, a simple imposition of Western knowledge onto a passive East. It was a complex and often contentious dialogue, a co-production of knowledge in which Indian scholars played an indispensable, if often unacknowledged, role.[3]

The legacy of this engagement is, to put it mildly, ambivalent. On the one hand, Orientalist scholarship produced profound distortions. It created a rigid, textualized, and often Brahminical version of Hinduism that was frozen in time and became the basis for colonial law, steamrolling over the subcontinent's rich diversity of local and popular traditions. It introduced racial theories that justified colonial rule and have left a poisonous legacy in the politics of the region. But on the other hand, the consequences were not all negative. The Orientalists recovered forgotten histories, gave shape to modern Indian languages, and, in one of history's great ironies, provided the intellectual fuel for the fire of Indian nationalism. The "glorious past" that they "discovered" and celebrated became a cornerstone of the argument for why India deserved a glorious future, free from foreign rule.[4][3]

In the end, we are left with a powerful lesson about the nature of knowledge itself. It is never pure, never produced in a vacuum. It is always shaped by the interests, the prejudices, and the power relations of its time. The British effort to "know" India was inseparable from their effort to control it. But knowledge, once created, has a life of its own. It can escape the intentions of its creators and be put to new and unexpected uses. The story of Orientalism in India is the ultimate proof of that. It is the story of how the tools designed to build an empire were ultimately used to tear it down.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

None.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

None.

REFERENCES

Dodson, Michael S. Orientalism, Empire, and National Culture: India, 1770-1880. Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

"Impact of Orientalism in India." International Journal of English Language, Literature and Humanities, vol. 2, no. 7, Nov. 2014, pp. 260-66.

Matthiesen, Toby. "British India and Orientalism." The Caliph and the Imam: The Making of Sunnism and Shiism, Oxford UP, 2023, pp. 191-220. Oxford Scholarship Online, doi:10.1093/oso/9780190689446.003.0008.
Morrison, Alexander. ""Applied Orientalism" in British India and Tsarist Turkestan." Comparative Studies in Society and History, vol. 51, no. 3, 2009, pp. 619-47.
"Rise of British Orientalism in India." Academia.edu, 2013.
Slouber, Michael. "British India and the Quest for a New Orientalism." Visions of Greater India, Cambridge UP, 2023, pp. 127-53, doi:10.1017/9781009383849.006.
https://link.springer.com/book/10.1057/9780230288706
https://academic.oup.com/book/45757/chapter/398686647
https://ijellh.com/index.php/OJS/article/view/208/208
https://www.academia.edu/5373454/Rise_of_British_Orientalism_in_India
https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/comparative-studies-in-society-and-history/article/applied-orientalism-in-british-india-and-tsarist-turkestan/150ECB23D556F4A1B6BA208FFE5B3125