

Susheel Kumar SHARMA

University of Allahabad

susheelsharma.avap@gmail.com

WHAT IS IN A NAME?: PROBLEMATIC OF ANGLO-INDIAN LITERATURE

Abstract: Anglo-Indian Literature is not literature produced by or about Anglo-Indians but a distinct category of literature in English about India by the British. Many independent and appended Glossaries of Indian terms had also been published before George Clifford Whitworth's *An Anglo-Indian Dictionary* (1885) as a prelude to this literature. Later, even Indians' contributions in English were brought under this class. Scrutiny of several English and Indian historians' take on this literature-type reveals that Anglo-Indian Literature has been changing its contours quite frequently. What is amazing is that even the names of this literature have been changing with time and the new avatars keep on taking place by embracing new genres / literatures / litterateurs. The term *Anglo-Indian* is used both as an adjective and a noun. It is heavily loaded as it points towards paternal lineage, colour, religion, culture, mind and the location of the author that distinguishes one from other British nationals. It was introduced as the official description of the Eurasian communities for the first time in 1882. Viceroy Charles Hardinge, in 1911, sanctioned the use of the term *Anglo-Indian* in the official census. An insight into the community's history will certainly be helpful in understanding the cultural concerns of the community and issues in their literature. Confusion among the editors, literary historians and academic scholarship is no less responsible for the changing names and adopting the new ones for this hybrid literature. As their concerns are divided between allegiance to the emerging nation i.e. India and loyalty to the crown – the former masters they are not able to make up their minds about various published works. With the passage of time, Anglo-Indian Literature has disappeared like a meteor and has been transformed into Indian writings in English.

Key words: Anglo-Indian, Indo-Anglian, Indo-English, Literary History, Luso-Indian

*adharmābhibhavāt kṛṣhṇa pradūṣhyanti kula-striyaḥ
strīṣhu duṣhṭāsu vārṣhṇeya jāyate varṇa-saṅkaraḥ
saṅkaro narakāyaiva kula-ghnānām kulasya cha
patanti pītaro hy eṣhām lupta-piṇḍodaka-kriyāḥ*

*doṣhair etaiḥ kula-ghnānām varṇa-saṅkara-kāraḥ
utsādyante jāti-dharmāḥ kula-dharmāḥ cha śhāshvatāḥ*¹
(*Bhagavadgita*: I: 41-43)

Preliminaries

English does not find a place in the Eighth Schedule of the Indian Constitution though its use is admissible for various purposes under Articles 210, 343(2), 345, and 348(3) (iii). As the burden of colonial past is too heavy to be overthrown, in at least seven Indian states (Arunachal Pradesh, Karnataka, Kerala, Meghalaya, Nagaland, Tripura and West Bengal) and two Union territories (Daman and Div and Puducherry) English enjoys the status of official language. Studies in English Literature continue to be highly promoted in all the universities of the country and graduating in English is considered socially prestigious and valuable. Even Gandhi used English and published in it prolifically in the heydays of nationalistic fervour. Nehru, himself an exuberant user of English, argued for its inclusion in the list of languages to be patronised by Sahitya Akademi, the national body for Indian literature. Whether the literature written in this language in India is unique and if it deserves special treatment in the country is a debatable issue as has been made out also by Salman Rushdie's assertion in *The Vintage Book of Indian Writing*: "the ironical proposition that India's best writing since independence may have been done in the language of the departed imperialists is simply too much for some folks to bear" (Rushdie 1997: xiv) though Rushdie goes to correct himself in the very next sentence: "It ought not to be true, and must not be permitted to be true" (Rushdie 1997: xiv). If the awards given by Sahitya Akademi are any proof, the record of English is enviable. Therefore, Salman Rushdie's observation, "the prose writing – both fiction and non-fiction – created in this period by Indian writers working in English, is proving to be a stronger and more important body of work than most of what has been produced in the 16 *official languages* of India, the so-called *vernacular languages*, during the same time; and, indeed, this new, and still burgeoning, *Indo-Anglian* literature represents perhaps the most valuable contribution India has yet made to the world of books" (Rushdie 1997: x), appears to be quite valid and genuine. However, there are others who refuse to accept anything written in this language as authentic Indian as English

¹ "With the preponderance of vice, O Krishna, the women of the family become immoral; and from the immorality of women, O descendant of Vrishni, unwanted progeny are born. An increase in unwanted children results in hellish life both for the family and for those who destroy the family. Deprived of the sacrificial offerings, the ancestors of such corrupt families also fall. Through the evil deeds of those who destroy the family tradition and thus give rise to unwanted progeny, a variety of social and family welfare activities are ruined" (trans. Mukundananda 2014).

is not the language most of the writers “dream in” (Das [1965] 1997: 47). However, there is no denying the fact that a vast body of literature in India exists in English despite the debate about the genuineness of the literature.

Opinions differ on the starting point of the hybrid literature, a result of an interaction between English and India. Edward Farley Oaten, the earliest surveyor/historian of the Anglo-Indian Literature, considers 1783, the year when Sir William Jones arrived in India, to be the point of beginning of the Anglo-Indian Literature, as a few travelogues and letters written before this date were devoid of any literary merit ([1916] 1953: 16). Tracing the antiquity of Indo-Anglian literature in India K. R. S. Iyengar suggests three options: 1818, when Rammohan Roy’s tract on “Sati” appeared; 1801, when “Venkata Boriah’s [sic] dissertation on Jains appeared”; and 1780, when Hickey’s *Bengal Gazette* was founded (Iyengar [1962] 2013: 691). M. K. Naik suggests 1809, “when probably the first composition in English of some length by an Indian – namely C. V. Boriah’s [sic] ‘Account of the Jains’ – appeared” (1989: Preface). Sisir Kumar Das in his *History of Indian Literature* (Vol. I) also considers Cavelly Venkata Boriah’s [sic] “Accounts of the Jains” to be the first piece of Indian writing in English (1991: 29). Boria’s piece is not an original essay but a translated text as is also clear from its full title: “Account of the Jains, collected from a Priest of this sect; at Mudgeri: Translated by Cavelly Boria, Brahmen; for Major C. Mackenzie” (Boria 1809: 244-286). B. J. Wadia is right when he writes: “[...] all that is written by Indians in the English language cannot be called ‘literature’” (qtd in Iyengar 1945: ix) and therefore utmost care has to be taken in deciding the starting point of this literature. Prabhu S. Guptara in his review of the book *Indian Literature in English, 1827-1979: A Guide to Information Sources* provides the following piece of information:

[...] Raja Rammohan Roy began publishing his work [in English] in 1816, and recent research has shown that Indians were contributing to English-language periodicals in India before the end of the eighteenth century. The first book so far known to have been published in English by an Indian was Sake Deen Mahomed’s *Travels* (1794). Since English-language education started in India as early as 1717, it is possible that Indo-English literature was published even earlier. This needs concerted research which has simply not been done so far (Guptara 1986: 312).

Arvind K. Mehrotra endorses the year 1794 as the starting point of this hybrid literature in India (2003: 2).

In his anthology *The Vintage Book of Indian Writing*, restricted to just fifty years (1947-1997), Rushdie has used the following terms to refer to this body of literature: *Indo-Anglian*, *Indo-English*, *Indian writing in English*, *English-language Indian writing*, *English-language Literature*, *Indian novel in English and for the contributors*, *Indian writers working in English*, *English-language writer of Indian origin* and *non-English-language Indian writers* (1997: x-xxii). M. K. Naik, whose canvas of study is much larger than that of Rushdie, is also

conscious of the issue of difficulty in choosing the name: “Another problem which the historian of this literature has to face is that of choosing from among the various appellations [...] ‘Indo-Anglian literature’, ‘Indian Writing in English’, ‘Indo-English Literature’ and ‘Indian English Literature’” (Naik 1989: 4). In a different vein and tenor Arvind K. Mehrotra (2003: 1) writes: “Indians have been writing verse in English at least since the 1820s and it goes under many ludicrous names – Indo-English, India-English, Indian-English, Indo-Anglian, and even Anglo-Indian and Indo-Anglican. ‘Kill that nonsense term’, Adil Jussawalla said of Indo-Anglian, and ‘kill it quickly’”. In another book of his Mehrotra has used two terms *Indo-Anglian* and *Indian Literature in English*. Once upon a time, it was presumed that by making this literature a part of Commonwealth Literature, it will be given a new colonial identity and consequently the problem of naming it will be over for ever. But almost the opposite has happened – the very idea of a Commonwealth is scoffed at today. The following six terms for this body of literature in English (in India) have been in vogue since 1784: *Anglo-Indian Literature*, *Indo-Anglian Literature*, *Indo-English Literature*, *Indian writing in English* (with small w), *Indian Writing in English* (with capital W), *Indian-English Writing* and *Indian English Literature*. Because of the constraints of time and space, I wish to ruminate only on the term *Anglo-Indian Literature* in this article.

Anglo-Indian: the term

The term *Anglo-Indian* can be used both as a noun (compound noun, e.g. *six-pack*, *self-esteem*, *off-campus*, *Anglo-Saxon*, *Anglo-French*) and an adjective (compound adjective, e.g. a *well-known* writer, a *high-quality* patent system, a *well-developed* sense of humour, a *twenty-storey* building, *Anglo-Saxon* Literature). Therefore, the term *Anglo-Indian Literature* is a compound noun/phrase with the structure of Mod (Adj) + N (e.g. *black board*, *common room*, *free trade*, *registered post*, *old boy*) or N + N (e.g. *autumn leaves*, *alphabet worksheets*, *christmas activities*, *farm animals*, *animal pictures*). While in the former case it means ‘related to/by Anglo-Indians’ in the latter case it may mean ‘literature produced by or about Anglo-Indians’. In contrast, in compound words like *Hindi Literature* or *Kannada Literature* or *Sindhi Literature* (with word structure of N+N, for example, *water tank*, *printer cartridge*, *birth place*, *college mate*, *needle work*, etc), *Hindi* or *Kannada* or *Sindhi* simply indicates the language in which the literature has been produced. The question of being motivated by Indian culture is neither asked nor indicated in either case. Therefore, it will be in the fitness of things to ponder over the term *Anglo-Indian* to understand the term *Anglo-Indian Literature*.

When contemporary novelists like V. S. Naipaul, Salman Rushdie, Hanif Kureishi and Gautam Malkani are discussed under the broad rubric of *Anglo-Indian authors* (Masters-Stevens 2014) or when one comes across a phrase like “Anglo-Indian author [Amitav] Ghosh”² or “[...] Anglo-Indian writer Amitav Ghosh” (*Collins* 2010) it is difficult to decide if a reference is being made to the parental lineage of these authors or to the language chosen by them or to their subject matter or to their location or to their migrant status or to their ethnic identity (like Afro-American or Amerindian, or Amerind). Though *Collins Cobuild Advanced Illustrated Dictionary* and *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* define *Anglo-Indian* in very simple terms: ‘someone whose family is partly British and partly Indian’ yet the geographical denomination in the term has not always been limited to Britain. *Oxford Dictionary* mentions three possible meanings of the term: ‘Of Indian descent but born or living in Britain’; ‘of mixed British and Indian parentage’; or ‘(chiefly historical) of British descent or birth but living or having lived long in India’ (oxforddictionaries.com). A few more dimensions have been added to these in *The New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary on Historical Principles* (1993):

Anglo-Indian n. & a.

A. n. 1. A person of mixed British and Indian descent resident in the Indian sub-continent.

2. A person of British birth resident, or once long resident, in the Indian subcontinent.

B. adj. Of pertaining to, or being an Anglo-Indian or Anglo-Indians; of pertaining to or characteristic of Indian under British rule, (of a word) adopted into English from an Indian language.

The Oxford English Dictionary (2nd ed., Vol. I) gives the following meanings of the term *Anglo-Indian* ‘A. adj. Of, pertaining to, or characteristic of India under British rule, or the English in India. B. sb. a. A person of British birth resident, or once resident, in India. b. A Eurasian of India’ (*OED* 1998). *Cambridge Dictionary* describes *Anglo-Indian* either as ‘a person with British and Indian parents or grandparents’ or as ‘an English person born or living in India (old-fashioned)’ (dictionary.cambridge.org). Muthiah et al. (2017: 1) hold that the term *Anglo-Indian* was used by “the British to describe themselves, Anglo-Celtics for the most part, who spent most of their lives in India in the civil and military services, and who held senior positions in government departments, or spent years in the country as merchants and professionals, traders and planters” up till 1911. It is interesting to note that none of the above definitions mentions the British paternal lineage and the Indian maternal side as a necessary condition for being pronounced an Anglo-Indian

² “In a complex narrative filled with echoes of Naipaul and especially Conrad (with an occasional nod to Peter Matthiessen’s *At Play in the Fields of the Lord*), *Anglo-Indian author Ghosh* (The Glass Palace, 2001, etc.) interweaves the fates of several natives and visitors to the pristine (if not primitive) Sundarban Islands in the Bay of Bengal” (emphasis added, kirkusreviews.com/book-reviews/amitav-ghosh/the-hungry-tide/)

though for Ricketts it was a necessary condition out of three when he characterised East Indians (in today's context Anglo-Indians) as "The descendants of European British subjects and European foreigners, by native mothers, legitimate and illegitimate, as well as their offspring. [...] [They] have been educated, are entirely European in their habits and feelings, dress and language, and everything else [...] and they habitually speak English among themselves" (*Report* March 28, 1831: 52-54). The following background information provided by Muthiah et al. (2018: 1) makes this issue explicit:

It was in 1911 census that the government of Lord Hardinge officially termed those of mixed blood, children born of European fathers and Indian mothers and children born of their offspring, as 'Anglo-Indians'. Till then they had been called – ignoring such derogatory terms as 'half caste', 'half-and-half' and 'eight annas' – Eurasians (a term they thought disparaging, though it was well accepted in Singapore, Malaya and Hong Kong), Indo-Britons, and what was curiously, for long commonly used, East Indians.

The opposite, i.e. an Indian father and an European/English mother was a rare case in India in the days of European colonisation in India because of various reasons including several anti-miscegenation laws that had been passed after 1857, though by "the inter-war years, families with South Asian lascar fathers and English mothers had become part of the inter-racial communities in the dock areas of Britain" (webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk, movinghere.org.uk). However, the presence of such groups is ruled out in India owing to the Indian historical context. The *Indian Act* of 1919 (Schedule II: 1.a.i), 1935 (Schedule I: 26.1) and *Indian Constitution* (366.2) have restricted the term only to the "European descent in the male line" as there is no mention of the female/matrilineal lineage in them. In contrast to the constitutional provisions the community defines itself entirely in different terms. For example, in Warren Brown's *Anglo-Indian Race Preservation Course* the expression *Anglo-Indian* has been amplified as: "[...] the only *English speaking, Christian community in India, whose Mother tongue is English and who have a Western lifestyle in the sub-continent of India.* Anglo-Indians originated during the colonial period in India. When *British soldiers and traders had affairs or married Indian women their offspring* came to be known as *Anglo-Indians or Eurasians* in history" (Brown 2010: 7, emphasis added). Warren Brown's words have been used here but others in the community also accept and hold the same opinion. The names of individuals like Beatrix D'Souza (2017: ix), I. Allan Sealy (2017: 23-27), S. Afsheen (2011: 71), S. Muthiah (Muthiah et al. 2017:5-6), Thomaskutty (2012: Preface), Lionel Caplan (2004: 24-27), Walter Parker, (2015: 25-39), Glenn D'Cruz (2009: 201-219), Robyn Andrews (tandfonline.com), Afrinul Khan (2016: 21-38) and different websites (everyculture.com, encyclopedia.com, aiadanapur.org, araia.org.au) may be cited as examples to prove my contention.

Most of the scholars, Anglo-Indians and the Websites maintained by the Anglo-Indians hold that the Anglo-Indians were brought into being by the direct

policies of the Portuguese, Dutch, and British traders and colonists. Historically speaking the Portuguese (ruled India for 450 years from 1505 to 1961), the Dutch (ruled India for 220 years from 1605 to 1825), the Danes (ruled India for 249 years from 1620 to 1869) and the French (ruled India for 286 years from 1668 to 1954) had arrived and established themselves in India prior to the British. It is but natural that the existence of Indo-Portuguese (Luso-Indian), Indo-French, Indo-Danish and Indo-Dutch half-castes and their quarter-castes also goes back to the pre-British days. Besides, the armies of the colonisers had “up to the late 18th century, thousands of mercenaries from Sweden to Sicily, Spain to Russia and even men of European descent from North America and Australia” (Muthiah et al. 2017: 2). Therefore, it may safely be concluded that the Anglo-Indian community have descended from mixed blood groups. At this juncture, it shall not be out of place to go into the brief socio-cultural and anthropological history of the community to understand the etymology of the term and concerns expressed in the Anglo-Indian literature.

Transformation: from feringees to Anglo-Indians

The European Mixed Community in India has had a long and winding journey in traversing the times from being termed as *Feringee* to *Anglo-Indian*. Their story begins with the discovery of a new sea route, mainly for the trade of spices, rounding Africa from Western Europe to India in 1498 by Portuguese Vasco da Gama. Gama’s venture was not purely Portuguese as the Italians and the Germans were associated with the trade of the Portuguese as financiers as well as soldiers and *bombardieros*. The latter not only manned Portuguese ships but also appeared on the scene as copper dealers because the demand for copper was very high in Malabar. With the passage of time, they all settled in Malabar, especially at Cochin and had close relationships with each other as Europeans loyal to the Portuguese King. The Arab traders on the Malabar Coast called them *farangi*³. In Kerala in

³ *Farangi* or *Feringee* or *Firingi* or *firinghee* is an Arabic corruption of *frank*. This name was once applied to the crusaders and was an honoured name but now it is used in derision. Yule et al. ([1886] 1903: 352-353) describe *Firinghee* in the following terms: “s. Pers. Farangi, Firingi; Ar. Al-Farangj, Ifranji, Firanji, i.e. Frank. This term for a European is very old in Asia, but when now employed by natives in India is either applied (especially in the South) specifically to the Indian-born Portuguese, or, when used more generally, for ‘European,’ implies something of hostility or disparagement. [...] In South India the Tamil P’arangi, the Singhalese Parangi, mean only ‘Portuguese’, or by Mahommedans, any European”. *The Chamber’s Twentieth Century Dictionary* defines the word *Feringhi/Feringhee/Faringee* as ‘a Hindu name for a European’ (Geddie 1971: 392). *Webster’s Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary of the English Language* defines ‘Feringi’ as an Indian term for “1 a European or a person of European descent 2 a Portuguese born in India” (1989: 524). Online dictionaries define the word: “Feringee Fer’in’gee n. 1. The name given to Europeans by the Hindos” (thefreedictionary.com/Feringee) and “*feringee* Noun (plural Feringees) (dated, used by Hindus) A

daily parlance the Portuguese and their descendants are called *Parangi* which is a corrupt form of *farangi*. Because of the long and risky journey (of nearly eight months by sea) few women from Europe were able to reach India during the initial years of the Portuguese settlement in India. The Portuguese settlers took to the local women. Thus, the first progenies of the mixed-marriages of the Portuguese men and the Indian women, *Luso-Indians*, were there in Kerala. The word *Luso* in *Luso-Indian* derives from Lusitânia⁴, the former name of Portugal. Later along with the growth of the Portuguese empire they also spread to other parts of India like Calcutta, Surat, Daman, Diu, Goa, Bombay and Madras.

After seizing Goa from the Sultan of Bijapur in 1510, Afonso de Albuquerque, the Governor of the Portuguese State of India, in order to stabilize his empire started encouraging his bachelor soldiers (*soldados*) to become married settlers (*casados*) by taking Indian mistresses. Unlike later European colonisers he neither had any notion of racial purity nor a horror of mixed marriages. Under his policy *Politica dos Casamentos*, Albuquerque also encouraged marriages between Portuguese men “originally from lowest classes in Portugal including some convicted criminals” (Rocha 2010: 38) and native women as the number of Portuguese females who came with Portuguese officials (*renois*), those who were born to Portuguese parents in India (*castiças*), others who came on ships (*aventureiras*) and women of mixed blood (both *mestiços* and *mulatas*) in 16th century was very limited. Stephens writes: “Officers indeed might expect to return to the fatherland, but the Europeans of inferior ranks were too valuable to be allowed to escape. In all it is narrated that about 450 Portuguese were married to native women before [Albuquerque] left Goa for Malacca” (Stephens 1897: 153).

The primary motive of such arrangements was to divert Hindu/Muslim property to Portuguese and to create a new community that would identify itself with Portuguese power but would be happy to be in this region; this would also create a white identity which in turn would perpetuate the Portuguese rule in the region. The policy also saved the drain of gentlemen from his small country as the men involved were mainly rank and file (like soldiers, workmen in the arsenals and dockyards, masons, carpenters, rope makers and other artisans) and the exiled convicts (like gypsies, prostitutes, vagabonds and beggars called *degredos*) on account of the law of the Sesmarias and “Beggars’ Law” in Portugal⁵. It is said that Albuquerque gave dowry (18000 *reis*, clothes, rice, a

European. Origin From Hindi, from Persian *فرنگی* (*Farangi*, ‘Frank, French, European’) (compound of *فرنگ* (*Farang*) and *-ی* (-i)), from French *Franc*” (yourdictionary.com).

⁴ Lusitânia was an ancient Iberian Roman province including approximately all of modern Portugal south of the Douro river and part of modern Spain. The Luso-Indians were later called Eurasians. As they slowly started mixing with other Europeans or their progenies and later came to be called Anglo-Indians with the introduction of the Constitution of India in 1950.

⁵ A. J. R. Russell-Wood writes on the issue of “Beggars’ Law” in Portugal: “From an early date, overseas territories had been regarded as suitable repositories for undesirables of metropolitan

house, slave women, cattle and a piece of land) to each of such couples. Such men who took native wives were known as *casados*; they had special privileges as Albuquerque treated these women as his own daughters and men his sons-in-law. They were given pay and groceries (*soldo e mantimento*), separate quarters (*bairros*) in urban areas and locally important positions such as *tanadar* and *tabelio*. Despite this many soldiers preferred to have only casual relationship with native women who came from various social groups viz. those associated with soldiers and administrators from the preceding Adil Shahi administrators, fair Mooresses and slaves, *Mestiços* and temple dancers.

As Albuquerque was very conscious of the skin-colour he advised his men to marry fair Hindu and Muslim women and encouraged them to avoid dark complexioned Malabaris (Bethencourt 2013: 210, Pearson 1987: 101). M. N. Pearson writes further: “The great Jesuit missionary, St Francis Xavier, while urging the *casados* to marry their local concubines, drew the firmest of colour lines. ‘When the concubine was dark in colour and ugly featured, he employed all his eloquence to separate his host from her. He was even ready, if necessary, to find him a more suitable mate’” (Pearson 1987: 101). But in practice his instructions were ignored after his short spell in power in the Portuguese India. As a result, their children could not be distinguished on the basis of colour as they were as black as the natives. Describing the children of the Portuguese Linschoten writes: “the posteritie of the Poringales, both men and women being in the third degree, doe seeme to be naturall Indians, both in colour and fashion” (qtd in Pearson 1987: 101). In a similar vein Hamilton in his *Description of Hindostan* writes: “In the southern quarter (of Backergunje) there still exist several original Portuguese colonies [...]. They are a meagre, puny, imbecile race, blacker than the natives, who hold them in utmost contempt, and designate them by the appellation of *Caula* Ferenghies, or black Europeans” (qtd in Yule et al. [1886] 1903: 354).

Though the women taken as wives invariably were converted to Christianity yet there was some opposition to such marriages from certain quarters in the Church and the Government. However, the state reiterated its stand and policy in the form of *alvara* issued in 1684. The estimated number of *casados* in Portuguese Asia was 6000 in 1600. Many noblemen (*fidalgos*) who migrated to India had left their wives and children back home and had either kept native women as mistresses or had developed lasting relationships with temple dancers (*devadasi/baidadeiras*). “In the 16th century, Chinese, Korean and Japanese slaves were also brought to Portugal and the Portuguese settlements, including Goa” (lydiafellowshipinternational.org). A large number of them were brought for sexual purposes, as noted by the Church in

Portugal: convicts, New Christians, gypsies, and even lepers. Reference has been made to the use of Lançados in West and East Africa, but they were to be found as far away as Fukien coast of China. Exile (*degrêdo*) from Portugal could be to the Atlantic Islands, [...] or even Portuguese India. There was ranking of places of exile from the acceptable to least desirable: [...] Brazil, Maranhão, and India, held little hope of return to Portugal” (Russell-Wood [1992] 1998: 106).

1555 (Leupp 2003: 51-54). King Sebastião of Portugal feared that “it was having a negative effect on Catholic proselytisation since the trade in Japanese slaves was growing to massive proportions. At his command it was banned in 1571” (lydiafellowshipinternational.org). In order to prevent men from indulging in lustful and sinful lives, to bring down the number of mixed marriages in India, to transfer their surplus population in Portugal to other places and to increase Portuguese presence in the colonies they shifted Portuguese girl orphans (*Órfãs d’El-Rei* or ‘Orphans of the King’) at the expense of the crown to Portuguese colonies in India (particularly Goa) “to marry either Portuguese settlers or natives with high status” (worldheritageofportugueseorigin.com). Not only did several batches of such girls arrive between 1545 and 1595 in Goa but also “the system apparently continued to function intermittently until the (early) eighteenth century” (Coates 1995: 43). Those who married such girls were given various incentives ranging from captaincy of forts to trading agencies along with dowry. Despite this all the girl orphans could not find “suitable husbands” as most of them “lacked good looks” besides being “old and sickly” (Gracias 1996: 39). The Inquisition came into existence to punish Hindus and Muslims around the same time. In 1620, an order was passed to prohibit the Hindus from performing their marriage rituals. “A document available at Torre do Tombo states that in the middle of the seventeenth century the Municipal Council of Goa (*Senado*) requested the Portuguese king to decree that ‘no Brahmin or *Chardo* who is rich or has property might marry his daughter to any one except to a Portuguese born in Portugal and such people must leave their property to their daughters’” (Gracias 1996: 41). The mixed-race children bore no stigma of inferiority to the Portuguese.

However, with the arrival of the Dutch, the French and the English in the trade scenario around 1600 the Portuguese traders had to face a tough competition. Finally, the Dutch with the help of the Zamorin of Calicut were able to defeat the Portuguese at Cochin and thus the rule of the Portuguese in Cochin came to an end on 7 January 1663. With the defeat of the Portuguese, the Luso-Indians had to flee to the interior villages in different parts of Kerala to protect themselves from the Dutch. The Dutch, called *Lantha* or *Lanthakkar* in Kerala, were Protestants; they destroyed and burnt the Catholic churches and the libraries attached to them having thousands of books and manuscripts, along with Portuguese establishments, the houses of the Portuguese and the Luso-Indians. All the priests and friars were expelled. The enmity, vengeance and religious fanaticism of the Dutch could be seen in the narrations of Ferroli about the incident:

[...] the Blessed Sacrament was removed from the churches; they were robbed of all ornaments. On the square in front of each they lit a big fire, and burnt the ornaments therein—statues, crucifixes, holy pictures, missals and everything pertaining to the sacred worship. The sight of it caused the poor, miserable people to moan and cry. The next day the keys of the city were delivered. Rickloff took possession of it. [...] He gave leave to the

soldiers to plunder the city for three days. It is not possible to imagine the cruelty of the soldiers, the ways some women were treated [...] (qtd in Dias 2009: 130-131).

A similar description of the atrocities committed by the Dutch during their invasion of the Portuguese Cochin has been made by the Archbishop Joseph Sebastiani: “Those who, a short time before, owned fine houses and plenty of money, served by numerous slaves, living in ease and luxury, had become destitute, naked, with not even a hut where to take shelter [...] Honourable men were allowed to take away what they had on their backs, and perhaps a small bundle of clothes (qtd in Dias 2009: 138). The Portuguese settlers had to leave Cochin either to Goa or any other Portuguese settlement after the capture of Cochin as per the agreement. The three terms of surrender in 1663, among others, stipulated: “All true born unmarried Portuguese shall be conveyed to Europe. All married Portuguese and *Mesticos* (assimilated half-castes) shall proceed to Goa and may take their bed and bedding and such other articles as the General and his Council may permit. All free *Topasses* (semi-assimilated half-castes) and Canarins shall remain at the disposal of the General” (qtd in Koshy 1989: 304). As a result of all this Cochin was rendered a town of “empty houses and deserted streets” (Koshy 1989: 304). Realising the difficulties in carrying out the day to day administration without the Luso-Indians the Dutch changed their policy to some extent and recalled the former back to their enclave. Many of them returned and started acting as translators, interpreters and as *Lascorins* in the Dutch Armada. During the reign of the Dutch at Cochin and other parts of Kerala, there were marriages between the Dutch soldiers, traders and craftsmen and the Luso-Indian women. In these days the Luso-Indians were named *Topasse*, as they used to manage the canons. The Dutch policy in India was to encourage its lower cadres to marry Euro-Asians rather than native women. Their offsprings, Dutch-Portuguese-Indians in blood, came to be known as *Ollandaise/Wallendaise*.

With the incorporation of the English East India Company on 31 December 1600, the British also started their commercial activities in an organised manner in the Indian sub-continent during the second half of the seventeenth century. The British encounter with the Dutch ultimately resulted in the ouster of the Dutch from the Indian coasts. The French East India Company (*Compagnie française pour le commerce des Indes orientales*) was chartered by King Louis XIV in 1664 as a commercial enterprise, by fusing the three earlier companies, the *Compagnie de Chine*, the *Compagnie d’Orient* and *Compagnie de Madagascar* to compete with the English and Dutch East India companies. The decisive war fought between Robert Clive, a British general and the French governor Dupleix (who had married Jean Albert, a Euro-Indian from San Thomé, Madras) in 1751 over Arcot fort confined the latter only to a limited space. When the British defeated the Dutch at Cochin on 19 October 1795, special protections for the Luso-Indians and other ethnic groups were provided in Article 13 of the Dutch deed of Surrender: “All Topazes (half-

castes) and Inland Christians, as also the Banians, Silversmiths, who are subjects and vassals of the Dutch company, will retain their property and also privileges and protections which they always had enjoyed, of the said company” (Panikkar 1931: 181). Again, as few English women came to India, the young Englishmen had Luso-Indian women, Dutch-Portuguese-Indian women and native women to have companionship or marital relations as per the convenience. All the above mentioned Europeans had marital relations with each other and as the first settlers, the descendants of the Portuguese, the Luso-Indians. There is a sprinkling of the Dutch, the French and the English descendants also among them. One may find a few descendants of Germans, Swiss and Italians as well if one goes by the study of the surnames among the Anglo-Indians of Kerala today. A presumption that all Luso-Indian women were taken by the Dutch or by the French or even by the British will be stretching the imagination too far and misconstruing the whole history as there were some Luso-Indians who preferred to remain as such.

As the number of British men coming into the country steadily increased they were encouraged in 1684 to marry in India vide the directive of the Company to its Council: “The soldiers’ wives shall come to their husbands, if they can find the means to satisfy or pay the owners for the passages, and for such soldiers as are single men, prudently induce them to marry ‘Gentooes’ in imitation of *ye Dutch politicks*, and raise from them a stock of Protestant Mestizees” (qtd in Valiyaparambath 2005: 125-26). Consequently, the British, like their European counterparts, married Indian women. The Company encouraged such marriages. On 8 April 1687 the Directors of the East India Company addressed the Company’s president in Madras thus:

The marriage of our soldiers to the native women of Fort St. George [...] is a matter of such consequence to posterity that we shall be content to encourage it with some expense, and have been thinking for the future to appoint a [pagoda] to be paid to the Mother of any child, that shall hereafter be born of any such future marriages [...]” (qtd in Ghosh 1970: 76, aiaiaideli.org, Sen 2017: 9).

The offer of the Directors was accepted and put into effect so that the British in this way became officially responsible for the birth of the Anglo-Indian Community (Thomaskutty 2012). By 1750s they outnumbered the British in India (Jupp 2001: 434). There is another group of Anglo-Indians which is “the result of the opening of the indigo, tea, jute, and rubber plantations in jungle areas far from urban settlements and where, in the early years, the British planter’s only female company was a woman estate worker or her daughters. Tales of *droit de seigneur* were legion” (Muthiah et al. 2017: 29). However, as the number of Anglo-Indians increased, the practice of Englishman marrying an Indian girl fell into disrespect. The newly arrived Briton could always wed a girl of mixed parentage from Anglo-Indian community. The mixed marriages occupy a central position in Anglo-Indian fiction and Bhupal Singh has devoted one

chapter to study this theme in his *A Survey of Anglo-Indian Fiction* ([1934] 1975: 165-194). In the initial years The East India Company utilized the services of the off-springs of the mixed marriages and did not discriminate against them at social, economic or racial levels. As the perception of the community changed the Company soon changed its policy⁶.

Several Indian Census reports confirm that many Eurasians/Anglo-Indians returned themselves (or were returned by others) as Europeans (Anderson 2011: 21). The Regulating Act of 1773 tried to fix the status of the people in India by using terms like the 'British Subjects' or the 'natives'. It affected the mixed community of 'Indo-British' most as their fluid identity was frozen by declaring them as natives. The Anglo-Indians presumed that they had been raised to live in Britain unlike the Luso-Indians who were raised to live in India. Valerie E.R. Anderson has drawn a list of thirteen laws between 1773 and 1813 that were enacted to the detriment of Eurasian community (Anderson 2011: 36). By the directive of 14th March, 1786 all the wards in the upper orphanage school at Calcutta, established under the auspices of the East India Company for the orphans of British Military officers were stopped from going to England to complete their education; thus they were no longer qualified for the covenanted posts or become officers in British regiments in India. At Cornwallis' recommendation in 1789, Eurasians could no longer serve in regular army either as an officer or as a soldier. By yet another order in April 1791 a bar on covenanted Company service for native Indians and Eurasians was put. In 1793 Lord Clive's fund for EIC military and families specifically excluded Eurasians and natives from claiming benefits and was payable in Britain only; it discouraged intermarriage. In 1795 Cornwallis recommended that no Eurasians be recruited as combatants in EIC Armies except as sepoy or musicians. Thus left in lurch because of the loss of employment opportunities in EIC, some members of the community looked for greener pastures in princely states like Oudh, Hyderabad, Mysore, Punjab and the like. Many historians and the websites of the community hold that the uprising of the half-castes in San Domingo and Haiti had alarmed the British, after which a discrimination against the community started. (madrasmusings.com, Muthiah et al. 2017: 25) This is just a half truth as most of the discriminatory practices against

⁶ Five factors are generally held for this: 1. Social opinion about the Anglo-Indians was changing as is clear from the common saying amongst the British circles: "The Eurasians shared the vices of both races" (Sen 2017: 9); 2. The native British in the Company felt threatened by "the 'numerical superiority' of the Eurasians" (Sen 2017: 9); 3. The shareholders started looking at the Company's service as an attractive career for their sons and other near relatives as they realized that all those who returned to England after serving the Company were rich; 4. The upper echelons in the Company started looking down upon those Britons who married the natives as poor in morals as they could not control their physical demand to remain celibates; 5. The Mutiny in the English force under Clive in Bengal in 1766 and the imprisonment of Lord Pigott, Governor of Madras by the revolting army in 1776 (Carey 2001: 129) had scared the British – a panic in India and England was caused by thinking the possibilities of a rebellion in India led by the numerous Anglo-Indians

the Anglo-Indians had been started much before the uprising in Haiti during 1791-1804. The British did not like the increase in the number of half-castes and saw them as evil; they grew suspicious of them, especially after the half-castes' revolt in Spanish America and St. Domingo. The following description of the people of the mixed descent in Bengal by an important English voyager George, Viscount Valentia throws light on the relationship between the newly formed community and those who fathered it:

The most rapidly *accumulating evil* of Bengal is the *increase of half-cast children*. They are forming the first step to colonization, by creating a link of Union between the English and the natives. In every country where this intermediate cast has been permitted to rise, it has ultimately tended to the ruin of that country. Spanish America and St. Domingo are examples of this fact. Their increase in India is beyond calculation; and though possibly there may be nothing to fear from the sloth of the Hindoos, and the rapidly declining consequence of the Mussulmauns, yet it may be justly apprehended that this tribe may hereafter *become too powerful for control*. [...] With numbers in their favour, with a close relationship to the natives, and without *an equal proportion of that pusillanimity and indolence which is natural to them*, what may not in time be dreaded from them? (Valentia 1811: 197-198, emphasis added).

Viscount Valentia wanted the British to learn appropriate lessons from happenings in other parts of the world. He, therefore, suggests a strategy with a twin purpose in mind to nip the very possibility of a revolt by the Anglo-Indians, in the bud and to improve the morals of the Anglo-Indians:

I have no hesitation in saying that *the evil ought to be stopt*; and I know no other way of effecting this object, than *by obliging every father of half-cast children, to send them to Europe, prohibiting their return in any capacity whatsoever*. The expense that would thus attend upon children, would certainly *operate as a check to the extension of zenanas*, which are now but too common among the Europeans; and this would be *a benefit to the country, no less in a moral, than in a political view* (Valentia 1811: 198, emphasis added).

The community started organising itself against the sustained efforts to marginalize them. A suitable document was drawn by John William Ricketts, “the elected agent of the community”, who arrived with it in London on the 27 December 1829 to present it to the Parliament. On 4 May 1830, it was placed before the House of Commons and Ricketts stated the disabilities under which the Community had been placed. “He said: “If the real interest of India were sought, then these could not be better effected than through those who have been born, educated, and are destined to spend their lives in India, namely the Anglo-Indians” (aiaiadelhi.org). This petition to the Parliament resulted in the insertion of a clause in the Charter Act of 1833, proclaiming that all persons, without reference to birth or colour, were eligible for the civil and military services of the Government (aiaiadelhi.org, Muthiah et al. 2017: 27).

During his cross-examination on June 21, 1830 at the Select Committee on the Affairs of the East India Company on the “East Indians’ Petition to Parliament”

submitted by “certain Christian inhabitants of Calcutta and the provinces in the Presidency of Fort William” Ricketts, claimed that this hybrid community had “been known by various names, such as Eurasians, Anglo-Indians, Indo-Britons, Half-castes, &c; but they have latterly selected the name of East Indians for themselves” (*Report* March 28, 1831: 52). As against his definition of an Anglo-Indian mentioned in the *Report of Proceedings* (*Report* March 28, 1831: 52-54) many Anglo-Indian authors and websites maintained by the Anglo-Indians make the following unsubstantiated claim: “In 1830 *British Parliament* described the Anglo-Indian as those who have been *English educated*, are entirely European in their habits and feelings, dress and language” (emphasis added, Beverley Pearson 2005, aidaanapur.org, araia.org.au, Afsheen 2011: 71, Smith 2015). While most of the Anglo-Indians trace their ancestry to British, Irish, Scottish descent, the Goans and Mangaloreans tend to trace it to Portugal. The fracas in both these communities often comes to the fore not only regarding their ancestry but also over the use of language and their religious denominations. These groups have their own claims for using the language of their forefathers i.e. English and Portuguese. Dias throws more light on their fears: “Even their ecclesiastical leadership, who were mostly Portuguese, Spaniards or Italians did not prepare to accept English as medium of instruction as they thought that it was the language of the Protestant British. They feared that their Catholic folk may be inclined to Protestantism through the English language” (Dias 2009: 174). The condition of the community has very well been summed up by Stark, who writes:

In general terms it may be said that the Anglo-Indians of the period lying between 1600 and 1775 have merged either into the British or Indian peoples. Those of the years following 1775 are divided perhaps equally into three sections — (1) those who have merged or are merging into the British nation; (2) those who have merged or are merging into the Indian nations; (3) and those who exist as the Anglo-Indian race of to-day. As a larger and larger number of Anglo-Indians settle down in Britain, or are being welded with the Indian populace through the economic pressure of these days, the expectation is that, in course of time, the true Anglo-Indian population of India will be exceedingly small. Already there are more Anglo-Indians in England than there are in some Indian Provinces (1926: 36-37).

When the British rule in India was nearing its end Frank Anthony, an Anglo-Indian, represented the community in the Constituent Assembly as its member. There was no representation of the Luso-Indians as Goa (which had the largest concentration of the Luso-Indians) was still under Portuguese rule and in Kerala they were an insignificant minority. Frank pushed the name ‘Anglo-Indian’ for the community as against the broad term ‘Eurasian’ being advocated by the Luso-Indians. The term ‘Anglo-Indian’ was accepted by the Constituent Assembly with a broad definition of Eurasian: “a person whose father or any of whose other male progenitors in the male line is or was of European descent but who is domiciled

within the territory of India and is or was born within such territory of parents habitually resident therein and not established there for temporary purposes only” (Article 366(2)). It was in the fitness of things as the interests of a large number of Eurasians were to be protected by the founding fathers. The Constitution also grants some special political privileges to the members of the community under Articles 331 and 333 and some employment and educational privileges under article 336 and 337 respectively. However, English-speaking European descendants on the basis of their language often contest the homogenization of the community in the Constitution; they hold a false argument that ‘only English-speaking are the Anglo-Indians’. For example, Sudarshana Sen makes an incorrect claim that the article 366(2) of the Constitution defines Anglo-Indian as a person “whose mother-tongue in English” (Sen 2017: 6). Using English language as an alibi Frank Anthony had earlier raised an objection in the Parliament for the inclusion of Luso-Indians or Feringees of Kerala amongst the Anglo-Indians. “But his arguments were overruled by the then Home Minister of India, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant and the Parliament on 24th March 1960. Pant made it clear that ‘there is no condition [...] that an Anglo-Indian who cannot speak English cannot be considered as an Anglo-Indian’” (Dias 2009: 173).

As the *Constitution* does not discriminate between an Anglo-Indian and a Eurasian, any *gora* (to use an Indian expression for a European descendant) falls under this category. Others sometime known as European (non-Asiatic domicile i.e. Europeans born and bred; don’t live permanently in India), Domiciled European (i.e. of uncontested European ancestry; not settled in India), Anglo-Indian (i.e. Mixed-race ancestry; living in European lifestyle; not settled in India), Anglo-Asian, Asiatic Briton, Country Born, Domiciled European, Domiciled Indian, East Indian, Eurasian, Eurindian, Euro-Asian, Euro-Britain and Euro-Indian also are largely excluded in it. Sen points out the following three categories that are excluded in the definition: “a) Children of Anglo-Indian women who were married outside the community, b) Children of Anglo-Indian parents who emigrated permanently from India, and c) Children born to parents where the only mother or anyone from the mother’s line is or was a European” (6). However, some of the Indian Christians also pose as Anglo-Indians for political and social advantages and it is resented by the community (Millicent Bystandard, reddit.com, anglo-indians.com).

Anglo-Indians and English

The Anglo-Indians insist on maintaining a distinct identity on the basis of their language and British legacy in matters of dress, diet, literature, music, religion, culture and marriage, as is evident from the following remark of Blair R. Williams who himself is an Anglo-Indian:

The Anglo-Indians did not accept their Indian heritage, tending to look down on Indians of other communities. Their middleman role in government merely consolidated this attitude. [...] And so the Community lived for over two hundred years of British rule, not being accepted by either the British or the Indian communities. Many sociologists classified them as ‘marginal’ to the British and Indian cultures” (Williams 2002: ix).

The urban dwelling of the Anglo-Indians is one of the causes of their failing to mix-up with the rest of Indians. During the freedom struggle, they were by and large distrusted and treated as anti-nationals because of their West-oriented culture, their aloofness from the mainstream Indians and their siding with the British. Perhaps they could foresee that competition, and not ascription, will be the linchpin of the new nation (independent India) and they, without any British crutches, would encounter insurmountable difficulties. Therefore, after independence, a large number of them chose to relocate themselves in the white-skinned and Protestant-Christian dominated western countries (like Britain, Canada and the United States) and eastern countries (like Australia and New Zealand) though at times they were treated as half-castes and not as equals there. Many Anglo-Indians continue to migrate from the land of their birth even today despite generous guarantees given to them by the Constitution and the government of India.

English and not “Indian culture” continues to be their guiding force as against the spirit of Sahitya Akademi (“different languages but one literature”) and the Constitution. Frank Anthony, the president of the All India Anglo-Indian Association, the major political arm of the Community and an eight-time nominated MP (between 1952 and 1996) in his Presidential Address of the Association (1966) exhorted the community saying:

Remember this, without our schools and without our language English, we cannot be an Anglo-Indian Community. We may be like the Feringis of Kerala who claim to be originally of Portuguese descent but who have merged into the lowest stratum of the Indian Christian community, with their mother-tongue as Malayalam. Without our language, without our schools, we cannot be an Anglo-Indian Community. We may be anything else. And that is why we have mounted increasing vigil in respect of our schools and our language (qtd in Thomaskutty 2012).

However, there are hardly any authors left from this group in India writing in French, Portuguese and German. There are some in India who continue to write in English but, with the exception of a few (like *Ruskin Bond*), they have largely gone unnoticed.⁷

⁷ One may like to consult the following books for details: I. H-Shihan’s *Anglo-Indian Fiction: A Brief Outline* (Kolkata: I. H-Shihan, 2016, Print), *Voices on the Verandah: An Anthology of Anglo-Indian Prose and Poetry* (Margaret Deefholts and Sylvia W. Staub (Eds.), New Jersey: C T R Inc Publishing, 2004, Print), *More Voices on the Verandah – An Anglo-Indian Anthology* (Lionel Lumb (Ed.), New Jersey: C T R Inc Publishing, 2012, Print), *Women of Anglo-India: Tales and Memoirs* (Margaret Deefholts and Susan Deefholts (Eds.), New Jersey: C T R Inc Publishing,

Anglo-Indian Literature: Evolution and Evaluation

Having discussed the term *Anglo-Indian* as a noun, now let me rivet my attention to its use as an adjective in the phrase *Anglo-Indian Literature*. The term *Anglo-Indian* has been used as a prefix/qualifier/adjective by Edward Farley Oaten (1908), Alfred Comyn Lyall (1915) and Bhupal Singh (1934) in their histories and surveys. Though a new route from Europe to India had been discovered in 1498 by the Portuguese, the words of Indian origin started entering into English “since the end of the reign of Elizabeth and the beginning of the King James” (Yule et al. [1886] 1903: xv). The British contact with India formally began in a big way when the East India Company was chartered. Yet, it can be safely assumed that the term *Anglo-Indian*⁸ was not popular in Britain till 1785 as it does not find mention in the sixth edition of Dr Johnson’s *Dictionary* (1785). The great public interest created by various European travellers’ accounts and the trial of Warren Hastings between 1788 and 1795 led to the publication of various independent glossaries of Indian terms. Many Glossaries⁹ of such terms were also appended to different official Reports prepared by the Portuguese and the British officers for their superiors in India and back home. *An Anglo-Indian Dictionary*, the first full-fledged dictionary, was prepared by George Clifford Whitworth in 1885 a bit apologetically. The author writes: “In calling this work *An Anglo-Indian Dictionary*, some apology is needed, first for

2012, Print) *The Way We Were – Anglo-Indian Chronicles*, Margaret Deefholts and Glenn Deefholts (Eds.), New Jersey: CTR Inc Publishing, 2004, Print).

⁸ Bridget White claims that Warren Hastings was the first to use the term *Anglo-Indian* in the 18th century to describe both the British who lived in India and their Indian-born children (58). It is claimed by Dias and others that the term *Anglo-Indian* was for the first time introduced as the official description of the Eurasian communities at the formation of the European and Anglo-Indian Defence Association in 1882 (Dias 2009: 133, Jeswin in kerala-angloindians.blogspot). “In 1911 Viceroy Hardinge had sanctioned the use of the term Anglo-Indians for their community for the census, a term from then on signifying European in the male line but of European and Indian descent. The Montagu-Chemsford Report of 1918 classified the community as Anglo-Indians” (Jupp 2001: 434). Muthiah et al. (2017: 30) also maintain that “The Census of 1911 finally cleared the air, defining the ‘Anglo-Indian’ as a permanent resident of India of paternal European lineage. With that pronouncement, distinct community was officially born, its uncertain status of earlier years a thing of the past”. India Act of 1919 defines the term as follows: “I. In this Schedule (a) ‘an anglo-Indian’ means any person being British subject and resident in British India, (i) of European descent in the male line who is not a European, or (ii) of mixed Asiatic and non-Asiatic descent, whose father, grandfather or more remote ancestor in the male line was born in the Continent of Europe, Canada, Newfoundland, Australia, Now Zealand, the Union of South Africa or the united States of America, and who is not a European;” (The Government of India Act 1919, Schedule II). Its use has been restricted in the India Act of 1935: “26.-(1) In the foregoing provisions of this Schedule the following expressions have the meanings hereby assigned to them, that is to say: [...] ‘an Anglo-Indian’ means a person whose father or any of whose other male progenitors in the male line is or was of European descent but who is a native of India;” (The Government of India Act 1935, Schedule I).

⁹ A list of twenty-three such Glossaries is available in Yule et al. ([1886] 1903).

the name itself, and secondly, for giving it to this particular collection of words.” (Whitworth 1885: vii) Explaining the term Anglo-Indian, Whitworth writes:

The term ‘Anglo-Indian’ would properly designate something which, originally Indian, has been especially modified by something English; but popularly it is applied to English persons residing in India and to things pertaining to them. And while the stricter meaning does not wholly disqualify it, this inaccurate but common use of the term makes it specially appropriate as the name of a book which is not the work of an Oriental scholar, but only a compilation made for the popular use by an Anglo-Indian official (1885: vii).

Whitworth’s dictionary is perhaps the first dictionary where the word *Anglo-Indian* occurs. However, Arthur Coke Burnell, a young Indian Civil Servant at Madras, is said to have used the term in 1872 when he met Yule, his future collaborator in *Hobson-Jobson* (Yule et al. [1886] 1903: vii). The publication of Whitworth’s dictionary also indicates that the number of Indian words and phrases in nativised forms and manner in the active vocabulary of British in India was so large that an explanatory dictionary had become imperative to understand their language/discourse. It also became an impending need of the newly arrived Europeans in India and those who were listening/reading about it back home. This also justifies the publication of Yule and Burnell’s *Hobson-Jobson* ([1886] 1903) on the close heels of Whitworth’s dictionary.

Edward Farley Oaten’s magnum opus *Sketch of Anglo-Indian Literature* (1908) was actually the Le Bas Essay prize winning essay of Cambridge University in 1907 (undertaken as a Golden Jubilee tribute to India’s annexation to the British crown in 1857) which aimed at not only appreciating “the chief Productions of Anglo-Indian Literature in the Domain of Fiction, Poetry, the [sic] Drama, Satire, and Belles-Letters, during the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries, with an Estimate of the Chief Writers in those Spheres”, but also considered “Anglo-Indian Features of the Literatures” (Oaten 1908: xi). Oaten correctly describes his work as pioneering as “[h]istories of modern English literature [were] singularly destitute of any allusion to Anglo-Indian productions” (Oaten 1908: xi). While expressing his gratefulness to “*The Calcutta Review*, whose literary criticism has, ever since the magazine was founded in 1845, maintained a high degree of refinement and insight”, Oaten, also points out that “[*Review*] has done Anglo-Indian literature an immense service by continually pointing out to Anglo-Indian writers *the true aim which Anglo-Indian literature must always set before itself*” (Oaten 1908: xii, emphasis added). Oaten enumerates five characteristics of this literature: i) the ever-present sense of exile; ii) an unflinching interest in Asiatic religious speculation; iii) the humorous sides of Anglo-Indian official life; iv) description of Indian native life and scenery; v) ruminations about the ever-varying phases, comic, tragic, or colourless of Anglo-Indian social life (Oaten 1908: 194-195).

Perhaps the organisers of the essay competition at Cambridge had in their mind the location of the authors also when they used term *Spheres* in the title. Therefore,

an interaction between the (British) authors and their (Indian) location became an essential characteristic feature of Anglo-Indian literature. Oaten writes:

In India for the first time since the era of Asiatic Hellenism, the spirit of Western Literature came into vital contact with the imaginativeness, dreaminess, and mysticism of the Oriental temperament. There was no real union between them; and yet it was impossible that each should remain unaffected by the other. Such a meeting, though it was long sterile of result, could not remain so permanently. New conditions produced new emotions, and new emotions always call for new literary interpretation. And so there grew up in British India a literature, English in form and language, which is unique among the literatures of the world (Oaten 1908: 4).

He further clarifies, “Anglo-Indian literature, however, is not the literature of a young nation, but an offshoot from the literature of an older nation, transplanted to a foreign soil” (Oaten 1908: 18). As Oaten has these characteristics in his mind he is very cautious while classifying some authors: “Bishop Heber, whose reputation as a poet is mainly English, scarcely deserves a place among Anglo-Indian poets, though probably to the ordinary individual, in an enumeration of Anglo-Indian poets, few names occur to the mind before his” (Oaten 1908: 45). The only Anglo-Indian included in Oaten’s book on the basis of parentage is Henry Derozio, who had some Indian blood in him as his father was a Luso-Indian and the mother English (Asiapac Editorial and Krall 2003: 104). What is interesting is that Oaten does not discuss Indians (like H. Bijoy Chand Dutt, G. C. Dutt, H. C. Dutt, Shoshee Chunder Dutt, Toru Dutt, A. M. Risi Kunte, B. M. Malabari, P. C. Mitra, and Byaskh Lall Monukur, Michael M. Datta and P. V. Ramaswami Raju), though he mentions and includes them in his list of “Anglo-Indians’ Works” (poets and dramatists) available in India House library. His exclusion of these authors on the basis of parentage (as none of them had English blood in them though some of them had converted to Christianity and had relocated themselves out of India, in the Christian lands) proves that for him Anglo-Indian Literature consisted of literature produced by either the English or the Anglo-Indians.

In his *Studies in Literature and History* Sir Alfred Comyn Lyall devotes a chapter of about thirty-four pages (1915: 121-154) to study mainly eight Anglo-Indian novels. None of the authors taken up for study by Lyall had Indian blood, and these authors had described their impressions in the new found world, i.e. India, as civil or military servants mainly for the readers sitting far away in their homelands, i.e. the British Isles. Lyall writes: “No situation more unfavourable to the development of imaginative literature could be found than that of a few thousand Europeans isolated, far from home, among millions of Asiatics entirely different from them in race, manners, and language” (Lyall 1915: 121). Geographical distance, unnecessary details about the new land’s culture and traditions are some of the factors that Lyall discusses as the possible causes of the poor quality of the Anglo-Indian fiction before jumping to discuss the novels/romances. Lyall’s argument is a bit abstruse as literature in English in

Australia, North and South America, Canada and New Zealand etc. too was produced first by those who had left British isles for distant places. Interestingly enough, James H. Cousins' *Modern English Poetry: Its Characteristics and Tendencies* (1921) does not mention any Anglo-Indian, though it has full chapters on "The New English Poetry" and "Indo-Anglian Poets". It is apparent that for Cousins, the main point of distinction between Anglo-Indian and Indo-Anglian writer was the parentage of the author. Maybe like Oaten he also considers the quality of Anglo-Indian's poetry too poor to be included, but on this ground, Indo-Anglian literature too can be rejected. However, Cousins' attempt is revolutionary for he is seeking to make Indo-Anglian literature a part of British Literature.

Oaten's contribution to *Cambridge History of English Literature* (vol. 14) under the heading of *Anglo-Indian Literature* begins with a footnote: "The sense in which this term (now largely used in a different sense) is employed in the present section is defined in the text" (Oaten [1916] 1953: 331). The very necessity of a footnote to explain the meaning of the term *Anglo-Indian Literature* indicates that in between his last publication (1908) and this one (1916) a considerable change had come in its usage. Oaten writes that logically speaking Anglo-Indian Literature should be called "English literature of British India" on the analogy of the literature of the great British self-governing dominions ([1916] 1953: 331), but "the degree to which the ever changing English community that guards and administers India differs from the settled inhabitants of Canada or Australia is, at the same time, an explanation of the main peculiarities of that literature and also, the measure of the difficulty which confronts any attempt to define it" ([1916] 1953: 331). According to Oaten, Anglo-Indian Literature is a creation of those Englishmen who wrote about their first-hand encounter with India while on furlough or after retirement and those who were "Englishmen in mind", "English in thought and aspiration" and who "never lost bias towards that of England" and who printed/published in England owing partly to lack of facilities in India (Oaten [1916] 1953: 331). "[An] Anglo-Indian writer must, as a rule, make his appeal mainly to the public in England and only secondarily to the English community in India. [...] Anglo-Indian literature is based in origin, spirit and influences upon two separate countries at one and the same time" (Oaten [1916] 1953: 331-332). Keeping in mind the "potential of [its] development in the future" (Oaten [1916] 1953: 332), Oaten included amongst Anglo-Indian litterateurs the authors from "domiciled community of European or mixed origin" ([1916] 1953: 332) and educated Indians (of pure blood). The literature of the latter had "attracted little notice in comparison with the writings of the English immigrant population" (Oaten [1916] 1953: 332). Thus Oaten broadens the spectrum of Anglo-Indian literature by including in it the writings of non-Anglo-Indians as well.

Though Oaten rates those Indians "who attempted imaginative literature in English" very poorly and says "very few succeeded in writing anything of permanent interest" ([1916] 1953: 341-342), yet in contrast to his past practice

he devotes about two pages of the book to them. He refers to the contribution of Bankim Chandra Chatterji and Romesh Chunder Dutt, who developed their talent in Bengali under the influence of English and the social activists like Ram Mohan Roy, Keshab Chandra Sen, Kashinath Trimback Telang, Bahramji Malabari and “hundreds of other Indians” who used English “for their own purposes almost as if it had been their mother tongue” (Oaten [1916] 1953:341-342). He debunks creative authors like Michael Madhu Sadan [sic] Dutt, Malabari, Govind Chandra Dutt and “hundred others” (Oaten [1916] 1953: 341). He has some praise only for Toru Dutt:

Her English poetry displayed real creative and imaginative power and almost technical skill. [...] In her English translations and in her *Ancient Ballads and Legends of Hindustan* she so nearly achieved a striking success as to make one regret that our language is essentially unsuited to the riot of imagery and ornament which form part of the natural texture of the oriental mind (Oaten [1916] 1953: 342).

Oaten very frankly opines that “the bulk of Anglo-Indian literature [...] written by Englishmen in mind and thought [is] odd, except in the rarest and most exceptional cases, anything of lasting value to the roll of English literature” (Oaten [1916] 1953: 336). He concludes with finality, “[...] Anglo-Indian literature will continue to be mainly what it has been, with few exceptions, in the past – literature written by Englishmen and Englishwomen who have devoted their lives to the service of India” (Oaten [1916] 1953: 342).

Robert Sencourt’s *India in English Literature* seeks “to discuss the value of India to our literary genius, and to review the form in which course of history India has been conceived by the English mind” (1923: 257). It is a very comprehensive survey of literature available in Europe about India. Moving on from the European writers to the British authors writing on India Sencourt observes: “The record of Anglo-Indian Literature is but a chart of the materials of the history of British India” (1923: 284). Sencourt has used the term *Anglo-Indian* several times in his voluminous book and at least two subsections in it have this term in their title. Under the heading *The Development of Anglo-Indian Literature* (Sencourt 1923: 198-218) the author has limited himself to only British citizens’ contribution from the times of the East India Company, as the English language had not yet gained the roots as it was quite early for Macaulay’s policy to bear fruits. Under the heading *Anglo-Indian Literature – Profane* (Sencourt 1923: 367- 411) British authors’ writings who were posted in India have also been discussed. There are some passing references made to some Indians as well. For example, he refers to “Sarojine Nayadu’s [sic] cunningness in her poetry” (Sencourt 1923: 11), Tagore and Gandhi (Sencourt 1923: 455). Indians like Keshub [sic] Chandra Sen and Ram Mohun [sic] Roy who came under Christian influence have been discussed as social reformers in some detail. Though Derozio’s work was “little known” (Sencourt 1923: 385) and he was

considered to be a minor poet by the librarian of Bodleian Library, he has been discussed considerably (Sencourt 1923: 385-390) on the basis of Oaten's introduction and him being "unlike most Portuguese Eurasians, a protestant" (385). Sencourt claims, "Derozio is the sole example, of a poet of Anglo-India surrendering his genius to India with the passionate loyalty of her own children" (390). When Sencourt writes "Anglo-Indians in those days had even more their own ways than they have now, and they were far more ostentatious" (Sencourt 1923: 191), he has the likes of Clive in his mind. Thus, it is very clear that Sencourt uses the term *Anglo-Indian* for those Britons who were writing about India in English and for the readers in England. He mentions only four Indians, three of whom were either Christians or under Christian influence, while the fourth, the only Hindu, Sarojini Naidu, is mentioned contemptuously. In this light religion appears to be another dimension in the definition of Anglo-Indian.

George Sampson in *The Concise Cambridge History of English Literature* (1941: 909) says:

Unlike the literature of the self-governing Dominions, Anglo-Indian literature is in the main produced by a small body of Englishmen who, during the working part of their lives, are residents in a remote and exotic country to which they can never, in any real sense, belong. Thus Anglo-Indian literature is usually English literature with Indian local colour, and it is written for the whole English public, not merely for the English in India. A further distinction must be made. English not only became the language of law and government throughout India, it became the language of higher education for the Indians themselves. Thus English is a medium of literary expression of the educated Indian, and Anglo-Indian literature must therefore include literary works written in English by native Indians.

Sampson adds to Oaten's list Sarojini Naidu, Manmohan Ghosh, Aravindo [sic] Ghosh and Rabindranath Tagore and – like him – debunks them. Amongst the short-story writers one finds mention of Cornelia Sorabji and among the critics/surveyors Bhupal Singh, the first Indian in the genre.

Anglo-Indian Literature: the Indian take

Now let me turn to the Indian take on the issue. Two books published before Indian independence viz. Bhupal Singh's *A Survey of Anglo-Indian Fiction* (1934) and Iyengar's *Indo-Anglian Literature* (1943) merit attention. Bhupal Singh in his *Survey* mentions three layers of meaning of the phrase *Anglo-Indian Fiction*: "Broadly speaking it includes any novel dealing with India which is written in English. Strictly speaking, it means fiction mainly describing the life of Englishmen in India. In still a narrower sense it may be taken to mean novels dealing with the life of Eurasians, who now prefer to be called Anglo-Indians" (Singh 1934: 1). However, he broadens the canvas of Anglo-Indian fiction in his *Survey* as he "does not exclude Indian novels written by men of nationalities

other than English. [The survey] also includes novels describing the life of Eurasians and of Indians” (Singh 1934: 1). He considers this literature to be a sub-branch of English Literature as is clear from the following observation: “Artistically Anglo-Indian fiction is a record of the ephemeral. Excepting Kipling, there are not more than a dozen novels which may find a place in the history of English literature. [...] [Most of the novels] suffer from a propagandist tendency” (Singh 1934: 4). He divides the period of about a century and a half of Anglo-Indian fiction into three periods. “The first period begins with the Governor-Generalship of Warren Hastings and ends with the Indian Mutiny; the second period ends with the death of Queen Victoria and the publication of *Kim* in 1901; the third period begins with the partition of Bengal in 1905 and may be said still in progress” (Singh 1934: 1). Bhupal Singh makes an interesting observation when he says that an Anglo-Indian was being caricatured and being typified as an unworthy nabob in the first phase:

The earliest Anglo-Indians are known as ‘nabobs’ in English literature. But the nabob of the English comedies is frankly a caricature of an Old Indian, if not a mythical monster. He is generally described as a parchment-faced, diseased-livered, wealthy, vulgar, and effeminate being whose only function (according to English comedians) was to make the audience laugh and to make a profligate nephew or an impecunious niece happy at the end of the fifth act or the third volume. But he cannot be taken as an average Englishman in India of the eighteenth century. He represents the wealth, extravagance, luxury, and vulgarity of a very few Anglo-Indians, but not their good points (Singh 1934: 4).

Bhupal Singh holds that a false picture of the Anglo-Indians was being presented, as there were poor Anglo-Indians as well. He thus adds economic dimension to the issue while characterising the Anglo-Indian:

He does not represent those Anglo-Indians who could not return to England because they were not rich; he does not represent the life of loneliness and suffering, or the struggles and the trails of the earlier English adventurers in India who were never heard of in England. In view of the fact that only those Englishmen who had amassed much wealth could afford to return to England, it is not surprising that the English got the idea that all early Anglo-Indians were ‘nabobs’ and that India was an El Dorado (Singh 1934: 4-5).

While discussing the importance of Anglo-Indian fiction Bhupal Singh writes:

Anglo-Indian writers of fiction enable Indians to see themselves as ‘others’, or their rulers see them. Incidentally, they also enable us to see our masters as they see themselves – not as demi-gods, as we had imagined them to be, but as human beings. [...] Anglo-Indian fiction is a criticism of the life of Englishmen and Englishwomen in India, and of Indians (Singh 1934: vii).

Singh expands the meaning of *Anglo-Indian* by including translations such as those of Romesh Chandra Dutt’s novel *The Slave Girl of Agra* (tr. from Bengali by Madhbi Kankan, 1930) and Karl Adolf Gjellerup’s *The Pilgrim Kamanita: A*

Legendary Romance (tr. by J E Logie, 1911). Bhupal Singh has further expanded the meaning of the term Anglo-Indian by appending “A Note on Some Indian Writers of English Fiction” to his book. It includes brief introductions to the books such as, Panchapakesa Ayyar’s *Baladitya* (1930), Ganpat’s *Mirror of Dreams* (1928) and *Speakers in Silence* (1930), S. K. Ghosh’s *Prince of Destiny* (1909), P. A. Madhaviah’s *Thillai Govindan* (1916), H. S. Gour’s *His Only Love* (1930), Muhammad Habib’s *The Desecrated Bones* (1926), Sardar Joginder Singh’s two novels *Nur Jahan* (1909) and *Nasrin* (1915), Bal Krishna’s *The Love of Kusuma* (1911), T. Ramakrishna’s *Padmini* (1903) and *The Dive for Death* (1911), S. M. Mitra’s *Planters in India, Hindupore* (1909), Shankar Ram’s *Children of Kaveri* (1927), Subramanyam A.’s *Indira Devi* (1930), Venkatramani K. S.’s *Murgan, the Tiller* (1927) and Ms Sorabji’s *Love and Life Behind Purdah* (1901) besides many others. However, in the concluding paragraph of the Appendix Bhupal Singh dismisses the Indian authors on the grounds of poor language, poor craft, poor characterization and their leanings towards didacticism and allegory and declares “their contribution to Anglo-Indian fiction [...] of little importance” (Singh 1934: 310).

The Indian PEN at the behest of Sophia Wadia started documenting the histories of Indian literatures in the form of monographs and booklets. The onus of writing on English writings in India fell on K. R. S. Iyengar, who produced his magnum opus *Indo-Anglian Literature* (1943). The Introduction to the book was written by C. R. Reddy who, toeing the British line of thinking, states: “We have two types of literature motivated by Indian culture: (i) the Indo-Anglian [...] [and] (ii) the Anglo-Indian, by which is meant literature bearing on Indian topics or inspired by Indian motifs and spirit, and written by Englishmen or other Westerners” (Iyengar 1943: iv). In his above mentioned book Iyengar, therefore, does not discuss any Anglo-Indian writer. He adheres to this very line in his next book as well, which he wrote to justify his thesis that “Indo-Anglian literature, is both an Indian literature and a variation of English Literature” (Iyengar ([1962] 2013: 6). Similarly, by writing his second book, *The Indian Contribution to English Literature* (1945), he wishes to underline Indian contribution to English literature, a fact being missed by literary historians in Britain and elsewhere. Thus, Iyengar was trying to homogenise English Literature by including all those who were writing in English. In the Preface to *The Indian Contribution to English Literature* he writes: “But I thought it desirable to distinguish between Englishmen who write on Indian themes and Indians who use English as the medium of artistic expression; and I saw no harm in applying the already current terms ‘Anglo-Indian’ and ‘Indo-Anglian’ to these categories of writers” (Iyengar 1943: i-ii, emphasis added). Though Iyengar has enlisted and classified Indians’ works in English meticulously and has glorified them to the extent possible yet none of these authors including critics mentioned by him have been accepted in English Literature as none of them finds a mention in the English/British

canonical literary histories. I wish he had titled his book as *Indian Contribution to Literature in English*. Iyengar has not changed his stance even in his third book, *Indian Writing in English* (I ed 1962), though he has reached correct appellation in it. He has included Nirad C. Chaudhuri (who settled in the UK after independence as a British citizen) in this book. The fourth edition of the book (rpt. 2013), which has a long “Postscript” (by his equally competent daughter Prema Nandkumar) that includes books published up to late seventies, though Rushdie finds a brief mention in it. As the issue has become even more complex after the emergence of Post-Rushdie Indian diasporic writings, Nandkumar’s take on the issue is much awaited. Amongst the Indian scholars, M. N. Pandia perhaps is the first and the only one who has not made any distinction between Indo-Anglian and Anglo-Indian fiction as he has included writers from both these groups in his *The Indo-Anglian Novels as a Social Document* (1960). In her PhD thesis entitled *Indian Writers of Fiction in English* Roshan Nadirsha Minocherhomji has further expanded the meaning of the term by including the English translations of R. C. Dutt’s and S. K. Ghoshal’s novels in Bengali as well (Raizada 1978: ii). In his survey Harish Raizada has followed the line of argument advanced by Reddy and Iyengar. He writes: “For a considerably long time even Indian writings of Indians were included within the purview of Anglo-Indian literature” (i), but he has dealt with “only the Indo-Anglian fiction” in his book (iii).

While C. R. Reddy categorises the result of interaction between India and Britain into two groups, Gokak (1964) typecasts them into five. He classifies the Britons’ writings about India into three categories:

- 1) Books written by English men of letters on India or on Indian themes such as Southey’s *The Curse of Kehama*, Collins’s *The Moonstone*, Kipling’s *The Jungle Book*, Macaulay’s and Churchill’s works on Indian affairs. Gokak opines that such “writings are part of the mainstream of English literature and they have to be evaluated as such, though they may have a special interest for the Indian reader” (Gokak 1964: 160).
- 2) Translations of the Indian classics by the Englishmen like Jones’ *Shakuntala*, Ryder’s *Dashkumaracharitam*, Yeats and Swami’s *Yoga-Sutras* and the like form the second category (Gokak 1964: 160).
- 3) Books on Indian themes by those Englishmen (such as Meadows Taylor, Edwin Arnold and F W Bain) who lived in India and who made India their primary inspiration make the third category. It is the work of this category which is called Anglo-Indian literature by Gokak. The works in this category are important for the “interesting, though sometimes distorted, light on the social scene in India in the 18th and early 19th century [...]. It deserves to be studied as an appendix to our own literature of that period” (Gokak 1964: 161).

Gokak also makes a distinction between *Anglo-Indian* and *Indo-Anglian* on the basis of the “point of view” of the author, though he believes that the term “‘Indo-Anglian’ has been coined as a kind of cousin to ‘Anglo-Indian’” (1964: 160). He writes:

Indo-Anglian journalism is an ‘Anglo-Indian’ enterprise which was gradually ‘indo-anglianised’. Indeed, both the Anglo-Indian and ‘Indo-Anglian’ categories continued to exist side by side for a long time, the one representing the imperial and the other the national point of view. The demarcation in substance has disappeared with Independence and such distinctions as prevail now represent the ideologies that are active in the country (Gokak 1964: 167).

What Gokak writes in the context of journalism (one genre of literature) may very well serve as a criterion in other genres of literature (including fiction) as well. He coins a new term *Indo-English* for the growing volume of “the translations into English of the books published in one of the classical or modern Indian languages” (Gokak 1964: 160). Such translations were earlier considered to be a part of Anglo-Indian or Indo-Anglian literatures.

In his *A History of Indian English Literature* M. K. Naik has also echoed the views of Reddy, Iyengar, Gokak and Raizada. He writes: “‘Indo-Anglian Literature’ [was] [...] once even regarded unjustly as part of ‘Anglo-Indian Literature’ [...]” (Naik 1989: Preface). He admits that “[...] the failure to make clear-cut distinctions has often led to a confusion between categories such as ‘Anglo-Indian literature’, literature in the Indian languages translated into English and original composition in English by Indians” (Naik 1989: 2). He has introduced the parameter of Indian sensibility to include an author into the category of *Indo-Anglian literature*. He justifies his introduction of a new parameter on the basis of the writings of two authors viz. Annada K. Coomaraswamy and Ruth Praver Jhabwala. If this highly contested parameter is accepted, many contemporary Indian authors (in fact in abundance) who have been charged with writing about India and Indian themes for the foreign audience from the latter’s perspective and many of those labelled as “India-baiters” will not find a place in Indian literary histories. At the same time, they will not be accepted in British literary histories on account of their location. However, in the sequel volume, *Indian English Literature: 1980-2000: A Critical Survey*, Naik and his co-author Narayan have taken a more liberal view of *Indian*. Several of those who have surrendered Indian citizenship or those who never held it have been discussed under various headings. To accommodate such authors a complete section on “Diasporic Writing” (Naik and Narayan 2007: 106-113) has been added. Not only Nirad Chaudhuri, V. S. Naipaul and Salman Rushdie but also Vikram Seth, Uma Parmeswaran, Sujata Bhatt, Suniti Namjoshi, Ahmad Ali, Shauna Baldwin, Kirin Narayan, Kiran Desai, Tabish Khair and others find a place in it. Similarly, Anglo-Indians like I. Allan Sealy, Ruskin Bond, Randhir Khare and others also find a place. In this book the authors Naik and Narayan seem to have forgotten the parameter of Indian

sensibility as well since they take books like *The Golden Gate*, *In An Antique Land*, *The Conversations of Cow* and many others which are set outside India and have no element of Indian sensibility in their purview in detail. In absence of clear parameters and an objective approach to include either an author or a book Naik and Narayan's book becomes subjective and lopsided as some authors have been included while certain others left out.

In his *Rise of the Indian Novel in English* (1987) K. S. Ramamurti has discussed the novels published from the earliest times up to 1920. He has used five criteria for inclusion and evaluation of an author or a work in his history of which three viz. parentage, location, sensibility are related to the author and two viz. subject matter and literariness are related to the book. While Ramamurti has used the term "Indian novel in English", K. R. S. Iyengar in his foreword to the book has stuck to "Indo-Anglian" fiction. By using the term "English writers of Indian Fiction" (Ramamurti 1987: 50) for "Anglo-Indian Fiction" Ramamurti has tried to do away with the ethnic bias in the latter term besides restricting the meaning of the term *Anglo-Indian*. He has expanded the meaning of the term *Indo-Anglian*:

The term 'Anglo-Indian' has been retained to describe [the] writing by Englishmen in which the subject is India or material borrowed from Indian life [...] while English translations of [the] works in various Indian languages are often described as 'Indo-English'. Some writers like Alphonso-Karkala prefer the term 'Indo-English' to 'Indo-Anglian' even while referring to the English writings of Indians. But there is another class of writing in which the writers are Indian and the subject is Indo-British relationship or what may be called the colonial encounter. No particular name has been given to this class of writing, but they should be considered as part of Indo-Anglian writing (Ramamurti 1987: 196).

At another place he writes:

The term Anglo-Indian fiction has been used [...] to refer to [the] novels on India written by native British writers. The term Anglo-Indian was rejected by Dr K. R. Srinivasa Iyengar as one having too ethnic a connotation in Indian life, [...] Prof. Bhupal Singh [...] uses it to refer to the writings on India by native British writers. Prof. V. K. Gokak prefers the term Indo-English to *Anglo-Indian* while Prof Alphonso Karkala uses the term Indo-English in the place of Indo-Anglian (Ramamurti 1987: 56).

Ramamurti has somehow failed to notice that Gokak coined the term *Indo-English* for the translations from Indian languages into English. Ramamurti has not been able to stick to the five criteria mentioned above in the book under discussion (which is the revised version of his thesis submitted to Madurai University in 1974 but published in 1987), as is clear from his inclusion of authors like G. V. Desani and Salman Rushdie in it; he has also discussed these authors as if they were Indian passport holders. Ramamurti rightly identifies two visible tendencies in this hybrid literature – the one to be a part of English literature and the other to be a part of Indian literature.

Since Arvind Krishan Mehrotra, the latest historian of Indian writings in English, treats 1794, the year Dean Mahomed's *The Travels of Dean Mahomet* appeared, as the starting point of this literature, he begins his history with Raja Ram Mohan Roy and includes only those Indians who are connected with the geographical boundaries of the country in some way or the other viz. by way of holding an Indian passport or paying taxes to Indian government or social or historical family connection with India. Even those who deal with Indian subject matter but have some Indian connection (like Aubrey Menen, Ananda Coomarswami¹⁰, Verrier Elwin, Rudyard Kipling, G. V. Desani, Nirad C. Chaudhuri, Jim Corbett, Allan Sealy, Rushdie and other authors of the Indian Diaspora but not Forster) find a place in Mehrotra's *History* for he considers this literature to be "a literature whose development has been piecemeal and ragged, or like fresh start each time" (Mehrotra 2003: xx) and its history as "scattered, discontinuous, and transitional" (Mehrotra 2003: 26). He, therefore, does not use the term *Anglo-Indian* in his history in any of the above cited contexts and meanings but uses *Indian Literature in English* broadly.

The above discussion makes it clear that (i) *Anglo-Indian Literature* is not a literature produced by or about Anglo-Indians unlike the case with Canadian Literature or American Literature etc. and (ii) in its continuous evolution *Anglo-Indian Literature* kept on embracing new genres, literatures and litterateurs and provided succour to them in the process. The term *Anglo-Indian* is heavily loaded as it points towards i) paternal lineage, ii) colour, iii) religion, iv) culture, v) mind and vi) the location of the author that distinguishes one from other British nationals. All these are being used as tropes to highlight one's ancestry and provide a distinct regional identity. It may also be noted that the novelists and poets that have been discussed in the books cited above were British citizens by virtue of their being part of the British Empire but not every British citizen was of British descent; for an Indian the question of national identity and passport were immaterial before 1947, the year India got independence. The above discussion also hints that there is a strong under-current of social elitism operating in literary studies. All those associated with the power of any sort very easily gain limelight in the form of finding a mention in surveys and histories (to be specific for the limited purpose of this article) but those divested of power have to struggle to secure their position. The confusion of the editors, literary historians and academic scholarship was rooted in the historical reality. They were not able to make up their minds in the earlier days about various published works; their concern was divided between allegiance to the emerging nation, i.e. India, and loyalty to the crown, the former masters. Moreover, the factors like the market needs and the stature of a particular author (the backing of awards, reputed western publication houses and the reviewers) perhaps forced the historians/surveyors to change their

¹⁰ not discussed in detail as the essay "failed to reach".

stand in the later years. Thus, it may be safely concluded that the literature produced in England or British India has to be judged on its merit and intrinsic quality and not on the basis of extraneous considerations like nationality or the location of the authors. But what is interesting is that most of the authors that have been discussed by the literary historians of the genre do not find a place in the histories of English literature (published after 1947) and the *Oxford Companion to English Literature*. The questions that one needs to ask are: 1) Are Anglo-Indian authors poor in art? 2) Are Anglo-Indian authors poor in content/themes? 3) Are Anglo-Indian authors being discriminated against and ignored because of their parentage? 4) Are Anglo-Indian authors being discriminated against and ignored because of their location in India? Answers to these questions are beyond the scope of this paper hence are being left to the imagination of the readers of this paper and research in future.

References

Dictionaries

- Cambridge Dictionary* (2018) www.dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/
- Collins Cobuild Advanced Illustrated Dictionary* (2010) Glasgow: Harper Collins.
- Geddie, William (ed.) (1971) *The Chamber's Twentieth Century Dictionary* Bombay and New Dehli: Allied Publishers.
- Johnson, Samuel (1785) *A Dictionary of the English Language: In which the Words are Deduced from Their Originals, Explained in Their Different Meanings, and Authorized by the Names of the Writers in Whose Works They are Found*. Vol. I. London: J. F. and C Rivington Davis, T. Payne and Son, 6th ed.
- Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* (2004) Essex: Pearson.
- Oxford Dictionary* (2018) Oxford University Press. <www.en.oxforddictionaries.com>
- Simpson, John, Edmund Weiner (eds) (1998) *The Oxford English Dictionary*, Vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2nd ed.
- Webster's Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary of the English Language* (1989) New York: Portland House. Print.
- Whitworth, George Clifford (ed.) (1885) *An Anglo-Indian Dictionary* London: Kegan Paul, Trench And Co.
- Yule, Henry, A. C. Burnell, William Crooke (eds) ([1886] 1903) *Hobson-Jobson: A Glossary of Colloquial Anglo-Indian Words and Phrases, and of Kindred Terms, Etymological, Historical, Geographical and Discursive*. London: J. Murray.

Books and articles

- Afsheen, Shahrukh (2011) *Under Five Flags: Life Like a Turbulent River Flows*. Dartford: Xlibris.
- Andrews, Robyn (2010) "Christianity as an Indian Religion: The Anglo-Indian Experience." *Journal of Contemporary Religion*, 25:2; 173-188, <<https://doi.org/10.1080/13537901003750878>>
- Anthony, Frank (1966) "Presidential Address." *The Anglo-Indian Review*, 57; 39.
- Asiapac Editorial, Diane Kraal (eds) (2003) *Gateway to Eurasian Culture*. Singapore: Asiapac Books.

- Bethencourt, Francisco (2013) *Racisms: From the Crusades to the Twentieth Century*. Princeton: Princeton UP.
- Boria, Cavellay (1809) "Account of the Jains, Collected from a Priest of this Sect; at Mudgeri: Translated by Cavelly Boria, Brahmen; for Major C. Mackenzie." *Asiatic Researches*, Vol. IX, London; 244-286.
- Brown Lesley (ed.) (1993) *The New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary on Historical Principles*, Vol. 1, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Brown, Warren (2010) *Anglo-Indian Race Preservation Course*. n.p.: Lulu Publishing.
- Caplan, Lionel (2004) "Anglo-Indians." [In:] Ellis Cashmore (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Race and Ethnic Studies*. London: Routledge.
- Carey, W. H. (2001) "Mutinies in the Indian Army." [In:] Harbans S. Bhatia (ed.) *Justice System and Mutinies in British India*. New Delhi: Deep and Deep.
- Coates, Timothy (1995) "State-Sponsored Female Colonization in the Estado da Índia." *Santa Barbara Portuguese Studies*, vol. 2; 40-56.
- Constitution of India [The]* (2007) New Delhi: Ministry of Law and Justice, Govt of India, 2007, PDF. <www.lawmin.nic.in/coi/coiason29july08.pdf>
- Cousins, James H. (1921) *Modern English Poetry: Its Characteristics and Tendencies*. Madras: Ganesh & Co.
- D'Cruz, Glen (2009) "'The Good Australians': Anglo-Indians, Multiculturalism and Cosmopolitanism." [In:] Hans Löfgren, Prakash Sarangi (eds) *The Politics and Culture of Globalisation: India and Australia*, New Delhi: Social Science Press; 201-219.
- D'Souza, Beatrix (2017) "Foreword." [In:] S. Muthiah, Harry MacLure, Richard O'Connor (eds) *The Anglo-Indians: A 500-Year History*. New Delhi: Niyogi Books.
- Das, Kamala ([1965] 1997) "An introduction." [In:] *Treasury of Poems*. Calcutta: Oxford University Press; 47-49.
- Das, Sisir Kumar (1991) *History of Indian Literature*. Vol. 1. New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi.
- Drabble, Margaret (ed.) (2000) *Oxford Companion to English Literature*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Ghosh, Suresh Chandra (1970) *The Social Condition of the British Community in Bengal: 1757-1800*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Gokak, Vinayaka K. (1964) *English in India: Its Present and Future*. Bombay et al.: Asia Publishing House.
- Gracias, Fatima da Silva (1996) *Kaleidoscope of Women in Goa 1510-1961*. New Delhi: Concept.
- Guptara, Prabhu S. (1986) "Review of Indian Literature in English, 1827-1979: A Guide to Information Sources." *The Yearbook of English Studies. Literary Periodicals Special Number*, 16; 311-313.
- Iyengar, K. R. Srinivasa (1943) *Indo-Anglian Literature*. Bombay: PEN & International Book House.
- Iyengar, K. R. Srinivasa (1945) *The Indian Contribution to English Literature*. Bombay: Karnatak Publishing House.
- Iyengar, K. R. Srinivasa ([1962] 2013) *Indian Writing in English*. New Delhi: Sterling.
- Jupp, James (ed.) (2001) *The Australian People: An Encyclopedia of the Nation, Its People and Their Origins*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Khan, Afrinul Haque (2016) "Anglo-Indian Community in Ranchi: Issues of Culture and Identity." *International Journal of Anglo-Indian Studies*. 16/1; 21-38.
- Koshy, M. O. (1989) *The Dutch Power in Kerala (1729-1758)*. New Delhi: Mittal.
- Lyall, Alfred Comyn (1915) *Studies in Literature and History*. London: John Murray.
- Mehrotra, Arvind Krishna ([1992] 2003) *The Oxford India Anthology of Twelve Modern Indian Poets*. New Delhi: Oxford UP.
- Mehrotra, Arvind Krishna (2003) *An Illustrated History of Indian Literature in English*. Delhi: Permanent Black.
- Minocherhomji, Roshan Nadirsha (1945) *Indian Writers of Fiction in English*. Bombay: U. of Bombay.

- Muthiah, S, Harry MacLure, Richard O'Connor (eds) (2017) *The Anglo-Indians: A 500-Year History*. New Delhi: Niyogi Books.
- Naik, M. K. (1989) *A History of Indian English Literature*. New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi.
- Naik, M. K., Shyamala A. Narayan (2007) *Indian English Literature: 1980-2000: A Critical Survey* New Delhi: Pencraft International.
- Oaten, Edward Farley (1908) *A Sketch of Anglo-Indian Literature*. London: Kegan Paul.
- Oaten, Edward Farley ([1916] 1953) "Anglo-Indian Literature." [In:] Adolphus C. Award, Alfred R. Waller (eds) *Cambridge History of English Literature*, Vol. 14; 331-342.
- Pandia, Mahendra N. (1960) *The Indo-Anglian Novels as a Social Document*. Bombay: Bombay U. Press.
- Panikkar, Kavalam M. (1931) *Malabar and the Dutch*, Bombay: D. B. Taraporevala Sons and Co.
- Parker, Walter Hugh (2015) "I am Anglo-Indian – A Story of Belonging and the Dilemma of Identity." *International Journal of Anglo-Indian Studies*. 15/2; 25-39.
- Pearson, Michael N. (1987) *The Portuguese in India*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Raizada, Harish (1978) *The Lotus and the Rose: Indian Fiction in English (1850-1947)*. Aligarh: The Arts Faculty.
- Ramamurti, K. S. (1987) *Rise of the Indian Novel in English*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers.
- Report of Proceedings Connected with the East Indians' Petition to Parliament, Read at a Public Meeting Held at the Town Hall, Calcutta, March 28, 1831; With an Appendix*. (1831) Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press.
- Rocha, Elaine (2010) *Racism in Novels: A Comparative Study of Brazilian and South American Cultural History*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Rushdie, Salman (1997) "Introduction", in Salman Rushdie & Elizabeth West (eds) *The Vintage Book of Indian Writing 1947 – 1997*. London: Vintage; x-xxii.
- Rushdie, Salman, Elizabeth West (eds) (1997) *The Vintage Book of Indian Writing 1947 – 1997*. London: Vintage.
- Russell-Wood, A. J. R. ([1992] 1998) *The Portuguese Empire, 1415-1808: A World on the Move*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP.
- Sampson, George (1959) *Concise Cambridge History of English Literature*. Cambridge: UP.
- Sealy, Irwin Allan (2017) "The Anglo-Indians." *International Journal of Anglo-Indian Studies*. 17/2; 23-27.
- Sen, Sudarshana (2017) *Anglo-Indian Women in Transition: Pride, Prejudice and Predicament*. Singapore: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sencourt, Robert (1923) *India in English Literature*. London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton & Kent.
- Singh, Bhupal ([1934] 1975) *A Survey of Anglo-Indian Fiction*. London: Curzon Press.
- Smith, R. V. (2015) "The Anglo-Indian legacy saga." *The Statesman*. Nov 25, 2015.
- Stark, Herbert Alick (1926) *Hostages to India*. Calcutta: The Calcutta Fine Art Cottage.
- Stephens, H. Morse (1897) *The Rulers of India: Albuquerque*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Valentia, Viscount George (1811) *Voyages and Travels to India, Ceylon, the Red Sea, Abyssinia, and Egypt: In the Years 1802, 1803, 1804, 1805, and 1806*. Vol. 1, London: F., C., and J. Rivington.
- White, Bridget (2010) *Kolar Gold Fields – Down Memory Lane: Paeans to Lost Glory!* Milton Keynes: Author House.
- Williams, Blair R. (2002) *Anglo-Indians: Vanishing Remnants of a Bygone Era: Anglo-Indians in India, North America and the UK in 2000*. Calcutta: Tiljallah Relief.

On-line sources

www.aiaiadelhi.org/about-us

Anderson, Valerie E. R. (2011) *The Eurasian Problem in Nineteenth Century India*. Unpublished PhD thesis. [available at: https://eprints.soas.ac.uk/13525/1/Anderson_3334.pdf]

www.anglo-indians.com/index.asp?menuID=6&submenuID=49
www.araia.org.au/Anglo%20Indian%20History.htm
www.aiadanapur.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=70&Itemid=84
 Bystandard, Millicent (2015) www.reddit.com/r/india/comments/3e96ra/what_do_most_indians_think_of_angloindians_how/
 Dias, Charles (2009) *Social History of Luso-Indians in Kerala*. PhD thesis. Thenhipalam: U. of Calicut. [available at: www.shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/13205/10/10_chapter%203.pdf]
www.encyclopedia.com/humanities/encyclopedias-almanacs-transcripts-and-maps/anglo-indians
www.everyculture.com/South-Asia/Anglo-Indian.html
 Jeswin, Antony (2012) "Anglo Indians in Kerala: History of Anglo Indians in Kerala." [available at: www.kerala-angloindians.blogspot.in/2012/03/name-indo-european-races-were-calledby.html]
www.kerala-angloindians.blogspot
www.kirkusreviews.com/book-reviews/amitav-ghosh/the-hungry-tide/
www.lydiafellowshipinternational.org/national-pages95263/india.php
 Masters-Stevens, Ben Russell (2014) *Identity in the Anglo-Indian Novel: "The Passing Figure" and Performance*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Hatfield: U. of Hertfordshire. [available at: www://uhra.herts.ac.uk/handle/2299/15071]
 Pearson, Beverley (2005) "Three Hundred Years in Ten Minutes: A Very Brief History of the Anglo-Indians". [available at: www.margaretdeefholts.com/angloindianhistory.html]
www.thestatesman.com/mobi/news/section-ii/the-anglo-indian-legacy-saga/106491.html
 Thomaskutty, K. V. (2012) *The Anglo Indian Community in Kerala*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Thiruvananthapuram: U. of Kerala. [available at: <http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/handle/10603/12575>]
 Valiyaparambath, Anvarsadhath (2005) *Ethnic Articulations in Contemporary Indian English Fiction: A Study of Selected Novels*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Malappuram: U. of Calicut. [available at: <http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/handle/10603/35314>]
www.webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+http://www.movinghere.org.uk/galleries/histories/asia/growing_up/growing_up.htm
www.worldheritageofportugueseorigin.com/2015/08/12/estado-portugues-da-india-portuguese-state-of-india/
www.yourdictionary.com/feringee