CORRECT DELINEATIONS AND PROMISCUOUS OUTLINES: ENVISIONING INDIA AT THE TRIAL OF WARREN HASTINGS

FINBARR BARRY FLOOD

For the image – as point of identification – marks the site of an ambivalence. Its representation is always spatially split – its makes present something that is absent – and temporally deferred: it is the representation of a time that is always elsewhere, a repetition.

Homi Bhabha

In March 1774 the famous lexicographer Samuel Johnson wrote to Warren Hastings, first Governor General of the East India Company’s possessions in India, bemoaning the lack of information on the distant regions then coming under British control:

... my knowledge of them is too scanty to furnish me with proper topics of inquiry: I can only wish for information; and hope, that a mind comprehensive like yours will find leisure, amidst the cares of your important station, to inquire into many subjects of which the European world either thinks not at all, or thinks with deficient intelligence and uncertain conjecture. I shall hope, that he who once intended to increase the learning of his country by the introduction of the Persian language, will examine nicely the traditions and histories of the East; that he will survey the wonders of its ancient edifices, and trace the vestiges of its ruined cities; and that, at his return, we shall know the arts and opinions of a race of men, from whom very little has been hitherto derived.²

Had he been writing a decade later, Johnson would have had no shortage of published works to provide him with topics of inquiry. Indeed, so great was the volume of information on India appearing in the last decades of the eighteenth century, that, by 1780, one political commentator could assert that India had in 'late years become so much the subject of public attention, that almost every one had gained a competent knowledge of the history, manners, and politics of that country.'³ Despite this author's optimistic assessment, the flow of information gathered pace during the following decade, with the founding of the Asiatic Society of Bengal in Calcutta in 1784 (with history, science and art as the main...

lines of its inquiry), and a myriad of Indological 'firsts' being offered to the British public; the first British atlas and geographies of India, the first codification in English of what was seen as Hindu law, the first English translation of the Bhagavad Gita; the first Persian and Bengali grammars and dictionaries, and the first translations of several Persian histories of India. This information revolution was due in no small measure to the patronage of Warren Hastings, the object of Johnson's address. In addition to his duties as Governor-General, Hastings was a noted scholar of Persian and Urdu, who offered encouragement and financial support to scholars engaged in the process of
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textualizing India. Charles Wilkins’s translation of the *Bhagavad Gita*, the first published English translation of a Sanskrit text, was dedicated to Hastings, who famously wrote in the introduction that he had sponsored and encouraged the project in the belief that ‘every accumulation of knowledge . . . lessens the weight of the chain by which the natives are held in subjection.’ Hastings’s patronage of the visual codification of the country during the same period was no less stinging, for he was a keen patron of the artist William Hodges (1744–1797), who provided the London public with its first major corpus of Indian landscapes by a professional British artist, and later supported the acclaimed German portraitist Johan Zoffany (1733–1810). In recognition of his services to orientalist studies in India, Hastings was offered (but declined) the first presidency of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.

After Hastings’s return to England in 1784, however, the nature of his administration in India was contested in a celebrated parliamentary trial (plate 2.1). The trial, which centred on charges of embezzlement, extortion and the coercion of native Indian rulers, was instigated by the political philosopher Edmund Burke. The impeachment proceedings against Hastings ran from 1788 to 1795, and involved many of the glitterati and literati of late eighteenth-century London. In its self-conscious theatricality and its concern with contested versions of historical events, the trial of Warren Hastings was, in every sense, a rehearsal of India, a precursor of those dramatic re-enactments of Anglo-Indian history that were to burst onto the London stage even while the trial was in progress.

The proceedings against Hastings are a paradigmatic event in British orientalist discourse, revealing many of the ambiguities and ambivalences in the evolving relationship between Parliament, the East India Company and native Indian rulers, at a point when the territorial possessions of the company were rapidly expanding. At stake was the question of how best to represent India and the events of recent Indian history to a British metropolitan audience, one that was framed in highly partisan terms by the protagonists. As Sara Sulieri has observed, Burke’s goal was to inform the British public ‘about the representational difficulty of colonial India’, an endeavour that drew stark attention to the intimate relationship between ways of seeing and governing the subcontinent.

Previous discussions of the Hastings affair have focused almost exclusively on the question of textual representation. By contrast, this essay seeks to highlight the centrality of vision and visuality to the polemical exchanges that surrounded the impeachment proceedings. It considers the importance of the visual in negotiating relations between colony and metropole, reconsidering the visual’s claim to authority, the role of vision and the contemporary use and significance of optical devices. It is equally concerned to elucidate the significance of the visual in political debate and to investigate the connections between vision, colonial governance and society at an historical moment long acknowledged as a turning point in British attitudes to the subcontinent. It takes a somewhat unorthodox approach to its subject by examining contemporary political prints.
relating to these proceedings. It does so in the belief that they constitute a neglected source for the history of visual culture in general and for the history of orientalist representation in particular.

The trial provided a field day for political caricaturists, and the complex and concatenated allusions with which their prints were imbued demanded high levels of education and visual literacy on the part of their consumers, including the literate elite of the political classes who were centre stage during the proceedings against Hastings.12 As commentaries on the events of the impeachment proceedings and the issues that they raised, the graphic satires are both constitutive and illustrative of orientalist discourse on India at a key moment in its development, a moment before India was, as Jenny Sharpe puts it, ‘fixed and normalized as an unchanging text’.13 Moreover, the popularity of the genre in the second half of the eighteenth century coincided with the burgeoning of a British print culture that also satisfied a growing taste for images of domestic and distant landscapes, including those of India.14 The ambivalence towards the processes and products of visual representation that characterizes the reception of these images also permeates the political satires that I have chosen for discussion, where it is articulated around the use of optical devices such as the camera obscura and magic lantern. In my analysis, I suggest that this parody of optical technology, deployed in the representation of geographically and temporally distant scenes, articulates a tension between the aesthetic and documentary value of the image, often framed in terms of a dialectical opposition between artistic translation and transcription. Bringing India home (in multiple senses), contemporary artistic production is characterized by an hermeneutic problem common to other fields of orientalist endeavour, which effected a domestic inscription by finding correspondences between the foreign and the familiar. In contrast, therefore, to David Musselwhite, who sees the trial of Warren Hastings as demonstrating the ‘confrontation of systems of thought and cultural codings and expectations which are completely impenetrable to each other’,15 I view the trial as exposing angst about the remarkable permeability and imbrications of British and Indian elite culture in the late eighteenth century, a concern that is particularly evident in the visual materials and metaphors that it generated.16

Some of the most damning charges brought against Hastings concerned the Begums (princesses) of the independent kingdom of Oudh (Avadh).17 According to the indictments, Hastings had violated previous guarantees of security to the Begums by loaning British troops to Asaf al-Dawla, the Nawab of Oudh, to help him to coerce his grandmother and mother (the Barra and Bahu Begums) into parting with their considerable inherited wealth. The Nawab was motivated, at least in part, by the need to repay a debt owed to the East India Company. Hastings rationalized his actions by invoking the Begums’ reported support for the rebellion of Chait Singh, zamindar of Benares, in 1781, which Hastings was also accused of precipitating. The episode of the Begums became one of the most notorious of the trial, largely as the result of the oratorical skills of both Edmund
Burke and Richard Brinsley Sheridan, who closed the charges respecting the Begums in June 1788 with a speech that extended over ten days, and which was widely regarded as a *tour de force*.  

The overblown rhetorical images that permeated the daily proceedings provided a spectacle of lurid images to entertain a public hungry for exotic sensation. Reading transcripts of the speeches by Burke and his partisans, the intimate interrelationships between the textual, the verbal and the visual are striking. In one of his celebrated speeches on the charge concerning the Begums, delivered on 13 June 1788, Sheridan contrasts ‘true’ and ‘disgusting’ pictures of the events in question, and goes on to develop an extraordinary anthropomorphizing metaphor, in which he compares the ‘true image’ of British justice with the idolatrous Oriental image offered by Hastings and his partisans:

> I ask your Lordships - do your Lordships approve this representation? Do you feel that this is the true image of justice? Is this the character of British justice? Are these her features? Is this her countenance? Is this her gait or her mien? No; I think even now I hear you calling upon me to turn from this vile libel - this base caricature - this Indian pagod [i.e. temple] - this vile idol hewn from some rock - blasted in some unhallowed grove - formed by the hands of guilty and knavish tyranny to dupe the heart of ignorance - to turn from this deformed idol to the true majesty of justice here.

In light of the graphic imagery of these metaphors, and the theatrical nature of the trial itself, it is hardly surprising that the exchange between the two camps provided rich pickings for the political caricaturists of the day.

In the midst of the deliberations on this charge, which lasted from 28 April until 13 June, the images conjured in the Commons inspired a rapid-fire visual dialogue between James Gillray (1757–1815), the leading British political caricaturist of the day, and his rival, James Sayers (1748–1825). On 6 May, Sayers published *Galante Show* (plate 2.2), employing a common (and somewhat pejorative) term for the figure of the itinerant magic lanternist found in contemporary engravings. The device features in several caricatures of the period: in 1753, Paul Sandby’s *The Burlesquer Burlesqued* had shown the artist Hogarth transformed into a magic lantern; a magic lantern also appears in a print that Gillray may have executed in 1783. As a genre, eighteenth-century graphic satire had much in common with the magic lantern, whose grotesque, exaggerated projections were used in a more theatrical variant of the static, single-frame lampoon; an exhibition of political caricatures entitled *The Magick Lantern* was held in London in 1775.

Here the figure of the lantern is deployed in the service of contested visions of India and its recent history. Sayers’s image shows Edmund Burke projecting his accusations in relation to the events at Benares and Oudh by means of a magic lantern, on the right side of which a cross-legged Oriental figure appears. Operating the device, Burke makes a mountain out of a molehill (or in this case the
classical Mounts Ossa, Pelion and Olympus out of a 'Begum wart'), and an elephant out of 'a Benares flea', while the giant eyes of the Begums, whom Burke referred to at the time as 'despoiled and forlorn creatures', produce a quantity of tears sufficient to float an ouzle transformed into a whale. 27 The onlookers affirm the spectacle with exclamations of 'finely magnified', 'poor ladies they have cried their eyes out', and 'very like an Ouzle'. 28 Ouzle is usually glossed as 'weasel', the term used in Polonius's speech to Hamlet about the forms of passing clouds, which is its source (a fact acknowledged by the appearance of 'Polonius' beside the relevant words in Sayers's image). 29 However, in keeping with the punning
nature of these prints, the term lends the image further layers of meaning by evoking the ouzel, a type of blackbird and hence, colloquially, a person with dark hair or complexion. To the right of the title, the Latin phrase Redent Spectacula Mane (Spectacles Return by Morning) appears, while below are inscribed ‘Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays’, the days on which the court sat.

Sayers’s emphasis upon magnification recalls passages in Burke’s magnum opus, A Philosophical Enquiry (1757), in which he propounded his theories on the Sublime, among them the idea that ‘a true artist should put a generous deceit on the spectators, and effect the noblest designs by easy methods. Designs that are vast only by their dimensions, are always the sign of a common and low imag-

invasion. Sheridan had invoked the Sublime in his speeches relating to the Begums, and it seems likely that the caricaturist is taking a sideswipe here at Burke's views on aesthetics, as he does in other political prints of this period.

Three days later Gillray responded to Sayers's satire with his own print, Camera-Obscura (plate 2.3), published under Sayers's name. Gillray's Camera-Obscura parodies by appropriating, echoing, and inverting details of Sayers's drawing. In Gillray's print, the portable camera obscura functions as a peepshow operated by Hastings, providing a diminutive corrective to Burke's overblown rhetorical representations, which restores the representational order previously distorted.

Reflected through the mirror of the camera, the image of the exotic fauna and topography conjured by the magic lantern are transformed into banal simulacra, so that elephant, mount and whale revert back to their former states. The Begums, menaced by British officers with a wagon marked 'plunder' (by which a decapitated body lies) are transmuted into 'skin'd mice', a pun that combines the metaphorical idea of fleecing with the British colloquialism for penury. The veracity of the scene is approved by King George III, Queen Charlotte and Lord Chancellor Thurloe, all of whom were reputed to be Hastings's partisans, and who exclaim in their turn, 'charmingly diminished', 'poor Mice! I shall cry my eyes out', and 'very like an Ouzel'.

Warren Hastings is represented as an Indian prince, the 'King of the Nabobs' or Nawabs, as he is in other political prints of this period (plate 2.4). As early as 1783 Hastings had been described as 'an Indian Rajah with a white face – the most terrible animal in God's creation'. Hastings's acculturated dress is more than a personal foible, hinting at moral corruption and accusations that he had bribed his accusers, including George III. Gillray thus echoes both contemporary perceptions of the East India Company servants as Oriental despots, and the specific charges of 'Asiatic' despotism levelled against Hastings in relation to the Begums. The manner of Hastings's depiction also reflects an increasing concern with the imbrications of British and Indian culture which, in the decades after Hastings's departure from India, a variety of legislation sought to address. It has been estimated that in the late eighteenth century, in addition to as many as 9,000 soldiers, up to 3,000 non-military British personnel (including employees of the East India Company) were resident in India. It was not uncommon for them to adopt the attire, customs and domestic arrangements of their Indian contemporaries, and to take Indian mistresses. In 1793, just seven years after Hastings left office, however, Indians and those of mixed race were excluded from government and military office. This was followed by a law prohibiting Britons in India from wearing native dress.

These concerns were not confined to the Indies. The ostentatious entry of the returning Nabobs into parliamentary life, facilitated by the fabled fortunes that they acquired in the East Indies, led to contemporary fears that 'a malignant web of influence' stretching from India House and beyond might introduce an imported strain of despotism that could fundamentally alter the nature of the
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The imperatives of mercantile empire, with their perceived emphasis on individual desires, were thus pitted against the requirements of civil society, so that Hastings's trial may be seen as a mirror in which the possibility of dissolution intrinsic to the nation-state confronted the metropole itself. 43

In the densely intertextual world of eighteenth-century British political prints little was left to chance, and there are hours of entertainment and instruction to be derived from decoding the various allusions in these compactly coded images. 46 In the space available to me here, however, I want to suggest that the camera obscura in Gillray's cartoon functions both as the representation of an optical device in contemporary use and as an 'epistemological figure' that refers to the role of orientalist representation in contested visions of recent Indian history. 47 At issue is not only the contemporary faith in the ability of optical devices to produce accurate renderings of an objective reality, but the centrality of the visual in contemporary representations of India and its recent history. The role of the camera obscura in this staging of Indian history reflects the multiple natures of the instrument itself as both a model of empirical observation essential to rational thought, and a material object deployed in the service of contemporary artistic production, popular entertainment and scientific inquiry. 48
2.5 William Dent, *The Rare Show*, published 25 February 1788. Engraving, 32.38 × 23.81 cm.
It was the hallmark of the caricaturist to draw on the contemporary, and Gillray's inspired choice of the camera obscura as the manifest content of his political satire also reflects a late eighteenth-century vogue for optical devices that reveals itself across a range of cultural fields. The idea of diminution and enlargement in the representation of historical events had been invoked just a few months earlier in The Raree Show, a political caricature by William Dent relating to the impeachment. Published on 25 February 1788, the print depicts the proceedings as a chaotic, theatrical extravaganza, in which a booth (recalling the peepshows familiar from Hogarth's engravings of London fairs) bears two posters (plate 2.5). One depicts a pair of spectacles and the legend 'From the left side of the booth may be seen Alexander the Little', while the other illustrates a spy-glass and the legend 'From the right may be seen Alexander the Great' (plate 2.6).49

On 6 May 1788, the day on which Sayers's Galante Show was published, a report on Hastings's trial appeared in The Times (of London) alongside an advertisement for an optical instrument designed to copy drawings, natural flowers and insects; the device is guaranteed to give 'the true likeness on paper to any size, either as large as life, or as small as miniature' (plate 2.7). Gillray and Sayers may also have been aware of the Lanterna Megalographica of Johann Sturm (d. 1703), a German professor of Mathematics and Oriental Languages, and its reported ability to make a mountain out of a molehill, and transform an elephant into a fly.50

The late eighteenth-century interest in things optical witnessed in these advertisements and images reflects the popular reception of the work of Locke and Newton, whose ideas concerning the primacy of vision in cognition were exploited to great rhetorical effect by political wags in the various parliamentary exchanges on India during the 1780s.51 In contemporary political speeches on India, metaphors of enlargement and diminution, reflection and inversion proliferate, often in relation to mirrors and lenses. Indeed, so commonplace are references to faulty vision and prosthetic eyes in these exchanges that the parliamentary engagement between the partisans of Edmund Burke and those of Warren Hastings might be dubbed the 'battle of the lenses'.

In a speech given in 1783 in support of a bill that would have taken control of India from the East India Company, Burke attempted 'to awaken something of sympathy for the unfortunate natives, of which I am afraid we are not perfectly susceptible, whilst we look at this very remote object through a false and cloudy medium'.52 Opponents of the bill employed similar images, with one critic suggesting, in an extended play on the interrelation between political perspective, vision and topography, that his opponent's belief in the bill's ability to right Indian wrongs,

was plainly owing to some strong rays of a side light, that darted from the East, and perhaps a little horizontally from the North, upon the pupil of the right hon. Secretary's eye ... Seated on that illustrious bench, on which the sun always shone, when he viewed the Bill through his magnifying glass ... it much aggrandized himself, and all his influence as a minister of state.53
Comparable metaphors proliferated in relation to the trial of Warren Hastings. A mock-heroic satire of 1786 on the charges levelled by Burke against Hastings even before the impeachment began uses the image of the reflecting glass.\textsuperscript{54} Similarly, when the impeachment proceedings were in their final stages, a critic of the charges wrote about, ‘When the \textit{ideal charges} were first presented to the general eye, as presenters of rarities present a microscopic instrument, not for the purpose of seeing things as they really are, but as they are enlarged by the deceiving influence of invention’.\textsuperscript{55}

Graphic evocations of these optical metaphors proliferate in contemporary political prints, which emphasize the vagaries of prosthetic vision. Burke’s eyeglasses were a particular gift to the caricaturists, and feature prominently in a number of images from the 1780s relating to the impeachment, where issues of visuality and veracity intersect. In William Dent’s \textit{impeachment}, dating from the build-up to impeachment, Burke’s prosthetic eyes are the source of ‘false optics’, which keep his rhetoric focused on the injustices of Hastings, even as he reaches
for the lacks (i.e., laks - hundreds of thousands) of Indian rupees suspended above (plate 2.8). Another image published by William Dent in 1791 (plate 2.9) shows a Jesuitical Burke instructing the devils attending Hastings on a metaphorical deathbed to hold his monstrous spectacles to Hastings's eyes, 'so that he may see as I do.' Hastings replies by way of punning response, 'If guilty of these represented Crimes consequent reflection were worse than Death.' Burke's spectacles, like Hastings's camera obscura, not only facilitate vision, but colour or distort it, underlining the problems of representation at a remove from its objects. The problem was particularly acute when it came to distant lands like India, where even those who reveled Hastings were dependent for their information on the products of his patronage, which included both textual and visual representations of the subcontinent.

Stephen Bann has noted 'a gradual intensification of the claims of both travel discourse and historical narration to reproduce the real' over the course of the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Although knowledge in late eighteenth-century England may not have been predicated on the visual alone, images appeared to offer authoritative access to knowledge about distant lands such as India. A close relationship existed between the processes of textualizing and visualizing India, witnessed in personal and professional relationships, and in the use of contemporary scholarly works as sources for the explanatory letterpresses accompanying published images. Hastings himself asserted that the real character of India and Indians could only be brought home by means of their writings, but his patronage of the artist William Hodges (active in India between 1780 and 1783) provided the British public with its first extensive corpus of Indian landscapes executed by a professional artist. A letter introducing Hodges to Hastings in 1778 describes the artist's mission to 'bring... home upon Paper... the most curious appearances of nature and art in Asia.' The idea is a commonplace in writings of the period, one that locates the artist's endeavour within broader projects of exploration and discovery that were garnering data, facts and materials about the new worlds then opening to European eyes. Hodges was quite aware of his pioneering role in these enterprises: a letter to Hastings written on the eve of the former's departure from India in 1783 offers the East India Company a gift of five canvases depicting places that had 'not yet... been represented by any artist who has travelled to that part of India.'
Between 1785 and 1788 Hodges published a series of forty-eight Indian aquatints, the celebrated Select Views of India, drawn on the spot in 1780–1783. This was dedicated to the directors of the East India Company, including Hastings, who owned thirty-six paintings and ninety drawings by Hodges at the time of his death in 1797.25 Foreshadowing a concern with utility that was to dominate nineteenth-century colonial documentation, the celebrated Indologist William Jones
addressed the Asiatic Society of Bengal in 1785, expressing his hope that the 'correct delineations' shortly to be provided by Hodges, 'may furnish our own architects with new ideas of beauty and sublimity.'

During the years of Hastings's trial Hodges frequently exhibited his Indian views in the annual exhibitions of the Royal Academy. As Eaton has noted, Hodges's images assumed the role of 'totemic artefacts', which were fundamental to contemporary metropolitan imaginings of India. The Royal Academy exhibition of 1788 opened just a week or so before Gillray's caricature appeared, and Hodges's Indian views had excited considerable interest among its members, of whom Gillray was one. In the judgement of Sir Joshua Reynolds, Hodges's were the 'best landskips' exhibited in that year. In his speech to the students of the Royal Academy in December of 1788, Reynolds echoes Jones's earlier sentiments, expressing the hope that 'the Barbarick splendour of those Asiatick Buildings, which are now publishing by a member of this Academy, may possibly...furnish an Architect, not with models to copy, but with hints of composition and general effect, which would not otherwise have occurred.'

Gillray's satirical prints from this period demonstrate an ambivalent engagement with the subjects and themes of his fellow academicians, and the likelihood that Camera-Obscura makes allusion to Hodges's images of India is heightened both by its timing and by the existence of a particular connection between them and the
events for which Hastings was on trial. Hodges had accompanied Hastings during several of his official travels in India, including a visit to Chait Singh, zamindar of Benares in 1781, to collect unpaid debts to the East India Company. During this visit Chait Singh rebelled, provoking a crisis that played a central role in the later impeachment proceedings against Hastings, and which he allegedly used to rationalize the plunder of the Begums. Hodges provided Hastings’s defence with an affidavit regarding his experience of these events, and refers to the affair in his Travels in India, published in 1793, in terms that validate the actions of his patron. A newspaper advertisement from 1787 soliciting subscriptions for Select Views refers directly to the contemporary interest in India, offering, ‘faithful representations of remarkable places in that remote country, presuming they will be highly interesting on account of their novel and picturesque scenery, and more especially as they illustrate the history and antiquities of places, now so much the object of enquiry’. As this suggests, many of Hodges’s Indian images depicted cities and sites that became familiar to an elite metropolitan audience as a result of the impeachment proceedings and the political debates surrounding them. Hodges’s participation in some of these events put him in a unique position to act as the ‘visual recorder’ of key moments in the unfolding of a proto-colonial history.

Based on the sketches that he made while present in Benares during the events for which Hastings’s was impeached, Hodges painted several views of the city. Hodges’s diploma piece (plate 2.10), presented to the Royal Academy in 1787,
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In addition to its probable reference to Hodges's work, Gillray's image can also be read as a more general reference to Hastings's role in providing representations of India to a wider audience. The issue of fidelity of representation, which is so graphically evoked in the prints by Sayers and Gillray, is the very problem of translation that haunted late eighteenth-century British orientalist productions of India. In his introduction to the translation of the Bhagavad Gita, published in 1785, Hastings dealt directly with this issue, referring to the 'errors of interpretation' associated with 'the extreme difficulty of rendering abstract terms by others exactly corresponding with them in another language'. The realm of the visual was no more immune from the vexed issue of translation, however. Although Hodges asserted that his work was distinguished by his genius for 'accurate observation', an assertion supported by William Jones, who praised his
views of India for their 'correct delineations' (a phrase also used by Hastings), he had evidently felt the sting of criticism on this account. In 1787 Hodges introduced his Dissertation on the Prototypes of Architecture with a statement that obliquely linked criticism of his work with the accusations against his patron Warren Hastings. This he does by juxtaposing the rhetorical figures of India employed by contemporary politicians with the candour of his own 'genuine productions of truth, candour and justice'. In order to achieve these productions, he explains, he has foregone 'the very possibility of satisfying the natural historian, architect, antiquary, and politician, who look for no pictures of India and Indian affairs but what can be expressed in rhetorical or arithmetical figures, algebraic forms, or the shape of a cash book'. For Hodges, the 'genuine productions of truth' are not related to the 'algebraic forms' of unmediated transcription, but admit of the artist's agency within certain parameters. In Travels in India (1793), he states that the artist's subjects can be combined and disposed to advantage but 'under the strict guidance of cool judgement, or we shall have fanciful representations instead of the truth, which above all, must be the object of such researches.' In the following paragraph, he links his art to a desire to visualize what is both chronologically and geographically distant:

Pictures are collected from their value as specimens of human excellence and genius exercised in a fine art; and justly are they so; but I cannot help thinking, that they would rise still higher in estimation, were they connected with the history of the various countries, and did they faithfully represent the manners of mankind.

Here Hodges invokes an idea of history made manifest that was most strongly articulated in what Geoffrey Batchen has called the 'photo-prophetic' writings of the late eighteenth century, but which also made itself felt in images such as William Dent's The Raree Show (see plates 2.5 and 2.6). In Giphantia, published in London in 1760, for example, canvases prepared with a viscous matter and exposed to the events of history, preserve transparent representations of these events fixed on the 'mirror' of the canvas, traces that are said to constitute 'the most real signs' of historical events. This contemporary conceit of history as a series of signs that could be fixed and circulated as graphic representation has a self-evident relevance to Hodges's experience of events, which were themselves to become the subject of historical inquiry.

The desire for faithful reproductions of distant lands and the instantiated remains of their histories is, however, somewhat at odds with the application of contemporary conventions of British landscape painting, which served to enhance the alien landscapes and architecture of India even while domesticating them. With its tripartite division of space, diminutive observers, multiple hillocks and architectural scenery, Hodges's View of the Pagodas at Deogur (plate 2.12) from the Select Views (1785–88) finds much in common with contemporary renditions of British pastoral landscapes. The compositional debt owed by Hod-
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ges's Indian images to the art of Richard Wilson (c. 1713–82), the romantic landscape painter to whom he was apprenticed, has been noted elsewhere. In the texts stemming from his Indian journeys, the advertisements for Select Views, and the letter-presses accompanying them, Hodges frequently invokes the figure of the Picturesque, whose conventions achieved canonical form only after his return from India, most famously in the Three Discourses of William Gilpin (1792). A poem appended to Gilpin's text contrasts the mechanical precision of painters, who copy exactly what they see, with the artist who emphasizes particular features of his subject, and thereby leads the viewer to a truer knowledge of it:

Artists there are,
Who, with exactness painful to behold,
Labour each leaf, and each minutest moss,
Till with enamell'd surface all appears
Completely smooth. Others with a bolder hand,
By Genius guided, mark the gen'ral form,
The leading features, which the eye of Taste,
Practis'd in Nature, readily translates.

Hodges's ameliorations and embellishments in similar vein were not lost on his critics, chief among them Thomas Daniell (1749–1840) and his nephew William
(1769–1837). Between 1786 and 1793, ten years after Hodges's Indian adventures, the duo essentially retraced his footsteps, sometimes making images from the same spot as Hodges, but using the portable camera obscura both to facilitate the making of rapid sketches and to invest their sketches of India with a scientific objectivity that they found lacking in Hodges's work. Repaying Hodges generous praise of their work not a little cruelly, the Daniells commented that one of Hodges's views of Benares was 'so very unlike that one would imagine he had taken it under full sail'. In contrast to the criticism that Hodges attracted, a contemporary reviewer notes of the Daniells' Indian images: 'there is every reason to confide in the fidelity of the representations ... Every thing is drawn with the most astonishing accuracy. The animals, trees, and plants, are studies for the naturalist.' The Daniells' writings emphasize the importance of the visual, while de-emphasizing the agency of the artist. In the introduction to A Picturesque Voyage to India (1810), Thomas Daniell wrote:

... delineation is the only medium by which a faithful description can be given of sensible images: the pencil is narrative to the eye; and however minute in its relations, can scarcely become tedious; its representations are not liable to the omissions of memory, or the misconceptions of fancy; whatever it communicates is a transcript of nature.

Prefiguring the auto-transcription of the photograph, the move from translating to transcribing is part of a contemporary effort to marginalize the degree of mediation in artistic production. With its decorporealization of vision, the camera obscura was uniquely suited to the purpose.

Contemporary emphases on their accuracy notwithstanding, a comparison between Hodges's Ghaunts at Benares (1787, see plate 2.10) and the Daniells' Dasa-sumade Ghaut, Benares (1788, plate 2.13) suggest that the latters' endeavours to bring home the 'picturesque beauties' of India were no less in thrall to the domesticating conventions of eighteenth-century landscape painting than Hodges's had been. Thomas Daniell's involvement with Sezincote House in Gloucestershire, built between 1805 and 1817, illustrates the popular aesthetic consumerism associated with this transumption of both idiom and place. Designed by Samuel Pepys Cockerell for his brother the Nabob Sir Charles Cockerell, who had lived for many years in Bengal, the house, its landscape setting, temples and grottoes were shaped by Cockerell's desire to reproduce Indian forms, with which the Indian drawings and sketches of Thomas Daniell had acquainted him. Thomas Daniell was not only hired as a consultant on the project that his images had informed (thus fulfilling the hopes of both Jones and Reynolds that images of India might inspire British architects), but went on to create seven large oil paintings of Sezincote, which were exhibited at the Royal Academy. There could be little better illustration of the inherently self-referential character of the picturesque, or of the visual artefact's ability to effect the cognitive assimilation and aesthetic imbrication of India with the metropole. If, as Suleri has argued, the trial of
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2.13 Thomas and William Daniell, Dusasumade Ghaut, Benares, 1768. Pencil and watercolour on paper,
37.46 x 53.97 cm. Reproduced courtesy of Christie's Images.

Warren Hastings was less about the accuracy of representation than about
Burke's attempt to assert India as 'a place that resisted translation into western
images', then this was a resistance ignored in the work of contemporary artists.97

The domesticating codes of late eighteenth-century picturesque representation
find parallels in Gillray's print, where the general echo of the Picturesque in the
mountains, animals and grouped figures, and a tripartite division of the scene into
foreground, middle distance and far distance (see plates 2.3 & 2.12) may not be
fortuitous. This aspect of contemporary artistic production is further echoed by the
power of Hastings's camera obscura to transform the marvellous and extravagant
back into the mundane and banal, restoring a natural order based on familiar,
European terms. In this way, the instrument domesticates the 'otherness' of India,
presenting it as a variant of the known even as artists like Hodges were tempering
the alien qualities of the unfamiliar landscapes that they were representing.

This was not just India through the lens, however, but India refracted through
multiple lenses, a point made by King George's use of a spyglass (a prosthetic
supplement that supplants the eye) to confirm the veracity of the vision conjured
by Hastings's camera obscura (see plate 2.3). If the eye provided a window on the
world, between seeing and believing lay a visual chain of transmission. from
direct observation to textual or visual transcription, to publication and viewing: by the late eighteenth century, the meanings of the term ‘illustration’ included ‘embellishment’. Anxiety with the potential for distortion inherent in the process of mediation is frequently addressed in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century illustrated works on far distant places, especially where engravings were prepared overseas and with native assistance. Even those prepared at home were not immune, despite attempts to invest them with an indexical authority by inscribing them ‘from a sketch [or drawing] prepared on the spot’, in much the same way as the sub-caption ‘from a photograph’ was to lend authority to engravings of India in the following century. Hodges’s championing of the aquatint technique enabled him to reproduce the effects of watercolour but necessitated a reliance on the skills of print-makers. In the case of Select Views the process of mediation may have been even more laboured, for there is evidence that some of the plates are engraved after watercolours worked up from field sketches specifically for this purpose. If, as Bann has suggested, the large-scale copperplate engravings favoured by Hodges for his Indian images enhanced their claim to authority, the necessity of mediation posed problems addressed obliquely in the letterpresses accompanying them, and rather more directly in the introduction to Travels in India (1793), where he introduces the accompanying engravings by asserting their relationship to drawings made upon the spot and the fact that ‘to the utmost of my ability, [they] are fair and accurate representations of the originals.’ Despite its different status within the visual economy, the political print was not immune from this chain of mediation. On the contrary, the jaundiced eye of the caricaturist was no less dependent than that of Hodges and the Daniells on the printing press for its effect. In an illustrated satirical pamphlet published in 1821, George Cruikshank (Gillray’s successor as the pre-eminent caricaturist of his day) represents himself as a panoptic presence, attempting to impose order on the world of courtiers and politicians by means of his cyclopean eye, mediated through the printing press that it contains (plate 2.14).

Situating the artist’s endeavour to transport the picturesque beauties of distant lands to Europe within the context of global exploration, Thomas Daniell identifies it with the contemporary researches of the philologist, naturalist and philosopher, which were also providing the raw material through which the unfamiliar might become known. Bernard Cohn has drawn attention to the role of translation within this broader hermeneutic project as a means of accessing and controlling the ‘epistemological space’ of India by establishing correspondences that ‘could make the unknown and strange knowable.’ It was at this very moment that textual translations were bringing the esoteric and exotic texts of Indian literature home to an English-speaking audience, even as comparative philologists were ‘discovering’ affinities between Indian languages and their European counterparts. Similar principles of correspondence are explicit in Hodges’s evaluations of Indian architecture. Writing of a gate leading to a mosque at Chunar, Hodges remarks, ‘the general forms of this building, as well as
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many others in India, are the same as those we see in Europe.106 Along with the 'Moorish' architecture of Europe, he sees Indo-Islamic monuments as the progenitors of Gothic architecture, sometimes making additions and changes that emphasize their 'Gothic' qualities in his graphic representations of them.107 In other cases, the correspondences between Europe and India reveal themselves in an 'orientalized classicism': the trishuls (tridents) mounted on the superstructures of the temples at Deogar (see plate 2.12) resemble Neptune's trident, while Indian columns are carved with 'Grecian' scrolls.108 It is even possible that Hodges's treatment of Indian ruins and the large-scale engravings that he favoured were inspired by a desire to evoke Piranesi's majestic images of Rome, casting ancient India in a classical mould.109

Late eighteenth-century visual and textual translations both served to frame the object of representation within European terms and canons of taste, reaffirming, what Jenny Sharpe describes as 'the universality of a European episteme'.110 This tendency to domesticate the Orient was noted in Edward Said's
classic study of Orientalism, which, he suggests, provides a lens through which 'a new median category emerges, a category that allows one to see new things, things seen for the first time, as versions of a previously known thing.' Historically, the phenomenon is more characteristic of eighteenth-century European representations of the 'Orient' than those of the following century. By then, the proliferation of orientalist imagery across a range of media was sufficient to permit the experience of distant lands as the 'reoccurrence of a picture one had seen before, as a map one already carried in one's head, as the reiteration of an earlier description.' In the late eighteenth century, however, the map or picture was still very much under construction, and dependent upon a process of domestic inscription for its reception. The phenomenon pervades parliamentary discussions of India during the period, most obviously Edmund Burke's speech on Charles James Fox's East India Bill of 1783:

'It is an empire of this extent, of this complicated nature, of this dignity and importance that I have compared it to Germany and the German government, - not for an exact resemblance, but as a sort of middle term, by which India might be approximated to our understandings, and, if possible, to our feelings, in order to awaken something of a sympathy for the unfortunate natives, of which I am afraid we are not perfectly susceptible, while we look at this very remote object through a very false and cloudy medium.'

Similar sentiments also permeate Burke's representations of India at Hastings's trial, in which he relies on comparisons between European regions and Indian territories not immediately familiar to his audience.

Writing about the process of translating and textualizing India in the late eighteenth century, Jenny Sharpe has characterized the process of domestic inscription through the finding of affinities as an endeavour 'to make two unlike concepts conform to an analogous relation.' According to Sharpe's reading, 'the violent forcing of affinities in the comparative method is represented as the restoration of an original sense.' In Gillray's Camera-Obscura (see plate 2.3), Warren Hastings assumes the role of artist-showman, achieving the restoration of an original sense, the violent forcing of affinities, by means of a device, which, as both model and metaphor, had long embodied the principles of European epistemology. However, just as other optical devices such as the Claude glass were held to imbue the miniature landscapes seen through them with desirable picturesque qualities, the mirror in Hastings's camera not only reflects India, but transforms and improves it according to contemporary European canons of taste.

In its ambiguities and ambivalences, the tensions that it articulates between the desire for immediacy and the necessity of mediation, Gillray's print perfectly captures the paradox inherent in the eighteenth-century orientalist enterprise, which simultaneously sought to represent what existed in its natural state and impose an order that rendered it comprehensible, to fix an external reality while translating and enhancing it in the representation. Hastings offers us India as
a representation of his own creation, but it is a representation in which he himself is implicated, as his dress implies. In his hybridity, Hastings partakes of the mendacity of the native informant that contemporary orientalist scholarship was designed to transcend, thereby undermining the veracity of the vision that he offers us. Operated by Hastings, even the apparatus of representation becomes suspect, producing not a visual transcription but a translation, which serves his mendacious political purposes. The instrument through which that translation is achieved is itself a hybrid, combining the attributes of mirror and lantern, refracting while producing light. In a gesture that prefigures the central metaphor of photography, the representations of India are brought into being by means of rays of light, which literally enlighten their refracted objects for the figurative enlightenment of the viewer. This is a false dawn, however, a point driven home by the inscription Minor fuit infamia vero to the lower right of the title, which plays on the idea of diminution by asserting that ‘deception is less than truth.’ King George’s use of a spyglass to confirm the veracity of the image conjured through the camera affirms a contemporary faith in visual technology even as it undermines it, for the verbal affirmation, ‘very like an Ouzle,’ is cribbed from Polonius’s speech to the mad Hamlet, affirming the veracity of a truth that was entirely subjective and not empirically verifiable. These allusions to Hastings’s guilt draw upon the paradoxical nature of the camera obscura itself for, as Jonathan Crary has noted:

For those who understood its optical underpinnings it offered the spectacle of representation operating completely transparent, and for those ignorant of its principles it afforded the pleasures of illusion. Just as perspective contained within it the disruptive possibilities of anamorphoses, however, so the veracity of the camera was haunted by its proximity to techniques of conjuration and illusion. The magic lantern that developed alongside the camera obscura had the capacity to appropriate the setup of the latter and subvert its operation by infusing its interior with reflected and projected images using artificial light.

The visual exchange between Sayers and Gillray thus serves as a reminder that the authority of transparency claimed for optical devices and the images produced by means of them was not uniformly accepted; eighteenth-century audiences could express a considerable degree of scepticism about the artistic products of scientific mediation. Staging European technology in the service of Oriental magic, Hastings undermines the binaries of science and art, blurring the boundaries between reality and illusion, truth and artifice, by employing the apparatus of representation in order to conceal the historical relationships between the presenter and what is (re)presented. Tensions between the claim to reproduce the real and the mode of representation are neither synthesized nor presented in a strictly dialectical opposition but derive their force from a polyvalence or plurality of meaning that has been noted in other images of the period. In this sense, the contested nature of the images conjured by Hastings is indicative of a
change in the meaning of the camera and its mirror around 1800, when it lost its status as a guarantee of unmediated access to empirical reality and became instead ‘a metaphor for a dynamic enfoldment of opposites’, a site for problematizing questions of vision and representation rather than simply modelling them. Highlighting the close relationship between invention and invention, Gillray’s image anticipates the reinvention of the camera obscura as a figure of concealment and mystification.

Camera-Obscura reflects the nature of the instrument that it depicts, which prevents the observing subject from perceiving his or her part in the representation that it offers, and the paradoxical desire that one finds in contemporary writings for a mode of representation ‘that both reflects and constructs its objects’. It thus points to a tension between the world as an object of representation and the setting for an observing subject that would become the hallmark of the European experience of the Orient in the age of photography. While the radical innovation of photography precludes any simple teleological narrative of its origins, differences in the nature, scale and ease of representation that it offered should not obscure the fact that its reception was conditioned by earlier doubts and expectations regarding the reality claims of the image and the role of artistic agency in its production.

The material presented here suggests that the representation of geographically and temporally remote subjects amplified contemporary assertions and aporias regarding the documentary status of the image, which recourse to optical technologies sometimes attempted to bolster. In the years following the travels of Hodges and the Daniells in the subcontinent the process of capturing India was facilitated by new technologies that promised to satisfy a desire for accurate transcription that underpinned the documentary value of the image. In 1844, seventy years after Samuel Johnson wrote to Warren Hastings bemoaning the lack of information on India, the members of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland wrote in very similar terms to the then incumbent of the office of Governor General of the East India Company. This time, however, the request was more specific, with the emphasis firmly on prosthetic vision:

We take this opportunity also of appraising you that we are desirous of collecting a series, as complete as possible, of Delineations (accompanied by short explanations) of various objects of interest and instruction illustrative of the liberal and mechanic Arts in India, and of the phases character and condition of its various tribes and people: comprising architecture, implements, costumes, etc., for our own Library, frequent reference being made to it (at present with little advantage) for such sources of information. We should think it possible that moderate encouragement on your part would readily obtain an abundant supply of such materials from different individuals in the service of the Company.

Absolute accuracy being essentially necessary in the drawings, and the use of Dollond's Camera Lucida ensuring that indispensable object we shall transmit without delay to the Govt of each of the Presidencies three of these instruments.
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ENVISIONING INDIA AT THE TRIAL OF WARREN HASTINGS

Here, on the cusp of the photographic age, the latest in a long line of optical devices invests the representation of India with an authority essential to its ability to provide Johnson’s metropolitan successors with topics of inquiry. Five years earlier, just half a century after Gillray’s print was published, the daguerreotype had made its appearance, hailed as a ‘mirror with a memory’ whose ‘natural images’ were, according to a contemporary authority, to be distinguished ‘from the promiscuous outlines of artists’. Nevertheless, the problem of visual translation continued to be a topic of remark and the tendency of British artists to ‘Europeanize’ Indian features, a subject of lament well into the late nineteenth century.

Notes

Earlier versions of this essay were presented in a panel entitled ‘Looking for Lenses’ at the Annual Conference of the College Art Association, Philadelphia, 2002, and at the Hagop Kevorkian Center for Near Eastern Studies at New York University, March 2003. My sincere thanks are due to the anonymous reviewers for Art History for their generous insights and helpful comments on the first draft submitted.

1 H. Bhabha, The Location of Culture, London and New York, 1994, 51.
8 Kejariwal, Asiatic Society of Bengal, 35.

© ASSOCIATION OF ART HISTORIANS 2006
15 Musselwhite, 'Trial of Warren Hastings', 77.
16 Although I dwell here on the representation of India by British artists and scholars, it should be noted that a small number of Indian writers also sought to represent India to a British metropolitan audience during the same period: J.R.I. Cole, Invisible Occidentalism: Eighteenth-century Indo-Persian Constructions of the West, Iranian Studies, 25:3–4, 1992, 3–16; M.H. Fisher, Representations of India, the English East India Company, and Self by an Eighteenth-Century Indian Emigrant to Britain', Modern Asian Studies, 32:4, 1998, 891–911.
19 Musselwhite, 'Trial of Warren Hastings', 94.
22 C. Banerji and D. Donald, Gillray Observed: The Earliest Account of his Caricatures in London and Paris, Cambridge and New York, 1999, 3, 35. The popularity of Gillray's caricatures was such that they were often pirated and sold as originals by unscrupulous competitors.
24 Robinson, The Lantern Image, 10, nos 42 and 84.
28 The first inscription is erroneously given as 'finely imagined' in Mary George's magisterial catalogue. The tears recall contemporary accounts of the inchoumose response to the testimony of Burke and Sheridan at the trial: S. Sulieri, Rhetoric of English India, 54.
29 M. D. George, English Political Caricature to 1792, Oxford, 1959, 194. 'Weaxel' was among the pejorative employed by Burke for Hastings: V.K. Saxena, Introduction to Edmund Burke's Speeches on the Impeachment of Warren Hastings, volume 1, Delhi, 1987, introduction. For Polonius's speech, see note 120 below.
32 Anon., The History of the Trial Of Warren Hastings, 103.
34 Gillray rarely signed his work in his own name before 1788, often adopting the identity of his great rival Sayers for caricatures attacking Pitt, in whose employ Sayers was widely seen to be. Sayers was implacably hostile to Burke; English Caricature, 17; Robinson, Edmund Burke, 95, 105. Gillray originally defended Hastings, but changed course from 1787, when the widespread belief that Hastings had bribed the Queen alienated public opinion: Draper Hill, Mr. Gillray the Caricaturist; a Biography, London, 1965, 30.
35 Miniaturization was frequently noted as an effect of the camera obscura: H. Schwarz, 'An Eighteenth-Century English Poem on the Camera Obscura', in Van Deren Coke, ed., One
Hundred Years of Photographic History: Essays in Honor of Beaumont Newhall, Albuquerque, 1975, 132. See also S. Stewart, On Longing: Narratives of the Miniature, the Giganatic, the Souvenir, the Collection, Durham, 1993, 36–69.

Two days earlier, on 7 May 1788, the trial had heard evidence that an English officer had beheaded eighteen natives of Oudh: Anon., History of the Trial of Warren Hastings, 53.

Cambridge History of India, volume 5, British India, 1497–1858, Cambridge, 1929, 306; Mussenwhite, ‘Trial of Warren Hastings’, 87; Robinson, Edmund Burke, 105. Queen Charlotte’s observation serves as a reminder that the Begums charge was of considerable interest to the women of contemporary British high society, who attended in large numbers; accordingly, Burke and Sheridan harped on themes of gender and femininity: History of the Trial of Warren Hastings, 33n., 97.


George, Catalogue, nos. 7294, 7274–79, 7299.


Powles Tobin, Picturing Imperial Power, 117, 120, 136.


As Robinson notes in his discussion of Gillyar’s work, ‘even the smallest detail may contain a sly bit’: Edmund Burke, 107; Clayton, English Print, 245. The mountains and mice, for example, are cribbed from an earlier visual salvo between Sayers and Gillyar on the Begums charge, which took place in the week before publication of the images discussed here: George, Catalogue, nos 7309, 7312.

60 In the letter-press accompanying View of Ruins at Oud, no. 65 of the Select Views (1786), Hodges draws upon Dow's recently published translation of Frishtta, a sixteenth-century Indo-Persian historian.

61 Archer and Lightbrown, India Observed, 74. In 1788, when Gillray's Camera Obscura appeared, no less than fifteen British artists were documented as resident in India, while another fourteen had been resident in the preceding two decades: Sir William Foster, 'British Artists in India 1769–1820', The Nineteenth Volume of the Wellesley Society, 1930–31, 1–88. Unlike Hodges, these were mostly either soldier-artists or professional portraitists working for Anglo-Indian patrons: P. Rohatgi and P. Godrej, Under the Indian Sun: British Landscape Artists, Bombay, 1995; Fowkes Tobin, Picturing Imperial Power, 110–38. There is, however, some evidence that Johan Zoffany executed landscape scenes for Anglo-Indian patrons in the 1760s: Leppert, 'Music, domestic life, and cultural chauvinism', 99, figs 20–21. See also G.H.R. Tiltinton, The Artificial Empire: The Indian Landscapes of William Hodges, London, 2000, 60 ff.


64 India Office Library, 101, P/2/64 359–61.

65 Stuebe, 'William Hodges and Warren Hastings', 665; Foster, 'British Artists in India', 41.


70 M. Halley, 'James Gillray and the Language of Graphic Satire', in R. Godfrey, ed., James Gillray: The Art of Caricature, London and New Haven, 2001, 32–3. In arguing for a connection between Gillray's caricature and Hodges's images, I am at odds with Natasha Eaton, who noted in a recent innovative and important essay that the caricatures of the period 'never refer to Hodges's landscapery, despite the fact that many depicted sites associated with the charges against Hastings; Eaton, 'Hodges's Visual Genealogy', 40.


73 W. Hodges, Travels in India During the Years 1780, 1781, 1782, & 1783, London, 1793, 48–9.


75 Tiltinton, Artificial Empire, 2, 4, 87–8.

76 These included A Mosque at Chunar, and View of Aurangzeb's Mosque at Benares: Stuebe, 'William Hodges and Warren Hastings', 660, 644; Stuebe, Life and Works, 58, 204–209, 365; Tiltinton, Artificial Empire, 132, figs 37 and 47.


78 Wilkins, Bhogour-grein, 7–8. See also B.S. Cohn, Colonialism and its Forms of Knowledge, Princeton, 1996, 27.

79 Stuebe, 'William Hodges and Warren Hastings', 663; Cooper, 'Indian Architecture', 127; Guest, 'The Great Distinction', 40; Bonehill, 'This hapless adventurer', 12.

Hodges, Travels in India, 155-6. See also Quilley, ‘William Hodges, artist of empire’, 3-4.


83 C.F. Tiphaine de la Roche, Gita: An essay of what has passed, what is now passing, and, during the present century, what will pass in the world, London, 1760, 100.


87 W. Gilpin, Three Essays: On Picturesque Beauty; On Picturesque Travel; and On Sketching Landscape: to which is added a poem, On Landscape Painting, London, 1792, appendix, 19, 33.


89 Hardie and Clayton, ‘Thomas and William Daniell’, 15; Tillotson, ‘Indian Travels’, 394; Tillotson, Artifical Empire, 42. As early as 1793, Hodges noted that ‘some views of the city of Calcutta, published by Mr. Daniel (sic), are highly to be commended for their accuracy’: Travels in India, 16.


91 Cited in Archer, Early Views, 224.


95 Cooper, Indian Architecture’, 126-7.

96 G. Quilley, ‘William Hodges, artist of empire’, 1. See also P.J. Marshall, ‘Naming the Exotic’, 47, 53, 62; Tillotson, ‘Indian Picturesque’, 146-7; Dirks, ‘Guiltless Spoliations’, 217. The phenomenon represents a macrocosmic aspect of the domestication of Indian culture that is found in eighteenth-century Anglo-Indian homes, a process to which visual representation was central: Leppert, ‘Music, domestic life, and cultural chauvinism’, 94-5.

97 Sulier, Rhetoric of English India, 66.


99 One of the most elaborate apologias appears in the preface to M. Ritchie’s Illustrations of Indian Architecture from the Muhammadan Conquest Downwards, Calcutta, 1838: ‘Each drawing has first to be either increased, or reduced, to one scale in the rough; it is then correctly delineated in Indian ink outline on drawing paper. The exact size of the plates: these are again traced on to the transfer paper by the native, which work I generally have to correct; the drawings thus far advanced, are done with the chemical ink, some by myself, and others by the draftsmen whose work invariably requires further correction; under these circumstances, then, I trust that every allowance will be made for imperfections, and as “practice makes perfect”, it is to be hoped that the maxim will be verified in our case, and as far as it lies in our power, no pains will be spared.’


102 Anon., The Political Showman – at Home! Exhibiting his Cabinet of Curiosities and Creatures – All Alive!, London, 1821.


104 Cohn, Colonialism and its Forms of Knowledge, 4.

© ASSOCIATION OF ART HISTORIANS 2006
Cohn, Colonialism, and its forms of Knowledge, 32.

Halhed, Grammar, iii-iv: 'I have been astonished to find the similitude of Sanscrit words and those of Persian and Arabic, and even of Latin and Greek.'

Hodges, Travels in India, 76: Tiltston, 'Hodges and Indian Architecture', 51.

Hodges, Travels in India, 62-3. In her essay, Natasha Satin is also concerned with Hodges's role in 'translating' India ('Hodges’s visual genealogy'), 39, but focuses on the way in which Hodges’s work invokes Mughal paintings as 'strategic mediators'. Making the interesting and provocative suggestion that Hodges’s Indian Images reflect a 'hybrid aesthetic' that draws on both European landscape painting and Mughal court painting, Satin downplays the role of the picturesque in Hodges’s Indian images.

Tiltston, 'Hodges and Indian Architecture', 51; Bann, 'Antiquarianism, Visuality and the Exotic Monument', 79.

Sharpe, 'Violence of Light', 35. See also Tiltston, 'Indian Picturesque,'147; Suleri, Rhetoric of English India, 29.


Diköté, 'Guiltless Spoilations', 228.


Sharpe, 'Violence of Light', 41.


Sharpe, 'Violence of Light', 31, 34.

Cohn, Colonialism and its Forms of Knowledge, 23. In this regard, it should be noted that the reversion to a previous state orchestrated by means of the camera obscura does not include the Begums, who are transformed into mice. In this implicit accusation of Hastings's guilt there is the point about which a rupture in the representational order is articulated.

The speech (Hamlet, III.iii, 242-6) relates to the form of a passing cloud:

Hamlet: Methinks it is like a weasel
Polonius: It is back'd like a weasel
Hamlet: Or like a whale
Polonius: Very like a whale.

The quotation is acknowledged by the appearance of the word ‘Polonius’ beside the relevant text in Sayers’s Galante Show.


As Jay observes, the theories and practices defining the ‘scopic regime of modernity’ were characterized by a degree of heterogeneity often obscured by teleological narratives of photography’s origins: M. Jay, ‘Scopic Regimes of Modernity’, in H. Foster, ed., Vision and Visuality, Seattle, 1988, 3-4. See also Crazy, ‘Camera Obscura’, 246.


Batchen, Burning With Desire, 81, 84.


As early as the 1850s certain observers were pointing out the limitations of photography’s apparent verisimilitude: M. Jay, ‘Photo-unrealism: The contribution of the camera to the crisis of ocularcentrism’, in S. Melville and B. Reading, eds, Vision and Textuality, Durham, 1995, 347-50.

It has even been suggested that the increasing desire to stabilize and fix the fleeting images of the camera obscura that one sees expressed with increasing frequency in the late eighteenth century was directly related to the experience of new and alien landscapes: Batchen, ‘Desiring Production Itself’, 17, 20; Batchen, Burning with Desire, 94.

