



Our own religion in ancient Persia: Dadabhai Naoroji and Orientalist scholarship on Zoroastrianism

Dinyar Patel

To cite this article: Dinyar Patel (2017) Our own religion in ancient Persia: Dadabhai Naoroji and Orientalist scholarship on Zoroastrianism, *Global Intellectual History*, 2:3, 311-328, DOI: [10.1080/23801883.2017.1370238](https://doi.org/10.1080/23801883.2017.1370238)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/23801883.2017.1370238>



Published online: 05 Sep 2017.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 7



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Our own religion in ancient Persia: Dadabhai Naoroji and Orientalist scholarship on Zoroastrianism

Dinyar Patel

Department of History, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC, USA

ABSTRACT

Dadabhai Naoroji (1825–1917) is today best known as an economic thinker and an early leader in the Indian nationalist movement. Between the 1860s and 1890s, however, he was also recognized as a scholar of Zoroastrianism, sharing his ideas on Parsi religious reform and ‘authentic’ Zoroastrian belief and practice. Aside from corresponding with some of the leading European Orientalists of his day, Naoroji authored papers on Parsi religious belief and religious reform that were widely distributed and cited in Europe and North America. Over time, he began to function as an interlocutor between European Orientalists and the Parsis in India, disseminating European scholarship amongst his co-religionists while also facilitating scholars’ patronage of the wealthy Parsi community. Naoroji’s correspondence with the Oxford philologist Lawrence H. Mills, in particular, demonstrates this dynamic at work. These activities point to the oftentimes complex and collaborative relationships that existed between non-Europeans and European Orientalists, illustrating the degree to which European scholars could be dependent on the intellectual, financial, and logistical assistance of their objects of study.

KEYWORDS

Orientalism; Dadabhai Naoroji; Zoroastrianism; Zoroastrian studies; Parsis; religious reform

1. Introduction

In 1862, a young Dadabhai Naoroji joined a small circle of his fellow Parsis in Great Britain to purchase a plot in Brookwood Cemetery, about 30 miles to the southwest of London, to bury the community’s dead.¹ The first tombstones here were decisively simple affairs. Thin sheets of black slate inscribed in Gujarati and English, they identified the deceased as ‘Parsi’ or ‘Zoroastrian’. By the first years of the twentieth century, however, these tombstones were overshadowed by imposing mausoleums – many built to evoke the form and style of structures from ancient Persia – proclaiming a fundamentally different type of identity for those interred inside. The epitaph of one such tomb, built for a Bombay native who passed away in Bournemouth in 1899, begins as such:

I AM NOWROSJEE NASHIRWANJEE WADIA

OF THE ANCIENT ARYAN RACE OF PERSIA

Wadia's tomb is an apt symbol of the fundamental transformation in Parsi identity that occurred in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, one premised on the recovery of Parsis' ancient Iranian heritage. Other such examples abound: new fire temples in Bombay being built in Persepolis-inspired styles rather than Gujarati vernacular architecture; the widespread adoption of the winged *fravahar* or *farohar* as a symbol of the Zoroastrian faith; or, further into the early 1900s, the increased frequency of Parsi children receiving names such as Cyrus, Xerxes, and Darius.² These were all expressions of a Parsi search for what was considered 'authentic' or 'original' in their heritage and faith, one that paralleled similar movements amongst different religious groups in South Asia.

Parsi intellectuals, like their counterparts from the Hindu, Muslim, Jain, and Buddhist traditions in the subcontinent, drew upon and reacted to European Orientalist scholarship in order to reform both religious belief and community identity.³ In this sense, it is appropriate to return to the small Zoroastrian burial ground in Brookwood and to Dadabhai Naoroji. Naoroji (1825–1917) played an indirect role in enabling Parsis such as Nowrosjee Nashirwanjee Wadia to identify themselves as being members 'of the ancient Aryan race of Persia'. In the late nineteenth century, Naoroji was one of the principal Parsi interlocutors with European Orientalists and their scholarship on Zoroastrianism. He shepherded a brand of Parsi religious and social reform that drew upon the philological and historical scholarship of some of Europe's leading savants – individuals who were radically reinterpreting the Zoroastrian corpus and expounding upon ancient Persia's broader cultural legacies.

Naoroji is best known for his pioneering economic work on Indian poverty and his political leadership during the early Indian nationalist movement. He was, however, also recognized as a scholar of Zoroastrianism and, between the 1860s and 1890s, participated to an impressive degree in academic discussions on the religion that were taking place in India and the West. Naoroji was uniquely placed to contribute to such discussions. From the late 1840s, he was a leading figure in Parsi religious and social reform activities in Bombay, participating in fractious community debate over the authenticity of particular customs and beliefs. Between 1855 and 1907, however, he primarily resided in the United Kingdom. While living in Liverpool and, eventually, London, Naoroji channelled his involvement in Parsi reform through British academia and learned societies. A year before the establishment of the Parsi cemetery in Brookwood, for example, he delivered two landmark papers in Liverpool that clarified the salient differences between the reformist and orthodox camps in the Parsi community. Naoroji quickly became acquainted with some of the leading Orientalists of his day. He corresponded with Friedrich Max Müller, the celebrated Oxford-based philologist; Friedrich Spiegel, professor of Oriental languages at the University of Erlangen; Monier Monier-Williams, Boden Professor of Sanskrit at Oxford; James Darmesteter, professor of Persian language and literature at the Collège de France; and James Hope Moulton, the author of numerous works on ancient and modern Zoroastrianism, among others.⁴

Naoroji did much more than simply communicate with the leading scholars of the late Victorian era. He actively promoted the dissemination of Orientalist scholarship. In 1892, for example, he co-founded with Müller a society for publishing such scholarly work, the rather grandly named 'New Association for the Study and Propagation of European and Eastern Literatures'.⁵ The society, unfortunately, appears to have quickly become moribund, but Naoroji persisted in his engagement with academic endeavours. Over time,

he began to occupy a unique position: that of an interlocutor between Orientalists in Europe and the Parsi community in India. Aside from promoting contact between western academics and an emerging band of Parsi scholars in Bombay – he was in regular correspondence with figures such as Khurshedji Rustamji (K.R.) Cama, Sheriarji Dadabhai Bharucha, and Jivanji Jamshedji Modi – Naoroji helped facilitate Orientalists' patronage of the Parsis, well-recognized in European universities for their wealth and influence. Correspondence with the Oxford scholar Lawrence H. Mills, in particular, provides a fascinating glimpse into this process. Moreover, as Naoroji's links in the academic community broadened and deepened, he became internationally recognized as a leading authority on contemporary Zoroastrianism and the Parsi community, and was actively sought out as a source of information across Europe and the United States.

These activities allow us to reconstruct a hitherto unwritten chapter in Naoroji's life and career, thus demonstrating that the 'Grand Old Man of India' was much more than just an economic thinker and political figure. In existing scholarship on Parsi religious and social reform, Naoroji makes a brief appearance and then entirely disappears from the scene in 1855, the year that he left Bombay for Liverpool. Naoroji's voluminous private correspondence, in particular, indicates that he played a far longer and more complex role, often-times in tandem with his political work.

Additionally, Naoroji's engagement with European scholars speaks to a wider body of literature that has emerged in response to the ideas contained in Edward Said's *Orientalism*. As critics of Said have pointed out, Orientalist scholarship did not emerge in isolation in the libraries, lecture halls, and salons of Europe. It is important to remember that such scholarship oftentimes resulted from significant interaction and intellectual exchange with non-Europeans. Andrew Nicholson, for example, suggests that 'real contact did at times take place between the Orientalists and their objects of study', and that 'elites in Asian societies were often complicit in creating and sustaining Orientalist ideas'.⁶ Dadabhai Naoroji's scholarly activities – and the fiercely argumentative nature of debates over Parsi reform in Bombay – point to a much more collaborative dynamic at work. Indeed, they demonstrate the extent to which European scholars could be dependent upon the ideas, literature, and patronage they received from their objects of study.

2. In defence of reform: 'The Manners and Customs of the Parsees' and 'The Parsee Religion'

Parsi history has, to a very large degree, been shaped by a seemingly endless procession of internal divisions and quarrels. Since at least the sixteenth century, the community has been wracked by acrimonious disputes over priestly authority and community governance, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, religious ritual and calendrical matters, and, finally, questions of religious and social reform. It would be no exaggeration to state that infighting has served as a principal historical motor for the community. These disputes, furthermore, stimulated Parsi interaction with European scholars and Orientalist scholarship by the nineteenth century. They also propelled the careers of some of the community's most significant leaders.

Dadabhai Naoroji, born in Bombay in 1825, grew up in the shadow of Scottish missionary John Wilson's (1804–1875) conversion of two Parsi boys to Christianity in Bombay in 1839.⁷ Parsi outrage over the conversions had a direct impact on Naoroji's life. Around

1845, Erskine Perry, Chief Justice of the Bombay Supreme Court – and someone who had been impressed by Naoroji's academic performance at Bombay's Elphinstone College – proposed sending him to London to qualify for the bar. Community elders, however, feared a sly attempt to save the soul of yet another impressionable youth and rejected Perry's offer.⁸ The conversions also helped shape the contours of an emerging Parsi movement for religious and social reform, triggering fractious intra-community debate over how best to respond to polemics against Zoroastrianism offered by Wilson and other missionaries. Naoroji, alongside one of his instructors from Elphinstone, Navrozji Fardunji (1817–1885), played a leading role in this debate, challenging many of the shibboleths of Parsi orthodoxy and thereby helping 'Protestantize' Zoroastrian belief and practice. Their activities took place within the broader stream of the Young Bombay movement in the late 1840s and 1850s, where Elphinstone graduates championed a wide-ranging programme of religious, social, and eventually political reform that cut across community boundaries.⁹

In 1851, Navrozji and Naoroji – serving as president and secretary, respectively – organized the first meeting of the Rahnumae Mazdayasnan Sabha (Society of the Guides of the Mazdayasnan Path). The Sabha quickly evolved into the primary forum for Parsi religious reform, countering criticism offered by Wilson and other missionaries that Zoroastrianism was a dualistic, nature-worshipping, obsessively ritualistic faith. Instead, the Sabha argued that Zoroastrian belief was simple and rational but that it had, through the centuries, been muddled by 'foreign' accretions. Reform-minded Parsis, Naoroji and Navrozji held, now had a responsibility to face down orthodox opposition and restore the faith to its supposedly simple and pure original form.¹⁰ A little later in 1851, student and teacher joined hands once more to help inaugurate the *Rast Gofar* (*Truth Teller*), a Gujarati-language newspaper that supported a broad programme of religious and social reform, including female education. As noted by a later commentator, the *Rast* became 'the *bête noir* of priests and reactionaries', dealing the orthodox Zoroastrian priesthood 'a blow from which it has never recovered'.¹¹

Dadabhai Naoroji was all of 26 years old when he helped found the Rahnumae Mazdayasnan Sabha and the *Rast Gofar*. He had little opportunity to witness their growing success. In the middle of 1855, Naoroji sailed for Southampton in order to help set up the first Indian commercial firm in Great Britain, Cama and Company. Joining Naoroji in this endeavour were K.R. Cama (1831–1909), a colleague at the *Rast Gofar* and Rahnumae Mazdayasnan Sabha, and Mancherji Hormasji Cama, erstwhile founder of the Rahe Rastnumae Zarathushtrian Sabha, a short-lived orthodox body meant to counter the activities of Parsi reformists (thus illustrating how Parsis could put aside their sharp ideological differences for the sake of profit). Shuttling between Liverpool and London in the late 1850s, Naoroji forged his first personal links with European Orientalists. In 1856, he joined the faculty of the University College in London as a professor of Gujarati. Here, he met Theodor Goldstücker, professor of Sanskrit; he also worked alongside Friedrich Max Müller to test the language abilities of Indian civil service candidates.¹² Once K.R. Cama abandoned his commercial pursuits in 1859, choosing instead to pursue Zoroastrian studies in Paris and Erlangen, Naoroji most likely widened his circle of contacts to include Cama's new professors, Julius Oppert, Julius von Mohl, and Friedrich Spiegel.¹³

It was in Liverpool that Naoroji decided to deliver two talks on Zoroastrianism in 1861, focusing on the reformist activities that he had helped spearhead in Bombay and the

resultant divisions within the Parsi community. By this time, Naoroji had already become a fixture in English institutions and societies such as the Liverpool Athenaeum, the Royal Asiatic Society, and the London Ethnological Society. His talks, furthermore, came at a time of growing interest in the Parsis and Zoroastrianism amongst educated Britons. By 1858, such interest had already convinced the young Dosabhai Framji Karaka – a fellow Young Bombay reformer and contributor to the *Rast Goftar* – to publish his English-language work, *The Parsees: Their History, Manners, Customs and Religion*, designed specifically to ‘make the English public acquainted with ... the Parsees, who, though unimportant in point of numbers, have, by their commercial habits, formed an important link between the English in India and the native inhabitants’.¹⁴ This interest must have been especially high in Liverpool, Britain’s premier port of entry for raw Indian cotton, a commodity over which Parsis in Bombay and Gujarat exercised significant commercial control.

Naoroji read his first paper, ‘The Manners and Customs of the Parsees’, before the Liverpool Philomathic Society on 13 March 1861 and, five days later, presented ‘The Parsee Religion’ to members of the Liverpool Literary and Philosophical Society. In both papers, Naoroji strove to compare contemporary religious belief with what he deemed to be authentic Zoroastrianism; i.e. the faith as represented in the holy texts. He devised his own methods in order to accomplish this task. Naoroji quoted extensively from a Gujarati translation of the principal Zoroastrian liturgical text, the Yasna¹⁵ – which he subsequently rendered into English – in order to identify what he argued to be the essential tenets of the creed. Missionary polemics were, evidently, still very much on his mind. Naoroji found enough evidence to specifically refute some of John Wilson’s most stinging claims against the Parsis, such as allegations that they were polygamists and nature-worshippers. Zoroastrians, Naoroji maintained, were strict monotheists: they believed in ‘only one God, the creator of all’.¹⁶ They also believed in ‘angels’ who acted as ‘the superintending spirits of the various parts of creation’. While Zoroastrians considered these parts of creation to be holy, they did not worship nature per se: Naoroji declared that there was ‘no text in which any lifeless material object without intelligence or spirituality is invoked for assistance or benefit’. A Zoroastrian was, therefore, ‘no idolator, or worshipper of matter’, and instead directed his or her prayers to the ‘intelligent spirits or angels’ associated with a specific element, such as fire or water. Consequently, Zoroastrians could not be labelled as fire worshippers. He offered a creative explanation for this common misnomer. Fire, as opposed to the sun or the sea, was the only venerable element that could be brought within the confines of a temple. Naturally, Zoroastrian temples became sanctuaries of fire exclusively, and ‘hence has arisen the mistake of the Parsees as being regarded as “Fire Worshippers”’.¹⁷

Perhaps the most intriguing element of Naoroji’s paper on ‘The Parsee Religion’ is an excerpted Zoroastrian catechism,¹⁸ translated by Naoroji from its original Gujarati into English. In the Zoroastrian tradition, priests commonly employed catechisms as a form of polemical literature. This catechism, Naoroji declared, provided an accurate picture of contemporary belief amongst orthodox Parsis, and thus made a fitting contrast to his excerpts from the Yasna. Naoroji gave few details on the catechism’s origins, remarking that it was produced at least a quarter century beforehand, perhaps in response to Christian missionary offensives.¹⁹ Composed well before the establishment of the Rahnumae Mazdayasnan Sabha or the publication of the *Rast Goftar*, the catechism provided a

unique look at religious belief prior to the heyday of the reform movement. In Naoroji's English translation, at least, the catechism had a markedly Islamic flavour: it exhorted Zoroastrians 'to know God as one; to know the prophet, the exalted Zurthost [*sic*], as his true prophet' while remarking that venerable elements such as the sun, fire, and water should be considered 'our "kibleh"' [*sic*]. Yet the contents of the catechism did not differ greatly from the main religious tenets Naoroji identified from the Yasna. Zoroastrians, it remarked, believed in only one God, the creator of all.²⁰

By contrasting excerpts from the catechism and the Yasna, and thereby revealing extensive similarities, Naoroji identified a common – and 'authentic' – core set of beliefs shared by all Zoroastrians. Indeed, Naoroji concluded his paper on 'The Parsee Religion' by remarking on a degree of continuity in Zoroastrian belief: in spite of being a 'handful of persecuted exiles living in a foreign land, surrounded for 1200 years by idolatry, and persecuted at times by religious fanaticism', the Parsis had 'always recoiled from degenerating to the worship of idols, and have tenaciously clung to the idea that they were worshippers of the invisible Hormuzd'.²¹ Naoroji and his fellow Parsi reformers clearly had no issue with what they regarded as established Zoroastrian doctrine. Rather, it was on social and ritual practice that Parsi reformers wished to leave their mark.

In both papers, Naoroji underscored the immense social change that had convulsed the Parsi community for the past two decades, splitting it into opposing liberal and orthodox camps. 'There is at present', Naoroji elaborated on these factions, 'nearly as great a difference between one portion of them and another as there was between Englishmen and Parsees twenty years ago'. Using dining habits as an example, he remarked that while one household might be comfortable sitting at tables and using English silverware, a neighbouring family might very well hold on to the traditional practice of squatting on a mat and employing fingers to dine off one common tray. Social and ritual practice varied wildly amongst individuals within the same socioeconomic strata, occupational sector, and geographic location. The one factor, Naoroji declared, that had unleashed this 'revolution' was 'English education and example', such as the instruction he had received at Bombay's Elphinstone College.²²

As the complete antithesis to the emerging class of English-educated reformers, Naoroji singled out the Zoroastrian priesthood. His criticism of the clergy was unswerving and devastating. Instead of teaching the true doctrines and duties of Zoroastrianism, priests were 'generally the most bigoted and superstitious' and exerted a particularly 'injurious influence' over women. Naoroji blamed the clergy for the historical decay of the religion: the 'priesthood acting upon ignorance' resulted in the introduction of new ceremonies and beliefs as well as texts that 'the Parsee has no reason to be thankful for'. Completing the contrast with the reformists, he identified a lack of proper education as the reason behind the clergy's current degraded state. Naoroji condemned priests as being 'entirely uneducated', simply memorizing prayers by rote without understanding their meaning. The dozen or so priests who claimed to actually understand the Zend Avesta had, in reality, no real knowledge of its languages 'either philologically or grammatically'. 'I doubt much whether any one of them has a clear notion of what grammar is', he declared, 'and as to a liberal education, they never had it, and do not, in consequence, understand the necessity of it'.²³

Due to the clergy's utter dereliction of its duties, the Parsi laity was starved for accurate religious knowledge and reduced to learning about actual Zoroastrian doctrine via 'casual

conversation'.²⁴ With little surprise, therefore, the community was – in Naoroji's mind – a fortress of unthinking orthodoxy, tethered to religious and social practices by 'strong prejudices and deep rooted beliefs'.²⁵ Two facets of orthodox practice were particularly irksome to Naoroji's reformist sensibilities: excessive ritual and supposedly 'Hindu' ceremonies and influences. In criticizing these practices, Naoroji sought the authority of the Zoroastrian religious texts – or, at least, what he believed these texts to state. The daily routine of an orthodox Zoroastrian, for example, which required tedious and constant repetition of prayers before and after functions such as bathing, eating, and defaecation,²⁶ was 'unnecessary and not enjoined' by the scriptures. Similarly, he maintained, there was 'no authority whatsoever in the original books of Zurthosht' for the use of *nirang*, or consecrated bull's urine, as a purificatory substance. This 'dirty practice' was, instead, a later introduction and deserved to be abolished. In his search for what he believed to be authentic and correct, Naoroji was willing to question some of the most essential elements of Zoroastrian practice, refusing to rule out the possibility that one could still be 'a true Zurthoshtee' without wearing the emblems of the faith, the *sudreh* or under-vest and the girdle-like *kusti*.²⁷

Concluding his 'The Manners and Customs of the Parsees', Naoroji expressed his desire to not tinge descriptions of orthodox practice with his own opinions. Although delivered in his characteristically modest style, Naoroji nevertheless did make a forceful case for reform in his two papers by first setting out the main doctrinal tenets of Zoroastrianism and then identifying orthodox institutions and sensibilities as barriers towards achieving 'authentic' practice. The Rahnumae Mazdayasnan Sabha, consequently, had a clear and vital role to play in Parsi society: to 'bring the Parsees to their old good and simple ways'. For Naoroji, this meant a drastic simplification of marriage and funerary ceremonies, as well as the reduction or outright abolition of other supposedly inauthentic customs and rituals. Naoroji, furthermore, specifically identified social reform as the best method towards achieving this religious reform. In particular, Naoroji held out hope that female education – a cornerstone of Young Bombay's reformist programme – would 'sweep away all superstitious and unsocial customs among the Parsees'. There was no pulpit in Zoroastrianism, he noted, nor did the priesthood aspire to any such position. By tying together social and religious reform, however, Naoroji placed himself and his fellow educated and reformist Parsis on a clear path towards constructing and then occupying a pulpit, with all the responsibilities of community leadership that it involved.²⁸

Naoroji's two Liverpool papers did much more than simply introduce British audiences to the most recent set of internal divisions within the Parsi community. As some of the few English-language sources on Zoroastrianism composed by an actual follower of the faith, the talks gained wide popularity after they were published as pamphlets and distributed across Europe, North America, and India. The talks were quoted extensively and cited as recommended reading on Zoroastrianism in various books, magazines, and encyclopaedias – oftentimes alongside the works of established Orientalists such as Martin Haug, Friedrich Spiegel, James Darmesteter, and Charles-Joseph Harlez.²⁹ Edward Burnett Tylor, a founding figure in the academic field of social anthropology, relied upon Naoroji's descriptions of the purificatory *nirang* ritual in his best-known work, *Primitive Culture*.³⁰ Universalists and Theosophists commented on the Zoroastrian catechism that Naoroji had rendered into English. Helena Blavatsky, significantly, included an excerpt in her first major work, *Isis Unveiled*.³¹

However, it was Max Müller, the young Oxford don, who penned the most thoughtful response to Naoroji's ideas. In a review of his papers that was published in August 1862, Müller, who also seemed particularly intrigued by the catechism, praised Naoroji's relatively objective account of orthodox practice. While correcting some of Naoroji's notions on what constituted 'authentic' Zoroastrian ritual, Müller largely concurred with the reformists' belief in the inherent doctrinal simplicity of the faith.³² He agreed with Naoroji about the general ignorance of the Zoroastrian priesthood and laity. Müller asserted that social and religious reform would never catch on without the liberals 'first entering on a critical study of the Zend-Avesta', in effect encouraging the development of Parsi philological and religious scholarship. Finally, in a move no doubt appreciated by Naoroji and his fellow reformists, Müller cautioned against the attempts by Wilson and other missionaries to proselytize amongst the Parsis. Zoroastrianism's tenets, he argued, 'rest on a foundation which ought never to be touched – a faith in one God, the Creator, the Ruler, and the Judge of the world'.³³ In this sense, Naoroji's talks helped pull off an important coup for the Parsi community: they recruited the support of a well-known European scholar against their missionary opponents.

3. Naoroji as an interlocutor between the Parsi community and European scholars

Five years after the Liverpool talks, Naoroji approached the lectern once again to speak to a British audience about Zoroastrianism. The circumstances surrounding this talk were starkly different: in February 1866, John Crawfurd, president of the London Ethnological Society, had delivered a paper 'On the Physical and Mental Characteristics of the European and Asiatic Races of Man', a racist screed that pronounced most Asians to be without culture, civilization, significant literary output, or any sense of morality. Deeply perturbed by the speech, Naoroji delivered a response on 27 March, which relied heavily on his knowledge of Zoroastrianism and the ancient Iranian tradition to counter Crawfurd's most base and prejudiced allegations. He assembled an impressive battery of sources, revealing his extensive knowledge of the Zoroastrian faith and his engagement with contemporary scholarship. Most strikingly, Naoroji drew upon personal correspondence with many European scholars of ancient India and Iran. Aside from reaching out to Theodor Goldstücker, his colleague at University College, he corresponded with Julius von Mohl to craft arguments about the literary worth of the *Shahnameh* and exchanged letters with Friedrich Spiegel in order to counter Crawfurd's blanket allegations of rampant polygamy in Asian civilizations.³⁴

By the time of this 1866 talk, Naoroji was beginning to occupy a peculiar role with relation to the Parsi reform movement. Based in London, where his burgeoning political responsibilities constrained his abilities to directly take part in activities in Bombay, he nevertheless urged on particular reforms and maintained steady lines of communication with reformist-oriented Parsi scholars and authors. In 1877, for example, Naoroji encouraged K.R. Cama to develop a modified *geh sarna* – funerary prayers in Gujarati meant to give help and comfort to the soul of the departed – which coincided with Naoroji's interest in simplifying funerary customs. He intended to introduce a new *geh sarna* in the tiny Parsi community in London, holding out hope that 'it might find its way into Bombay also after the example set here'.³⁵ Similarly, Naoroji urged Sheriarji Dadabhoy Bharucha,

a priestly member of the Rahnumae Mazdayasnan Sabha, to craft a Gujarati funerary service 'based upon the pure Zoroaster's words'.³⁶ Parsi scholars and authors also approached Naoroji for patronage: N.B. Gazder of Bombay, for example, asked Naoroji for help in editing and then distributing his sister's recent English translation of Delphine Menant's *Histoire des Parsees*, while Dhunjibhoy Jamsetjee Contractor of Ahmedabad forwarded his book on *Ancient Iranian and Zoroastrian Morals*, soliciting Naoroji's endorsement for having the work introduced as a textbook in Parsi schools.³⁷

Aside from regular correspondence with Parsi scholars and authors, Naoroji informed and influenced Parsi intellectual currents in another way. By the 1880s, he had become a vitally important interlocutor between European Orientalists and the community, not only assisting in the diffusion of western scholarship in India but also facilitating Orientalists' patronage of the Parsis. Some of these interactions were relatively straightforward. For example, when James Darmesteter, taking leave from his duties at the École des Hautes Études in Paris to visit London, required assistance in reading Gujarati documents, he sought out Naoroji's help in finding a Parsi tutor.³⁸ Other Orientalists had bigger favours in mind. In July 1892, in the wake of Naoroji's election to Parliament, Max Müller wrote a letter of congratulation and slipped in a request for help: could he encourage Parsis in Bombay to elect him as that city's representative for the managing committee of London's new Imperial Institute?³⁹ Julius Eggeling, who had met Naoroji decades beforehand through their mutual friend Theodor Goldstücker, sought to leverage the new MP's powers in Westminster. Writing during Naoroji's maiden year in the House of Commons, Eggeling complained of the poor treatment he was receiving as the chair of Sanskrit at the University of Edinburgh, especially in comparison to the chair of Hebrew, and asked Naoroji, 'as the only Indian member of Parliament', to bring the issue before that legislative body.⁴⁰

Sadly, very little survives of Naoroji's correspondence with prominent European Orientalists. But one exception – correspondence with the Avestan and Pahlavi philologist Lawrence H. Mills (1837–1918) – neatly illustrates how such academics interacted with Parsis and sought their patronage on a variety of fronts. Mills, an American by birth, relocated to Oxford in 1886 in order to undertake the 31st volume of the *Sacred Books of the East* series (edited by Max Müller), which involved the formidable task of translating the Zend Avesta. He quickly developed important and mutually beneficial ties with Parsi scholars in India: Mills, for example, facilitated Dastur Jamaspji Minocherji Jamaspasa's donation of an important Pahlavi translation of the Yasna, dating from 1323 CE, to the Bodleian Library. In return, Mills convinced Oxford to confer an honorary Doctor of Civil Law (DCL) degree on Jamaspasa and organized a subscription for a gown as well as a portrait of the priest to be hung in the university's Indian Institute.⁴¹

Mills first reached out to Naoroji in 1888, seeking his assistance. Completing his volume of the *Sacred Books*, Mills complained, had 'cost me a good deal of money, and I wish to reimburse myself for the purpose of continuing my labours'. Consequently, he requested Naoroji to furnish him with a list of wealthy Bombay Parsis who might purchase copies. Naoroji sent Mills the desired list, instructed him to write to associations such as the Rahnumae Mazdayasnan Sabha for further assistance, and pledged to buy one copy of the volume. From subsequent correspondence, we learn that many of the Bombay Parsis on the list also ended up purchasing copies and that the Bombay Parsee Punchayet lent financial support, as well. Naoroji further offered to send Mills a series of lectures in

Gujarati that a 'Parsi student of Zend' had recently delivered in Bombay, contributing to the exchange of scholarship between India and Europe.⁴²

Naoroji's warm response, in a sense, opened the floodgates. Over the next several years, Mills peppered Naoroji with numerous other requests, mostly revolving around the issues of finances and publicity. For example, just days before Naoroji sailed to Bombay in order to preside at the December 1893 Indian National Congress session in Lahore, Mills dispatched a note asking his correspondent to advertise the *Sacred Works* volume via a letter to *The Times* of London. A letter from Naoroji that was datelined Bombay, Mills reasoned, would have 'even more effect'. A few years later, Mills asked Naoroji to write another letter to *The Times* mentioning a recently completed Gujarati translation of one of his articles.⁴³ In such correspondence, the Orientalist was clearly attempting to leverage Naoroji's fame not only as a preeminent Indian political leader, but also as a well-known figure within scholarly circles.

By June of 1897, Mills's attention had turned towards endowing a prospective professorship for himself at Oxford. After asking if the Zoroastrian Fund – the body, led by Naoroji, which managed the affairs of the minuscule London Parsi community – could open its coffers, he made a much more direct appeal: 'Perhaps some of you rich ones may unite to endow the professorship annually with something like a fair sum'. Mills also indicated that he had written to Mancherji M. Bhownagree, the Parsi who served as the Conservative MP for Bethnal Green, about funding ideas, something that further underlined the Orientalist's eagerness to engage with the community. Then, in late July, Mills learned about the recent demise in Bombay of Bai Motlibai Wadia, a venerable philanthropist and a matriarch of the famous Wadia shipbuilding family. Not wasting a moment, Mills dashed off a letter to Naoroji asking him to write to Wadia's heir and suggest that he endow the professorship with some of his deceased mother's fortunes. When Naoroji expressed his reservations, Mills spoke ebulliently about the prestige the Wadia family would earn from such a donation. 'I would most surely see that [prime minister] Lord Salisbury & the Queen knew about it', he promised, noting that Salisbury – who in 1888 had derisively labelled Naoroji as a 'black man' and was, therefore, unlikely to be Naoroji's favourite politician – had offered warm praise for the *Sacred Books* volume. Mills dangled further incentives. If the Parsis endowed the chair, he pledged to take on Parsi students for free at Oxford.⁴⁴

Through the course of his correspondence with Naoroji, Mills proved himself to be a skilful self-promoter. 'There is no harder working scholar living & you know that my work has had success', he declared in his first letter to Naoroji concerning a proposed Wadia professorship, driving home the point by dismissing his Regius professor colleagues for teaching 'commonplace subjects; etc, etc'.⁴⁵ But it would be wrong to view Mills's relationship with Naoroji as being based solely on patronage. The professor and politician engaged in a variety of conversations that further drew together the Parsi community and western scholarship. For example, sometime in 1890, while Naoroji was engaged in fierce infighting over his nomination to be the Liberal parliamentary candidate for Central Finsbury, he became, somewhat bizarrely, perturbed by the ancient Zoroastrian practice of *khwedodeh* or next-of-kin marriages (he appears to have been troubled by M. Zénaïde A. Ragozin's description of the practice in his recent work on Media). Naoroji wrote to Sheriarji Dadabhai Bharucha in Bombay for his opinion but it was Mills who seemed to set his mind at ease: Mills affirmed that next-of-kin marriages 'never were the rule' in

ancient Iran. Mills, for his part, also shared with Naoroji some of his professional difficulties working with the Parsis, especially his encounters with Parsi factionalism. While 'doing what I could for the honour of the whole Parsee community', he confessed, 'I have unfortunately aroused the jealousy of one against the other'. Mills's assistance in getting the DCL for Dastur Jamaspji Minocherji Jamaspasa, he explained, had chilled his relations with another priest, Darab Dastur Peshotan Sanjana. Aside from this episode, the Oxford don expressed feelings of profuse warmth and friendship towards the Parsi community. In 1888, he even asked Naoroji whether there were enough Parsis in London to merit a class on ancient Zoroastrian literature ('I can make a first class Zoroastrian student of any one, making all the steps easy & agreeable, and that simply because I know the whole matter', he reminded his correspondent in his usual self-confident style).⁴⁶

Mills's correspondence demonstrates that the relationships between European Orientalists and non-European interlocutors such as Naoroji could be quite complex. These relationships oftentimes involved much more than just scholarly exchange. While the proposed Wadia professorship never came to fruition, Parsi assistance – financial, logistical, and intellectual – played a critical role in allowing Mills to continue with his academic activities until he finally secured a permanent position at Oxford in 1898. Perhaps because of this fact, the Oxford scholar's relations with his Parsi interlocutors were remarkably deferential and cordial in nature. They bore no colonial or Saidian imprint. Rather, Mills was eager to share and discuss scholarship with Naoroji, participate in Parsi scholarly debates, and facilitate Gujarati translations of his works. In early 1895, for example, he sent Naoroji a copy of his recent article, titled 'Our Own Religion in Ancient Persia', and asked Naoroji for his thoughts and a possible review. In later reprints of the article, eventually incorporated into a much larger book of the same title, the professor acknowledged the support that he received from Parsi institutions and translators and, recognizing that much of his readership would be Parsi, pointed to differences in earlier Gujarati renditions.⁴⁷ Non-Europeans, therefore, featured at every stage of his scholarship: its facilitation, production, dissemination, and reception. For its active support and encouragement, Mills was visibly grateful to the Parsi community. 'In this cynical world', he noted in one of his last letters to Naoroji, 'it is truly gratifying to meet with such sympathetic treatment'.⁴⁸

4. Conclusion

In 1888, Lawrence H. Mills and Dadabhai Naoroji were invited to deliver talks on Zoroastrianism at the South Place Institute, a prominent Universalist association in London. Along with essays from a variety of religious scholars, thinkers, and theologians – such as Annie Besant, G.W. Leitner, the nonconformist leader John Clifford, and the Sinologist James Legge – their papers were eventually incorporated into the Institute's immensely popular volume on comparative religion, *Religious Systems of the World*. Naoroji's paper, simply titled 'The Parsi Religion', marked his final public intervention into scholarly discussion of Zoroastrianism. It will therefore be an appropriate point from which to consider the evolution of his views and the circulation of his ideas.

Naoroji's paper responded to over two decades of scholarship that fundamentally transformed both Zoroastrian studies and popular Parsi conceptions of their religion. This

meant, primarily, consideration of the work of Martin Haug, the German Orientalist who translated the Gathas, a portion of the Avesta, and argued that the Gathas alone were authored by Zarathushtra. Echoing Haug, Naoroji now considered Zarathushtra himself to have been a religious reformer. 'Zarthusht [*sic*] made a complete revolution', he informed his audience; the prophet swept away the inauthentic rituals and beliefs of his own day. Accepting Haug's premise about the Gathas, Naoroji explained that certain other Zoroastrian texts, once considered canonical, were in fact only 'later compilations by priests'. Parsi scholars affiliated with the Rahnumae Mazdayasnan Sabha, Naoroji continued, were actively pursuing their studies of the Zoroastrian canon and advocating new conceptions of the religion, dismissing polytheistic elements and ritual that had, in fact, been 'rehabilitated' by the priesthood after the era of Zarathushtra.⁴⁹ Naoroji, in other words, utilized the latest Orientalist scholarship on Zoroastrianism to further bolster the reformist cause in the Parsi community. Mention of the Rahnumae Mazdayasnan Sabha reminds us that a broader circle of Parsis were also active participants in the creation of Orientalist scholarship that so fundamentally changed Parsi identity and religious belief in the late nineteenth century.

The South Place Institute talk, and its publication in *Religious Systems of the World*, secured Naoroji's position as an authoritative, internationally recognized commentator on Zoroastrianism and Parsi affairs. From Naoroji's correspondence, we learn that a contact in Switzerland presented the talk in French before Geneva's Société des Sciences Théologiques and then, by popular request, printed the French translation.⁵⁰ In 1892, John Henry Barrows, the chairman of the first World's Parliament of Religions – scheduled to be held in Chicago the following year in concurrence with the World's Columbian Exposition – wrote to Naoroji 'at the suggestion of an American scholar' and requested his attendance. Naoroji's reply, indicating that he was unlikely to attend as he was waging a fiercely contested campaign for the British House of Commons, did not faze Barrows, who sent two further letters beseeching him to travel to Chicago. 'There is a strong desire on the part of many in America that you should attend the Parliament of Religions', Barrows wrote shortly after Naoroji's election as the Liberal MP for Central Finsbury. 'Your name is widely known in America and your presence would be cordially welcomed. Would it not be possible, since Parliament will not then be in session, for you to be present?' While Naoroji indicated his definite inability to participate in the Congress, Barrows still convinced him to serve on the Congress' advisory council.⁵¹ If it were not for his prior commitments, Naoroji could have shared the stage in Chicago with Swami Vivekananda.

Thus, while Naoroji gained renown in the 1890s as the first Indian member of the British Parliament, he continued to be recognized as a scholar of repute and perhaps the most preeminent Parsi spokesman on his religion and community. There were, in fact, many important links between these two worlds that Naoroji inhabited, that of Orientalist scholarship and Indian nationalism. His scholarly networks often buttressed his political work, and vice-versa. Lawrence H. Mills, for example, first contacted Naoroji through their mutual friend, Thorold Rogers. Rogers, who served as the Drummond Professor of Political Economy at Oxford, had also been a Liberal MP. In this capacity, he supported Naoroji's failed campaign for Parliament as a Liberal candidate in 1886. Naoroji, in turn, regularly cited Rogers's work on poverty in the United Kingdom while campaigning.⁵² Max Müller was another supporter, sharing many of Naoroji's views about the

necessity of significant Indian political reforms. Shortly after Naoroji's election to Parliament in 1892, Müller confided that 'though we do not quite agree about Ireland, we do agree about India'. Late in the following year, Naoroji, along with the social reformer Behramji M. Malabari and the *gaikwad* of Baroda, submitted a special address to thank the Oxford don for his advocacy of Indian political affairs.⁵³ Finally, there was George Birdwood, who was both an India Office bureaucrat and a well-known scholar of Indian art. The topics of his correspondence with Naoroji, consequently, varied wildly, ranging from imperial high policy to the possible Persian ancestry of a seventh-century English saint. A staunch Conservative, Birdwood nevertheless endorsed Naoroji's parliamentary campaigns and offered, in 1897, to preside at the next meeting of the Indian National Congress.⁵⁴ Naoroji, in turn, recruited Birdwood to advise on the design of Nowrosjee Nashirwanjee Wadia's elaborate tomb at the Parsi cemetery in Brookwood, and had Birdwood deliver an address on the history of Zoroastrianism at the tomb's dedication ceremony.⁵⁵

The link between imperial politics and Orientalism is, of course, well-tread ground. However, Naoroji's experience demonstrates that the power dynamics involved were not always like that described by Said: 'shot through with doctrines of European superiority, various kinds of racism, imperialism, and the like' as well as the 'ineradicable distinction between Western superiority and Oriental inferiority'.⁵⁶ Non-Europeans such as Naoroji could rely upon certain scholars for assistance in activities that included radical criticism of imperial policy. Furthermore, it was not impossible for non-Europeans to utilize the link between imperial politics and Orientalism for their own distinct purposes. Naoroji, for example, was one of several Bombay Parsis who, beginning in the 1850s, laboured to ameliorate the conditions of the Zoroastrian minority in Iran, which had been ground down by centuries of poverty and oppression. In London, he relied on Orientalists in order to make several representations on the subject to the Persian government. Thomas William Rhys Davids, a Pali scholar, helped put him in contact with Mirza Malkam Khan, the Persian consul in London, in 1884. A few years later, in 1889, Naoroji collaborated with Edward Granville Browne – who was then just beginning his career at Cambridge – in drafting a petition to Naser al-Din Shah, the Qajar monarch who was touring Europe at the time.⁵⁷ All of this further discredits the idea that 'Orientals' were always passive actors with regards to Orientalism. They could oftentimes use Orientalist scholarship, and the personal networks that undergirded it, in different, unexpected ways.

Finally, by considering the scope and extent of Naoroji's scholarly activities, we can broaden our efforts to identify the many other non-Europeans without whom the work of Orientalists would have been well near impossible. Michael Dodson has noted the degree to which, in late eighteenth-century India, British scholars were dependent on the Sanskrit *pandits* they encountered in Bengal.⁵⁸ Similarly, Filipa Lowndes Vicente has examined the relationship between José Gerson da Cunha, a Goan doctor and scholar resident in Bombay, and the Italian Orientalist Angelo de Gubernatis.⁵⁹ Many other such examples abound: indeed, Naoroji's teacher and colleague in Parsi reform activities, Navrozji Fardunji, made his own contributions through a talk in London in 1874 on the history, religious practices, and social development of the Parsi community.⁶⁰ By further digging through their musty correspondence, we can, in our own scholarship, avoid repeating the sins of omission that many European Orientalists committed in their own time.

Notes

1. Naoroji and his fellow Parsis in Great Britain met in London in late 1861 to establish the Religious Funds of the Zoroastrians of Europe. One of the organization's most pressing concerns was finding a place to bury Parsis, adhering as much as possible to Zoroastrian funerary customs. The Parsis approached the London Necropolis Company and eventually purchased the plot by the end of 1862. Patell, *Pārsī Prakāsh*, 19–20; Hinnells, *Zoroastrians in Britain*, 107–9.
2. For more on Parsi development and adoption of neo-Achaemenid styles of architecture – and their role in transmitting such styles of architecture to Iran – see Grigor, “Parsi Patronage of the Urheimat.”
3. For more on the Parsi reform movement, see, especially, Chap. 5 in Sheffield, “In the Path of the Prophet,” 144–217; Ringer, *Pious Citizens*; section 2.2 in Chap. 2 in Kulke, *The Parsees in India*, 91–114; Chap. 4 in Palsetia, *The Parsis of India*, 128–96; Chap. 8 in Maneck, *The Death of Ahriman*, 182–252; and Hinnells, “Social Change and Religious Transformation.” For an overview of religious reform movements in South Asia, see Jones, *Socio-Religious Reform Movements in British India*. Tanya Luhmann has noted the apt comparison between a ‘Protestantized Zoroastrianism’ and the transformations that occurred in Sri Lankan Buddhism. See Luhmann, “Evil in the Sands of Time,” 869; and Gombrich and Obeyesekere, “Protestant Buddhism.”
4. Much of this correspondence survives today in the Dadabhai Naoroji Papers (hereafter referred to as DNP) at the National Archives of India (hereafter referred to as NAI) in New Delhi. I plan to publish a selection of this correspondence in a future volume of *Dadabhai Naoroji: Selected Private Papers*, which I have coedited with S.R. Mehrotra (the first volume was published by Oxford University Press in 2016).
5. Charles Rössler de Graville to Dadabhai Naoroji, 31 March 1912, NAI, DNP, N-88.
6. Nicholson continues:

Emphasizing the heavy influence of the European Indologists in the modern period often conceals something else, the influence of premodern Indian texts and native Indian scholars on those Europeans themselves. The Saidian model, portraying Orientalism as a pure product of European imperialism with no engagement with Asian texts and ideologies, is untenable in the face of overwhelming evidence of a two-way cultural influence. (*Unifying Hinduism*, 126, 143)

7. For more on the conversions, and the crisis that they provoked in the Parsi community, see Palsetia, “Parsi and Hindu Traditional and Nontraditional Responses,” 621–9.
8. Masani, *Dadabhai Naoroji*, 37–9.
9. For more on Young Bombay and the broader political and social context out of which the Parsi reform movement arose, see Chaps. 1 and 2 in Masselos, *Towards Nationalism*, 1–77; Chaps. 1–3 in Dobbin, *Urban Leadership in Western India*, 1–53; and Mehrotra, *Emergence of the Indian National Congress*, 58–61.
10. *Rāhānumāe mājdisnā*, 4–6.
11. Karkaria, “Revival of the Native Press,” 237.
12. *Eighth Report of Her Majesty's Civil Service Commissioners*, xviii.
13. Maneck claims that it was Naoroji who in 1859 encouraged K.R. Cama to pursue Zoroastrian studies with some of these professors. I have been unable to corroborate this claim (*The Death of Ahriman*, 230). Interestingly, Hinnells notes that, upon its establishment in 1861, the Religious Funds of Zoroastrians in Europe set up a special fund to help ‘scholars dealing with research in Zoroastrianism [and] to help intelligent and suitable Zoroastrians for research work in Zoroastrianism’ (*Zoroastrians in Britain*, 108).
14. *The Parsees*, x. The author goes by Dosabhoj Framjee in this work. Karaka was also very keen to express Parsi loyalty to British rule in light of the recent Mutiny-Rebellion of 1857. In 1858, Karaka also published a short pamphlet lauding British rule entitled *The British Raj Contrasted with its Predecessors*.

15. Naoroji refers to this work as the 'Yazashné'.
16. While taking questions from the audience, Naoroji cast doubt upon the Zurvanite theory that Ahura Mazda, or God, and Angra Mainyu, the evil spirit, were twin creations of Zurvan or 'Boundless Time' (*The Parsee Religion*, 21, 29).
17. Ibid., 20, 21, 24, 25.
18. Naoroji renders the subject heading of the catechism as such: 'A few questions and answers to acquaint the children of the holy Zarthosti community with the subject of the Mazdashnná religion (i.e., of the worship of God). Dialogue between a Zarthosti master and pupil'. *Sic* (Ibid., 3).
19. The catechism appears to attack Jesus rather than the missionaries:

Some deceivers, with a view of acquiring exaltation in this world, have set themselves up as prophets, and going among the labouring and ignorant people, have persuaded them that, 'if you commit sin, I shall intercede for you, I shall plead for you, I shall save you'; and thus deceive them, but the wise among those people know the deceit. (Ibid., 8)

20. The catechism remarks that the only thing God cannot create is 'another like Himself'. It does not elaborate as to whether God created evil. Ibid., 7, 5, 4.
21. Ibid., 28.
22. *Manners and Customs of the Parsees*, 3, 4.
23. The Zend Avesta is the Avesta and its exegetical glosses. *The Parsee Religion*, 1, 2, 27.
24. This is a somewhat strange remark on Naoroji's part given his inclusion of the catechism mentioned above. Ibid., 2.
25. *Manners and Customs of the Parsees*, 4.
26. These are the *kusti* prayers, recited while tying and untying the *kusti* or sacred girdle. In his review of Naoroji's paper, Müller estimated that a pious Parsi would have to say his *kusti* prayers at least 16 times a day ("The Modern Parsis," 164–5).
27. *Sic*. *Manners and Customs of the Parsees*, 21. On the subject of *nirang*, John R. Hinnells notes that Naoroji also published a booklet against its use ("Changing Perceptions of Authority," 115).
28. *Manners and Customs of the Parsees*, 23, 22; *The Parsee Religion*, 1–2.
29. See, for example, "Max Mueller and Naoroyi [*sic*] on Modern Parseeism," in Fluegel, *Zend Avesta and Eastern Religions*, 233–8; Cave, *An Introduction to Theology*, 210–11; "The Parsees in London"; Schem, "The Parsees," where Naoroji's papers and Haug's *Essays on the Sacred Language, Writings, and Religion of the Parsees* are reviewed together; *Chambers's Encyclopedia*, 299–301; and *The International Cyclopædia*, 343–5.
30. Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, 438.
31. Blavatsky, *Isis Unveiled*, 579.
32. Müller pointed out that the use of *nirang* as a purificatory substance was enjoined in the ninth *frasgard* of the Vendidad. On the simplicity of Zoroastrian doctrine, Müller comments:

A Parsi believes in one God, to whom he addresses his prayers. His morality is comprised in these words – pure thoughts, pure words, pure deeds. Believing in the punishment of vice and the reward of virtue, he trusts for pardon to the mercy of God. There is a charm, no doubt, in so short a creed. ("The Modern Parsis," 163–4, 175)

33. Ibid., 167, 178.
34. "European and Asiatic Races," 6, 3, 14.
35. Naoroji to K.R. Cama, 23 November 1877, NAI, DNP, N-1 (42).
36. Sheriarji Dadabhai Bharucha to Naoroji, September 1891, *ibid.*, D-3 (2).
37. N.B. Gazder to Naoroji, 6 November 1899, *ibid.*, G-20; Dhunjibhoy Jamsetjee Contractor to Naoroji, 14 February 1888, *ibid.*, C-236 (1).
38. Naoroji to James Darmesteter, 5 April 1891, *ibid.*, N-1 (1759)
39. Max Müller to Naoroji, 22 July 1892, *ibid.*, M-81a.

40. Naoroji declined to intervene, explaining that he was already pressed with too many parliamentary responsibilities. Julius Eggeling to Naoroji, 21 August 1893, *ibid.*, E-28.
41. Lawrence H. Mills to Naoroji, 15 November 1893, *ibid.*, M-127 (5).
42. Mills to Naoroji, 15 September 1888, *ibid.*, M-127; Naoroji to Mills, 19 September 1888, *ibid.*, N-1 (1177); Naoroji to Mills, 23 September 1888, *ibid.*, N-1 (1194).
43. Mills to Naoroji, 15 November 1893, *ibid.*, M-127 (5); Mills to Naoroji, 29 January 1895, *ibid.*, M-127 (9).
44. Mills to Naoroji, 16 June 1897, *ibid.*, M-127 (11); Mills to Naoroji, 30 July 1897, *ibid.*, M-127 (12); Mills to Naoroji, 4 August 1897, *ibid.*, M-127 (13).
45. Mills to Naoroji, 30 July 1897, *ibid.*, M-127 (12).
46. Bharucha to Naoroji, 28 August 1890, *ibid.*, D-3 (1); Mills to Naoroji, 21 June 1890, *ibid.*, M-127 (4); Mills to Naoroji, 15 November 1893, *ibid.*, M-127 (5); Mills to Naoroji, 29 September 1888, *ibid.*, M-127 (2).
47. Mills to Naoroji, 2 February 1895, *ibid.*, M-127 (10); Mills, *Our Own Religion in Ancient Persia*, 1–2.
48. Mills to Naoroji, 2 February 1895, NAI, DNP, M-127 (10).
49. *The Parsi Religion*, 14, 15.
50. Clement de Faye Pasteur to Naoroji, 25 October 1890, NAI, DNP, C-188 (a).
51. John Henry Barrows to Naoroji, 2 January 1892, *ibid.*, W-166; Naoroji to Barrows, 27 February 1892, *ibid.*, N-1 (2226); Barrows to Naoroji, 22 March 1892, *ibid.*, W-166 (1); Barrows to Naoroji, 6 October 1892, *ibid.*, W-166 (2).
52. “The Honorable D. Naoroji on Poverty.” (*Weekly News and Chronicle*, October 20, 1888), 4. Naoroji requested Thorold Rogers to speak at one of his campaign rallies in 1886. Naoroji to Thorold Rogers, 28 June 1886, NAI, DNP, N-1 (604).
53. ‘Max Müller has been our friend throughout’, Malabari wrote to Naoroji. Müller to Naoroji, 22 July 1892, NAI, DNP, M-81a; Behramji M. Malabari to Naoroji, 2 December 1893, *ibid.*, M-32 (362); Malabari to Naoroji, 5 December 1893, *ibid.*, M-32 (364).
54. See Chap. 4 in Mehrotra and Patel, *Dadabhai Naoroji*, 118–19, 123, 128–9, 139–40.
55. “Parsees in England,” 5.
56. *Orientalism*, 8, 42.
57. Thomas William Rhys Davids to Naoroji, 22 June 1884, NAI, DNP, D-48. Within the Naoroji Papers, I located one brief telegram sent in 1889 from an ‘Edward Browne’. John Gurney, with whom I corresponded by email in March 2013, confirms that a letter from Naoroji to Browne, also from 1889, exists in the Edward Granville Browne collection at Cambridge University Library, which is still not fully catalogued.
58. ‘Orientalist research into Indian history and language initiated in the eighteenth century through the employment of *pandits* helped to naturalise the Company into India’s accepted socio-political practices of religious and scholarly patronage. Similarly, British scholars invoked the assistance gained from *pandits* to speak with authority on issues relating to a series of European debates over the status of “oriental” civilisation, and the methodologies most appropriate to the proselytisation of Indians’ (*Orientalism, Empire, and National Culture*, 5).
59. ‘The construction of knowledge of India’, Vicente notes,

was not linked only to the institutions, agents or cultural policies of colonisers who were aware of the interdependence of power and knowledge. Many Indians took part in the process, actively participating in the historical, archaeological, literary and linguistic construction of India, and they did so through writing, photography, organising exhibitions and opening museums. (*Other Orientalisms*, 22)

60. “English Intelligence: London Branch,” 305–6. For further examples from the Parsi community, see Sheffield, who has written on the collaborations between K.R. Cama and Friedrich Spiegel and Dastur Hoshangji Jamasp and Martin Haug (“In the Path of the Prophet,” 178–85).

Acknowledgements

An earlier version of this article was presented at the ‘After the Persianate’ conference organized by Afshin Marashi at the University of Oklahoma in February 2014. I would like to thank Murali Ranganathan for his thoughts and comments on this article.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Notes on contributor

Dinyar Patel is an assistant professor of South Asian history at the University of South Carolina. He received his PhD in History from Harvard University in 2015. He is co-editor, with S. R. Mehrotra, of *Dadabhai Naoroji: Selected Private Papers* (Oxford University Press, 2016) and, with Mushirul Hasan, of *From Ghalib's Dilli to Lutyens' New Delhi: A Documentary Record* (Oxford University Press, 2014).

Bibliography

- Blavatsky, Helena. *Isis Unveiled*. Vol. 2. New York: J.W. Bouton, 1892.
- Cave, Alfred. *An Introduction to Theology*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1886.
- Chambers's *Encyclopedia*. Vol. 3. London: W. & R. Chambers, 1886.
- Dobbin, Christine E. *Urban Leadership in Western India: Politics and Communities in Bombay City, 1840-1885*. London: Oxford University Press, 1972.
- Dodson, Michael S. *Orientalism, Empire, and National Culture: India, 1770-1880*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Eighth Report of Her Majesty's Civil Service Commissioners*. London: George E. Eyre & William Spottiswoode, 1863.
- “English Intelligence: London Branch.” *Journal of the National Indian Association*, no. 48 (Dec. 1874): 305-306.
- Fluegel, Maurice. *The Zend Avesta and Eastern Religions*. Baltimore, MD: H. Fluegel, 1898.
- Gombrich, Richard F., and Gananath Obeyesekere. “Protestant Buddhism.” In *Buddhism Transformed: Religious Change in Sri Lanka*, 202-240. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988.
- Grigor, Talinn. “Parsi Patronage of the Urheimat.” *Getty Research Journal*, no. 2 (2010): 53-68.
- Hinnells, John R. “Changing Perceptions of Authority among Parsis in British India.” In *Parsis in India and the Diaspora*, edited by John R. Hinnells and Alan Williams, 100-118. London: Routledge, 2007.
- Hinnells, John R. “Social Change and Religious Transformation among Bombay Parsis in the Early 20th Century.” In *Zoroastrian and Parsi Studies: Selected Works of John R. Hinnells*, 175-200. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000.
- Hinnells, John R. *Zoroastrians in Britain*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- The International Cyclopædia*. Vol. 11. New York: Dodd, Mead, 1899.
- Jones, Kenneth W. *Socio-Religious Reform Movements in British India*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Karaka, Dosabhai Framji. *The Parsees: Their History, Manners, Customs, and Religion*. London: Smith, Elder, 1858.
- Karkaria, R.P. “Revival of the Native Press of Western India: The Rast Goftar.” *Calcutta Review*, Oct. 1898.
- Kulke, Eckehard. *The Parsees in India: A Minority as Agent of Social Change*. München: Weltforum Verlag, 1974.

- Luhrmann, Tanya. "Evil in the Sands of Time: Theology and Identity Politics among the Zoroastrian Parsis." *Journal of Asian Studies* 61, no. 3 (Aug. 2002): 861–889.
- Maneck, Susan Stiles. *The Death of Ahriman: Culture, Identity, and Theological Change among the Parsis of India*. Bombay: K.R. Cama Oriental Institute, 1997.
- Masani, Rustom Pestonji. *Dadabhai Naoroji: The Grand Old Man of India*. London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1939.
- Masselos, Jim. *Towards Nationalism: Group Affiliations and the Politics of Public Associations in Nineteenth Century Western India*. Bombay: Popular Prakashan, 1974.
- Mehrotra, S. R. *The Emergence of the Indian National Congress*. Delhi: Vikas, 1971.
- Mehrotra, S. R., and Dinyar Patel, eds. *Dadabhai Naoroji: Selected Private Papers*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Mills, Lawrence H. *Our Own Religion in Ancient Persia: Being Lectures Delivered in Oxford Presenting the Zend Avesta as Collated with the Pre-Christian Exilic Pharisaism, Advancing the Persian Question to the Foremost Position in Our Biblical Research*. Chicago, IL: Open Court, 1913.
- Müller, F. Max. "The Modern Parsis." In *Chips from a German Workshop*, Vol. 1, 158–178. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1891.
- Naoroji, Dadabhai. "The European and Asiatic Races." In *Essays, Speeches, Addresses and Writings (on Indian Politics) of the Hon'ble Dadabhai Naoroji*, edited by Chunilal Lallubhai Parekh, 1–25. Bombay: Caxton, 1887.
- Naoroji, Dadabhai. *The Manners and Customs of the Parsees*. London: Pearson & Son, 1862.
- Naoroji, Dadabhai. *The Parsee Religion*. London: Pearson & Son, 1862.
- Naoroji, Dadabhai. *The Parsi Religion*. London: Swan Sonnenschein, 1889.
- Nicholson, Andrew J. *Unifying Hinduism: Philosophy and Identity in Indian Intellectual History*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2010.
- Palsetia, Jesse S. "Parsi and Hindu Traditional and Nontraditional Responses to Christian Conversion in Bombay, 1839–45." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 74, no. 3 (Sept. 2006): 615–645.
- Palsetia, Jesse S. *The Parsis of India: Preservation of Identity in Bombay City*. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- "Parsees in England: Dedication of a Cemetery." *Times of India*, July 15, 1901.
- "The Parsees in London." *Littell's Living Age*, March 1865, 554–59.
- Patell, B. B., ed. *Pārsī Prakāsh*. Vol. 2. Bombay: Sanj Vartaman Press, 1910.
- Rāhānumāe mājdīsā eheve nāmni sabhāni pehelī, bījī tathā trījī bethaknī ūpaj nīpajno ehevāl* [Proceedings of the first, second, and third meetings of the Rahnumae Mazdayasnan Sabha]. Bombay: Duftur Ashkara Press, 1851.
- Ringer, Monica M. *Pious Citizens: Reforming Zoroastrianism in India and Iran*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2011.
- Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.
- Schem, Alexander. "The Parsees." *Methodist Quarterly Review*, April 1864, 278–294.
- Sheffield, Daniel J. "In the Path of the Prophet: Medieval and Early Modern Narratives of the Life of Zarathustra in Islamic Iran and Western India." PhD diss., Harvard University, 2012.
- Tylor, Edward Burnett. *Primitive Culture*. Vol. 2. London: John Murray, 1920.
- Vicente, Filipa Lowndes. *Other Orientalisms: India Between Florence and Bombay, 1860–1990*. Translated by Stewart Lloyd-Jones. Hyderabad: Orient Blackswan, 2012.