# ENGLISH HISTORICAL WRITINGS on THE INDIAN MUTINY 1857-1859

S. B. CHAUDHURI

WORLD PRESS

Marfat.com

Collection of Prof. Muhammad Iqbal Mujaddidi
Preserved in Punjab University Library.

# پروفیسر محمد اقبال مجددی کا مجموعہ
## پنجاب یونیورسٹی لائبریری میں محفوظ شدہ



Marfat.com

**By the same author**

*Civil Disturbances During the British Rule in India*

*Civil Rebellion in the Indian Mutinies 1857-59*

*Theories of the Indian Mutiny 1857-1859*

Marfat.com

# ENGLISH
# HISTORICAL WRITINGS
# ON
# THE INDIAN MUTINY
## 1857—1859




SASHI BHUSAN CHAUDHURI, M.A., Ph. D.

*Formerly, Professor of History, Burdwan University,*
*West Bengal, India*



CALCUTTA
THE WORLD PRESS PRIVATE LTD
1979



Marfat.com

*Copyright reserved*
© COPYRIGHT 1979, THE WORLD PRESS PRIVATE LTD.
37A, COLLEGE STREET, CALCUTTA-700073

138049

*First Published : January 1979*

PUBLISHED IN INDIA BY S. BHATTACHARJEE FOR THE WORLD PRESS PRIVATE LTD., 37A, COLLEGE STREET, CALCUTTA-700073 AND PRINTED BY AJIT KUMAR ROY AT SREE SARADA PRINTING, 31/1, GHOSE LANE, CALCUTTA-700006.

AUTHOR'S ADDRESS : 1/10, R. C. MUKHERJEE LANE, CALCUTTA-700 025, WEST BENGAL, INDIA.

Marfat.com

# PREFACE

We are sensitive to the 'Sepoy Mutiny' of 1857 ; the appearance of a new book on the subject may tend to cause eyebrows to be raised lest it becomes an attempt to place the Revolt in any particular light. But the present volume may claim to be a work with a little difference, it is a study of the historical writings on the Indian Mutiny of 1857-59. Many books have been written on this great Indo-British confrontation but no attempt was made to survey this huge mass of literature in a collective form. There was thus a scope for an elaborate treatment of the more important works on the Indian Mutiny in their relevant bearing. The motives and urges which inspired those writings and the angle of vision of the writers and perspectives adopted are of great significance which if treated from the standpoint of historiography may give the much needed dimension to the history of the mutiny-war of 1857. The author was engaged in the work since long but the difficulties involved in exploring this massive literature of the great Revolt and in classifying them on the basis of their originality and importance seem unlimited and unlimiting which delayed the publication of this book. One is conscious of the fact that many scholars may still give more information about the historical works and their authors. The contributions of Eric Stokes towards a greater measure of 'intellectual progression' have given a new direction to mutiny studies. The author would have liked to incorporate a few observations on 'The Peasant and the Raj', recently published, but the book was on hand at a time when the present work was almost printed

The author is grateful for the facilities he received from the librarian and staff of the National Library, Calcutta in the preparation of the work. His obligation to the World Press, Calcutta, is immense. Previously three of his works were published by them, this being the fourth one. The Indian Council of Historical Research granted a sum of rupees five hundred to meet a portion of the initial expenses which is gratefully acknowledged. The author is also obliged to Dr Sankarananda Mukherjee, one of his old students, for reading the proofs.

December, 1978 Author



Marfat.com

Marfat.com

# CONTENTS


| | | *Pages* |
|---|---|---|
| Preface | | |
| Introduction | | |
| CHAPTER ONE | ... | 7 |
| Approach to the Subject | | |
| CHAPTER TWO | ... | 24 |
| Bibliography | | |
| CHAPTER THREE | ... | 41 |
| Early Contemporary Works | | |
| CHAPTER FOUR | ... | 87 |
| Kaye and Malleson | | |
| CHAPTER FIVE | ... | 135 |
| English Women in Mutiny Literature | | |
| CHAPTER SIX | ... | 155 |
| Forrest, Holmes, Savarkar, Sen, Majumdar and others | | |
| CHAPTEE SEVEN | ... | 203 |
| Military Historians | | |
| CHAPTER EIGHT | ... | 229 |
| Minturn, Butler, Campbell, Valbezen, and Dobrolyubov | | |
| CHAPTER NINE | ... | 256 |
| The Trend of Attitudes | | |
| CHAPTER TEN | ... | 278 |
| A Short Conspectus | | |
| Appendix | ... | 287 |
| Bibliography of Books and Pamphlets | ... | 289 |
| Proclamations | ... | 350 |
| Index | ... | 357 |
| A Table on the Course of the Mutiny-war | ... | 365 |




Marfat.com

Marfat.com

# INTRODUCTION

A very plausible contention about a book on the Rising of 1857 is that it may evince a racial spirit which characterised the writings on the Indian Mutiny in general. The prejudices and deep-rooted convictions generated by the distempers of that age were no doubt reflected in the mutiny literature of the nineteenth century, but historical writings on the Mutiny in the post-centenary years of the Sepoy War seem to have favoured a more rational spirit in approaching the subject. Dr. S. N. Sen who had embodied this spirit so well writes : 'Time, however, is a great healer. Independent India may well afford to ignore many of the shortcomings of the former rulers, and Englishman do not any longer feel obliged to defend everything that colonial imperialism dictated'. It is true that time had changed and both the parties cannot necessarily look back in anger. For an Englishman, the instinct of 'Empire' is on the wane and the evangelical spirit is relatively free from the incubus of political pretensions. People prominent in public eye of the United Kingdom now have shown a broad-mindedness, 'an awareness of Britain's special relationship with India based on mystical bonds', which offers a contrast with the attitude of the former leaders of the British public.

One may feel very strongly and sincerely on this point that let bygones be bygones and there is no use in raking up the attitude of the British public and historians to those atrocities and excesses committed in the Sepoy Mutiny which obviously cannot be ignored in a work of this nature. The process of history, however, can neither be suppressed nor reversed. Enough has been written about the Sepoy Mutiny but something may as well be written on the historical writings on the subject. A work on this line was long overdue from purely historical considerations if only as a complement to the history of the great event. It is hoped that the book will not be judged from any other point of view. Interest of England in the vanished empire has no doubt been rationalised but the overwhelming number of works on the Indian Mutiny bears the most tangible proof of the deep emotional involvement of the British public in the



Marfat.com

nineteenth century in the fortune of the 'Empire', the existence of which was threatened by the rising of the Sepoys. The 'Empire' and the Mutiny were linked up in the historical process. The Mutiny was caused by the presence of the former, but its suppression reinforced the position of the 'British Empire in India' and increased its scale and grandeur. There was a tremendous renewal of interest in British paramountcy in India and a whole set of apologists, particularly the mutiny veterans, who wrote their 'Memoirs' with justifiable pride described the story of the Indian Mutiny as one in which Englishmen will never cease to be interested, or that as long as the 'Empire' endured and the British people existed, the Mutiny, the 'noble epic' that it was, will not cease to speak to every Englishman. The Mutiny thus furnished an excellent medium for a display of the magnificent and shining exploits of British valour. It was natural, therefore, that British writers would dominate the field of mutiny studies and since it was mainly the mutiny of the sepoys which demanded all the attention of the English, a more appropriate title for a book dealing with historical writings on the Indian Mutiny could not have been possibly adopted.

The study is based mainly on its direct sources, that is, the writings in English on the Indian Mutiny. These are listed in the alphabetical bibliography along with other works in the different European languages and works of Indian writers in English. Together they make out a formidable number of titles. Since the study deals with writings produced over more than a century, the great variety of materials often created diverse interests and embodied the growth of many assumptions and contradictory approaches to the subject. Links and connections in this massive literature on all points of conflict and controversy were not always clear. Very few movements which are recorded in history were perhaps fed by such a steady flow of writings but obviously it adds much to the obligations of one who attempts an assessment of these contributions.

Moulana A. K. Azad, Minister of Education, Government of India in his 'Foreword' to the official publication, 'Eighteen Fifty-Seven, by D:. S. N. Sen very correctly estimated : 'Even if we consider the work only of recognised historians the number of books on the uprising can be counted in hundreds. In spite of this I felt that no

Marfat.com

objective history of the struggle had yet been written'. However, it is doubtful if any author will find it possible to go through each and every species of this mass of historical writings that the 1857 uprising had produced and so a work on the historians of the Indian Mutiny may tend to suffer to that extent. Even within some limits, the heap of digested and undigested materials are of such variegated interest that it becomes difficult to follow any intelligible line of action to marshal them into a proper form. In the circumstances, notice can be taken only of those authors and historians whose contributions give a full and complete history of the subject and conform to a measure of objectivity and to a degree of critical and analytical study. The historians who have covered the full-length history of the mutiny-war and explored its dimensions will necessarily attract close attention and what is more important is that the legion of contemporary histories which may as well be regarded as source-books of the Indian Mutiny will have a special significance of their own as mutiny studies, unlike other such topics, did not originate from officially oriented sources. It also appears clear that writers and historians despite their attempts to keep an open mind, could not maintain the distinctness of objectivity and integrity of outlook once they entered into the subject.

The following pages aim, therefore, so far as possible within a general survey, at drawing attention to the different stages in the evolution of this stupendous historical literature on the Indian Mutiny, the line of historical thinking on the events of those gruelling years, the comprehension and interpretation of the complex problems attending the mutiny and above all in the attitude and stances reflected in the treatment of the whole upsurge. The book does not offer any connected narrative of the whole course of the movement but reference to the occurrences have been made in all cases to examine the views of the historians in their proper perspective. Attempts have been made to enhance the value of the work by furnishing a comprehensive bibliography of the different categories of works on the Mutiny which have been compiled after years of intensive enquiry and study. The bibliography, it is hoped, will abundantly reflect a continuity of historical activity on the subject over a period exceeding a century and

Marfat.com

also meet the demands of inter-disciplinary utilities of this epoch of the Indian Mutiny.

Books written by Indians in English have necessarily been included to indicate the process of the incorporation of new information and the discovery of new documents of special interest which almost led to a revision of mutiny studies in the post-centenary years in respect of perspectives and interpretations. Quite a good number of books on the revolt were also written in the different vernaculars of India, a list of which is included in the 'Bibliography'. A study of these writings will no doubt be rewarding on one point or other, but most of the materials were not properly oriented to serve the purpose of history.

The organisation of the work presented considerable difficulty. It does not become particularly easy to find a way through the dense overgrowth of prolific writings which obscure the vision and distract the mind. A regional approach to this forest of writings will not take into account books written on the Mutiny as a whole and will only be conducive to the possibility of missing the wood for trees. An approach to the historical writings on the Mutiny from the standpoint of an army officer, missionary, administrator and imperialist will lead to endless diversification of a compact unitary theme with its prologue and epilogue clearly estimated. A chronological treatment of a motley of writers, civilians, military officers, professional historians, chaplains, biographers, reminiscence writers and diary-keepers in a given year of publication may look like a convergence of all hybrid matters relating to this event which may cause considerable distraction in any attempt to trace the historical thinking of the movement. In the medley of all these approaches the character of the rising might be lost sight of. The author is fully conscious of these difficulties and could not adopt any particular line of treatment which would cover all the requirements of the subject but the one presented here took shape under his pen, quite unconsciously as he was negotiating with the materials under study.

The abbreviations made will be readily intelligible. In order to avoid repetition of the name of the books which in some case are quite long, the name of the author is referred to as

Marfat.com

representing his book, the full title of which is given in the bibliography. In the case of authors of two books or more, the titles are indicated all along. The words 'revolt' and 'rebellion' have been used in this book as interchangeable terms like many of the mutiny historians, and any attempt to make out a distinction between the two would not be fruitful. The subject was discussed at considerable length in the book on the Indian Mutiny published in 1860 by William P. Nimmo & Company from Edinburgh. The author referred to all biblical allusions about the two words and to a series of those instances with which Roman history was full. He made out a case that the word 'revolt' would perhaps imply a more specific sense for a movement having a clear objective. However, the word 'rebel' has been used frequently enough in this work in its purely etymological sense without attaching any stigma. Similarly, the word 'native', though infamously used by the British, could not possibly have been avoided becasuse of its frequent reference by the English writers whose contributions constitute the subject matter of this work. Any substitution of the word 'Indian' for a 'native' in the context of their narrative would stop short of expressing the matter clearly. In the spellings of proper names, old spellings of Oudh, Cawnpore, Lucknow and Nana Sahib and some others have been retained only as a tribute to the 'Mutiny Memoirs' of a wide circle of British writers. Such expressions also like '1857 uprising', 'mutiny historians', 'mutiny-war' with or without a hyphen have been frequently used in the interest of simplicity of the treatment.

Marfat.com

Marfat.com

## CHAPTER ONE

# APPROACH TO THE SUBJECT

The great outbreak of 1857 is a memorable episode in Indian history. It was in a sense the most formidable revolt which had ever broken out against a foreign domination. It is impossible not to admit that the English fought in the Mutiny with a passion and determination as though they were fighting in defence of their country and struggling for their cherished rights. No military revolt in the world has produced so much literature as the uprising of 1857 in India, commonly known as the Sepoy Mutiny. The spate of 'Memoirs', 'Journals', 'Reminiscences', 'Histories' and 'Narratives' that followed the events of 1857-59 is a proof enough of the immensity of that historic episode as also of the dread and alarm felt in England for the threat to her 'Empire' underlying this challenge which explain why on the British side more was written about the revolt than about any other epoch of Indo-British connection.

The first reaction to the revolt was one of anger and revenge and English writers could not possibly make a critical assessment of the situation then prevailing. The large mass of literature revealing sensational accounts of personal experience and of British military achievement, written under excitement mainly to satisfy the thirst for news of the English public could not help restore a proper perspective in mutiny studies for the purpose of offering an objective historical retrospect. In this period of strife and struggle when passions ran high, Anglo-Indian Press in particular felt no restraint in using the movement as a means of making slanderous attacks against institutions like the East India Company and persons like Dalhousie and Canning, and specially against the Indians and the Asiatics in the most malignant way[1]. Some British writers again found it easy to turn a movement of Indian origin and prominence into an episode of British eminence, a British epic in an Indian scene, and a saga of England's imperial experience. To them it was purely a chapter of British military history, a record of the glorious activities of

[1] Cf. Henry Lawrence quoted in Kaye (III, p. 19) : 'No paper has done us more harm than the *Friend of India*'.



Marfat.com

the British generals, scarcely paralleled by any other known events of the time. It does not appear that the British writers in general had any inhibitions on these points which influenced their perspectives and distorted their vision. It will be necessary to refer to some of the works published in 1857 which reflect an amalgam of all these distempers and prejudices and various other cross currents of the time.

Henry Mead's 'The Sepoy Revolt' regarded as the earliest work on the Indian Mutiny was not unfortunately free from certain prejudices of the time which were commonly shared by other writers also. Mead, an ex-editor of the *Friend of India* was removed from that office on the ground of his infractions of the conditions of the Press Act. It was talked about that the famous petition framed in Calcutta and addressed to the Queen for Canning's recall was eventually sent to England by the hand of Mead[1]. Obviously, he had changed his views, for on 25 June 1857, he wrote an article in the *Friend of India*, when the Mutiny was in full swing, supporting Company's administration in strong terms. He referred to the material and political benefits of British rule in India and observed that a Hindu enjoys liberty such as he has not enjoyed for centuries and stands upon the same platform with the Englishman, and yet he is in arms. It is hard to believe that the same Mead was writing bitterly against the government of the East India Company by the end of the year 1857. In the preface to his book he records some instances of agrarian distress as adding to the 'sum total of Asiatic misery' and also of the cruelty, the oppression, and the measureless folly of the British government and observes 'if we are wise henceforth in dealing with India, the well of Cawnpore will so fertilise the land, that every corner of it will yield a crop of blessings.'[2] For an Englishman to refer to the 'Cawnpore well' in this context almost amounted to apostasy. It, however, transpired that the article in the *Friend of India* was prompted by vested interest but when the control of the revolt was passing out of the hands of Canning who remained impassive and unmoved in a situation which called for immediate action, Mead like other Anglo-Indian writers of Calcutta, turned

[1] Kaye, III. p. 44 fn., Martin, II, p. 269.
[2] Mead, Preface, p. iv.

Marfat.com

furiously against the government. The critics, however, suspected that the 'Sepoy Revolt' was meant to buttress the case of the India Reform League for the prosecution of the East India Company and making Dalhousie, its agent, the target of attack. However, all these reveal how the history of the Indian Mutiny was made a vehicle for the propagation of certain ideas by interested persons. Mead had not taken up the role of a 'historian-judge' to get at the truth, he seems to have taken up the position of a prosecutor in holding the administration of Dalhousie responsible for the impending fall of the Company. He regarded Dalhousie as a most 'profligate statesman' and recounted the evil effects of the annexation of Oudh. But of all these charges, the Dalhousie-Napier relations became a very favourite theme of acrimonious duels. In many works of that time Sir Charles Napier was held up as a martyr to the imperialistic pretensions of a high-horsed pro-consul, that the wise sedate commander-in-chief had the prescience to warn the government that the army was in a state of disaffection, but he met with a rebuff only from Dalhousie who refused to accept the views of Napier. There was nothing objectionable, some critics pointed out, that if Napier had stated his opinion, it was not new for experienced officers of the Company including Metcalfe and others who had also repeatedly drawn attention of the government to the possibility of a mutiny posing a threat to the Leadenhall Street. But actually the commander-in-chief did never categorically state or predict or anticipate 'the proximity' of any occurrence even remotely resembling the Mutiny of the Bengal Army of 1857 and neither did he suggest to government any measure of reform to renovate the army. On the contrary, like many other men in authority of that time he shared a 'fatuous confidence in the fidelity by the Bengal Sepoys'[1]. It was also pointed out that in his memoir on the military defence of India, he wrote that he could find nothing to fear from the sepoys.[2] The prevailing faith in the fidelity of the sepoys was also indicated in his report on the military occupation in India where he stated that the native army of India was in a good state of discipline and was

1 *Calcutta Review*, 1858, vol. 30, pp. 234, 243.

2 *Edinburgh Review* quoted in 'A few words' etc. (p. 27) By one who served under Dalhousie.

Marfat.com

'faithful to a proverb'. There are many other such recorded statements which on an objective analysis would not furnish a proof that Napier had given the warning and Dalhousie invited the cataclysm by disregarding it. There is, however, a measure of truth in what Mead complains that the evils of the Bengal Army are the legacies of Napier's administration and Dalhousie could have altered the system. It was undoubtedly true that the practice of concentrating all power at the headquarters and the policy of weakening the authority of the commanding officers had damaged the discipline of the army. But it was Napier who wanted to enlarge the immunities of the 'disaffected sepoys' in disregard of the rules of service and when Dalhousie pointed out that he 'had exceeded his power, Napier resigned. Yet Napier became a legend at the hands of the writers who could not 'help sighing for Napier' and this was reflected in the whole body of the mutiny literature. Even Evans Bell, a shrewd observer of the Indian Mutiny denounced Dalhousie who presumed to charge the old general with having brought "unjust and injurious imputations against the Army" and indulging in extravagant and mischievous exaggeration.[1]

Thus the *Red Pamphlet* published in or about the same time by an officer who served under Sir Charles Napier highlighted this legend. The *Red Pamphlet*, miscalled a pamphlet, was the most famous, sensational and attractive work in the whole range of mutiny literature. The author was the historian, colonel G. B. Malleson, a young captain in the Bengal commissariat who by virtue of his affiliations so openly stated, accepted 'the legend' as true and could not help 'sighing for Napier' the great general, who as the author writes, was driven away by Dalhousie a 'man of paltry littleness and petty jealousy'.[2] All others of Canning's administration also came in for stringent comments, that Dorin was a Sybarite, J. P. Grant was an adept at intrigue, colonel Birch a sycophant, and Beadon unscrupulous.[3] The *Red Pamphlet* excited much attention in every class in India and England. Earl of Derby in his speech in the House of Lords made a complimentary reference to the book and advised their

[1] Bell, *Retrospects* etc. p. 236.
[2] *Red Pamphlet*, p. 12.
[3] Ibid. pp. 13-16.

Marfat.com

Lordships to read it if any of them had not done so. He opined that a more able resume of facts connected with these occurrences he could not conceive of. This when published in the *Times* of 4 December 1857 attracted the attention of Charles Allen, late of the Bengal Civil Service who promptly issued a rejoinder : 'A few words Anent the Red Pamphlet, By one who served under Marquis of Dalhousie' with a view to contradicting the gross misrepresentation and calumnies made in the 'Pamphlet'. A pamphlet of 30 pages, it was dated Oriental Club 15 December 1857[1] and was published from London in 1858. Charles Allen was reputed to be a man who was free from all that constitutes 'old civilianism' and refuted all the allegations made by Malleson in the controversy about Dalhousie succumbing to the pressure of the 38th regiment who were alleged to have been ordered for Burma. On various other matters such as Grant's appointment, his pernicious influence in opposing prompt and severe measure on the occasion of the mutiny at Barrackpore, colonel Birche's appointment and his telegrams of 26 and 27 January regarding greased cartridges and on other matters about the measures adopted by Hearsey and Canning, Allen furnished convincing explanation in the light of facts. In fact, the Napier-Dalhousie question and the confrontation of Malleson with Allen brought to light many a point of uncertain authenticity. All these will make it clear how institutions and persons, and from the racial point of view, Indians and Asiatics were subjected to attacks in the writings on the Indian Mutiny from the very beginning of the revolt. But this attempt to expose the Company and its agents, Dalhousie and Canning, was not completely successful. There were other writers who argued that there was no point in holding up Napier in a light that was so strange, and that a grievous mistake would be committed if the architects of British power in India were defamed. Thus about Dalhousie, one wrote : 'the only idol that Anglo-Indians had set up after their heart, that of Marquis of Dalhousie, who by spreading the arts of civilisation and peace and by various other measures ; have bound India

[1] The author refers to the *Times* of 4 December 1857 which published the remarks of Earl of Derby made in Parliament lately. This obliged the author to contradict the gross misrepresentation and calumnies made in the *Red Pamphlet* by one who served under Sir Charles Napier.

Marfat.com

firmly to the British throne in a way as no one else would have done'. Another writer added that in the list of governors-general we stop at Wellesley ; from him there is a gap till Dalhousie comes on the scene. It would be 'jumping over the events of history to say that had Dalhousie been in power no mutiny would have happened, but that it would have been crushed in bud was widely believed'.[1]

Any book critical of the administration of the Company or of the attitude of the Anglo-Indians was not very much favoured. So when Russell's *Diary* was published it produced the same impression. The letters of W. B. Russell, special correspondent of the *Times* in India was published under the title : 'My Diary In India in the year 1858-59'. The difficulty was that it was not the work of an ordinary tourist who comes and goes with superficial views. Russell like the author of 'Oakfield' could identify the real blots and so his work had aroused a storm of indignation. Very few questioned the truth of his observations but wished that he should not have pushed his views to such an extent. He might have come to India with some fixed ideas but encountered a different situation. The Anglo-Indian view was that there was no reason why he should run down the community and hold the Home Government and Calcutta responsible for the outbreak. Russell found the European community harbouring bitterest hatred towards the natives. In a letter dated 28 August 1858 he writes that roughness of manners in British intercourse with the natives is one of the chief causes that led to the rebellion. In returning to this charge it was stated with emphasis that certain acts of wanton rudeness, of actual violence and oppression and a general contempt for Asiatics might appear painful to one coming from England but to maintain that this was the only cause of the revolt would appear to be not quite true even to the most quixotic of writers. A similar remark of Dr. Russell on the Cawnpore scene evoked a storm of protest. He wrote, 'The history of Mediaeval Europe affords many instances of crimes as those of Cawnpore. The history of more civilised periods could afford some parallel to them in more modern times'. The Anglo-Indian critics could hardly stomach these 'extravaganzas' which appeared in his diary and advised

[1] *Calcutta Review*, 1858, vol. 31, Misc. Notices, p. xxv.

Marfat.com

Russell to read some works on Indian history before taking a pedestrian view of men and things during his short period of visit. It was painful to reflect that one in the role of *Times'* correspondent should lose sight of the noble aspects of British rule, whether India was not much better, so far as the condition of the great mass of people was concerned.[1]

Unfortunately for the Anglo-Indians, Dr. Russell was not the only writer of the mutiny period to accuse them of showing bitter feeling against the Indians and Asiatics. The obstinacy of the ruling community in maintaining that they had not been racial in their attitude towards the Asiatics was exposed for the first time by Charles Ball, the British historian who himself was not less racial in his attitude than any of those who were accused of this charge. He referred to the hauteur and insolence of tone and manner of British officials towards the Indians and remarked that the treatment was such that no people of spirit could readily submit to it.[2] Another high official of the Government of India made this position very clear even at a time when the revolt was in progress. He writes, 'there is no human relation between the English and the natives of India, neither that of a master and slave nor that of a patron and client, nor until 1857 even that of open foes; but a hard misunderstanding and mutual distrust'.[3]

The foregoing sketch about the views and opinions of the early English writers may foreshadow the pattern of historical writings on the Indian Mutiny. Apart from these prejudices indicated above, there was the other more significant question about the character of the movement on which there was a curious position. Many English writers and observers were impressed by the political content of the revolt since its very inception and wondered if it was not the first symptom of the emergence of a national feeling long suppressed by British occupation. Assumptions about the nature of British rule in India were called in question by many writers and some of them even condemned British reprisals for the suppression of the Mutiny. Even while the Mutiny was in progress, two British

[1] *Calcutta Review*, 1859, vol. 32, p. 119; 1860, vol. 34, pp. lix, lxvi.
[2] Ball, II, p. 636.
[3] Bell, *The English in India*, pp. 41, 43.

Marfat.com

officers J. B. Norton of Bombay and Evans Bell of governor-general's Agency at Nagpur freely criticised government policies and reflected on the popular character of the uprising. Captain Evans Bell, in particular, in his letters from Nagpur written in 1857-58 was perhaps the earliest of the English writers to explore the popular content of the mutiny-war, the struggle of a weak and ignorant people against a dominant alien race which naturally took the form of a war of extermination. He records that the mutineers fully believed that their signal be taken and their example followed by all. Their expectations were nearly fulfilled as in places in the Peninsula, Bombay, Ahmedabad, Kolhapore, Belgaun, Dharwar there have been plots among the sepoys. The Madras sepoys even wanted a beginning to be made somewhere, a rallying point of some sort, a standard, 'either of a raja or a pretender'. The whole army in the south was in a state of animation, as there had been no less than three great military conspiracies in the Madras army with political aims in the pre-mutiny period, such as at Vellore (1806), Nagpur (1820), and at Bangalore (1832). The idea that India taken by the sword must be kept by the sword was to the author a shibboleth which could no longer be upheld without distorting history.[1] He refers to the well-known cases of the substantial help received from the Indian elites by Sir John Lawrence of the Punjab, Gubbins of Benares, Edwardes and Davidson of Hyderabad, Robert Ellis of Nagpur and Willoughby Osborne of Rewa, without which British position would have been seriously endangered.[2] The author firmly held the view that the Mutiny of 1857 was no pretorian mutiny ; the sepoys were the first in the field because they were the only organised collected body of armed man ; because they knew that no one would begin without them.[3] It may be noted that another British writer writing from England in about the same time, R. M. Martin made a similar observation which was pertinent. He writes : 'But if the soldiery had grievances, however slight, compared with those of the people, the two classes would coalesce—the army would initiate rebellion, and the people would maintain it'.[4]

1 Bell, *The English in India*, pp. 2, 12, 18-20, 23.
2 Bell, op. cit. p. 36.
3 Bell, op. cit. pp. 24. 63 ; Chaudhuri, *Theories of the Indian Mutiny*, p. 41.
4 Martin, II, p. 122.

Marfat.com

But of all the contemporary writers, Bell was the most ardent exponent of the national character of the revolt. He attacks R. D. Mangles, the Director of the East India Company who was still parading that shallow 'exculpatory hypothesis of a military mutiny' as a substitute for the 'most thoroughly national rebellion that history has ever recorded'. He refers to the letter of the governor-general himself dated 17 June 1858 in which he distinctly asserted (paragraph 27) the existence of a general revolt. He finds fault with Gubbins, the author of the revenue settlement of Oudh who described the great feudatories of the country, the talukdars, as mere 'middlemen, farmers of the revenue'. As opposed to this he adverts to the statement of captain Crump of the Madras artillery who wrote of the stubborn fight put up by the matchlock-men against Havelock's offensives. There was no doubt that these people were the villagers of Oudh who had rejected the proffered tenant-right of Gubbins and followed the oppressive middlemen farmers, the talukdars of Gubbins' descriptions.[1] Later on in his book 'Retrospects and Prospects' Bell made a clearer exposition of the village system. He says that to the villagers it only meant that the 'proprietory right' enjoyed by them was nothing more than the right to pay their quota directly to the government instead of to the talukdars but the intermediate profit-rent which was thus saved would not flow back to them for their benefit. So it appeared to the author that the villagers stood to lose the protection and countenance of their hereditary chief, and hence they apprehended disturbance of rights connected with the soil. The Mutiny arose in the villages and not in the cantonments.[2] All these ideas of Martin and Bell find their corroboration in the Administrative reports of the government, the 'Narrative of Events'.

But the opposite view regarding the military character of the revolt was stressed with great emphasis by most of the Western writers even while the rebellion was going on in the years 1857-58. The views of the American missionary, R. B. Minturn are typical of its kind. His book 'From New York to Delhi' was published in 1858. The missionary was a high priest of Western racialism.

[1] Bell, op. cit. pp. 143-44.
[2] Bell, op. cit. pp. 92, 233.

Marfat.com

While arguing about the military character of the revolt, he gave up *a priori* reasoning as it was more or less liable to error and coming to the *a posteriori* proof he maintained : 'If it (1857) was a popular movement why did it extend over only one-third of India ? Why was the Madras Presidency, the worst governed part of the British Dominions, the most tranquil throughout the disturbances ? If the movement was occasioned by annexation why were Nagpur and the Punjab with its war like inhabitants tranquil.... Why has nearly the whole revenue been paid when there was no power to enforce it and.....why was it confined only to the Bengal Army'.[1] It is a striking peculiarity of mutiny studies that difference of opinion on the character of the Upsurge was not always influenced by a racial or colonial prejudice ; there was as much similarity of views between the British writers in general and some eminent Indian historians on the military character of the revolt as between a few British and Indian writers on its non-military character. It appears that the same view as held by Minturn was repeated almost exactly in the same way after a century in 1957. R. C. Majumdar delivered the same judgment after measuring the extent of the area covered by the rebellion and raising almost the same questions as did Minturn.[2] Many other Indian historians also subscribed to the views of Minturn and Majumdar. Similarly what S. N. Sen feared that 'the mutiny leaders would have set the clock back'[3], was exactly the reaction of Minturn who also remarked : 'A movement which, had it succeeded, would have thrown India back to the state in which it was after Nadir Saha's conquest.'[4] It is strange that a subject ploughed for more than a century by hundreds of writers, continued to be studied much in the same form from the beginning to the end. There has been very few development of ideas, almost all the issues which were discussed at that time in the early stages of the revolt have the same priority in modern studies also, its feudal, national or military aspects. The divergent impulses behind the books written by Englishmen and

[1] Minturn, pp. 454-55.

[2] Majumdar, *The Sepoy Mutiny* etc. pp. 222 ff ; Chaudhuri ; *Civil Rebellion*, p. 289 ; *Theories of the Indian Mutiny*, pp. 10-17.

[3] Sen, p. 412.

[4] Minturn, pp. 227, 460.

Marfat.com

Indians, the difference of interpretations so glaringly maintained appears all the more incomprehensible having regard to the fact that the historians in general, used much the same sources, the English language materials, which provided ample scope for an intensive study of the subject. The facile argument that the sudden revolt of India had aroused so much passion and racial or national feelings that to very few historians it could be a subject for objective treatment does not cover all the issues of the case and cannot explain the surprising consistency of views between the Western writers of 1857 and the Indian writers of 1957 who had the undoubted advantage of making an objective study on the basis of the accumulated knowledge of the past and a wider range of materials. However, the coincidence of views may only show that the time factor was not of any consequence in the evolution of a historical thinking on the Mutiny, the impressions formed in the early years regarding its opposite aspects were not radically contradicted by the emergence of new materials from authentic sources in later years. It also shows that in the Mutiny of 1857, official records hardly contained any new information that was not known to the early writers.[1]

Besides these there were other impulses behind the writings on the Mutiny by Englishmen. The military historians who formed the biggest single group of British historians saw the Mutiny as a purely military event[2]. Being accustomed to think in military terms, most of them failed to see any other development of interest, the emergence of any issue of a different complexion other than military which deserved to be recorded in the story of the revolt. This preoccupation with British military action which was agreeably projected by the English historians of the imperialist school accounted for the great bulk of writings on the upsurge of 1857. The book of Fitzgerald Lee and Radcliffe, presumably the earliest work on the Indian Mutiny, was written from a military point of view

[1] What Embree says that mutiny studies have gone through a process of refinement and re-interpretation possibly relates to the addition of new evidence in favour of or against either of the basic contentions (Embree, p. x, Intro.).

[2] See Chapter on Military Historians.



Marfat.com

holding the civil authorities responsible for the outbreak and criticised their undue interference in military matters. Very similar to this attitude was another which placed particular emphasis on the failure of evangelical activities as a factor making for the anti-British upsurge. The Mutiny provoked a new but strong evangelical spirit among men in England and in the Civil Service and Army in India who sincerely believed that the gospel could have cured all these distempers had it been widely spread and propagated. To them the Mutiny was a warning sent by Providence to christianise the people, to uphold and maintain the supremacy of the Church. It cannot be denied that the outburst of racial feeling in its acute form towards the Indians was long being generated even before 1857 by these christian missionaries who in their fanatic zeal to propagate the Christian faith had deliberately represented Indian life and people in the most despicable form with a view to showing that conversion to the Christian faith was the only way to their redemption and reclamation. The missionary writers persisted in the belief, and Alexander Duff in his book on the Indian rebellion published in 1858, not at all a creditable work, freely stated that the Mutiny was an evidence of the displeasure of God on the British and proclaimed the necessity of regenerating the heathens by the influence of the gospel. Similarly, to Chaplain Rotton,[1] it was a conflict between "truth and error", the Indians representing all the wickedness of the earth. Some of the missionaries proved to be very refractory and Marshman even invoked the mercy of the Divine Providence in blessing the British Empire in India so that it can be the instrument of 'leading the way to the extension of European Supremacy throughout Asia.'[2]

The other aspect of the revolt was equally interesting. Cave-Browne writing in 1861 discovered that the Mutiny was the result of a two fold conspiracy, a deep political intrigue and a wide military conspiracy. The former was purely of Muhammadan and the latter of Hindu origin.[3] The theory of Muslim origin of the revolt was referred to by many foreign writers like Minturn who

[1] Rotton quoted in Harrison p. 3; Joshi, pp. 154-55.
[2] Marshman, *History of India etc.* III, p. 457.
[3] Cave-Browne, II, p. 288.

Marfat.com

stated that the movement was the expiring effort of Islamism to retain its lost supremacy.[1] But the idea did not receive much attention in the historical writings on the Mutiny. George Campbell frankly wrote that the main elements in the formulation of Mutiny were the Hindus.[2] The theory of Muslim conspiracy in the revolt was not accepted by most of the eminent historians who wrote in the centenary year of the Mutiny.[3] The attempt of the Pakistanis to write up the Mutiny as the Muslim National Revolt by emphasizing the share of the Wahabis in the origin of Mutiny might have regional or communal appeal but evidence about the presence of Wahabis behind the agitation against 'Angrez-Ka-Kartooz', as the poet-king of Delhi sang, seem meagre. So in addition to what Forrest wrote[4] about a British epic we have now a Muhammadan epic in the Indian Mutiny.[5] Evans Bell writing in 1857-58 gives a picture of total confusion and bewilderment on the sudden upsurge of 1857. He writes that it was an enigma as no one can account for the rebellion 'to the day'. None has found out how or where the plot began or whether indeed there was a plot. He refers to the political situation created by the Russian war, Persian war, and the expected war with China and the greased cartridges followed most opportunely, and all these, the Persian Agency, Muslim conspiracy, Wheeler's preaching or the stupid oversight of the greased cartridges or a little of all these perhaps combined to produce the conflagration. But the perplexities of his mind were not resolved. He writes that nobody had ever dreamed of such an event as a general mutiny of the army which took all the experienced and distinguished officials by surprise excepting some few 'crotchety men' and alarmist like Metcalfe and Shore and perhaps the old Sleeman who had opinions about the evils of annexation but none had any idea as to how and when the rebellion would happen[6]. It may be mentioned that Charles Ball also refers to a similar state of confusion and astonishment that

1 Minturn, p. 456.
2 Campbell, *Memoirs*, I, p. 392.
3 Chaudhuri, *Theories, etc.* pp. 125-26, 145-46.
4 Forrest, *History*, I, p. 362.
5 See M. N. Safa (Sen Gupta, *Recent Writings*, p. 57).
6 Bell, *The English in India*, pp. 62, 183. Also Martin, II, p. 2.

Marfat.com

prevailed in England for the failure to appreciate the real causes of this upsurge[1].

With all these confused and contradictory features clearly visible in all these writings of the mutiny-war, it will be quite easy to understand why the early writers could not be either restrained or objective and far less comprehensive in covering all sides of the upsurge in their works. Attempts to place the revolt in its social and economic background, though tangible enough, was not treated as such by most of the writers. Economic background of the revolt deserved to be studied at depth and excepting Sir John William Kaye, most of the contemporary works paid scant attention to this subject. It is P. C. Joshi who in his 'Rebellion-1857' offered a new construction on the economic aspects of the revolt, following certain formulations of the Marxist School. The centenary year of 1857 uprising also saw the publication of the book 'Civil Rebellion during the Indian Mutinies' which was based on the British sources of highest authority, the Administrative reports, in the form of 'Narrative of Events'. The importance of this series of British records, the Narrative of the Events providing materials for a study of the economic background of the revolt was reflected in the book which illustrated the course of the rebellion, district by district, the part played by the peasants, cultivators, wage earners, and other rural elements in the rebellion.[2]

All these social elements acknowledged the leadership of the dispossessed landlords to the surprise and shock of the British bureaucrats.[3] This is how a talukdari movement feudal in character was converted into an anti-alien popular movement.[4] Agrarian distress, over-assessment of peasants, the evil effects of the resumption

1 Ball, I, p. 425.

2 Chaudhuri, *Civil Rebellion*, pp. 275-79. Ladendorf considers that the book offers the best and most complete discussion on Civil rebellion of the Mutiny (Ladendorf, *The Revolt in India*, p. 4). To Maclagan this was a most interesting book on a side of the Mutiny which had been neglected (*Clemency Canning*, p. 374, note 17). T. Metcalfe also considers that the book 'Civil Rebellion' gives the most complete discussion of the subject (See Introduction to Ladendorf's work). For Richard Collier's yiews see Chaudhuri, *Theories etc.* Preface.

3 *Civil Rebellion*, pp. 275-79.

4 Ibid. pp. 15-20, 292-4, 297-8. Also pp. xxii-xxiii (Approach).

Marfat.com

of rent-free lands and other such factors were strongly stressed by British writers also and required no reiteration as is done by some writers. But a detailed study of the rebellious activities of the peasants and other rural elements in their agrarian background will have much importance on the economic aspect of the revolt. Eric Stokes' work in these lines, as published in different journals will throw further light on the position of the traditional elites and peasants in the civil rebellion of 1857.[1] But other writers as shown by Sengupta in his monograph has gone wide of the mark in offering an economic interpretation of the struggle of 1857. They only 'restated the off-stated Marxist Theory regarding the impact of colonialism in India'.[2] Some again raised all sorts of issues from demonetization of gold currency,. to Manchester cloth and Western capitalism as factors making for the revolt[3] thus mixing up wide and remote factors with the immediate issues of the outbreak. There were economic historians also who wrote that the misery of the people caused by the economic exploitation of the East India Company was a major factor which contributed to the uprising of 1857.[4] All these certainly indicate a new trend of mutiny studies which may be rewarding if kept within the limits of historical discipline. Insistence on the study of the revolt in its economic context will be highly appreciated if historical facts are not allowed to be subverted by any ideological considerations. T. Khaldun observed that the rebellion ended as a peasant war against 'indigenous landlordism and foreign imperialism'.[5] Undoubtedly, the peasants were in arms against foreign imperialism but no historian of the Indian Mutiny had ever stated that the peasants were fighting against the traditional elites, the indigenous landlords, during the whole course of the rebellion or even towards the end. Indeed P. C. Joshi, the Editor of the *Symposium* contradicted Khaldun on this point by stating that there are no historical facts to prove that the peasant struggle during 1857-58 turned out to be a struggle against the landlords as a class

1 Sen Gupta, *Recent Writings*, p. 24.
2 Sengupta, pp. 17, 19.
3 Ibid.
4 Ibid. p. 19.
5 P. C. Joshi, *Rebellion—1857*, p. 52.

Marfat.com

and took the character of a peasant war[1]. The 'Civil Rebellion' in the Indian Mutiny quoted above will have shown that in 1857-58 the British were fighting not so much a mutiny but the revolt of a people under its hereditary chiefs and leaders.[2]

All these views and combinations of them have brought to light a very remarkable diversity of opinions on the Indian Mutiny. The divergence of interpretation no doubt provides a fascinating study in historiography, but this multitude of insights have tended to violate the intrinsic character of a very tangible episode of Indian history having a well accounted beginning, a course and an end. In historical writings, there is a point of view or moral perspective which rests on accuracy in details .made available after honest search for historical truth. The nice adjustment of scales which enables the detached historian to marshal facts according to their relative values for the formulation of judgments on a given episode should be very perceptible in all works of history. It is just possible that even a full knowledge of facts of history leaves scope for a difference of opinion, for history is often enough coloured by a complex of sympathies and antipathies specially in a subject like the Indian Mutiny, but that will not necessarily imply an infirmity in the historian's outlook, for the validity of his opinions will have to be judged by the measure of his respect for facts as he could at all know them.

All these varieties of opinions and differences regarding the origin, nature and character of the revolt only add to its multicoloured dimensions and contribute to one's total knowledge of the 1857 uprising. However, despite these features, the Mutiny was working out into a pattern of intense historical depth unfolding in its exotic maze, a unique galaxy of characters, whose activities naturally created diversions productive of many attitudes. Napier may have been panicky over the army and Dalhousie complacent if not supine ; Sir John Lawrence's thesis of greased cartridges may have been either too narrow or too precise ; the 'readymade' king of Delhi may have been or not an apostle of legitimacy ; there may have been too much or not enough 'clemency' in Canning or cowardice in Campbell, and

1 Joshi, p. 201.
2 *Civil Rebellion*, p. 275.

138049

Marfat.com

also if Outram was not an Oudh talukdar in European dress ; all the same, the Mutiny followed its own course, and illustrated the Tocquevillian truth that people revolt not merely because they are poor and oppressed but mainly because they were aware of the gulf that existed between the rulers and the ruled.

Marfat.com

## CHAPTER TWO

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Indian Mutiny of 1857 called forth a mass of books and pamphlets to an extent that could hardly have been approached. Purely narrative accounts and histories were numerous and were supplemented by the biographies and the printed reminiscences which existed of all the great soldiers. In course of time the bibliography of the revolt of 1857 attained a huge proportion specially in records of personal and local experience, on the military side of the story and on biographies which was a spècial feature of historical writings on the Mutiny. But strangely enough, the more celebrated writers of the Sepoy War, Kaye, Malleson, Forrest, and Holmes, gave no specific indication of bibliographical information of the literature that was steadily growing behind their works. Forrest and Holmes, in particular, made a very liberal use of the published works on the Indian Mutiny but no consolidated list was furnished in their works though by that time printed books on the Indian Mutiny probably ran into hundreds. Lieutenant-Colonel G. H. D. Gimlete in his 'Postscript to the Records of the Indian Mutiny' wrote that 'no military revolt in the world's history has had so many chronicles as the Indian Mutiny', and calculated, possibly the first British writer to do so, that as recently as 1912, he had in his possession 164 books on the subject and knew of many more still. But no attempt was made to 'keep track' of the scattered materials so abundant, so diverse in character, or to codify this immense corpus of writings on the Mutiny. The absence of interest in bibliography possibly originated from the fact that down to the end of the nineteenth century, books on the Indian Mutiny mostly originated from eye-witnesses to the war or from the knowledge and experience of personal involvements of the authors in various episodes of the war. Thus Mackenzie of Meerut who completed his work in 1891 and Hope Grant's work published in 1873 were a type of work so personal that they required no other official papers to support their contention. In fact, most of the books on the Mutiny had a dual character as the author himself was both an actor in the



Marfat.com

Mutiny and the historian as well of the whole revolt or of a part of it. It is in this way that the conventional distinction between the official sources and contemporary historical writings, at least in the case of the Indian Mutiny of 1857, had tended to disappear. The writers relied mostly on their own impression and experience and on the notes taken by them in the midst of the war. And as all others also wrote from a position of authority which they held, however great or small, not much of a need was felt to comply with the methodology of historical writings of consulting books published previous to their own works. Writers of the nineteenth century, particularly the civilian historians, between them, had utilised nearly all the published and manuscript materials and key documents relative to the upheaval of 1857, which Dodd, Ball, and Martin, the earliest of the mutiny historians had collected from various sources. But there was no standard bibliography either of the books or of the source-materials, though the newspaper articles, private and official correspondence and letters collected by them even at that early stage was simply overwhelming in number.

Accordingly, the historians who came to the field of mutiny studies in the middle of the present century were keenly aware of the absence of a work of this kind. Books of the early period which were based on primary sources of diverse types containing original materials had to be identified. It became a matter of special importance to prepare a list of works which were the source-books on the Mutiny ; those which were composed by persons who were contemporaries whether in England or in India or by military officers who participated in the campaigns. These requirements led to attempts made by Indian scholars to furnish bibliography of the war in their publications though a correct estimate of the scattered titles was difficult to make. For the first time S. N. Sen completed the task in his 'Eighteen Fifty-Seven' which was considered to be extensive and extremely helpful by many other writers on the Indian Mutiny[1].

A very remarkable contribution on the bibliography of mutiny literature has been recently made by Miss Janice M. Ladendorf whose

[1] M. Edwardes, *Battles of the Indian Mutiny*, p. 207 ; Embree, p. 100 ; Maclagan, p. 358.

Marfat.com

annotated bibliography of the 'The Revolt of India—1857-58' has indeed removed a long felt need in the field of mutiny studies. Besides being methodical and comprehensive in the classification of hundreds of works which are subjected to perusal and scrutiny, she was perceptive and fairly critical in the short annotations which she offered in respect of most of the works listed. The more revealing portion of the book are the lists of private collections of manuscripts still held by the owners which display author's industry and resourcefulness in searching out materials from various sources. The 'Annotated Bibliography' will have a very lasting place in the historical writings on the Indian Mutiny. It will be indispensable to specialists and certainly invaluable for an infrastructure of a work towards the historiography of 1857 which could not have been attempted so long for want of a compilation of the above kind. The bibliographic shortcomings of mutiny studies attracted the attention of many other scholars also. The list furnished in the present work is the result of a long continued process spread over a decade when the list of publications was taking shape but constantly revised almost annually to make it up to date. In its final form as exhibited in this book in an alphabetical order, it will have the same titles as shown by Sen and Ladendorf but both the lists have been examined in detail to place in perspective the works not noticed by either or both of them.

Sen's list of 'General works' contains 282 titles including 23 books written in Indian vernaculars. A separate list of pamphlets is also exhibited. Actually Sen refers to only 259 (282-23) books on the 'Revolt' published in the period between 1857 and 1957 in the English language. This will appear to be quite an underestimate, having regard to the number of books published during the century ending in 1957. It seems that the historian confined his attention only to the more well known books written exclusively on the Mutiny and did not take any notice of the treatment of the subject made in books on general history of British rule in India, in which there were contributions manifestly important. He has also left many of the biographies and memoirs out of account[1], though he included works dealing with the military aspect of the movement. Altogether books

[1] Sen in C. H. Philip's *Historians of India*, p. 384.

Marfat.com

dealing directly or indirectly with the events of 1857, not mentioned by Sen, are quite a few and it is not improbable that the number will have exceeded one hundred. The more glaring of the titles omitted by him are Colin Campbell, Boyle, Butler, Buckler, Nolan, and in particular the two books on the civil and military disturbances of the pre-mutiny period. In the section of 'Pamphlets' only forty-two titles including anonymous writings are listed. This again includes four titles which are not really in the nature of pamphlets. Excluding this number, Sen actually refers to 38 pamphlets which is very much on the lowside considering the enormous number of these booklets circulated in the initial stages of the revolt. Many of these were out of circulation very soon after their publication and quite a number of them cannot be traced at the present time to any source, yet the presence of these writings deserved notice if only to indicate the interest taken by the general mass of people in England in this revolt. These pamphlets overlaid with a thin veneer of partisan spirit had very much added to the excitement of that time but quite a few contained matters of historical importance also. They were of two kinds, some of which were anonymous writings while others went in the name of some writer. The list of pamphlets offered in the present work possibly covers all these fragmentary pieces which appeared contemporaneously with the outbreak or even many years after.

In Ladendorf's plan there is no such section as 'Pamphlets'. instead, she has introduced a new section on the 'Causes of the Mutiny' in which category she has placed the pamphlets she was able to take note of. Judged by the contents, many of these pieces undoubtedly deal directly or indirectly with the causes of the Mutiny and so the classification may be considered appropriate, but pamphlets were written for a variety of purposes as the list furnished in this book will show. In taking a limited view of these stray papers as dealing exclusively with the causes of the mutiny, a very considerable portion of these pamphlets which deal with various aspects of the movement have been left out. Ladendorf's reference to such titles as 'Our conduct after the disaffection', 'The Empire of the middle classes', 'English tenure in India', 'What is to be done with the Bengal army', to refer to only a few, and a crop of pamphlets on the reorganisation

Marfat.com

of the army as noticed by her would point to a very extensive field covered by these pamphlets. The omission of such pamphlets as 'History of Nana Saheb's Claims', 'Letters describing the causes of the Indian Mutiny by an Indian Officer', 'The volunteer's journal of the march of Havelock' (Swanston), 'The Crisis in the Punjab by an Employee', 'The story of the Indian Mutiny' (Nimmo), to quote only a few, also cannot be accounted for.

Ladendorf's list of main works on the Mutiny may now be examined in detail. The book was published in 1966 which was quite the latest published so far on the subject excepting K. K. Sengupta's 'Recent Writings on the Revolt of 1857—A survey' published by the Indian Council of Historical Research in March 1975, which constitutes a useful supplement to the 'Annotated Bibliography'. This 'Survey' adds some new titles, about fifteen short monographs,[1] some of which were published before 1966 but were not noted in the 'Annotated Bibliography'. However, Ladendorf has adopted a novel method in assessing the number and category of these books by making out several sections each of which showing a list of the works relevant to it. Thus we have 24 books under 'Scholarly Studies', 76 under 'Narrative History', 11 under 'District Histories', 106 under 'Biography', 211 under 'Letters, Diaries and Memoirs', 55 under 'Military Aspects', 13 under 'Guides and Gazetteers' and 10 under 'Pictorial Representation'. Besides these there is a section on the 'Causes of the Indian Mutiny', as stated and also a section on 'Fictions' and another on 'Government Documents'. So excepting the titles going under the last three sections, the total of general books covered by the different categories of publications as detailed above comes to 506. This offers a contrast to 259 titles shown by Sen but somehow approximates with the 646 titles collated in the present work under the name 'General Works' including all kinds of writings noticed by Ladendorf in the different sections excepting those on 'Causes', 'Fictions' and 'Government Records'.

[1] The monographs are the works of Batsford (1963), Bora (1957). Clive (1971), Dharaiya (1970), Ghalib (1970), Hussain (1965), Khitmani (1972), Mehrotra (1971), Mistri (1959), Mujeeb (1958), Rahman (1957), Savarkar (1963), Srivastava (1957), Smythe (1966), Sen (1970), Yadav (1965) (K. K. Sengupta, *Recent Writings*, pp. 63 ff.).

Marfat.com

The difference of about 140 books is, however, obvious. The bibliography of the 'General Works' composed on a liberal plan by the present author[1] cannot explain this difference. Not a single book in Indian vernacular has entered into this estimate of 646 titles, exclusive of pamphlets, and even serialised volumes of an author have been taken to represent only one work. On scrutiny it appears that some important books and writings familiar to the mutiny scholars have been omitted in Ladendorf's 'Bibliography'. No reference is made to Sir George Campbell's 'Memoirs', Sir J. H. Grant's 'Life with the Selections etc.', Minturn's 'From New York to Delhi' and also no notice has been taken of Landon, Medley, Holloway, Stocqueler, and quite a good number of all such works. Another very interesting and a very curious point emerges from this scrutiny. It seems that nearly 45 works as indicated by the name of the authors mentioned below which are devoted exclusively to an assessment or description of one or the other aspects of the revolt have been left out by both Sen and Ladendorf in their respective 'Bibliography'[2]. Of these books the one of Adams is a work of prime importance, Butler presents the reader with a grasp of the social and political atmosphere of the Moghul Court, Nolan wrote a concise but a correct full length history and Rana Pudma Jung, son of Jung Bahadur, discloses valuable information about the last phase of the Sepoy War. The omission of any reference by both Sen and Ladendorf to these works rendered the bibliography of the Mutiny and Revolt open to revision. Other works also as noted below could not have been missed. Altogether nearly hundred titles, if not more, which are missing in Ladendorf's

[1] See Appendix.

[2] See Bibliography in the Appendix. The number within bracket refers to the number of the book in the list. The books are : Adams (1), Captain T. C. Anderson (11), Baron DE Rimini (30), Bell (41—Retrospects and Prospects), Bengal massacres (47), Beveridge (51), Birks (55), Brereton (62), Burway (72), Butler (74), Colin Campbell (75), Crawford (110), Dewar (127), Greener (212), Herbert (236), Hypher (262), James (281), Jerrold (282), Kingsley (303), Low (326—Soldiers of the Victorian age), Macpherson (342), Martineau (363), Morris (390), Mullens (397), Nolan (415), Narrative of a journey (407), Oswell (427), Pudma Jung (460), Parry (442), Rogers (477), Shand (503), Siddons (514), Smith (520), Spencer (527), Sturges (537), Thornton (560), Trevor (568), Vibart (591), Wilson (614).

Marfat.com

list have been included in the bibliography presented in this book. Books not known to the present author but brought to notice for the first time in the 'Annotated Bibliography' have been indicated in appropriate places. But the compilation of a bibliography especially of the Sepoy War and of the Rebellion that followed will be obviously a continuing process. No such work will ever be final and complete and the one that is exhibited here will also be outdated in the very near future requiring a fresh attempt at revision. It is all a question of bringing to notice the works completed or current on or before the time when a fresh list was offered.

Another strong point of the bibliography of Ladendorf is the list of scholarly articles published in the accredited journals in both India and Europe on the subject. These articles in most cases particularly those which were published in the *Blackwood's Magazine* and *Calcutta Review*, constitute a major contribution to historical writings on the Mutiny. It was a difficult work to make a complete list of all these articles published in 1857 and since for a century. S. N. Sen prepared a comprehensive list of these articles so far published when his book was written. A similar compilation was made by the *Journal of Asian Studies* of cataloguing all the notices which appeared in the shape of articles and monographs from 1857 to 1957 in different periodicals all over the world.[1] The bibliographical interest of such a work would be invaluable but Ladendorf's book being the latest in the field will have a tremendous reference value. For the articles which appeared in the last twenty years in Indian Journals and in the proceedings of the Indian History Congress and in the Indian Historical Record Commission, K. K. Sengupta has made a meticulous collection of these papers on the Indian Revolt which eminently gives a clear comprehension of the trend of mutiny studies of the present times.[2] Much material on the revolt appeared in some of these articles as also some valuable first-hand accounts but most of these writings represented the general narrative histories and biographies which subsequently appeared in the form of books.

[1] Volume xvii, Number 5, 1958 ; xviii, Number 5, 1959.
[2] Sengupta, pp. 66 f.

Marfat.com

Ladendorf's reference to newspaper articles and accounts is yet another branch of mutiny bibliography which has been compiled from various sources. It is very difficult to take note of all such accounts appearing in widely scattered papers in the dailies and weeklies of both India and Great Britain at that time. In England alone all the articles which appeared in the *Times* perhaps constitute the largest single non-official source of the history of the Indian Mutiny. From the summer of 1857 down to 1860, and even many years after, articles continued to appear from writers who actually participated in the war or otherwise were in a position to make competent observations about men and things of the revolt. In fact, the *Times* became remarkable for the variety and accuracy of its Indian intelligence. Thus Goldwin Smith in his 'Reminiscences' observed that they got a correct impression about the revolt and insurrection in India from the letters of the good Lord Elgin (James, the Eighth Earl) and from those of Russell to the *Times*.[1] The *Times* became the chief organ of the civil and military officers of the government of India who wrote long accounts and essays on the Mutiny and Rebellion and their suppression by military operations. In many of these articles the standard of accuracy was high as they were written by men who were directly involved in the war either in the field or in the barracks or in office and their observations were also critical. Most of the early historians of the Mutiny writing from England drew heavily from the overwhelming mass of source-materials that began to fill up the columns of the *Times* and Martin in particular complained that no catalogue or compilation was yet made of the vast series of notices, accounts and narratives on the Mutiny which the *Times* published.[2] It may as well be investigated if the Blue Books prepared for Parliament incorporated materials previously published in the *Daily News* or in the *Times*. In India the *Hindu Patriot* of Calcutta had featured military intelligence of the revolt. However, Ladendorf has covered

[1] Goldwin Smith, *Reminiscences*, p. 204.

[2] A bound collection of clippings taken from the *Times* was issued by the *Times*, London, under the heading *Indian Mutiny 1857-8.*, No. V. See also Martin, II, pp. 139, 321. George Campbell in his *Memoirs* (*II, Appendix*) gives extracts of many articles on the Indian Mutiny by eye-witnesses and contemporaries published in the December issues of (1857) the paper.

Marfat.com

the sources quite well particularly in respect of manuscripts and private collections she brings to light.

A point of substantive bibliographical interest has however been completely ignored by both Sen and Ladendorf. The Proclamations made by both English and Indian leaders and other important notes, addresses, letters and announcements which lie scattered in various records represent a very interesting and important item of source-material of the Indian Mutiny. These have neither been treated from the larger perspectives they reflect, nor codified in full to complete the bibliographical apparatus of the history of 1857. British historians in general while acknowledging those which originated from English sources have not paid adequate attention to those issued by the Indian leaders.[1] Very little work has been done to estimate the total effect of these proclamations in either moulding the mind of the people or accelerating the force and pace of the revolt. The want of attention on the part of the writers on these proclamations might be due to the non-availability and obscurity of these documents which have to be brought to light from a heap of recorded and unrecorded official papers. It may be due also to the lack of interest and sheer contempt shown by the British writers to the messages of the Indian leaders. The placards issued by the Indian leaders had positively a limited circulation and disappeared soon after their publication. The most important of these messages are, however, best preserved in the early works on the Indian Mutiny, in the books of Dodd, Nolan, Ball, Martin, in their most original and authentic form. Some have been found in Kaye's 'History' also and later writers referring to these proclamations from official sources only recorded the same version as in the old books. Early contemporary writers indeed refer to most of these addresses and it is from these sources that the list of proclamations and other allied state papers as presented here is composed. The importance of these materials can hardly be overestimated. The proclamations issued by British officers are officially recorded and highlight government policies and actions. On the Indian side they constituted the Indian version of the story so sadly missing in bibliography of the Indian Mutiny and certainly reflected the urges

1 Chaudhuri, *Theories of the Indian Mutiny*, pp. 33-4, 48-9.

Marfat.com

and tensions of at least a cross section of the people of India who were involved in the struggle. The counter-proclamation of Begam Hazrat Mahal to the one issued by Queen Victoria illustrates this point.

A very significant feature of the bibliography of the revolt was that it consisted mainly of accounts, chronicles, narratives and histories written by contemporary writers. Indeed there is no event in the history of India of which we possess so many contemporary or nearly contemporary records, memoirs, reviews, and reminiscences, too many in fact one can possibly peruse through. Narratives written by actors in and witnesses to particular episodes of the struggle or by competent observers either civilian or professional soldiers or other non-official persons who derived information from authentic sources, form a class of literature which provide a major part of the sources of the mutiny-war. It is true that absolute impartiality is not to be expected in a contemporary writer who cannot isolate himself from the inescapable personal approach, but in the case of mutiny-history that was not necessarily a constraint to the historians who relied on such accounts as evidence was so plentiful on either side that the correct version could not possibly be obscured. They either wrote out their impressions during the Mutiny or in the closing years of the upsurge, or a few years after the suppression of the Mutiny, while quite a few works of original authority came out much later, in some cases even after fifteen years. Thus Hope Grant's work was published sixteen years after the commencement of the Mutiny. The work of colonel Mackenzie of Meerut after thirty-four years, that of Forbes-Mitchell after thirty-eight years, Innes and Gough after forty years and so also was the book of field-marshal Roberts. Others whose works were published still later were colonel Edward Vibart of Delhi who published his work in 1898, forty-one years after the Mutiny, Keith-Young in 1902, field-marshal Wolsley in 1903, J. Ruggles, a mutiny veteran in 1906. The last of the field-marshals who saw the war and wrote a history was Sir Evelyan Wood whose work was published in 1908, fifty-one years after the Mutiny.

Strictly speaking all these military autobiographies were not contemporary works for though written by military men in action, they were published much later. But in a way this delay only



Marfat.com

enhanced the merit of these works for remote from the excitement of times, it was possible to take a more detached and impartial view of their experiences and estimate the veracity of the materials they collected. From the purely historical point of view there was no other way than to acknowledge some of these works as original sources of the Indian Mutiny and in some cases as the only authentic source of the history of the revolt. In fact, from the Meerut catastrophe to the Terai campaigns of 1859, the history of the mutiny-war was essentially derived from and sustained by military autobiographies, from colonel Mackenzie whose autobiography dealt with the first incident of the sepoy rising at Meerut to Hope Grant's 'Incidents of the Sepoy War', which covered the Terai campaigns and yet none could possibly maintain that the accuracy of treatment in the above works was diminished by their late appearance. And throughout the last part of the nineteenth century a number of other officers who joined the struggle at one stage or other, such as Walker, Norman, Medley, Roberts, Bourchier, North, Swanston, Wilson, Innes, Majendie, Mowbray Thompson, Windham, Adye, Vibart, Prichard, Lowe, Durand, to refer to only a few, have furnished the history of the various phases of the 1857 uprising.

In addition to all these, the bibliography of the Indian Mutiny was also full of many biographical works. The biography of the period is immense of both civil and military officers which official sources cannot cover. The huge number of such works can only be accounted for by the fact that in no other episode of the Anglo-Indian Empire, was there such opportunities of independent action, such a demand for ready wit and leadership of individual characters as in the mutiny-war of 1857. In the earliest stages of the war, British actions were spasmodic, there was no cohesion and joint action was neither possible with the result that the British officers had to move in their own way to meet exigencies of the situation and offensive symptoms. Inevitably, the characters of individual Englishmen impressed themselves with vital reality on the course of the war. Kaye writes in his characteristic way : 'For it was by the energies of individual men acting mostly on their own responsibility, that little by little rebellion was trodden down and

Marfat.com

the supremacy of the English firmly re-established'[1]. So by tracing the movements of Anson, Barnard, Wilson and Nicholson on one side, and Neill and Havelock on the other side, and by following the subsequent campaigns of Campbell and Sir Hugh Rose we can comprehend the magnitude and dimension of the mutiny-war. Of Sir Hope Grant, Earl of Derby said, 'A complete narrative of the engagements in which he has taken a part would in itself furnish a history not very imperfect of the whole operations of the war'.[2] The way in which military and political memoirs carry us into the history of the war is best illustrated in lieutenant-general Shadwell's, 'Life of Colin Campbell, Lord Clyde'. The two-volume work published in 1881 is a kind of biography which has a special charm of its own. In the background of the revolt, Campbell's career is represented as a substitute for the history of the war ; it is focussed in the actions and achievements of Colin Campbell. The author refers to the political situation of the time, the 'bastard political consistency' of the revolt, the native princes biding their time, and British prestige reeling under the effects of the Cawnpore catastrophe. That was the time when Campbell took over. Of the other military biographies, Havelock received the best attention. More fortunate than most warriors, Havelock found in Marshman a competent biographer. Marshman's . work is an excellent specimen of what biography should be. It gives at great length, a succinct and stirring account of various campaigns and points a moral of unswerving rectitude of character. The classic work published in 1860, was reprinted in 1909 even though Forbes' work was published in 1891. Biographies of leading mutiny figures also contained letters and other papers which provided much useful materials as found in L. J. Trotter's, 'Life of John Nicholson' and of 'Sir James Outram'. In respect of biographical works, Kaye's 'Lives of Indian Officers' published in two volumes in 1867 gives model accounts of some of the mutiny heroes in the light of original sources. He writes eloquently about John Nicholson and his hero Henry Lawrence. Another writer C. R. Low writes interesting accounts of most of the mutiny veterans

[1] Kaye, II, Preface, p. xii.
[2] Quoted in C. R. Low, *Soldiers of the Victorian Age*, II, p. 292.

Marfat.com

adding a tribute in all cases and quoting couplets to project their image relevant to their involvements. 'Nicholson was like a noble oak riven asunder by a thunderbolt'. Sir Hugh Grant was more constantly and actively engaged than any other officer. The achievements of Sir Hugh Rose do not look like actual historical events but resemble the 'prodigies of valour of a far-off age of ancient romance'. The book touches a range of different warriors and analyses the contribution of each to enhance the glory of the Victorian age.[1] A very reliable biography was colonel H. M. Vibart's 'Richard Baird Smith' which gives many essential details about the siege of Delhi, so effectively utilised as original information by Kaye in his account of the Delhi Operations. On the Indian side, 'The life of Maharaja Sir Jung Bahadur' of Nepal by his son Pudma Jung Bahadur Rana was an important work. The author says that he had in his possession materials which enshrined the chronicle of his father's activity day-by-day. The services rendered by his father during the Mutiny and by the Gurkhas, called 'Himalayan Highlanders', leading to the siege of Lucknow are furnished, but a sense of loyalty to the British government seems to have overpowered his intellect so much that the rebels were not looked upon as Indians but aliens. The author also gives details of the restitution of territory to Nepal on 17 May 1858 which the Nepalese ceded to the British in 1815. This was done by Canning in lasting memorial of great services rendered.[2] Like military biographies, works on administrators and civilians like Dalhousie, Canning, Henry and John Lawrence also projected biographical elements in shaping the course of the war. On the civilian side, R. B. Smith's 'Life of Lord Lawrence' was the most popular one as he gave interesting insights into the thinking of one who practically turned the table against the mutineers.[3]

The civilians who wrote the administrative reports contributed to the primary source of the Mutiny.[4] Quite a few of them kept

1 Low, *Soldiers of the Victorian Age*, II, pp. 252, 273, 278, 291-92, 309.

2 Pudma Jung, *Life of Maharaja etc* ; pp. 216-17. 219.
Also William Digby, p. 68.

3 Ladendorf's observation cannot be accounted for. She writes : 'In general most of the biographical material adds little to either scholarly analysis or valuable source material' (p. 5) of the Mutiny.

4 Chaudhuri, *Theories*, etc., pp. 2-7.

Marfat.com

diaries and journals and even published books the value of which as contemporary sources cannot be questioned. Written with sufficient interest in the events that were occurring around, the books may not be absolutely impartial as historical works, but undoubtedly they were valuable documents giving original information of a local variety. The more famous of the civilian historians of the Mutiny were Greathed of Delhi, Gubbins of Lucknow, Robertson of Shaharanpur, Edwards of Budaun, Sherer of Cawnpore, Thornhill of Mathura, Tayler of Patna, Boyles of Bihar and quite a few others also belong to this class. Robertson's interesting account of the hybrid nature of his duties in his book 'District duties during the Revolt' affords interesting glimpses of the abnormal conditions of the time.[1] Kaye considered that this was one of the best of many valuable books, illustrative of scattered passages of the rebellion.[2] Contributions of the civilians to the history of Mutiny have been rendered famous by an exquisite piece of work of Edwards of Budaun whose 'Personal Adventures' during the Indian rebellion was published in 1858. The book deals with the circumstances prevailing in the immediate vicinity of Budaun and throws light on the position of the officers-in-charge of the district during this time of crisis. The title of the book is unambitious but the experiences of the magistrate in exile are told with such simple and unaffected pathos, and every motion is so vividly and yet naturally portrayed without any racial rancour that it evoked sympathy with the author in every heart, more so because, the magistrate stuck to his post 'till the ship sank'.[3]

The importance of the current issues of the more important journals during the time of the Mutiny has been indicated. The articles published in the *Calcutta Review* on the Mutiny and revolt of 1857-59 had a peculiar significance of their own as they had a local bearing based on the personal observations and experiences of the writer. In the whole sub-continent of India there was no other monthly journal like the *Calcutta Review* at that time. Sir John William Kaye who retired from the Bengal artillery in 1841 established

1 *Calcutta Review*, 1858, vol. 31, pp. 71 ff. for *Glimpses of District life etc.*
2 Kaye, III, p. 249.
3 Forrest, *History*, III, p. 328.

Marfat.com

the *Calcutta Review* in 1844. He edited the first five issues and wrote many articles till he left for England in 1845.[1] Kaye's association with the 'Review' worked well. It became the foremost journal of the day, a great organ of the Anglo-Indian community, an inseparable part of Indian colonial life. In was enriched by contributions from Henry Lawrence, Innes, Keene, Macpherson, Malleson, Cave-Browne, and many others. To the *Calcutta Review* belongs the credit of bringing to light many competent studies on the nature, causes, character and origin of the revolt.[2] The writers were mostly government officials or otherwise specialists in their own subject. Most of their observations had undoubtedly an anti-Indian tone but their studies were the outcome of intensive investigation and analysis of the successive stages of the outbreak. The article on the 'Campaigns of 1857-58' published in March 1859 based on the works of Norman, Medley, Cooper, Adye, and the memoranda of the Oudh Field Force is an article on the military side of the struggle and contains critical estimates of war strategy. The narrative ends with the battle of Banki. In England the articles published in the *Blackwood's Journal* were works of very great importance. Malleson in his preface to the second volume of his book admitted that his work was based on an article on 'Lord Clyde's Indian Campaigns' published in the October issue (1858) of the journal. The author was major-general Archibald Wilson, and Malleson says that had he continued his work, his book need not have been written. Forrest also made extensive use of these articles published in that journal. Martin, however, states that the article 'Lord Clyde's campaigning in India from August 1857 to February 1858' was written by lieutenant-colonel Alison, the elder of the two brothers (the sons of Sir Archibald Alison) who went out, the one as military secretary and the other (lieutenant-colonel) as 'aide-de-camp' of Sir Colin. He says that the authorship was evidenced by the omission of any notice of the services rendered and other internal matters.[3] Malleson observed that the article as written by the gallant officer was a 'masterpiece of narrative and analysis of military

[1] Buckland, *Dictionary of Indian Biography*, p. 230.

[2] See *Calcutta Review*, 1857, vol. 29, pp. 98. ff.; 1858, vol. 30, pp. 103, 390, 407; vol. 38, pp. 415, 863.

[3] Martin, II, p. 468.

Marfat.com

movements.'[1] Besides this, the article on the First Bengal European Fusiliers in the Delhi Campaign published in January 1858 offers the earliest account of the historic siege of Delhi and the assault of the imperial city and all other subsequent developments. The author was attached to the First Fusiliers.

Similarly the articles published in the *United Service Journal* were also important from the point of view of originality and veracity of facts. Various articles appeared on different subjects like the 'Jack Sepoy' in which one writer expressed his belief that there was something defective in the organisation of the infantry. Views were also expressed that the miserable weakness of the 'boosted empire' has been exposed as clearly as the Retreat of the Ten thousand did that of ancient Persia.[2] In another article the Napier legend was highlighted against Dalhousie's ill-timed complacency and the legacy of a volcano left by the proud Scotch nobleman.[3] One writer was very much impressed with the popular character of the revolt[4] and another enthuses that nowhere was the Mutiny prevented by the presence of British soldiers.[5] The whole series of operations at Shahabad consequent upon the flight of Kunwar and the continuance of the struggle in the Jagadishpur Jungle are narrated by an officer serving in India under the title 'Azamgarh Field Force'.[6] The author, who contributed a series of articles under the caption 'Our Advance on Lucknow', gives a full description of the whole complex of operations originating from the Indian chiefs like Mansingh and Rustamshah. On the sack of Lucknow he gives a vivid account of the destruction of the books of the royal library which contained the most valuable works of any in India but records that Sir James Outram was enabled to have many cartloads of books and papers removed and saved.[7]

[1] Malleson, II, p. 208.

[2] *United Service Journal*, 1857, pt. II, pp. 317-23, 475.

[3] Ibid. pt. III, pp. 5 ff.

[4] Ibid. pp. 16 ff.

[5] Ibid. 1859, pt. I. pp. 215, 428, 561.

[6] Ibid. 1858, pt. III, pp. 409 ff, 552 ff. 560 ff., 1859, pt. I, pp. 81 ff., 244 ff.

[7] *United Service Journal*, 1858, pt. II, pp. 354 ff, 557 ff ; 1858, pt. III. pp, 196 ff., 413 ff. Destruction of books and manuscripts in palace libraries of upper India was quite a common practice with the avenging army. Another British Officer William Muir, Secretary to the government of N. W. Provinces showed similar anxiety to save the treasures of eastern learning. See also Sen, pp. 288 fn.

Marfat.com

The journal also collected some rare correspondence on the military intelligence of the Mutiny.[1] A long article, 'Our position in India' makes some firm statements about the responsibility of Great Britain for this tragic catastrophe. It denounces the Oudh affair as a clear absolute swindle from beginning to end and states, "we have a national weakness, call it vanity...which makes us think that we must be acceptable everywhere ... we are so thoroughly self-sufficient that we give no consideration to the possibility that we may not be wanted. This infatuation on our part, so strangely exhibited in India has caused us to be taken by surprise"[2] Another writer makes a categorical statement that the presence of flying columns in all the recovered districts proved that the whole country was against the British rule.[3] The famous Journal 'The Nineteenth Century and After' also contained some remarkable articles on the Mutiny.[4]

All these materials as surveyed, memoirs, biographies and the autobiographies and the whole range of articles published in contemporary journals had gone to the making of a body of evidence as complete and credible as there is for any history.

[1] Ibid. 1857, pt. III, pp. 406, 440, 443-45, 447, 449-51, 453-4. A very interesting fact is recorded by Knox, the Assistant Commissioner of Kooloo who captured ninety mutineers assisted by the men of his party and also by the Noonoo of Spiti. At the time of their capture in September 1858 they were encamped at Chuga in Tootso, belonging to the Chinese Territory, being the first village beyond the British border. Knox, it is reported, had communicated with the Chinese headman who had promised assistance (Ibid. 1858, pt. III, p. 534).

[2] Ibid. 1858, pt. II, pp. 159 ff., 331 ff., 371 ff., 483, 491.

[3] Ibid. 1858, pt. II, pp. 553 ff.

[4] In an article 'Agra in 1857' (1897, vol. 41, pp. 556 ff), Auckland Colvin refuted the charges made by Lord Roberts on the neglect of the defence of the Agra Fort by Colvin the governor. Robert's criticism, according to him, was entirely based on Thornhill's 'Indian Mutiny', published in 1885. An article on the 'Sepoy Rebellion' by Rev. W. Arthur published in the October issue (1857) of the Quarterly Review of London is frequently referred to by Martin.

Marfat.com

## CHAPTER THREE

# EARLY CONTEMPORARY WORKS

Henry Mead's 'Sepoy Revolt' was not the earliest work on the Indian Mutiny ; a monograph published by Fitzgerald Lee and Radcliffe of Dorsetshire was still earlier. The work entitled 'The Indian Mutiny up to the relief of Lucknow', was prepared for the staff college candidates. The monograph had all the features of a planned work with a good introduction and a factual account of the causes of the Mutiny, the sepoy army and the military resources of the government. The work is mainly devoted to a description of the narrative of the successive outbreaks and the military preparations made on the British side. They bring the narrative up to the second relief of Lucknow and end with the withdrawal of the Lucknow garrison on 23 November 1857. It encloses an Appendix, a very detailed synchronological table of events, from January to 19 November 1857 and an outline map to illustrate the Indian Mutiny.[1] Within its limits, the book envisages a fairly accurate history of the outbreak with the exception of some minor inaccuracies of dates and events. It is a noteworthy feature that the authors ascertained those ranges and attitudes which were subsequently elaborated by other writers. They begin with this statement that the revolt was not a rebellion but a mutiny although politics and civil discontent played a prominent part in causing it.

About the causes of the revolt they referred to the relaxation of discipline in the Sepoy Army, the cartridges, the annexation of Oudh which added fuel of political discontent to the smouldering fire of the Mutiny. They criticised the disgraceful passiveness of general Hewitt,

[1] The *Calcutta Review* acknowledged the publication of the work prior to that of Mead's 'Sepoy Revolt' (Cal. Rev. 1858, vol. 30, p. 232 ff.). It is a book of 97 pages in close print of long size. The book cannot be traced in the catalogue of the British Museum. The personal copy of the author bears no date of publication but obviously it must be towards the very end of December 1857 if not in the early part of 1858, for the marshalling of facts regarding regions as far off as Punjab, Rajputana, Gwalior, Indore and Jhansi and North-West Provinces must have required sufficient time for publication. Ladendorf assigns the book to the year 1918.



Marfat.com

the stupid 'red-tape, roll-calling commanders of Meerut', the blunder of leaving the large arsenal in Delhi at the hands of a native garrison. They also refer to the Delhi operations of June, Nana's implication with the mutineers and his march to Kalyanpur and the siege of Delhi about which they give the total of assaulting columns with minutest detail. Havelock's advance on Cawnpore and Lucknow is also described along with an estimate of the political situation of the country. About Havelock's relief of Lucknow, they had the candour to admit that it was no relief at all ; it was only the arrival of reinforcements, a point which was subsequently stressed by Malleson.[1] In conclusion the authors state that the history of the Indian Mutiny reflects very little credit on British statesmen and administrators, the stupid meddlesome policy of the civil rulers of India who 'never set a squadron in the field'. The authors again were of the Napier School and hurled an attack on the 'titled Scotch lawyer' of 35 years of age, venturing to insult on a purely military matter, the 'victor of Meeanee'. And so the British muddled through the Mutiny somehow in the greatest of all their 'small wars'.[2] However, the book furnishes for the first time a brief but fairly accurate account of the Mutiny.

Not so was Henry Mead's 'Sepoy Revolt' which was not meant to be a narrative of the contemporary events but a history of the revolt, a subject which was not perhaps historically mature to be treated as such in 1857. As shown above, Mead was involved in the prejudices of the time and strikes a frankly anti-government note in most of his observations. He writes directly from his own knowledge and impression and from a few official letters issued to and from Calcutta which were possibly the only public records currently known at that time, and also some Indian sources like the Delhi Proclamation and accounts of news writers. The work seems to have been composed after the fall of Delhi, the latest event to be recorded in his book[3] but unlike Fitzgerald and Radcliffe there is no account whatsoever of any detail of the struggle. The book makes a rapid survey of the initial outbreaks at all the military stations. There are some factual mistakes,

[1] Chapter Four.

[2] Fitzgerald Lee, p. 97.

[3] Mead, pp. 98, 107, 117. Martin refers to Mead's 'Sepoy Revolt' published by Routledge in 1858 (Martin II, p. 6, fn.)

Marfat.com

no doubt[1], but it abounds in striking ideas, and critical appreciation of situations which appeared very profound and original having regard to the time when it was written. Mead had his own views about the situation. He could not condone the weakness of Hewitt, and his opposition to Canning's government was unrelenting. In everything and everywhere it was 'too late' ; the story of Sisphus was being enacted—'the Sibyl's price paid but the book of fate not forthcoming'.[2] He referred to the Dinapur situation where 1200 British troops whose presence elsewhere would have been invaluable were detained.[3] At times his outpourings might sound a little scurrilous but his description of the facilities for the transit of men, guns and stores to Upper India which were not made use of by the government even in the face of the revolt was noted by both Martin and Kaye.[4] The whole piece, full of intelligence of the commissariat, rang with noble indignation against the shocking indifference of the Calcutta authorities. As a historian, he was most interested in explaining the spirit underlying the events. He detected the popular urges of the revolt, the legitimacy of the king of Delhi, the possibility of averting the Cawnpore massacres. On Colvin's proclamation he commented that even if it was issued it would not have made matters worse.[5] Besides the Mutiny, Mead devoted half the portion of his book in dealing with public affairs of India in which his knowledge was incomparable being a long standing journalist of repute. In many ways the book of Henry Mead was a leading work which brought into prominence the whole background of the great revolt of 1857.

Another journalist J. H. Stocqueler wrote a book on India[6] adding a narrative of the causes of the terrible rebellion then raging. The book seems to have been compiled before the fall of Delhi and was perhaps the only one written from London in the year 1857 which

1 Mead, pp. 85, 140 (his estimate of the number of Europeans at Cawnpore and the statement that general Wheeler was killed on 2nd July).

2 Mead, pp. 70, 86, 184.

3 Ibid. p. 177.

4 Mead, pp. 82-83 ; Martin, II, pp. 266-67 ; Kaye, II, p. 123.

5 Mead, pp. 94, 101, 122, 140.

6 *India, its History etc.* with a full account of the development of the Bengal Army, London 1857, Published by George Routledge and Company. The book also goes by the name of J. H. Siddons.

Marfat.com

attempted to deal with the causes of the revolt within a few months of its outbreak. Stocqueler could not be as informative as Mead who was writing from India but the work of the London journalist is important enough as showing the earliest pattern of English writings on the Indian Mutiny. He actually knew nothing about the causes of the revolt excepting in a very general sense, the discontent of the sepoys and the annexation of Oudh, but what he said about the reaction of the sepoys to the social innovations introduced by the British 'may be authentic and important as the only surviving example of the causes of the Mutiny as the general public thought'. The author quotes press reports about the fears of conversion by the natives ; fears generated by the suppression of the sati, infanticide, and the decree legalising the marriage of Hindu widows and particularly by the introduction of the Enfield Rifle Cartridge[1]. He also started evolving the same philosophy of equating British Imperialism with humanitarian intentions which was to become so characteristic a feature of British historical writings on the Indian Mutiny. As a possible explanation of the demand for vengeance by the English people he says that the main ground for their fierce temper was the ingratitude of the Indians. To illustrate this point he writes, 'One thing at least is certain whether we have come by our empire righteously or unrighteously the natives at large have eventually benefited by the change of masters'. Furthermore, the British have not erected temples, tombs or fortresses, but amidst enormous difficulties they have given the people the benefits of education, justice and material developments of a wide variety of things. They have been tolerant of the different religions of India and have respected private property[2]. Even at that time when he wrote the book, he seemed to have got the intelligence that the work of vengeance was going on bravely and that the gibbet and sword had their victims[3] as the rebellion was being suppressed. Another book published in 1858 from Cambridge was not however very popular with the people[4].

[1] Stocqueler, p. 20. [2] Ibid. p. 11. [3] Ibid. p. 22.

[4] J. M Ludlow's work *British India its races and its history considered with reference to the Mutinies of 1857*, 2. Vols., Cambridge, 1858. It was affected in tone and exaggerated in sentiment. His personal ignorance of the country is manifest in every line of the book. 'The book is not redeemed by research, candour or modesty' ( *Calcutta Review, 1858*, Vol. 31, p. 455 ).

Marfat.com

The famous *Red Pamphlet* already referred to is both a narrative and a commentary which combine to result in a compact and an integrated history of the early stages of the revolt. The work is executed with such striking clarity and detail that it at once sets the Indian Mutiny as a challenging episode of British Imperial history. Then quite young, colonel G. B. Malleson compiled the work entirely from his personal impression and experience of the war when he was in India. With the aid of Blue Books, a few journals and letters and occasional notices which appeared in the government gazette, he composed the work under the title 'The Mutiny of the Bengal Army : By one who served under Sir Charles Napier'[1]. The work is divided in two parts, one of which was dedicated to Earl of Ellenborough and the other one to Sir Charles Napier. The first part seems to have been completed on 2 July 1857 and published soon after. Allen's rejoinder dated 15 December 1857 relates to this part of the Pamphlet[2]. The second part according to the author was in a manuscript form up to 21 November 1957. The narrative concludes with the fall of Delhi on 20 September 1857[3], and was publised from London in 1858. The controversial point and other disputed features which are discussed in Malleson's work have been referred to. His prejudices providing emphasis on British action and on the strength of British Empire were no less pronounced. His narrative also contained some mistakes as pointed out by S. N. Sen that the Nana had never been adopted by Baji Rao and that he got possession of Baji Rao's property by a forged will.[4] However, Malleson gives a lucid account of the Mutiny of the different stations and offers very critical sketches of the political

1 *Red Pamphlet*, pp. 94, 99.

2 *Supra*, p. 11.

3 *Red Pamphlet*, pp. 55, 67, 214-15. Shepherd says (*A Personal Narrative of the outbreak and massacre at Cawnpore*, Preface, pp. i-ii-v), that his 'Brief account of the outbreak at Cawnpore' prepared under the orders of Col. Nuthall was published in the papers at Calcutta and London on 6 and 9 November 1857. This is the same narrative which is referred to in the *Red Pamphlet* : 'He has since written a lucid narrative of the events of the siege which must form the basis of any authentic history of that fearful period' (p. 159).

4 Sen in Philip's *Historians of India etc.* (pp. 373-4).

Marfat.com

situation of the country[1]. His views about the annexation of Oudh was accepted by many other writers and his estimate of Anson was appreciated by Kaye[2]. On Canning he was critical. The historian observed that the enrolment of the volunteers would have enabled the government to dispense with the service of the European regiments and its rejection of the offer of help from many associations of Calcutta only depressed the spirit of loyalty of the people. He writes that Canning had done little to claim admiration of the people and was almost the only man to disbelieve that the whole Bengal Army was infected with the spirit of revolt. About Colvin's proclamation it was inexplicable why Colvin made no reference about it to the governor-general. He also found it very surprising that Canning's counter-proclamation never appeared in the Agra Gazette at all[3]. His other observations were equally striking. It was pointed out that if Anson would have despatched European infantry and Cavalry to the south of Delhi in response to Canning's famous telegram of 31 May, Delhi would have been the seat of a rebel government with Punjab throwing in its lot with them. He also stated that the Mutiny of the 6th N. I. at Allahabad had sealed the fate of Cawnpore and that if a detachment of Cavalry would have been pushed to Cawnpore after the battle of Pandu Nadi, it would have been not merely possible but probable that the massacres of 15 July could not have been perpetrated.[4] Malleson's knowledge of arms and military action was profound. He detected the defective arrangement of brigadier Innes at Ferozpur on 13 May when the troops mounted an attack, and the deficiency of cavalry of Havelock's army which acted as a hindrance to the consummation of victory[5]. At the same time the historian formed his own views about the Mutiny of 1857 which did not appear to be a mutiny only. 'It appeared as if the ryots and zamindars were about to attempt the execution of the project in which the sepoy had failed'. The character of a military outbreak is neutralised if not obliterated by the common cause, the princes, people, farmers, villagers and ryots made with the sepoys.[6]

1 *Red Pamphlet*, pp. 99, 105.
2 See *infra*, Chapter on Kaye.
3 *Red Pamphlet*, pp. 61-2, 68.
4 Ibid. pp. 72, 129, 150.
5 *Red Pamphlet*, pp. 64-5, 148-150.
6 Ibid. pp. 91, 124.

Marfat.com

The *Red Pamphlet* was thus the earliest work to give a shape to the incidents of the revolt of 1857 up to the fall of Delhi. In a sense it laid the foundation of British historiography on the Indian Mutiny. But the 'Narrative of the Indian revolt to the capture of Lucknow' by Sir Colin Campbell which was published in 1858 by the Vickers[1] was not so comprehensive. The internal evidence seems to imply that the book was pre-dated. By implication it refers to the *Red Pamphlet*. but makes direct mention of Greathed's 'Letters' published in 1858. Nanakchand's journal and quotes from Shepherd[2]. The narrative is also carried to a point much later than what was covered by the 'Red Pamphlet' published withal in 1858. Doubts may be raised about the authenticity of the author also. In the preamble it is stated that unspeakable atrocities were committed by the sepoys and other such things as children being tossed in the air and caught upon bayonets. So the author writes, 'The Story of the Mutiny has reached us in so fragmentary a manner at such uncertain intervals accompanied by details so ill-digested, doubtful and contradictory that the public have very confused idea of the purpose of the revolt. This we propose to remedy'[3]: Evidently the author took up the work to reflect the feelings of the people of England who greedily swallowed all sorts of gossip about massacres of Europeans. The anti-Indian feeling of the early writers originated from this milieu, and Sir Colin Campbell could not be free from this

[1] The book has no introduction, but it is illustrated with nearly two hundred engravings from authentic sketches and a map of India illustrative of the 'Narrative'. Some of the interesting engravings are : a) Arrah holding out (pp. 138-39), b) Army on the March (pp. 234-5), c) Colin Campbell and Jung Bahadur (pp. 426-7), d) Plan of the Siege and defence of Delhi (p. 159), Scene in the Intrenchment at Cawnpore (p. 217), e) Bibighar (pp. 202 and 349). The picture of Bibighar with large banyan trees round the well, and the interior chambers, are all similar to those given in Shepherd's 'Narrative'. The book cannot be traced in the British Museum Catalogue.

[2] Campbell, *Narrative*, pp. 5, 14, 112, 116.

[3] Ibid. p. 2. The description given of the atrocities committed bv the sepoys must surely provoke feelings of animosity, but it is difficult to find out the source of Campbell's information for Charles Ball gives exactly the same description. Ball quotes another letter of children being thrown up in the air and caught in the point of bayonet (Ball, I, pp. 75, 106).

Marfat.com

incubus which disfigured his narrative. Malleson writing from India did not show this weakness. Campbell's book does not indicate the sources from which he drew his materials. He makes much of the 'chapatis' and 'lotus' but he also deals with the greased cartridges, the Oudh annexation and the discontent of the people as contributory causes of the revolt. He makes special mention of Wheeler's missionary activities which he thinks were sufficient to impress the people of the 34th N. I. that the government resolved to compel them to profess Christianity. But the account of the mutiny he gives is very weak in details. Military situations are not treated with considerable knowledge and political situations are described without any critical awareness of the problems at issue. There are even some grave factual blunders as the statement that the Meerut mutineers fled in the direction of Delhi pursued by the 6th Dragoons[1]. No comment is made on Anson's conduct or on the shooting of princes by Hodson. He refers to the sack of Delhi with the comment that no victorious army could ever be restrained from licence in a captured city[2]. Some points which deserve attention are the views held by the author with regard to the complicity of the rani of Jhansi and that of the king of Delhi in the revolt, the constitution of the rebel government, the rise of the whole population against the English in Oudh, the unconvincing nature of the victory at Delhi and its doubtful advantage. A detailed description of Havelock's relief of Lucknow[3] is also furnished but in general the book is replete with imaginary descriptions of the various forms of revolting crimes committed by the sepoys which are repeated with a degree of perversion and at times, from history, the book degenerates into a story of murders and assassinations and the flight of the fugitives[4]. It is sustained by quotations some of which might have been taken from Charles Ball's work and there are passages which bear a near resemblance to the treatment of the same subject as in the *Red Pamphlet*. The account on the fall of Delhi may be ascribed to the statement of the Indian correspondent. Forrest refers to the journal of Sir Colin Campbell kept in his official capacity by captain George Allgood, assistant-quarter-master-general and also to the short narrative of Sir David Baird who was one of

[1] Campbell, *Narrative*, p. 14.
[2] Ibid. pp. 76, 170, 172.
[3] Ibid. pp. 53, 172, 185.
[4] Ibid. pp. 20, 68, 92, 171.

Marfat.com

Sir Colin's aides-de-camp[1]. But it is doubtful if the 'Narrative of the Indian Revolt' going in the name of Sir Colin Campbell originated from or were the same as these works.

Books published in England in the year 1857 were of the same kind. Another work 'A Complete Narrative of the Mutiny in India' edited by Thomas Frost and published in 1858 was scarcely noticed, if noticed at all, by the mutiny historians. A. Duff who was very much respected in India and whose views were highly appreciated exposed himself to grave misrepresentation in the letters he wrote regarding the causes and results of the 'Indian Rebellion', the second edition of which came out in 1858. He was not critical about his sources of information and was expressionistic and emotional. Duff was criticised by Edward Leckey whose 'Fictions' published in 1859 showed the fictitious nature of the work of Duff. Martin wrote that misstatements in Dr. Duff's work calculated to set the British mind 'aflame' against the natives ought in justice to have been recanted.[2] But Rev. M. A. Sherring's 'The Indian church during the great Rebellion' is worthy of its subject. The book was published in 1859 and the author offers an authoritative account on the basis of many original sources, of the sufferings of both missions and missionaries of each station with an air of 'calm truthfulness as well as of heroic endurance'. It is a noble work nobly planned. Sherring gives the impression that the Indian Church imitated the ideals of the 'Church of first three centuries in its faith and firmness'.[3]

But all these works, excepting Malleson's *Pamphlet*, touched only a fringe of the full history of the Mutiny.[4] Increasingly as the Mutiny spread over the whole of northern India, accounts of regional outbreaks by contemporary writers, observers and many others who were caught up in the exigencies of the war, began to appear in large numbers, reinforced by a variety of chronicles, narratives and

1 Forrest, *History*, I, Preface, pp. xi-xii.
2 Martin, II, pp. 274-75 fn.
3 *Calcutta Review*, 1859, p. xiv.
4 The book 'Narrative of the Indian Mutinies of 1857 compiled for the Madras Military Male orphan' published in 1858 presented the events in a flat factual type.



Marfat.com

diaries dealing with local and regional history of the Mutiny and of the military operations conducted to suppress the risings. Such accounts came mostly from military officers who were witnesses to the flare-up in their respective stations though the books embodying these accounts were published much later in some cases. Thus in regard to Delhi we have many important works which are some of the best products of the early period of mutiny studies. Major H. W. Norman, deputy-adjutant-general of the Bengal Army published his 'Narrative of the Campaign of the Delhi Army' in 1858. It was an official report and was looked upon as the only narrative which gave the fullest account of the contest at Delhi. Norman, like Hope Grant, was in the thick of the fight almost everywhere without intermission. During the whole period of the seige of Delhi, amidst all fluctuations, Norman exhibited Christian courage and consummate temper and judgment. His book bears the stamp of 'calm veracity' and the spirit of a soldier. It was a plain unadorned narrative as 'comfortable to read as the Duke of Wellington's work'.[1]

Other works of primary importance on Delhi are the letters of the famous officer, commissioner Harvey Greathed, which must take precedence of all such works connected with the siege of Delhi. Of similar importance are the letters of colonel Keith-Young published in his book "Delhi-1857" edited by general Sir W. Norman. Both the authors, Greathed and Young, occupied positions of trust in the Delhi siege-army and had intimate knowledge of the scenes they described. Hodson's letters in 'Twelve years of a soldier's life', edited by Rev. Hodson possessed worth and interest of the same kind but Martin says it is doubtful if the letters would have been published by the author himself had he been alive.[2] Colonel Baird Smith, the engineer turned soldier and planner, had given with a fulness and precision the whole history of the siege of Delhi not often found in official documents. Baird Smith is quoted extensively by Sir John William Kaye for his unpublished memoir, manuscript correspondence and particularly his report to major-general Wilson which constitute a valuable supple-

[1] *Calcutta Review*, 1858, vol. 31, pp. Misc. Notices, lviii.

[2] Martin, II, p. 441, fn. See also *Calcutta Review* for opinions on the book (1859, vol. 32. p. lxv). Also, p. 8 for Letters of Greathed.

Marfat.com

ment to Norman's narrative.[1] Colonel H. M. Vibart's work 'Richard Baird Smith' published in 1897 is a necessary appendage to a study of the siege of Delhi just as R. Bosworth Smith's 'Life of Lord Lawrence' published in 1883 contains authentic information about the contributions of the Punjab hero to this epoch of heroic struggle which by itself was an event of the history of the Mutiny.[2] Other books from contemporary military sources and actual participants in the siege operations possessing worth and interest of the same kind are quite a few, one of which is Turnbull's 'Letters written during the siege of Delhi'. It is worth recording that Ladendorf has traced several manuscript sources having an important bearing on the siege of Delhi.[3]

Of the other books on Delhi, mention should be made of the 'Chaplain's Narrative of the Siege of Delhi' by J.E.W. Rotton published in 1858. This unpretending narrative based on authoritative sources projects itself at times to describing some of the most crucial points of the war and helps a better understanding of the situation. The Chaplain notes that the military authorities at Meerut were paralysed and there were all sorts of uncanny fears.[4] He regarded that an early assault on Delhi would have been foolish and does not support the view of Greathed that the sepoy casualty was heavy.[5] He deplored the excesses committed by the British troops and bemoaned the lot of the 'natives' who sacrificed their lives[6] but it is pointed out that an 'affectation and cloth-feeling' marked every page of Rotton's work who wrote more as a priest than as a man. In everything he makes the readers feel that he is a priest.[7] A very infamous but a useful work on the Delhi episode is F. Cooper's 'The Crisis in the Punjab etc'. Cooper had a knack of telling just what the general public wanted to know.

[1] Lieut-Col. Baird Smith's report dated 17 September was published in London Gazette, 15 December, 1857.

[2] *Calcutta Review*, 1861, vol. 37, Notices, p. vii.

[3] The manuscripts traced are one from William Wilkie on Crimean and Indian Mutiny. He is a very sharp-eyed observer on the siege of Delhi. Other manuscripts traced are written mostly by army officers including C. B. Saunder's Ms. on the siege of Delhi (Ladendorf, pp. 152-154, 158, 161-62).

[4] Rotton, pp. 4,7,22.

[5] Ibid. pp. 62-63, 75

[6] Ibid. p. 134.

[7] *Calcutta Review*, 1858, vol. 31, Misc. Notices, pp. xxxiii-iv.

Marfat.com

He had the best means of getting information of all kinds and Martin observed that the philanthropist might condemn the tone of his book but the historian must gratefully acknowledge the clear and comprehensive manner of his treatment and his statements of facts according to his view of them without arranging and garbling them to suit the public eye.'[1] But Martin seems to have ignored the fact that even correct and comprehensive history is vitiated when it is loaded with fury and fierce hatred of a section of people. To Cooper the Indian Mutiny came as a long expected opportunity to unfold his mind and vilify the Asiatics. The easiest way to get infected with a racial spirit was to read Cooper's work.[2] To him the Meerut mutiny appeared to be the 'dread symbol' even without a 'Daniel' to confirm it.[3] He frankly states that most vigilant measures were adopted to suppress local intrigues. His idea was that the local government in this time of crisis should look fearfully intangible like the countenance of Louis Napoleon.[4] Short shrift awaited all captures. The motto of general Nicholson for mutineers, *a la lanterne*, was strictly followed ; Cooper discusses with fiendish delight how he massacred all the deserters at Ujinala.[5] To the author, Sir John Lawrence was the man of the hour whose name alone counted in the Punjab. Honour and prestige were at stake when general Wilson assumed the command of the Delhi Field Force on 20 July. Lawrence alone represented power, 'the amalgamation of the law into a name.' The name 'formed the idea of a governing impersonation' before which the Dost, Gulab Singh, the nawab of Bhawalpore and all others quailed.[6] Besides all these, Cooper also gives a vivid account of the condition of Delhi during the siege which would compare favourably with other such accounts coming from Indian sources.[7]

A book entitled 'The Punjab and Delhi in 1857' by Rev. J. Cave-Browne, assistant chaplain of the Bengal Presidency published

[1] Martin, II, pp. 441.
[2] Cooper, pp. 6, 129, 189.
[3] Ibid. Preface, p. xiii.
[4] Ibid. pp. 24-25.
[5] Ibid. p. 149.
[6] Ibid. pp. 238-42.
[7] cf. The Crisis in the Punjab by a Punjab Employee, p. 121.

Marfat.com

in 1861 is another authoritative work which was frequently brought under reference by later writers. The book was the work of an evangelist but it was not marred by any disregard for objectivity. It has all the forms of a sound and complete historical writing on the Mutiny. The author's range of sources embraces all contemporary celebrities who either saw the Mutiny or took part in it and had published works as such. He also consulted official despatches of which he gives an account including all the available military despatches of the time. Thirdly, the historian also furnishes a list of persons of that time whose evidence he took, and of other source-materials he used all of which are shown in the Appendix. He himself was stationed at Nowshera when the Mutiny broke out. It is very significant that Cave-Browne spared neither himself nor others in search for truth, and it is no less remarkable that a chaplain would be in quest of truth in the matter of the Indian Mutiny during the excitement of the revolt of 1857.[1] Throughout the book he hardly refers to the Christian spirit and the Asiatic complex which characterize other historical writings on the Mutiny.

The work originated in a journal kept by the author while in camp and appeared in the *Blackwood's Magazine* in the beginning of 1858 and eventually amplified into a continuous narrative under the title as shown. The book was meant for the British readers who will have a nostalgic pride in the record of so many of England's sons who covered themselves with glory and saved the 'Empire'. However, the important points made out by the author are not many. Like early writers he also makes too much of Muhammadan intrigues and conspiracies, of the King Persia and others, in the outbreak of the Mutiny. He writes that the greased cartridges were no more responsible for the events of 1857 as was the leather head-dress for the Vellore Mutiny of 1806. The author furnishes vivid accounts of the rise of troops, station by station. Sir John Lawrence's activities are described in the most objective way showing that he alone grasped the significance of the present crisis in all its vastness.

He refers to Greathed, the commissioner, as belonging to the North-West Province who was not very cordial in acknowledging the

[1] Cave-Browne, Preface, pp. xiii-xiv.

Marfat.com

authority of the Punjab government. Cave-Browne also makes a significant remark that there was no basis for the statement of Lord Granville made in the House of Peers, that Lawrence was willing to make terms with the king of Delhi. But the author observed that if the siege of Delhi had to be maintained at all hazards then there was no other alternative but to bring into use the regiments at Peshawar even by making a present of trans-Indus territory to Dost Mahammad. Cave-Browne also discussed at full-length the massacres of the sepoys at Ujinala by F. Cooper in the light of the question raised by Montgomery, first, whether the men were legally or morally liable to punishment or death, second, whether the punishment was necessary and just, and third, if it was possible for Cooper to wait for a formal trial. On each of these counts the historian advances strong grounds in support of R. Montgomery, judicial commissioner of the Punjab[1]. He also, like other British writers, supported the action of Hodson and showed a keenness in the glorification of his own race. On Nicholson he pronounced a eulogy which was characteristic of mutiny literature of that time. But his death dimmed his victorious achievements as in the case of other great generals of England. As Wolfe fell at Quebeck, Abercrombie at Acre, Nelson at Trafalgar, so also Nicholson met his doom at Delhi[2]. The historian, however, ascribes British success in the Mutiny to external factors such as an alliance with France and the termination of the war with Russia and Persia[3].

The *Calcutta Review* attacked Cave-Browne for his commercial mentality of repaying the Punjab officers with praise for all the considerations received from them. He is lost in feelings of admiration for the Punjab officers who are extravagantly eulogised. His statement that without John Nicholson, Delhi would not have fallen, evoked a protest from the critics at Calcutta who reminded the author that there were hundreds of thoughtful heads and thousands of brave hearts of Delhi who struggled for the recovery of the city. It was also very unfortunate that Cave-Browne should have stressed that the

[1] Cave-Browne, II, pp. 101-3.
[2] Ibid. II, p. 143.
[3] Ibid. II, pp. 194-5.

Marfat.com

Sikh soldiery held the Poorbeahs in supreme contempt for it would have widened the breach between the Punjabis and the Hindusthanis to the detriment of military interest[1].

On Delhi there are many other works from army quarters which were published during the period of the Mutiny and as such came to be ranked as sources of original importance. One such writer was lieutenant-colonel Julius Medley, R. E. who had experience of frontier warfare in which such men as Chamberlain, Nicholson, Hodson, Probyn and others were trained. Medley took part in the siege of Delhi, in the Doab Campaigns and also joined the operations at Lucknow. The details regarding tracing of battery and plans of the engineers in the siege operations could not have been described by a more competent authority than by this military officer who himself was a distinguished actor in the scene he describes. Later historians like Kaye and Malleson could not but acknowledge the importance of his work, 'A year's campaign in India from March 1857 to March 1858'. Medley's account of the memorable epoch was regarded as most authoritative, confirmed as it was by the testimony of distinguished officers. His book was looked upon as a treasure in the annals of the Indian campaigns of 1857-58. Another such work was colonel George Bourchier's 'Eight month's campaign against the Bengal Sepoy Army during the Mutiny of 1857' published in 1858. Bourchier was one of the most daring officers of his regiment, the Bengal Artillery. It was a difficult task to give a practical sketch of the whole campaign for eight months beginning with the exploits of Nicholson's moveable column in the Punjab. He gives a vivid picture of the operations before Delhi and an account of its final assault and capture. Later on he fought in a series of battles in the Doab accompanying Greathed's column and ended his campaigns with the final rescue of the Lucknow garrison. He also fought at the battle of Generalgang on 6 December 1857. His exploits in that battle were only one instance of the many wonderful performances of the horse artillery in the mutiny-war[2]. Bourchier had access to the best sources of information. His book was the work of a dashing

1 *Calcutta Review*, 1863, vol. 38, p. 161.
2 Sedgwick, p. 103.

Marfat.com

soldier characterised by a certain disregard for historical and literary grace, but the narrative was a clear and a spirited account of a greater number of events[1].

Another book copiously referred to by Kaye was the 'History of the Siege of Delhi', by an officer who served there, with a sketch of the leading events in the Punjab, connected with the great rebellion of 1857[2]. It was published in 1861. The anonymity of the author could not be explained, neither was it maintained for in another work, W. W. Ireland, who seems to have been a member of the Indian Medical service[3] described himself as the author of the 'History of the Siege of Delhi',, etc. Ireland attempts to write in the style of a historian by referring to the work of previous authors in the field, all of whom failed to satisfy him. He was of the view that Norman's account was much too short in facts and technical details though he gave a complete account of the military operations. Rotton had his mind 'too much imbued with the solemnity of his office to be able to note all the military details'. And also what he wrote was not history but a personal narrative of what came under his eye. The published letters of Greathed and Hodson contained many valuable details and information, but they were full of uncorrected mistakes which gave an imperfect and wrong idea of the operations and are further tainted by the undue attention they gave to their friends and admirers. Like a pontiff the historian in Ireland writes, 'for in writing history, it is necessary to pull up the weeds as to sow the good seed'[4]. He says that he was present during the whole of the siege operations and was an eye-witness of every battle described, went out of the ground into the batteries, talked with soldiers, took notes and sifted

[1] The *Calcutta Review* commented that Bourchier in spite of his rank wrote like a 'griff' with light-heartedness that was proverbial of the Bengal subaltern. Careless execution and prejudicial ignorance were the weak spots of his work but his professional merits might have compensated the shortcomings as the composer of a book (*Calcutta Review* 1859, vol. 32, pp. 109-110).

[2] Kaye refers to the author under various titles (II, pp. 140, 171, 194; III, Pp. 171, 621, 639).

[3] For a review of the Book see *Calcutta Review* 1861, 37, Notices, pp. iii-vii. In a book on a story of Anglo-Indian life (Randolph) by W. W. Ireland, Ireland describes himself as the author of 'History of the Siege of Delhi'.

[4] *History of the Siege of Delhi, etc.* Preface, pp. v-vi.

Marfat.com

them on the spot. His conscience and his conviction were clear that he had endeavoured to tell the truth, that he had no ill feeling against any human being and that he had not written anything with the deliberate intention of adding to or detracting from the exploits of any one[1]. So much for the infrastructure of a book of few pages. In dealing with the condition of the city he gives a description and also a causerie on the trial of Bahadur Shah. The sketch of the events offered was considered to be final and complete and admitted of no other changes in the light of which some slight errors of facts of previous writers were detected[2].

Kaye brought this anonymous work frequently under reference while dealing with the military operations at Delhi but it does not appear that the book was so original or even informative. Ireland utilised some of the Blue Books, the general report on the administration of the Punjab (1856-58). He had before him also the press report of the proceedings of the trial of Bahadur Shah. In regard to the Punjab he freely reproduced Cooper and on Delhi he drew from Rotton also and quoted extensively from Medley who made the work in the trenches a 'part of the history of his own'[3]. For a careful historian which he claims he is, it is surprising that he should mistake major-general Thomas Reed who succeeded Sir Henry Barnard, to be general Reid[4], and even otherwise his account of the siege operations was not in any case more detailed than that offered by previous writers like Ball, Dodd, and even Nolan. It is a plain chronicle of facts and does not evince any critical acumen in the estimate of men and things nor does it give the impression of any breadth and depth of thought which enhances the value of historical works. The self-styled historian criticises the 'atrocious machiavellism' of Dalhousie but described most indifferently Hodson's activities as there was no use lingering over these accusations[5].

1 Ibid. pp. vi-viii.

2 Thus for instance he writes that the Red Pamphlet's description that Brigadier Graves led the 54th out of the Cashmere gate was wrong. He led them into the Cashmere gate (p. 31),

3 *History of the Siege of Delhi*, p. 236.

4 Ibid. p. 154.

5 Ibid. p. 269.

Marfat.com

The more important point he refers to relate to the indignities suffered by European girls in the streets of Delhi, the battle of Badli-ke-serai which was a great mark in the 'worlds history' because the victory acted most favourably in tranquilizing the Punjab which became the means of saving the British Empire[1] in India. Ireland states, as if it was beyond any doubt, that the king of Delhi sent an emissary to the British camp and offered to betray the sepoys to throw open the gates and admit British troops into the palace. Sir John Lawrence, it is said, accepted the proposal on condition that they should clear themselves of the murder of the Europeans[2]. The author gives no date when this transaction was going on but gives a graphic description of the excitement on the camp at the news that many native chiefs had joined Bahadur Shah, particularly the *maulavis* who flocked from all parts and harangued the sepoys to commit excesses. The mosques rang with military preachings. 'A kind of muhammadan revival took place, high caste hindu soldiers were converted to *El Islam* and even Brahmins broke their threads'[3]. This aspect of the situation is not, however, recorded in any other contemporary account. The author also refers to the horrible feeling of revenge and the mad cry for blood which seized the people in the British camp. This he says was quite in keeping with the spirit manifested by Cooper and the *Lahore Chronicle* which was cursing every 'Pandy' and crying for a hangman to hold him up by the 'rope'[4]. The style in the narrative portion of the book is simple but he is magnificent and even splendid in his frill-work as in the description of the silvan surroundings of the Himalayas where Anson was relaxing, the delicious summer nights of the troops' march and the British camp on the Ridge[5].

On the siege of the Lucknow Residency there were many accounts written by the besieged which eloquently bear out all the details of

[1] Ibid. pp. 32, 84.

[2] See R. C.Majumdar on this point.

[3] *History of the Siege of Delhi*, p, 144. G. Campbell, however, found not much trace of muhammadan element in the Mutiny of 1858. See Chapter on Campbell.

[4] *History of the Siege of Delhi*, pp. 160-1.

[5] Ibid. pp. 58, 130.

Marfat.com

those protracted operations which could not have been better covered by any other species of source. Apart from the monumental despatch of the gallant defender of Lucknow, brigadier Inglis[1], there is the staff officer, T. F. Wilson, who wrote the diary recording events of the siege of the Europeans in the Residency from 31 May to 25 September 1857 which supplemented the 'Rough Narrative of the Siege of Lucknow' by lieutenant-general McLeod Innes published in 1857[2]. The diary is intrinsically valuable for its exact military information with distinctness. The story of the glorious garrison of Lucknow is told with all its thrilling and painful details. The journals, notes and diaries kept by some of the ladies of the Residency constitute a unique feature of mutiny literature of those memorable days and provide detailed information regarding the various phases of the siege of Lucknow[3]. Ladendorf has also thrown much light on other available manuscripts on Lucknow during the Mutiny[4]. The narrative of Rees is also another very authentic account of the Lucknow Residency. Rees of Calcutta was formerly attached to the Mariner College, his book crowded with military details of wars and sieges are mostly taken from Blue Books and from other sources in the Residency. For Havelock's moveable column and the account of those memorable operations, the gallantry of the 78th Highlanders, the services of the Olpherts' battery,—the unfailing precision of that invaluable weapon, the Enfield rifle, are all described in the 'Journal of an English officer in India' by major North of 60th Rifles. North left Allahabad on 30 June *enroute* for Cawnpore. He joined the Highlanders on 11 July and though he was in the thick of the fight, all through he was perhaps the only member of the avenging army of Havelock to complete the Journal which furnished a narrative such as an eye-witness can only furnish and yet a narrative of which the author has been an actor. As for other works on Lucknow which

1 Quoted in Ball, II, pp. 35-56.

2 Calcutta Review, 1858, vol. 31, pp. 112 ff.

3 See chapter on English Women in Mutiny literature.

4 They are letters of general Sir J. Outram, a diary by Rev. Thomas Moore, journal of Bevil Granville, letter of Sir John McLeod written from Lucknow, diary of Sgt. Quibell Cooper on Lucknow and Bareilly (Ladendorf, pp. 149, 151, 160).

Marfat.com

can be regarded authoritative sources of the initial stages of the rising, captain R.P. Anderson's 'A Personal journal of the Siege of Lucknow', published in 1858 is one. Captain Anderson is mentioned with brilliant commendation in the despatch of brigadier Inglis. His narrative is picturesque and pleasant. It supplements the volume of the staff officer's diary and contains accounts of some remarkable incidents. Anderson had the forethought of the coming storm from the sinister glances of the people. He also refers to the vast supply of foodstuff laid up by Henry Lawrence and the deterioration of the government paper which was selling as low as 37 Rupees for the hundred and even less.

Another work, the 'Narrative of the Mutinies in Oudh' by captain Hutchinson, was published in 1859. Hutchinson gives in detail original information regarding the Mutiny in the various districts of Oudh and of the state of the country before the outbreak[1]. Another officer Charles Raikes who was stationed in a high official capacity at Agra at the time of the Mutiny shared with the garrison of the station, all the dangers and sufferings of the time. Facts recorded in the narrative portion of his 'Notes on the Revolt in the North-west Provinces of India' 1859, have been accepted as such by later writers as original and authentic. A civilian with twenty years' experience of Indian Official life, Charles Raikes also made some observations on the future of India. He also demanded a rigorous policy for the suppression of Mutiny as he feared that before long the Sikhs would flare up if the mutiny was not suppressed[2]. But of all these works the book of Martin Richard Gubbins, 'An account of the Mutinies in Oudh and Siege of the Lucknow Residency' was regarded as a contemporary account of great historical merit by historians. Gubbins' narrative of daily incidents based on a personal knowledge of the circumstances of events, is blended and composed with a measure of craftsmanship which makes his account both continuous and connected, readable and pleasant. A personal touch which characterised

[1] Hutchinson's work is regarded as an official document but Kaye points out that his statement that Henry Lawrence returned on a gun carriage from Chinhat was wrong (III. p. 509).

[2] Raikes, p. 180.

Marfat.com

most of the publications of this period has been rendered purposeful in Gubbins' work. The author never allowed the readers to lose sight of the writer as the principal actor in the scene but it is not difficult to separate each incident from its hero and gain a general view of the position described. The style is free, fluent and eloquent. The interesting picture he draws of the return of Ungud, the spy, could not have been surpassed by any other sketch more characteristic of the siege. Gubbins probably disappointed expectations of many in the disquisitional chapter on the cause of the Mutiny. His high position, long experience and wide acquaintance with many Indians should have been helpful, it was thought, in providing definite information on the point, but all these did not form the open 'sesame' in investigating the causes of the rebellion, but the time possibly was not mature enough for a treatment of the subject before the calm which follows a storm, had set in. The only defect of Gubbins' work was a kind of egotism which blurred his historical vision particularly in respect of his behaviour with Henry Lawrence to enhance his reputation for wisdom and foresight. All through his work Gubbins shows a lack of sympathy in appreciating the work of others[1]. His bias arose from his eventual suppression by major Banks on Henry's direction. The only defensible post in Lucknow was Muchi Bhabon and Henry invested it. The propriety of retaining Lucknow was a subject of much discussion. Experienced military officers asserted that Lucknow was essentially a false position, that Sir Henry should have evacuated and fallen back to Cawnpore, and if need be to Allahabad. But the actual circumstances were so different and the moral and political influence of every movement was such that the evacuation of Lucknow would have proved a blunder at least for this reason that the immense arsenal of Lucknow would have fallen in the hands of the enemy and rebellion would have spread over the whole country in June 1857[2].

Another interesting work on Lucknow is Chaplain Mackay's 'From London to Lucknow' published in 1860. It makes no preten-

[1] Kaye, III, pp. 494-95 ; *Calcutta Review*, 1858, vol. 31, Misc. Notices, pp. xxxii-ii.

[2] Ball, II, pp. 90-91 ; Kaye, I, pp. 398-99.

Marfat.com

sions to bring a history of the Indian Mutiny or even a chronology of events. He was at Calcutta at the beginning of the outbreak and while in Lucknow he was 'interested, amused, surprised and shocked' by various things he saw and heard but he was encouraged to collect original sources like letters, memoranda, notes, telegrams, based on real occurrences. which were found highly valuable in following the history of the Indian Mutiny. He deemed it expedient to introduce a series of public documents for distinctness of impression which he arranged chronologically to show the progress of the Mutiny. He exhibits Colvin's messages regarding the Meerut telegram and the authentic intelligence of a letter from the King that he is in the hands of the insurgents[1].

A book on the operations at Rohilkhand was published in 1859. The author of 'Recollections of a Winter Campaign in India', captain Oliver J. Jones, was all through in Campbell's operation between the relief and final capture of Lucknow. The account was based on his personal experience. Jones came out to India as a sailor and was chiefly with H. M's 53rd, and the Naval Brigade but the sailor did his work quite well in leaving a record of his impression of the mutiny campaigns.

The story of Cawnpore to the time of the embarkation of the English has been written by captain Mowbray Thomson published in 1859. It is a great contribution to the history of the Indian Mutiny. Among many books written on the subject Thomson's 'Cawnpore' is the only work which 'affords an adequate idea of the depth and variety of wretchedness endured by the Englishmen.' He is mentioned in the list of lieutenant Delafosse as one who was wounded but he escaped from the slaughter of the 27th June by swimming down the Ganges. He wrote from Cawnpore on 16th August 1857 his experience of the Indian rebellion, and furnished a most interesting account of occurrences intermingled with that terrible episode until they reached the climax on 15 July. His work is eminently entitled to notice although incidents described are not strictly in chronological order of the course of events connected with the beleaguered garrison. Thomson describes touchingly the vivid

[1] Mackay, pp. 122, 133.

Marfat.com

scene of those twenty-one days of shrieks, cries and the depth of suffering and silent endurance of one thousand or above Europeans who were crowded in those wretched entrenchments. Another original account of Cawnpore is furnished by W. J. Shepherd of the commissariat who was within the entrenchment from 5th to 24th June. His book under the title 'Brief account of the outbreak at Cawnpore' was first published in the papers at Calcutta as also in London in November 1857. It was later on published in January 1862 in the Delhi Gazettee as the 'Narrative of events at Cawnpore." Still later in 1879 the book was published by the author from Lucknow under the title 'A personal Narrative, etc.' Shepherd's account was highly acclaimed as the most authentic source of the Cawnpore mutiny, of the whole history of those eventful days. Ladendorf again refers to many other valuable manuscript sources on Cawnpore.[1]

Early authoritative accounts of the war in the Jumna tract is available in two books, the authors of which were eye-witnesses to the scene. They are 'The Mutinies in Rajpootana' by I. T. Prichard published in 1860 and 'Central India during the rebellion of 1857 and 1858' by T. Lowe published in 1860. Both the works are valuable as supplying an important link in the series of events of the revolt of 1857. Lt. Thomas Prichard was an officer of the 25th Regt. N. I. stationed at Nasirabad. The events he narrates are based on his personal observation and also on reports by officers on the spot. He resigned his commission after the suppression of the Mutiny in 1858 and devoted himself to literary pursuits. He was thus in a position to write most impartially of events of public character which made his personal narrative reliable and interesting. His literary tastes rendered his style light and cheerful, agreeably to the requirements of personal narratives. Lowe's book fills up a big gap in the romantic campaigns of Central India conducted by Sir Hugh Rose. The marches and counter-marches of the Central India Field Force, the assault on the fortresses and sketches of the interior of the rebel camp of Kalpi

1 The manuscripts are, Louisa Chalwin's letters, Wheeler's letter of 4th June to Lawrence, a diary by Rev. Thomas Moore, a diary of Quibell Cooper, and letters of Lt. Colonel William Augustus Fyers during the Mutiny and also of Sgt. Cox's statement of incidents of Nov. 27 1857 (Ladendorf, pp. 139, 160, 163).

Marfat.com

and of war materials found there are all described in Lowe's work. He gives a vivid account of the fighting at Jhanshi and the defence of the fort and other episodes of the war which were used as contemporary sources by later writers. The author wrote, 'No maudlin clemency was to mark the fall of the city. The Jezebel of India was there...(the) uncompromising Ranee, and upon her head rested the blood of the slain and a punishment as awful awaited her'.[1] Dr. Lowe's style was another asset of the work. Lowe's book fills up a vacant place in the history of the Indian Mutiny and gives the Central Indian Campaigns its spectacular character. Another book, 'Recollections of the Campaign in Marwar in Central India' under major-general Sir Hugh Rose by John Sylvester published in 1860 supplements the work of Lowe in the details of many other incidents of the campaigns in Marwar and the adjacent regions.

In view of these works which were sprawling up, each of which was a valuable contemporary source regarding regional risings in the period of the revolt, it would be surprising if no attempt was made to produce a full-length general history of the 1857 uprising. This was done by Messrs. W. And R. Chambers who published 'The History of the Indian Revolt etc.' in 1859-60[2]. The preface of the book goes under the initial G. D. dated December 1858 and states that the present work is quite distinct from the history of the Russian war, issued by the same publishers. The *Calcutta Review* commented that nothing was known about G. D., whether he possessed any knowledge of India or was a mere compiler[3]. But the identity has been established ; G. D. is taken to be George Dodd who claims in the Preface that he has carefully examined all available authorities to 'render the narrative a truthful one' and in particular he has avoided

[1] Lowe, *Central India during the rebellion*, pp. 236, 259.

[2] W. and R. Chambers, 47, Paternoster Row, London, 1859 (629 pages) with appendix, table, and index (size 25 cm). The book contains many illustrations some of which are very interesting and give a pictorial view of India in the Victorian age. The type is clear, the printing is close and the first letter of each chapter is embroidered with decorations current in that age. There is also a map of India and Asia and then supplementary chapters one each on Persia, China and the East.

[3] *Calcutta Review*, 1863, vol. 38, p. 159.

Marfat.com

hasty expressions on disputed points. The end of 1858 has been taken as a convenient limit to the narrative of this most 'formidable military revolt on record'. The Chambers' history, as it is popularly called, is presumably the first one-volume general history of the revolt as a whole. It is a valuable illustrated and detailed chronicle, fairly accurate and contains many dates, statistics and documents not to be found easily elsewhere. There is hardly any reference to the source-materials the author has utilised, and in one place he says that the narrative was constructed from materials derived from various quarters each supplying some of the links[1], but it is clear that the major part of the materials came from contemporary works already published and specially articles on the Mutiny which appeared in the *Times*. Like other writers Dodd also concentrated on the military side of the revolt and furnished detailed tabular statements of various aspects of the military condition of India, the strength of Queen's soldiers and Company's soldiers in all their branches[2]. No less important are the 'Notes' added at the end of the chapters on diverse topics, such as, the distances in India, the Indian vocabulary, and population of each presidency of India, Nana Sahib's proclamation, Oudh Royal family, the Lucknow proclamation, civil service of the Company, means of transport of troops and various other such ancillary matters[3]. Dodd's history of the Indian Revolt is undoubtedly a very comprehensive history of the movement but the question remains how as early as the end of 1858 the author could marshal all the relevant facts in respect of so many divergent episodes and incidents of the Mutiny and compile them into a book of a very commendable proportion. Yet the book does not read like a procession of events. The author was critical about the Meerut situation, that the mutineers were not pursued, that the outbreak occurred at 5 p.m. while the darkness can hardly come on until near 7 o'clock in the latitude of Meerut. About Delhi he could not commit to what extent the King of Delhi was implicated. He has handled the controversy about Colvin's proclamation very skilfully with this

1 Dodd, pp. 70, 75.

2 Dodd, pp. 208, 219-20, 225, 227-29, 231, 235, 245, 271, 293, 297, 302, 337, 363, 371, 387, 409-11, 535.

3 Ibid. pp. 12, 31, 119, 145, 161, 427, 443, 455, 480, 501.



Marfat.com

remark that it was infelicitous that opposite views should have been held on such a matter of policy at such a time. On Cawnpore he made use of all the available sources brought to our notice for the first time, and particularly Shepherd's account, and came to the conclusion that the true story of the boat-catastrophe at Cawnpore would probably never be told though he was convinced that Nana Sahib was the sole author of this iniquitous treachery of 27 June. In general, Dodd took notice of the bitter feeling that prevailed in the British camp against the Pandies and strongly wrote on many occasions that it was a war to the knife which made the Indian Mutiny much more terrible than an ordinary war. About the Europeans on the Ridge at Delhi he made a critical observation that the operations of the months from July to September 1857 did not really constitute a siege for the British poured very few shots or shells into the city against the walls. Neither was it an investment for not a single regiment could be sent. About the sack of Delhi after the capture of that city the author gives a vivid description of the atrocities committed. 'They refused to consider the rules of honourable warfare applicable to black-hearted traitors'. Hodson's action in putting to death the Delhi princes is noticed without any comment but the way he escorted the fugitive king of Delhi is characterised as a striking manifestation of moral power[1]. It is also very remarkable that Dodd gives very critical analysis of political situations at different stages of the uprising. He writes that all calculations about the termination of the rebellion from the capture of Delhi or Lucknow have been falsified and all hopes were dashed. To the dismay of the British people the rebellion continued accompanied by an unexpected display of military organisation among the revolted sepoys. It is true, he writes, that Englishman had much to be proud of but the prevailing feeling was one of disappointment caused by the long continuance of the war. In this situation the question was raised in its more insistent form : 'What was the cause of the mutiny' ? So theories about the causes multiplied faster as diverse as ever and were as warmly discussed after a year in 1858 as in the previous year. Dodd gives a long description of the various theories about the causes

[1] Dodd, pp. 55 f., 73, 111, 128, 138-43, 241-42, 244, 311-14.

Marfat.com

but all these voluminous documents entirely failed to satisfy the court of directors[1]. The details of the final operations at Lucknow are furnished[2] and particular reference is made about the controversy on Colin's rejection of the offer of Outram to cross the bridge to prevent the flight of the enemy. The author seems to have favoured the attitude of the commander-in-chief. As the city was practically twenty miles in circumference he could not possibly have guarded all the outlets without a much larger army. At Lucknow the siege was not aided by a complete investiture of the palace as at Sebastopol. and possibly the capture of Kaiserbagh and the consequent flight of the enemy occurred too early for Sir Colin to put in operation any other plan he had in view which he kept to himself. About Hodson's death he writes in a similar vein that it is difficult to say if motives of plunder prompted him to rush to Begum Kuthi[3], Dodd's history is carried up to the end of 1858 including the operations of the Central India Field Force, the pacification of Oudh, the end of company's rule and nearly all other miscellaneous and peripheral matters. In between, he draws a picture of the situation at home[4] and the more complicated topic of peregrinations of the English troops. and the circumstances attending the troops sent from England towards India[5], the trial of Bahadur Shah[6], the comparative estimate of the position of John Lawrence and Colvin[7] and other such matters. Chambers' history thus represented a complete history of India in 1857-58 in all its parts excepting the far south and the campaigns in the Terai regions in the winter of 1858-59. The book foreshadowed all the problems and controversies concerning the Indian Mutiny. The

[1] Dodd, pp. 388-390, 398. In pp. 605 ff. the author also discusses the views of Gubbins, .Rees, Bourchier, Ludlow, Mead, Raikes, Indophilus and Duff and concludes that the cartridge grievance was the spark which kindled the inflammable materials. J. Mackay refers to Dodd's book in a way which suggests that it was the standard work on the Mutiny ( From *London*, etc. p. 113 ).

[2] Ibid. pp. 418-22.

[3] Ibid. pp. 422, 426

[4] Ibid. p. 225.

[5] Ibid. pp. 94 ff, 102-4, 221-23.

[6] Ibid. pp. 405-6.

[7] Ibid. pp. 349-50.

Marfat.com

historian thus outlines the frontiers of the subject which will have helped later writers to determine the scope of their work.

Charles Ball's 'History of the Indian Mutiny' which came out after Dodd, covered the whole period of the Sepoy War up to its furthest point, the Terai campaigns of 1859, and embodied to the largest possible extent all available source-materials bearing on the subject as a whole not attempted by any English historian of the mutiny either before him or after him excepting possibly by Kaye and Forrest. His monumental work in mighty two volumes of 27 cm. each, in close print of 1312 pages (648 plus 664) was by far the most prodigious and voluminous of all the works on the Indian Mutiny[1]. Planned in a big way to show how the existence of the British empire had shaped the Asian World and integrated India, Ball treats the Indian Mutiny in the broader context of British imperial history of the Victorian age. The book is variously dated, 1858 and 1859, and it is difficult to be exact on the year of its publication. Internal evidence suggests that it was published after Chambers' history for Ball openly quotes from that book to the effect that Delhi was ruled in reality by a British Resident[2]. But the difficulty is that Martin whose work was published in about 1860-61 mentions Ball's work[3]. But Ball refers to Martin on the Pindaris[4] which was possibly the first volume of Martin's work, and again to his description of Nadir Shah's invasion of India[5]. It is, therefore, not clear whether Ball's work was published previous to Martin's 'The Indian empire'. It is also to be noted that Ball referred to a book published in 1859[6] which shows that his work was not in any case published before the end of that year. This also receives support from the fact that Charles Ball for the first time among all historians of his time describes in full the campaigns of the Terai region and refers to the operations of colonel Cormick of April

1 The title of the book runs : 'The History of the Indian Mutiny giving a detailed account of the Sepoy Insurrection in India AND A concise history of the great military events which have tended to consolidate the British Empire'.
2 Dodd, p. 67 ; Ball, I, p. 454.
3 Martin, II, p. 169.
4 Ball, II, p. 362 (this refers to p. 420 of Martin's first volume).
5 Ball, I, p. 503 (This refers to p. 165 of Martin's first volume).
6 Ball, II, p. 638.

Marfat.com

1859[1]. In the circumstances it is doubtful if the second volume of Ball's work of 664 pages[2] could have been published even by the end of 1859. All these early works on the Indian Mutiny seem to have been predated somehow or other.

As for his resources he only refers to the Blue Books (Indian Mutiny) and some works published in the year 1858-59 but the question of his source-materials for writing the history does not arise because the work by itself was a repository of all original source-materials of the Indian Mutiny as will be shown presently. In the concluding sentences of his *magnum opus*, Ball claims that he has followed the march of this outrage, from its outbreak to its close concentrating more on the fidelity of details than on ornamentation of style. He has tried to be correct in regard to facts and dates as compiled by a careful reference to the irregular and fitful issues of official documents, military despatches and parliamentary papers. The historian says that in view of the fevered state of excitement of the Europeans in the earlier stages of the Mutiny, he had taken particular care in 'sifting the husks of fiction from the grains of truth', and confidently asserts that his work should be ranked 'among the standard histories of the era to which they belong'[3]. But it is difficult to agree with Charles Ball in respect of most of his claims. He opens his book with these words that he will inscribe on the pages of history the details of acts of atrocity which have indelibly stained the annals of India and its people with crimes that disgrace the name of humanity.[4] For a historian to stand committed to this particular line of action does not agree well with his high sense of the method of collecting 'the grains of truth'. The author collected a vast mass of materials of diverse character on the Indian Mutiny, piles of official and unofficial

[1] Ball, II, pp. 605-6.

[2] It may be mentioned here that Malleson's three volumes each of 21 cm. covered only 1694 pages and Forrest's three-Volume *History* of 21 cm. each covered 1498 pages. These might appear to be bigger in volume than that of Ball, but the size of Ball's work (27 cm.) and the close printing of the book (648 & 664 pages) made it possible to include many more materials than the other two works. Kaye's three volumes of smaller size (20.5 cm. each) covered 2048 pages. For Martin see *infra*, p. 83.

[3] Ball, II, p. 664.

[4] Ball, I, p. 33.

Marfat.com

communications of the period, large number of letters, most of the Indian accounts and also a huge number of memorandum, despatches, orders, excerpts of public documents and significantly enough, nearly all the proclamations issued by the Indian leaders[1].

Ball's history is really invaluable as a store house of all sorts of original materials ; the inclusion of an immense number of private or demiofficial letters and correspondence is a very striking feature of his work. It was necessary to introduce private communications as embracing a wider view of the circumstances attending the episodes than was afforded by the mere military reports published under the sanction of the government. A reference may be made to the reports submitted by Hewitt or Lloyd or even the report on Delhi and the Residency of Lucknow by Wilson and Inglis respectively. These reports are not adequate for an understanding of the revolt in those stations. Similarly, Walpole's report on the collapse of the British Army at Roiya does not cover a measure of the reverses suffered by the invading army. There are indeed various other private matters regarding the temper and disposition of forces, the extent to which the people felt themselves aggrieved by the policy adopted by government, the nature of various influences which were at work on which official reports would have thrown very tardy and inadequate light. So in addition to information received from the usual civil and military sources, Ball brought views and opinions from those persons who had opportunities of becoming personally and in some cases intimately acquainted with them.

Ball's history occupies a significant place in mutiny studies because of the variety of source-materials it had incorporated but the difficulty is that the historian does not appear to have made any selection of materials representing various pursuits and view-points or even marshalled the papers properly to relate them to a connected, and integrated account of the whole course of the revolt and war in its chronological and regional background. The narrative portion of Ball's work is not very purposeful and sometimes sketchy which peeps out from dense overgrowth of many miscellaneous matters. There is no attempt to analyse and sort out this prodigious mass of materials

[1] See Appendix for the Proclamations issued.

Marfat.com

from the perspective of historical studies and nothing has been done to what he says, 'of sifting the husks of fiction from the grains of truth'. The historian's contention that he has offered an 'honest tale' is also not supported by the way he spins the story which is very often lost in the heap of undigested materials. it, therefore, appears that Ball has not made any conscious attempt to make history out of these materials which evidently does not strengthen his presumption that his work will rank 'as a standard history of the Indian Mutiny'. But he is not fair to himself when he says that his main purpose in writing the history of the Mutiny is to record the details of acts of frightful atrocity committed by the sepoys which compel 'manhood to blush'. The excessive bias and burning indignation against Indians notwithstanding, he has thrown a flood of light on many aspects of the movement and explored the vast variety of phenomena which made for the rising of 1857. The historian has shown his power of observation of historical situations, his critical views on the attitude of the leaders which were of a superior variety. Ball's history is undoubtedly a great work on the Indian Mutiny but it is amazing why his book is not referred to in the works of later writers. It seems that he was eclipsed and utterly surpassed by the British writers on the Mutiny and not even Sir John Kaye who refers to all the contemporary works produced in 1858-60 makes any acknowledgment of the work of either Dodd or Ball[1]. Of the British writers only Richard Hilton pays a tribute to this rare work on the great Indian Mutiny[2]. It is to be noticed also that Ball's history is not an office-oriented work. There is very little eulogy on the British officers and neither is there any long description of the careers of the military generals as in Malleson and Forrest. He concentrates on the great qualities and enduring energies of British character to which their success was due. But to read Ball is to know everything about India. It will be difficult indeed to make a list of the extraneous matters inducted by him in his narrative such as the stories of European fugitives, the people at Calcutta, the Christian missionaries in India, the means of civilizing the Indians, the reactions of the Bishop of London, the

[1] *Infra*, p. 93.

[2] Hilton, pp. 3-4.

Marfat.com

Mutiny Relief Fund, the Haileybury College, the proposal for reclaiming India by imperial evangelists. Along with this, readers are treated to serious discussions on the botanical wealth of the Terai region, Parsee manners and customs, the condition of the Sudras, the architecture of India, the Nairs of South India and all these and many things more have swelled the bulk of the volumes.

Coming to sober history it will be difficult to offer even a brief outline of the whole narrative of events of the Indian Mutiny recorded by Charles Ball. It is only possible to refer to some of his observations on some salient points, and in general he has not gone beyond the framework of the subject set up by George Dodd. All the preliminary disturbances of Berhampore and Barrackpore are narrated critically but the author does not discuss the other factors namely the *chapatees* and the greased cartridges in fulness of detail. He writes of the deep-seated feeling hostile to the company's government operating upon the impulsive temperament of the army which was waiting for a slight provocation to burst to revolt. The *Bombay Times* of early May 1857, is quoted to show that the whole district from Calcutta to Lahore was either in open mutiny or upon the verge of it. The forceful use of the shackles upon the legs of the men of third cavalry at Meerut kindled the fires of revenge and the conflagration commenced. The author quotes plenty of evidence to show that the 10th of May 1857 was a night of horror for Meerut[1].

Ball was convinced that the march to Delhi by the Meerut troops and the occupation of the city gave the movement a political significance and a national character[2]. He found it impossible to ignore the gross miscalculation of the Meerut and Delhi authorities on the extent of danger that had been evident months earlier. He points out that brigadier Graves had done nothing to prevent the access of Meerut troops to Delhi though he was forewarned[3]. Colvin's proclamation was roundly condemned and Canning was found justified in refusing to offer pardon to the murderers of its officers. It was a 'bounty for crime' as the *Friend of India* wrote ; Colvin

[1] Ball, I, pp. 54, 58, 63.
[2] Ibid. p. 69.
[3] Ibid. pp. 109-10.

Marfat.com

destroyed in a day the reputation of a lifetime[1]. The history of Oudh, its relations with the Company and the land tenure system is described in detail, and even in so early a period Ball anticipated to some extent the findings of Kaye on the subject. He writes, 'Time had not yet elapsed sufficient to destroy the strength of the talukdars, or to enable the village proprietors to appreciate their rights, and identify themselves with the government. Consequently the talukdars almost universally resumed and in so doing met with popular support'[2]. Like Malleson, he was sharply critical of the Calcutta government also which was not fully inclined even by the middle of May to appreciate the full importance of the warning of the times[3]. From the battle of Hindon, the career of the avenging British army was one of uninterrupted success. The historian refers to the superhuman efforts of the British soldiers and correspondingly applauds the infliction of punishment on the revolted troops. In the month of June the devastating career of the revolt had reached a climax of horrors scarcely paralleled in the records of human depravity. The author takes delight in recording the spirit of hatred and unappeasable revenge which seized the British army. The Gibbets became a standing institution[4]. He relates the story of the depredations carried out by the 78th Highlanders around Benares and recounts how they set fire to a large village and killed the villagers in all taking five hundred lives. The action of the Highlanders was considered effective[5] but the killing of the Europeans at Allahabad on 6 June reminded him of the 'Grand Inquisitor of the Indies in the palmiest days of Portuguese dominion'[6]. The historian, however, does not account for the summary execution of 237 rebel sepoys at Ujinala on 1 August 1857 by F. Cooper, deputy-commissioner of Amritsar. He, otherwise so emotional on the excesses committed by the sepoys, ignores this widely condemned massacre. On the Cawnpore episode he roars with curses and threats and regards the atrocity as an aggregation of

1 Ibid. pp. 138, 142.
2 Ibid. pp. 155-56.
3 Ibid.
4 Ball's history is full of horrible description of gibbets and gallows (I, pp. 240, 410, 412-13). cf. Picture of a group of rebels hung up (I, p. 242).
5 Ball, I, pp. 241-44.
6 Ibid. p. 252.

Marfat.com

the foulest crimes that can disgrace humanity. The Nana is described as an expressive symbol of this devilish malignity of the treacherous race. But he supports his claims based on the will of December 11 1839 by which Baji Rao declared Nana Dhondu Pant his heir and sole successor of his property. After his defeat Baji Rao received a liberal pension of eight lakhs of rupees from the Company's government for the support of himself and his family but 'not a word was there to warrant its perpetuity beyond the life of the Peshwa'. The historian remarks that this was unwise as the whole family was thrown into a state of extreme distress. The widows and daughters of a family which once ruled over Hindusthan were treated with indignity in the law courts of Company's government while defending their claims against the demand of the government. All these pointed to a case of sufficient hardship and tended to excite a strong feeling of dislike and resentment towards the Company[1]. But Ball was careful to warn that even the shadow of an excuse for the atrocities that distinguished the career of the malignant traitor was not implied or hinted at in stating about the condition of the Peshwa's family[2].

Ball's observation are of considerable significance as showing the reactions of a contemporary British historian writing from England. He was impressed by the sweep of the revolt and writes that by the middle of June it had become universal ; from Calcutta to Peshwar and from Delhi to Hyderabad India had become a theatre of savage strife. It appeared to him that the premature outbreak at Meerut on 10 May was simply a portion of an organised and well concealed plan which would have crushed the power of England in India but for its precipitancy which disorganised the whole insurrectionary plan and broke up the disaffected masses into 'details and fragments' which the British found it possible to subdue as they successively presented themselves.[3] The siege of Delhi, particularly the military preparations made are described in detail. The historian even gives a list of the quantity of materials used for military actions such as gascines, gabions and sand bags etc. But with reference to the final assault, he

[1] Ibid. pp. 302-3.
[2] Ibid. pp. 376, 392,
[3] Ibid. pp. 438-9.

Marfat.com

gives a plain account and does not refer to the controversy about Nicholson leading the first column[1]. He, however, makes some observations about the rebel government that was established in Delhi. On an examination of many papers on the intended proceedings of the government it appeared to him that the 'kind of government' to be permanently established was more of the nature of a military than a muhammadan government. It seems to have been a sort of constitutional monarchical milocracy. The king was honoured like a constitutional monarch but instead of a parliament he had a council of soldiers in whom power rested. No Arabic or Persian names, forms, or terms had been introduced but on the contrary the English forms were generally adopted. There was also a 'Court which seems to have been an important body composed of a number of colonels, a brigadier-major and a Seketur (Secretary). Very regular muster-rolls of regiments were kept up. The description of a constitution of the same kind in Campbell's 'Narrative' was the earliest reference to it[2]. After the fall of Delhi the consequences entailed upon the inhabitants of Delhi were necessarily most calamitous and the historian found nothing strange in it that soldiers on such occasions must be excited for such an excitement was an essence of the very nature of the war. Delhi was changed to the 'desolateness of Pompeii', and the author unblushingly states that Nadir Shah's massacres at Delhi were even more sanguinary. 'On 17 February 1739 the swords of the infuriated soldiers of Nadir Shah were fleshed in the bodies of near 100,000 Hindu inhabitants of Delhi'[3]. But this was not all. Severe punishment was also inflicted upon the citizens of Delhi who survived the massacres and Ball refers to a series of punitive measures adopted against them which is not to be found in other works on the Mutiny.[4]

[1] Ibid. pp. 499 ff.

[2] Ball, I, p. 524 ; Campbell, *Narrative* etc., p. 172 ; Joshi, pp. 37 ff.

[3] Ball, I, pp. 503, 529 ; II, p. 461. A member of the Parliament refers to the operations of Alva and Tilly for a parallel situation. Ladendorf takes notice of a manuscript of Vibart which furnished a more vivid account of the reign of British terror, more horrible than that described usually in the published accounts (p. 145). Also see Ball, II, p. 183 ; Joshi, p. 163.

[4] A. Llewellyn refers to the compensation tax in his book, 'The Siege of Delhi' (pp. 149-50) recently published (1977).

Marfat.com

Sir John Lawrence took over the administration of Delhi on 24 February 1858 and on 5 March his secretary, R. Temple, issued a series of circulars entitled 'Compensation to sufferers by the insurrections'. These circulars directed that every community and individual within the district should be made to repay the losses sustained by Europeans during the rebellion. Nothing is known as to how these black circulars were implemented but the process suggested was a house tax on urban property and tax on agricultural lands, and in default of satisfaction of compensation, sale or transfer of estates and attachment of effects was prescribed. The measures were undoubtedly hailed with delight by the Europeans but the dead weight of these monstrous decrees fell on the Indians already crushed by the avenging army and the military government. Ball calculated that in the Delhi division the inhabitants were mulcted of a quarter of their real property while the Europeans got every satisfaction[1]. This account of the historian plainly suggests how helplessly India lay at the mercy of its colonial rulers and it seems that not a voice of protest was raised against this inhuman attitude of the government, not even by the citizens of Calcutta.

Ball opens his second volume with the relief of Lucknow but it was so much loaded with emotion that it becomes difficult for a reader to follow the author through the labyrinthine complexes of its sentences emitting foam and fury against the whole race of felons and showing praises for those brave hearts and strong hands who withstood the tide of horrors for long weary months of daily-increasing peril, and diminishing resources in the midst of the shrieks of the dying children and the expiring groans of the mutilated defenders. The historian gives a glowing description of the magnificent qualities of British character, the perseverance and restless vigour, the vigilance and bravery of the defenders which successfully resisted the assaults of an enemy out-numbering them by thousands. It was an example of 'unsurpassed heroism displayed by all for the sake of all'. The whole description is given in such an opulent manner with a liberal use of offensive words and a play of tensions that it becomes difficult not to be excited with a bias.

[1] Ball, II, pp. 181, 612-13, 616-17.

Marfat.com

Ball's treatment of the campaigns of Sir Colin Campbell for the relief of Lucknow is complete in respect of most of the incidents of the war. But about the assault of Secundrabagh on 16 November, he does not refer to the controversy as to who jumped into the courtyard first, a Sikh or a Highlander[1]. The action at Shah Najaf where Captain Peel's 'Shannon' delivered a spectacular assault is described as an action 'unexampled in war' but Sir Evelyn Wood who took part in the war himself, wrote that captain Peel's 24-pounders battered for three hours the thick wall in vain[2]. The abandonment of the Residency after the relief of Lucknow against the views of others is supported by the historian because Campbell was never in doubt that the position taken by Henry Lawrence was a false one[3]. Ball also gives the impression that Campbell's attitude towards Outram was characterised by a kind of high-handedness. The commander-in-chief was a stern master who will not fail to enforce compliance with his orders. So when captain Peel made a hazardous attack at the battle of Khajwa on 1 November 1857[4] contrary to the instructions given, Sir Colin did not hesitate to administer a caution to him. He also issued strict instructions regarding the movements of Outram at Alambagh[5]. But when Outram ventured to ask for reinforcements he was given a sharp rebuff. Again when Kaiserbagh fell before the impetuous onslaught of the British troops on 14 March 1858 and the rebels were streaming out of the city by the stone bridge, Outram offered to cross the river and close the means of exit of the great multitude of fugitives. It has been seen that Dodd discussed the question fully stating Campbell's reasons for issuing an order to Outram prohibiting him not to cross the river. Historians are unable to account for this strange order and Ball also does not throw any further light on this question[6]. He also remains innocuously silent on the death of major Hodson on 12 March but he was very much interested in the defensive measure adopted

1 Mac Munn, p. 213.
2 Ball, II, p. 87 ; Wood, pp. 214-15.
3 Ball, II, p. 91.
4 Ball, II, p. 77.
5 Ball, II, p. 236.
6 Ball, II, pp. 255, 281. See also *United Service Journal*, 1858, pt. III, p. 197.

Marfat.com

by the rebel government at Lucknow to meet the English offensive and gives a graphic account of the high spirit of the people which sustained them in the struggle[1]. The details of the activities of the rebel leaders and of the *begam* which were in fact the chief levers by which popular resistance to British rule was continued are furnished[2]. On the British side the army was ready down to the last button, the regiments were in a highly efficient state, the Highlanders were conspicuous for their martial air, and as they marched off, the feeling was infectious: 'The Campbells are coming'[3]. A very remarkable feature of Charles Ball's history is that he gives a vivid description of the winter campaigns of the Terai region (1858-59), and the most authentic account of the flight of Tatya and the pursuit by British officers. It is perfectly amazing how he could offer such graphic details of the campaigns against Tatya in so many pages at such an early period of mutiny studies. Later writers like Malleson could not improve upon the subject as given by Ball[4].

The history of the pursuit of Tatya by the British is an exciting chapter of the Indian Mutiny. Scores of colonels were running after him sometimes even after their own regiments at cross purposes. Tatya took the British army upside down and made them roll or sink in quicksand[5]. The historian writes that Tatya, separated from the Rao and Feroz Shah, ran to cover his retreat, but his haunt was known to his late confederate and friend Mansingh, raja of Powrie (a fortress near Jhansi). On the information supplied by Mansingh Tatya was captured by colonel Meade's force on 7 April 1858[6]. Ball's observation on this point is based on the analogy of the previous history of Omichand and Mirzafar. He remarks that treachery, the traditional policy of all Asiatics, seems to have been remarkably absent in their mutual relations during the rebellion. Treachery of merchant Omichand in 1757 established English supremacy in Bengal and in the long dark record of Anglo-Indian greatness the 'double treachery' of

[1] Ball, II, pp. 242, 245-47, 254, 272-73. See also Wood, p. 260.
[2] Ibid. pp. 246-7.
[3] Ibid. pp. 253-54.
[4] Ball, II, pp. 514-17, 545-48, 557-58, 572-76, 582-83, 598-606.
[5] Ball, II, p. 514.
[6] Ball, II, pp. 599-602.

Marfat.com

Lord Clive was the stepping stone to power. But in the revolt of 1857, the English commanders could either obtain no information at all or such as could only mislead them. Rewards offered by the government for the persons of the rebel chiefs were not responded to[1]. But the old leaven of treachery asserted itself at last, the last of the leaders of the Sepoy War fell a victim to treachery, as did the last of the independent nawabs of Bengal in 1757. And in both the occasions it were the British who played the sordid game. Malleson also states that Manshingh was seduced with the prospect of his territory by general Sir R. Napier[2].

On the reaction of the people of England, Bale's account furnishes some insight into the situation. He writes that a section of people had indeed regarded these terrible details of outrages that each succeeding mail had brought as utter fabrications and malicious exaggerations and he even pleaded for a different consideration in the name of justice and humanity for the Indian rebels. Public indignation might lead to dangerous excesses but at the same time he deprecated all efforts to throw a cloak of palliation over the crimes for the rebels had placed themselves beyond the pale of humanity by their treachery and ruthlessness. He repeats what the *Times* formulated as the public opinion of Britain that these 'brutes' were fit only to be knocked on the head or crushed under feet[3].

However, the Mutiny became an exciting theme of discussions by the evangelists in England. Drastic proposals were made for the conversion of the heathens at all costs and at any risk. Ball says that it would have required one whole volume to give even a tithe of arguments adduced in favour or against these views. At a meeting held on 26 November 1857 the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London spoke vehemently of the necessity for infusing Christian spirit among the millions in India and that it would be an abnegation of Christianity not to make proselytes in India. But there were hindrances in the path of the missionary zeal and the historian was alive to the danger that 'the faintest suspicion of any

1 Ball, II, pp. 597 ff.
2 Malleson, III, pp. 370, 373, 376-8.
3 *Times*, 21 October, 1857 ; Martin, II, p. 414 ; Ball, II, pp. 426-7.

Marfat.com

official plan to christianise and Europeanise the people' would rake up the fires of revolt. The Mutiny seemed to have afforded a providential opportunity to the British evangelists to withdraw their proselytising mission from India[1]. He was clear in his mind about the obligations of England in India and foreshadowed what Kaye observed subsequently that England cannot divest itself of its character as a Christian nation, that the government of India cannot be called upon to abandon all schemes of elevating the moral tone of the people, grovelling amidst impure customs and practices. The historian argued like others that for the progressive enlargement of the people, acquaintance with European literature, history and arts and crafts cannot be ignored without violating the sacred injunction and neglecting a national duty. England is no doubt obliged not to interfere with religious prejudices but as the supreme ruler of India it is also her duty to advance the moral and intellectual welfare of the people. Rancour and bitterness springing from religious fanaticism were common in all parts of the world as in Spain, America, France and even England was no exception but what characterised the Indian Revolt was the uncommon and fiendish nature of excesses committed by the rebels[2].

The historian gives interesting glimpses of the attitude of the people of England, their futile attempts to know about the causes of the revolt. 'Everyone from John O'Groat's House to the Land's End'—had something to say about the Indian Mutiny and everybody, whoever he was, was listened to though his information was scanty ; 'it was enough that he was in India'. All sorts of theories utterly at variance with one another left the British public unappeased in getting to the bottom of the controversy and tear the veil from the face of that mysterious episode the 'Indian Mutiny'. In disgust Ball writes, 'No, unless we intend to pursue our investigations till we come to the earth on the elephant, and the elephant on the tortoise, and the tortoise on a fish, we had better look forward, not backward in this momentous question'[3]. But there was no confusion in his mind

1 Ball, II, pp. 428-30, 435, 438-9, 637-8.
2 Ball, I, pp. 644-45, 647-8.
3 Ibid. II, p. 425.

Marfat.com

about the character of the revolt. The rebellion of pampered soldiery was not uncommon in Asiatic history but it appeared to the author that the entire European element in India would be destroyed in the torrent of rebellion. He refers to the celebrated proclamation of the mutineers from Delhi and the extraordinary combination for this specific purpose of combating English assault on their religions as one of the deepest significance in the history of the human race. 'The movement', as Ball writes, 'now assumed a more important aspect. It became the rebellion of a whole people...sustained in their delusions by hatred and fanaticism'[1].

Next to Charles Ball, or in about the same time appeared E. H. Nolan's 'History of the British Empire in India and the East' from the earliest times to the suppression of the Sepoy Mutiny in 1859. The book in two volumes is not dated, the first volume traces the early history of India and also of Ceylon, 'Maritime Settlements' up to the coming of the Europeans, and the second volume deals with the history of the East India Company and other European settlements in 186 chapters. In the last eight chapters of the second volume, the author deals with the Sepoy Mutiny. There is not a single reference to any published work excepting Mead, Cooper and Rees[2], though he quotes occasionally from contemporary official sources.[3] The books could have been published only after 1859 but the publication of the work at a later date, though plausible[4], is not indicated by the scanty narrative he gives of the concluding stages of the revolt. The author was known to John Hollyer of the India House, H. T. Prinsep and Dr. Hayman Wilson of Oxford. He says that as in all his other historical labour he has been guided simply by love of truth and has not been influenced by party, political or personal considerations. His patrons are the 'Public', the work was not written in the interest of any class either in England or in India, definitely not to satisfy the Board of control or the East India Company[5].

1 Ball, I, pp. 644-45.
2 Nolan, II, pp. 707, 735, 756.
3 Ibid. II, p. 756. Nolan describes Sir Colin's advance on Lucknow from captain Monson's account.
4 See British Museum Catalogue.
5 See Preface.



Marfat.com

However, Nolan's account is very brief, concise and on the whole truthful. It was not a storehouse of information or of original materials and its value as a contemporary account is only marginal, though it supplies corroborative evidence on many points of dispute. The narrative is clear and factual and occasionally it rises to grave eloquence but the whole narrative is only a running summary of the main trends of events as he knew them from his sources. The cartridge question and the Meerut episode are discussed in full, holding the authorities fully responsible for the disaster. He also describes the massacres of Delhi and of other places, but all such accounts are marked by patience and restraint.[1] About Chinhat he wrote that the retreat was wretchedly arranged and it was wonderful how a single man came back alive.[2] The special feature of Nolan's history is the long description he gives from Parliamentary Papers of the Ujinala massacres of 1 August, when nearly five hundred of the 26th N. I. had suffered death by execution. In moral character the whole range of the history of the Sepoy Revolt can hardly furnish a picture of greater deformity. The incident itself was a standing indictment of the blind fury of the British authorities in India and its outspoken condemnation by the Parliament was necessarily a matter of chief interest. It excited attention in Europe and engaged the press in England in fierce discussion, and prolonged deliberations were initiated through a motion introduced in the British Parliament by Mr Gilpin in March 1859[3]. Letters of Montgomery and Sir John Lawrence approving the conduct of Cooper were read in the House of Commons to the fierce indignation of many, but Lord Stanley handled the situation admirably well. He expressed his regret and pain at the sacrifice 'of life made, not in the heat of action, nor after a judicial process', and found it impossible not to condemn the tone of flippancy and exultation which appeared in the official despatches written at the time and also the language in which Cooper narrated the transaction. It transpires that even Canning wrote to John Lawrence giving credit due to Cooper for his exertions. Eventually, the House passed over the motion 'with that silence which is sometimes the most judicious comment'.

[1] Nolan, op. cit. pp. 723, 725, 727-8, 732.
[2] Ibid. p. 730.
[3] Ibid. pp. 735-39.

138049

Marfat.com

Nolan was followed by Robert Montgomery Martin who wrote a more elaborate and comprehensive history of the British Empire in India. In his three-volume history of the 'Indian Empire' Martin devoted the second volume exclusively on the mutiny of the Bengal Army and on the exposition of the alleged causes. In its size (twenty-six cm.), printing and the number of pages covered (five-hundred and four) it approximated to nearly half the size of Ball's two-volume work. This second volume dealing with the Indian Mutiny was 'dedicated by Authority to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen' but it seems that Martin had previously written a brochure on 'The Rise and Progress of the Indian Mutiny' which along with other works on the colonies and commercial questions were addressed to Lord Stanley in 1859 for a proper appreciation of the condition of the British Empire in the East. It was possibly this work which was rendered into French under the title 'La Revolte de I'Jnde etc.' by M. Kermoysan in 1860, for the second volume of Martin's 'Indian Empire' could not have been published earlier than 1860-61. Martin refers to Ball's work and also described the final operation of the Sepoy War of November 1859 in the Terai region as reported in the *Times* of 21 January 1860[1]. This points to 1861 as the earliest possible time when the volume on the Indian Mutiny could have been published. It also agrees with his reference to many important works which he consulted as contemporary sources discussed in this chapter. Martin's work is no repository of original materials like Ball's history. He made a limited use of the available sources and based his work on the Blue Books for the early phases, but in general, mostly and predominantly, on Parliamentary Papers, and in particular on the *Times* every issue of which up to 1859-60 contained authentic reports on the Indian Mutiny from officials and persons serving and residing in India.[2] He also made use of London Gazettes of 1858 and '59 which published the military despatches and other official reports as well. As for Lucknow, he consulted both Rees and Gubbins but he considered that the authority of Rees carried more weight as he had access to the journal kept by Lady Inglis. Gubbins' account is

[1] Martin, II, pp. 169, 498.

[2] Most of the letters cited by Ball were used by Martin as they appeared either in the *Times* or in other newspapers.

Marfat.com

less circumstantial and is not free from prejudice as he had some differences with the authorities.

Martin was a surgeon, a botanist and a naturalist[1] but it is curious that he turned a historian. A man of intellectual vigour he possibly found in the history of the Indian Empire, above all a guide to the life of the British nation. Yet the 'Empire' had not cast its spell over him and the racial complex hardly affected his historical sense. Like all others he wrote that the English people had met with treachery in the very class they trusted most and described the high qualities displayed by Englishmen and women, the Christian heroism which adorned 'this sad .and thrilling page of Anglo-Indian history'. But he held the balance even and attributed the success of British arms to the absence of efficient leaders on the part of the mutineers. This leads him to draw a picture of the condition of India where scope for oppression still persisted. Ireland offered a notable example of the effects of 'absentee proprietorship' and India was suffering from the effects of 'absentee sovereigntyship'[2]. He quotes Mead who refers to the extinction of the aristocracy, the ruination of manufacture and impoverishment of agricultural and other sources to bear witness to the exploiting tendency of British rule in India[3]. It is no new thing that he wrote, that Englishmen in India were arrogant and exclusive, but to Martin it appeared that 'Mr. Thackeray's lash' was needed to keep within bounds the vagaries of the Anglo-Indian variety of the genus 'snobs'[4]. On the revenue system his views were sharp and critical and excepting Gubbins, not many early writers had gone so deep into the subject. The preference for the village system could not justify the suppression of every other coexisting institutions ; 'the village communities were not strong enough to feel safe in occupying the vantage ground on which they were so unexpectedly placed', and so they came to accept 'the rough-and-ready patriarchal sway of their chiefs'[5]. He realised it quite clearly, as already noticed, that rebellion of the people would accompany the Mutinies, the 'two classes would coalesce' in the nature of a sequel[6].

[1] Buckland, *Dictionary*, p. 277.
[2] Martin, II, pp. 1-2.
[3] Ibid. pp. 5 ff. cf. also Martin on Resumption (II, p. 91).
[4] Ibid. p. 123.
[5] Ibid, pp. 84, 85.
[6] Ibid. p. 122.

Marfat.com

About the cry of vengeance uttered in England at that time, Martin unlike Ball, was the first British historian to expose the venomous attitude of the British people which he deplored. He traced that the Indian articles which appeared during the first few months of the Mutiny in the *Times* which had set the ball rolling and under its influence the *Friend of India* in particular became an apostle of extreme severity. The people of England like those of their counterpart in India became credulous even believing the story of Lord Shaftesbury which was later found to be groundless. Those like John Pakington who argued that the 'British hands were not clear' were little heeded. Disraeli lamented that Moloch had come to sway the mind of the people who were worked up to the heights of frenzy by the poet Martin F. Tupper who would even like to see India covered with 'groves of gibbets'. Moore, the magistrate of Mirzapur, had become a terror. The historian, therefore, appreciated governor-general's policy drawn up on 31 July 1857 which might yet make a show that justice and not vengeance was the policy of the British government which was menacingly attacked by Neill's performance at Benares and Allahabad. But the vindictive spirit still persisted and Grant, the lieutenant-governor of the Central Provinces, was compelled to defend himself against a wholly unfounded charge of having released one hundred and fifty Cawnpore rebels[1]. About Frederick Cooper's action at Ujinala the historian exposed Montgomery's approbation of Cooper's conduct. It was surprising to him that the advocate for propagation of Christianity in India should regard the massacres as a feather in a man's cap—'a blood-red feather' that it was. Cooper's comparison of the Black Hole of Calcutta and the Well of Cawnpore with the Well of Ujinala was correct in this sense that the leading feature of the three massacres was an utter recklessness of human suffering. But while Nana Sahib preserved the wretched captives as long as it was considered safe, and Sirajuddaulah displayed cold blooded indifference towards the survivors of the Calcutta prison, Cooper surpassed them all ; within forty-eight hours there fell by the law nearly five hundred men. What crime, what law ?—Martin asked,

[1] Martin, pp. II, 282, 408-12.

Marfat.com

in exterminating a 'helpless multitude, famishing with hunger and exhausted with fatigue'[1].

In factual matters, Martin offered a narrative of the events which by that time had become standardised, and he did not engage himself in inserting minute details of events so much as focussing attention to grave situations. Thus in regard to the appointment of general Anson 'a clerk of the ordnance', he quotes authorities to explain the real situation and to show how disastrous it was. Anson had not sent any note, nor given the slighest indication of any disaffection among the sepoys to home authorities up to May 1857. This was only a proof of the fact that general Anson was indifferent to the issue[2]. Martin's 'Indian Empire', the Mutiny volume, is a contemporary source of great merit. His work is not a narrative of events but it touches all the important points in a discriminating style. He had a gift for marshalling facts and presenting them with an engaging effect. Even within the limits of his work he combined spaciousness with a facility of generalisation consistent with factual accuracy. His contribution had an additional significance in that he was the first of the British writers on the Mutiny who did neither applaud British excesses nor concentrate on the qualities of British character but attempted to offer a version of the Indian Mutiny with ample information and fearlessness of judgment.

[1] Martin, II, pp. 427-29. See also Cave-Browne for justification of Montgomery's views (*supra*, p. 54).

[2] Martin, II, pp. 135-36.

Marfat.com

## CHAPTER FOUR

# KAYE AND MALLESON

The progress of studies on the Indian Mutiny in the first few years of the outbreak has been sketched. On a regionwise basis it appears that no part of India, affected by the rising, remained unnoticed. For the Punjab there was Cooper and Cave-Browne ; the latter's work was even more helpful for Delhi on which there was an abundance of publications, such as, Norman, Rotton, Medley, Ireland, Bourchier and Greathed. Bourchier describes the pursuit of rebels after their flight from Delhi and the battle fought at Agra with the Gwalior contingent. The incidents of the siege of Lucknow and the mutiny in Oudh are furnished by a host of writers like Gubbins, Rees, Raikes, Hutchinson and also by a set of female writers of the Residency. The story of Cawnpore to the time of the embarkation was given by captain Mowbray Thomson but Shepherd's account already noticed in the Red Pamphlet was later on published by the Delhi Gazette in 1862. North's journal describes the campaigns of Havelock and Sir Colin Campbell's 'Narrative' furnished for the first time on account of the capture of Lucknow. From Behar, Tayler and Boyle wrote about the exciting events of Eastern India. Towards Central India the outbreak and its suppression was described in Pritchard's 'Mutinies in Rajputana' and Lowe's 'Central India', and in Mrs. Coopland's work 'Escape from Gwalior'. The narratives of Edwards during his concealment with Probyns in Oudh, of Dunlop's skirmishes with the rebels in the neighbourhood of Meerut and of Robertson's duties in the district of Saharanpur are episodes of the Mutiny replete with interesting facts. In addition to these, plain but detailed narratives in small compass, mainly descriptive of military movements and actions with a mixture of explanations were also attempted by various writers, such as, Lee and Radcliffe, Malleson (Red Pamphlet), Nolan and some few more. General history published during the progress of the Mutiny or sometime after its suppression, as those of Dodd, Ball, Martin, etc. are justly regarded as some of the classics of mutiny literature.



Marfat.com

So when Sir John William Kaye appeared in the field of mutiny studies towards the end of the first decade of the Indian Mutiny, British historiography on the Sepoy War[1] was already crowded with pamphlets, books and serialized volumes which resulted in a fairly good exploration of the subject matter. But there was always the advantage of looking at past events from a distance of time by later writers, increasingly as they receded further and further from the epoch of that mighty upheaval. In the historical process it was probable that the 'Revolt' with all its complexities would appear in a more perceptible and authentic form with the passage of time. Later writers might perhaps lack in that ardent and exciting tone which characterised works written during the progress of the Mutiny but plausibility of rendering a more objective account by removing wrong notions and erroneous views about the upsurge lay with the historians of later ages.

British public do not seem to have been satisfied with the content and nature of historiography on the Mutiny so far publised. A hunger for knowledge of the deeds of their countrymen was upon them. A number of articles in the *Calcutta Review* bear testimony to the great interest they took for more pragmatic works on the Indian Mutiny which will seek to broaden the special values of British culture. Some were thinking of how incorrect and unjust opinions were entertained of Cromwell and how Carlyle had given a new image of the epoch of the Great Protector in the light of the materials he had collected. And so since the facts of the eventful period of 1857-59 had been collected by many it should now be left to more impartial minds for grouping of facts and necessary deduction. Another view was that all the data necessary for writing a comprehensive history of the Indian rebellion have been published, the masterly *resume* of the siege of Lucknow by general Inglis, the despatches of Lord Clyde and Sir Hugh Rose, the letters of Hodson, the narratives of Edwards and Polehampton and captain Mowbray Thomson. All these exhaust the strategy and the tragedy of the unparalleled suffering of a time which shall never be forgotten.[2]

[1] History of the Sepoy War, 3 vols. each of 20.5 cm. size in all 2,098 pages (*supra*, p. 69).

[2] *Calcutta Review*, 1859, vol. 33.

Marfat.com

'The one work that remains is to embalm the whole in the prose of Lord Macaulay. It is a theme worthy of him, who sang the lays of Ancient Rome for never in history or fable did men dare to suffer more with high heart and unflinching spirit'. Should he decline to take the work Mr Kaye might be induced to 'give us a record if not so brilliant, perhaps more sober, truthful and impartial'.[1] Thus Sir John William Kaye appears as the trusted historian of the Anglo-Saxons to write the history of the Indian Mutiny. Many others also did not appear to have been satiated with what they got from the writings on the Mutiny. They were seized with a passion to discover and uphold the qualities of British character which may be displayed by historians as something more precious than any other mundane profits. They detested the utilitarian attitude that loco-motives and powerlooms count everything and frowned on Cobden's cliches that 'one number of the *Times* newspaper is worth eight books of Thucydides'. The industrial civilization of the nineteenth century pressed heavily on their minds and they accordingly found relief from the reflections of piece-goods and gunny clothes to the contemplation of qualities of the Anglo-Saxon race as highlighted in those years of mortal extremity.[2]

It is the quality of British character that the British historians were wooing in the Indian Mutiny and Sir John William Kaye was an excellent choice. He was extraordinarily perceptive about the characteristic features of the English which accounted for the outbreak of 1857 and its suppression. In his preface to the first volume of the Sepoy War he makes it clear[3]. 'The story of the Indian Rebellion of 1857 is, perhaps, most signal illustration of our great national character ever yet recorded in the annals of our country. It was the vehement self-assertion of the Englishman that produced this conflagration ; it was the same vehement self-assertion that enabled him, by God's blessings, to trample it out. It was a noble egotism, mighty, alike in doing and in suffering.... If I have any predominant theory it is that : 'Because we were too

[1] Ibid. Also *Calcutta Review*, 1863, vol. 38, p. 159
[2] *Calcutta Review*, 1864, vol. 39, pp. 321 ff.
[3] Kaye, I, Preface, p. xii.

Marfat.com

English the great crisis arose ; but it was only because we were English that when it arose it did not utterly overwhelm us'[1]. No other historian could possibly give such an emphasis on British character in such an attractive perspective and turn angularities of the Anglo-Saxons into assets of their national life. Kaye's 'Sepoy War' is one more example of British scholarship on the Indian Empire which though tinged with prejudices has withstood the test of time.

Kaye writes a 'Preface' in case of each of his three volumes which unfolds his ideas on the subject and the plan of his work. He writes that he ventured on this difficult task because materials of history within his reach or under his possession were so abundant, and further, assistance from surviving actors of the war were so spontaneous that none else would have been in a better position in respect of the availability of source materials to write a more truthful account of the war of 1857. By personal intercourse and by communication with men who were connected with events described, he collated vast piles of contemporary correspondence and his wide contacts helped him to get insights into the doubtful nature of many personal incidents. One great object of his ambition was to tell the truth without exaggeration or reservation. He was aware of his responsibilities and also of his opportunities which prompted him to make every conscientious endeavour to present an honest exposition of historical facts[2].

The materials he collected were private papers, and official documents were used in so far as they were necessary to make a better use of the former. He believed that there would not have been any difference at all in his 'History', had he not seen these public or state papers. It will be noticed that the opposite view was held by Forrest who stated that private accounts and contemporary narratives have to be fortified by official documents. However, Kaye explains why he does not refer to the sources or cite authorities in support of his statement in his books. He thinks that frequent citations and references encumber the text and impede the narrative. The factual basis of his statements was so strong that he felt no need to produce his credentials excepting those occasions where it was

[1] Kaye, I, Preface, p. I ; II, p. xii.

[2] Ibid I, Preface, p. x.

Marfat.com

necessary to give 'colour and vitality to the story'[1]. He fully acknowledges his responsibility for the opinions expressed which were confirmed by most authentic sources, though as a writer of contemporary history and 'in the exercise of independent thought' he might dissent from doctrines held in esteem or disapprove actions of some authorities. All those actions which apparently appeared to be erroneous on the part of the English people were, however, taken as a measure of 'benevolent design and a generous striving after good'[2]. The historian makes no reference to his opinions about Indian leaders. but he defends the role of contemporary historians as there are manifold advantages in writing of events still fresh in the memory of man, 'to compensate for its manifest disadvantages'. The disadvantages are that the contemporary historian may tend to discriminate in the treatment of the living or the dead showing more consideration to the former for the fact of his presence. But he firmly held the view that to the historians all men are dead and he should be prepared to speak freely and truthfully in all cases[3].

Kaye was very critical about his approach to the subject and the plan of treatment having regard to the confusion and distraction which was caused by the multiplicity of simultaneous mutinies in different parts of the country. While these suggested a unity of purpose and action, joint action on the British side for the suppression of the movement was, however, rendered impossible because of various factors in the earlier stages of the war. Naturally, British action in the initial stages bore a distinctly local character, every man doing what was best in his eyes to confront the situation regionwise. So if the treatment was to be chronological with a number of narratives of occurrences of one and the same day or of a particular week, it would no doubt have resolved the confusion which bewildered the readers. It would also have represented the character of the crisis in its factual aspect, but the divergent and distracting features of the local movements would not have come into prominence. He says that it would not have gratified the readers nor would it have created any distinct impression about the movement. Accordingly, he

[1] Ibid. I, Preface, p. x.
[2] Ibid. p. xi.
[3] Kaye, II, Preface, p. xv.

Marfat.com

adopted a plan, what may be called 'episodical', as the best possible historical way of treating synchronous incidents. To treat the history of the Mutiny episodewise, as Kaye did, amounted to a regional approach to the subject for the episodes of every region, such as, that of Meerut, Delhi, Cawnpore, Lucknow, Rohilkhand, Punjab or Jhansi and of other regions had a separate and distinct character[1].

Such a treatment would not only bring into play the various measures adopted by local officers to meet an unexpected crisis but would also highlight the military operations conducted to suppress the movement in a particular region. Eventually this regionwise study became largely a study of military actions of different generals of the great struggle, so much so, that it is by following the campaigns of the military leaders like Nicholson, Havelock, Neill and others that one could get the history of the mutiny-war, and as Kaye says, even 'arrive at a just conception of the general action of the whole'[2]. Thus the history of the Indian Mutiny was turned into a story of the British army and as emphasis on British action grew, it became army-oriented. The wars of the Mutiny had been found more spectacular than the insurrection of the sepoys which led to the rising of 1857. The wars of the Mutiny centred round the great generals so glaringly that the whole history was conditioned by the influence of individual characters. The primacy of individual characters influenced him so much that he had to acknowledge the necessity of bringing the readers face to face with the principal actors in the events of the Sepoy War[3]. But in his third volume he recoils from this position and introduces a fresh perspective. He writes, 'But I wish the reader to understand that I have not pretended to write a Military history of these or any other operations—that my narrative was not intended to bear 'stamp exclusive or professional' but to commend the common interests and catholic sympathies of all classes of readers'[4].

But Kaye calls himself a contemporary historian, and he was very much a contemporary historian not only because of the nearness of his time to the epoch of the revolt but also because of his contact with

1 Ibid. pp. ix ff.
2 Kaye, II, Preface, pp. xi-xii.
3 Ibid. I, p. xii.
4 Ibid. III, Preface, p. ix.

Marfat.com

people who were witnesses or actors in this struggle. In a sense, Kaye could not meet the requirements of the ideal condition envisaged by the British public that later writers writing from a distance of time and relatively free from contemporary prejudices would be in a better position to do the work. Besides this, his statement in the Preface that historical materials moulded into the narrative were more of a private than of a public character, is also not borne out by his reference to the many official and semi-official reports, accounts, narratives and despatches and such other things. In his three volumes he mentions quite a large number of the reports, of the civil or military officers of the spot who made the first report about the outbreak in their respective stations[1]. Many other documents of original importance in regard to the incidents of the Agra fort, and of Gwalior, Indore. Meerut and Jhansi are also referred to by him[2]. In particular he made use of the report of F. Williams, commissioner, first division, Meerut, as also 'Depositions' taken down by colonel G. W. Williams, commissioner of Police, North-West Provinces which he considered to be very full and of a very highly interesting and valuable character[3]. On Punjab, official reports of Sir John Lawrence and also those of Barnes, H. Edwardes and Ricket are too frequently mentioned[4]. Parliamentary Papers as also other public records are not omitted[5].

It appears, therefore, that though Kaye relied on private sources and varieties of manuscript records, he made frequent references to official sources also to confirm or substantiate the basic structure of his work in order to make a comprehensive narrative of the mutinies of the different places. But public record or private paper, it is more than odd that Kaye should make no mention of Charles Ball's monumental volumes and Chambers' history by G. Dodd which were almost standard works in those days. The historian in his Prefaces gives the impression as though he was the first historian to approach the work.

1 Kaye, II, 110, 244-45, 251, 255, 354 ; III, pp. 198, 217, 223, 224, 247, 249, 258, 287, 292, 305, 476. For a full list of the Official 'Narratives' with their Enclosures, see Chaudhuri, *Theories*, pp. 181 ff. (Appendix).

2 Kaye, III, pp. 229-30, 272, 282, 287, 303, 365, 371.

3 Kaye, II, pp. 173, 306, 372-3.

4 Kaye, I, pp. 58, 183, 194, 160, 478, 480, 500.

5 Kaye, III, p. 92.

Marfat.com

He refers to the vast mass of details, super-abundance of records and varieties of printed documents and manuscripts which increased his difficulty of narration. He had the complacency of admitting that no other historian had access to such a mine of materials which induced him to take up the work. It seems he was not even aware of the efforts made in that direction by Ball. Any synopsis of the prodigious materials surfaced by Ball would have shown that his collection of public and private materials had a kind of vraisemblance that was obvious. The military despatches apart, the overwhelming number of letters, correspodences and publications marshalled by him was not in any way less in number than that handled by Kaye. It may be true what Kaye claimed. that none would be able to write a more truthful account though some may write better history. Which is to say that very few were equal to the task like him of writing the history of the Mutiny. But as far as collection of materials and moulding them into an outline were concerned with plenty of information of peripheral interest, Ball's work was a pioneering one the omission of reference to which cannot be accounted for. It need not be stressed that the Chambers' History by Dodd which was one of the earliest works on the Mutiny was also not mentioned. But Kaye referred to Martin's work which contained many valuable references[1], complimented Cave-Browne for his trustworthy narrative[2], Norman for his accuracy[3] and colonel G. W. Williams for his 'Depositions', a unique record of great importance.

It would be difficult to select any specific issue from his voluminous work strongly suggestive of the 'nature of his study' but some striking points cannot but be referred to in a work of this nature. Nothing can be better than his account of the causes which prepared the way for the mutiny and rebellion both, as he treated it as such in his book on the 'Sepoy War'. He discusses in detail all the early mutinies, the insane conduct of the government in tampering with the pay of the men, the diminishing authority of the officers, the dangers of over-centralisation, the grasping policy of Dalhousie and above all the alienation of

[1] Kaye, III, p. 110.
[2] Ibid, I, p. 638.
[3] Ibid, II, p. 194.

Marfat.com

the higher classes and the elites, and the land settlement of the North-West, and the resumption of old hereditary grants and such other vital economic factors which entered into the composition of the 'Revolt'. But Kaye also seems to have been susceptible to the influence of other Englishmen in India who believed that the British government had invited the revolt to their door by their progressive social and economic legislation. Kaye indeed argued that the Christian spirit of Englishmen, their sense of responsibility to God came into conflict with error, superstition and prejudices of a decadent society. Like Charles Ball and other English writers of the Mutiny he highly appreciated the Christian attitude, that being Christians they were logically bound to put an end to all evil practices, check immorality, oppression and slavery, suppress caste and spread education[1]. In so doing, fears and hatreds had been roused but this was inevitable in the position of the alien rulers being Englishmen and Christians at that.

But all these seem to bear a family resemblance with the imperialist hangover that the Indian rising of 1857 was a reaction of obscurantism to social change, a reaction of conservative forces to the modernizing activities of enlightened English government. They ignored the view that disaffection created by social legislation and interference with Hindu manners and customs were real and genuine. The impatience of the Englishmen to tolerate Indian conditions of life generated by missionary teachings led them to denounce some 'ideological values' normal to Indian society and religious and cultural concepts which had evolved long since.[2] The British bureaucrats failed to appreciate that such things as common messing system in jails or sea voyages for soldiers and other such interference in the traditional way of life[3] were extremely irritating and generated fears of conversion to Christianity which were definitely encouraged by the Act 21 of 1850 which enabled converts to inherit their ancestral property. However, the Christian spirit, according to Kaye, does not seem to have been stronger than the racial spirit, the 'vehement self-assertion of the Englishmen' which as the historian states produced the conflagration.

[1] Ball writes eloquently on this point (Ball, I, p. 648). Also *supra*, p. 80.

[2] Sir Sayed Ahmad Khan, *The Causes of the Indian Revolt*, p. 18 ; Joshi, pp. 151-3.

[3] Kaye, I, pp. 153 ff. ; Ball, I, p. 648 ; Hilton, p. 204.

Marfat.com

He shows how Thomason, Bird, Dalhousie and his followers in the great body of the Haileybury Civil service differed from generous and wise rulers of the past. So it may appear surprising that Kaye who had summed up the real causes of the Mutiny by ascribing the revolt to 'bad faith', to the destruction of confidence in the fidelity of the British to treaties and in their pecuniary honesty, should have related the causes of disaffection to such other factors as the preaching of the missionary officers, jealous propagation of female education and limitation of kulin polygamy.

Kaye's defence of Dalhousie in regard to the state of the Bengal army again raked up the Napier legend. There was that 'sighing' for that heroic old chief who it was said was right in his assertion of the mutiny of the different regiments of the Punjab. Against all these, Dalhousie's denial of the truth of the statement of the commander-in-chief that India was in danger of mutiny did not carry conviction and Kaye's defence of Dalhousie betrayed his courtier-like attitude. Kaye also committed a grave misstatement of fact. He writes that within a period of three years after his arrival, that is, in the period of 1848-1851, he had brought to a close two great military campaigns and had captured two great provinces[1]. This is grossly inaccurate as the Burmese war was not begun till 1852 ; but the critics wondered if it was not deliberately done to place Dalhousie above board in his treatment of the Napier controversy. Again, referring to the period 1851-56 he writes 'after this there was again a season of quiet, the remaining years of Lord Dalhousie's administration passed away without any further military outbreaks to disturb his rooted conviction about the fidelity of the sepoys'[2]. It appears that Kaye was unable to face facts for in 1852 the 38th N. I. refused to proceed to Burma and Lord Dalhousie, fearful to admit that Sir Charles Napier had been right in his estimate of the disaffection prevailing among the sepoys, passed over this contempt of discipline in silence and possibly also to justify his views which he recorded in his final minute on the conduct of the sepoys in 1856. But it would be silly to agree with some of his critics that Kaye had no individuality and that he was the

[1] Kaye, I, p. 69.
[2] Ibid. p. 324.

Marfat.com

mouthpiece of a party and wrote like a partisan. It is to be admitted that if Kaye defended Dalhousie against Napier, he was equally strong in his attacks on Dalhousie's policy of annexation which again was resented by the agents of the E. I. Company. The Duke of Argyll published two anonymous articles in the *Edinburgh Review* 1863, defending Dalhousie's policy of annexation and lapse and in that connection roundly attacked Sir John Kaye as the author of the 'Sepoy War' in which the historian elaborated the evil effects of the policy of annexation and lapse. The Duke alleged that Kaye had preconceived theories and worked out his narratives to fit in with this pattern. It was lamentable, the Duke urged, that Kaye should have assailed Lord Dalhousie and made himself to a great extent the mouthpiece of a party and 'let the credit of his reputation' be exploited for party ends. Major Evans Bell mounted a counter-attack on the Duke denouncing the 'vindicators' and 'eulogists' who have come up on the surface now that the Mutiny had been suppressed to make fortune in the game of 'a lucrative lapse' again[1]. To the charge that the assailant of Dalhousie considered the rebellion of 1857 arising against oppression, Bell firmly maintained that Kaye was not definitely of this view. He attributed the outbreak to manifold causes producing a general feeling of suspicion and disaffection but not amounting to what is called 'oppression' but rather to what M. de Tocqueville terms *Orgueil*, pride or contempt of everything in India[2]. This approximates well with Kaye's theory of 'vehement self-assertion of the Englishman'. Kaye vindicated his position by a reference to the views of Henry Lawrence communicated to him on 16 July 1856. This was in reply to the statement of a writer in the *Edinburgh Review* about him. The writer banteringly remarked that Kaye was 'hanging on to the skirts of a popular delusion'. The opinion of Sir Henry Lawrence was clear that the Government was going too fast and it was losing its good name among the native states. He did not like the present system and scoffed the doctrine that it was 'wicked not to knock down and plunder every native prince'[3].

[1] Bell, *Retrospects and Prospects*, pp. 2-26.
[2] Ibid. pp. 230-01.
[3] Kaye, I, p. 454.



Marfat.com

But Sir John William Kaye was not, however, discerning enough in showering praises on men of influence. There was a feeling in some quarters that the 'Sepoy War' was written to order. The remarkable instance of Kaye's euphuistic spirit in speaking of Lord Canning lends colour to the view. He gives a long account of Canning's ancestry and builds up an image of the governor-general that was glorious. Referring to the month of May 1957, when Delhi had fallen and the naked fact of the juncture of the Delhi and Meerut troops was discharging its 'tempestuous terrors', Kaye wrote somewhat in a dramatic style : 'So Canning arose, and with his still, calm face confronted the dire calamity'[1]. But on all accounts Canning was neither a man of exalted genius nor a hero and in the months of May and June he was only acting behind 'Beadon's line of safety' in Calcutta, while Sir John Lawrence of Punjab was carrying the burden of the 'Empire'[2]. Malleson contends[3] that in the first half of the first week of May when he was fully aware that the temper of the native army, to say the least, was excited, the government of Lord Canning had even then actually ordered the return of the 84th to Rangoon. The fact was that Canning was incapable of carrying a nation along with him 'as a lump of ice cannot act as a fuel to a locomotive'. His speeches about clemency would have best suited those who were men of action like Lawrence and Outram and an appeal to resort to mercy would have been highly effective had it been issued by any of the generals. In his eminently handsome countenance some even found a lack of lustre or speculation in his eyes and his 'obstinate undecided hanging under-lip' was a damper to many.

In his treatment of the subject matter about various controversial issues Kaye writes with a unique understanding of the whole course of events. On Meerut he writes 'it was not the palpable but the unpalpable—a vague and voiceless idea that had driven the regiment to mutiny'[4]. He had no doubt that the execution of the sentence on May 9 and rivetting of the men's fetters on parade, made

[1] Ibid. pp. 597-98.
[2] Campbell, *Memoirs*, I. pp. 230-34.
[3] Malleson, I, pp. 6 ff.
[4] Kaye, II, pp. 45-46.

Marfat.com

the sepoys of the 3rd L. C. furious[1]. He depicts a picture of tremendous commotion on 10 May[2] though Williams' 'Depositions' pointed to a situation which was the very reverse of what was stated by Kaye[3]. Kaye's comments on the inaction of the British troops enhanced the importance of British historiography on the Mutiny. The whole episode at Meerut was an enigma to him it was amazing how the mutineers escaped from the English troops unless it was a spasm of madness coming from panic[4], but about captain Rosser he was definite that on the night of 10 May he expressed his willingness to cut off the mutineers[5]. The 'night of horror' in Meerut on 10 May was never more graphically described than by Kaye, though Ball had attempted it[6]. Mac Munn characterised it as a sensational overcolouring of the civilian historians[7] which, however, was against the evidence of many officers on the spot. About the pursuit of the mutineers, he like Sir Hugh Gough held that the presence of the Carabineers in pursuit would have had a moral deterrent effect. But he judged the whole issue from the standpoint of English national character, that to be forearmed to meet the peril would befit a vulgar alarmist and not a Briton. They were too arrogant to realise that this march of a few stragglers to Delhi posed a threat to their 'Empire'. The very policy was against any preparation for an emergency and it was not that either Hewitt or Wilson did not play the game. The military argument of the case that the Europeans in pursuit would have lost themselves in the streets of Delhi swarming with rebels, ignores the moral and historical aspect of the question that the presence of the English Dragoons on the Jumna which the sepoys could not have missed as an indication of the coming retribution would have been sufficient to terrorise them into submission[8]. His reading about the Meerut affair, however, shows the baffling nature of the imbroglio. Not prone to violent assumption and strange conjectures Kaye maintained that the premature outbreak at Meerut frustrated

1 Ibid. II, pp. 51-52.
2 Ibid. II, p. 55.
3 *Civil Rebellion*, p. 277.
4 Kaye, II, p. 56-7.
5 Ibid. II, pp. 67, 663-64.
6 Ball, I, pp. 56-63.
7 Mac Munn, p. 44.
8 Kaye, II, pp. 101-108.

Marfat.com

the plan for a general explosion and was the means of the salvation of British Empire in India[1].

The imperial experience left its mark upon every British writer, but Kaye was no apologist for the 'Empire' and showed accommodation and tolerance in dealing with such matters. He offers an exceedingly fair account of Anglo-Mughal relations from the time of Wellesley and onwards and leaves the impression of a historian who could hardly suppress the gyrations of his mind purely on objective considerations. In Shah Alam he saw a great political paradox, a pensioner, a pageant, but not totally so : 'He is to be a king and yet no king—a something and yet nothing—a reality and a sham', but a force to reckon with before the Company 'can work in the pleasant path of imperialism'[2]. He gives a detailed account of the various stages of this intricate question, the reactions of the Kings of Delhi to the many proposals made and the inhibitions of the Company's 'pure mercantile bottom'. As it seems, he found it difficult to suppress that the implied vassalage of the Company was like a 'halter round its neck' and that the *de facto* activities of the company were the only remedies left open for a termination of its humiliating tenure[3].

Kaye unfolds the real picture of those critical days when Anson was hovering between Simla, Ambala and Karnal. He refers to all the correspondence that passed between Anson, Lawrence and Canning, the miserable picture of the siege-army, the insistence of the civilians to march for Delhi with this 'boosted Indian army' despite the warning given by Anson about the risk involved in such an enterprise, are all clearly stated. Canning's directions also reflected the same attitude of immediate action and so Anson's pusillanimous attitude stood in contrast to the governor-general's emphatic assertion of the need of making a short work of Delhi which, however, was considered to be unrealistic by many[4]. Undoubtedly, enormous issues were at stake, but the historian could hardly conceal his sympathy for Anson who was made to 'bow his neck to stern political

1 Ibid. II, pp. 108-10.
2 Kaye, II, pp. 4-5.
3 Ibid. II, pp. 3-33.
4 *Supra*, p. 46.

Marfat.com

necessity'[1]. But Kaye's position was delicately poised as both Anson and Canning enjoyed the patronage of the Whigs and Canning in particular than whom 'there was never a braver heart'[2]. Even so, he was not afraid to speak out against the governor-general who 'believed overmuch in the facile execution of the impossible' and showed a tendency to give credence to contemporary utterances relating to the first paroxysm of perplexity. 'Anson outshone his colleagues alike in wisdom and integrity', but Kaye does not make it clear that if Anson was not to be judged by the measuring-rod of civil authorities why Hewitt should be[3]. There was not much reason to doubt what Lawrence stated that Delhi would have opened its gate on the approach of Anson's troops, just as what the historian had stated, that the mutinies would not have proceeded far had the Meerut Carabineers appeared on the banks of Jumna on 11 May[4]. Apparently, there was a case against both Hewitt and Anson. But Anson is held in high esteem by Kaye who quotes the *Red Pamphlet* to show that the general was not a 'mere Horse Guards' General who had gained his honours at New Market'. But the historian also refers to 'paroxysm of perplexity', which possibly explains why all suffered from the same complexes in those traumatic days. It will be unfair not to admit that Anson was no more wrong in his defensive postures than was Lawrence right in his offensive stances. Canning, however, expressed his view that Anson's wating for the siege-train was an unwise delay for the want of it would not have exposed the British army to any reverse[5].

It was been stated that a vast literature had grown up round the siege of Delhi before Kaye took up the work, but he gives the impression that he made a limited use of all these works. In general, he does not refer to published works as his authority for facts stated, though obviously enough the history of so huge an event as the siege and capture of Delhi which he has written with his wonted insights and imaginative sympathy for the human aspects of the crisis, could not have been attempted simply on the strength of his manuscript

[1] Kaye, II, pp. 157, 166.
[2] Ibid. I. p. 598.
[3] Ibid. II. pp. 166-68.
[4] Ibid. II. pp. 107, 152 ff.
[5] Ibid. pp. 166-67.

Marfat.com

correspondence and private materials[1]. The other writers like Malleson, Forrest, Holmes, Sen and Majumdar depended very largely on all the early works on Delhi, but with a difference, for the field was so vast that most of the historians writing on Delhi made their own choice of authors, some drawing mostly from Hodson, Medley, Rotton, and others preferring Greathed, Cave-Browne, Keith-Young as also the biographical works of Bosworth Smith and Vibart's 'Life of Richard Baird Smith'[2]. Kaye referred to all these works but only very casually, and despite this, the Delhi episode though not factual has been a very comprehensive and informative account. He narrated the chain of events in a way in which history and human values shaped each other producing a cameo of Anglo-Saxon life in its different aspects. The emotional edge, a lively sympathy and a warm feeling of love and admiration for the splendid achievement of the defenders of the 'Empire' from the lieutenant Quintin Battye of the "Guides" who died with *pro patria mori* on his lips to Nicholson, the 'Achilles' of the British, who died under the sunshine of victory have been nicely blended in the historical texture to produce the desired effect. A constant courage in action and an enduring fortitude in suffering which appeared all the more exemplary because of their elastic cheerfulness which never faded even when exposed to the fierce heat of the mid-day sun were some traits of British character which were unlike anything in 'military annals of any country or any time'[3]. It was not necessary to recite the history of the daily sorties in the British camp but Kaye gives the details as much as he can and refers to Barnard who worked with 'ceaseless energy' and to major Henry Tomb as type of English soldiership. He was again very much alive to the strength of the enemy and writes as though he was bearing the brunt of the struggle himself, that the artillery subaltern Willoughby had done little to diminish the resource of the enemy[4]. Nothing escaped from the range of his investigations. Inside the camp, the water carriers, the

[1] *Supra*, pp. 66 ff.
[2] For Reginald Bosworth Smith and Richard Baird Smith, See Buckland, *Dictionary of Indian Biography*, p. 395.
[3] Kaye, II, p. 540.
[4] Ibid. p. 549.

Marfat.com

cook-boys and other 'servile' classes lay exposed to racial bitterness of the British soldiers ; they were miserably treated or even unnecessarily killed by their European masters[1]. In the action of 19 June British losses were enormous and circumstances were most depressing[2], while the action of 23 June caused the gravest concern[3]. Kaye gives a long account over the coming of Nicholson and creates a halo round him—the legend of a great deliverer about whom everybody in the camp spoke with caution. Men began to see clearly the march of events for the final assault and the arrival of the movable column stirred the spirit of the whole camp. The battle of Najafgarh was acclaimed as a victory the like of which the British had not gained since the battle of Badli-ki-Serai on 8 June. The historian writes like a camp follower that for three months the great city had defied the best courage and the best skill of the English nation but without the material resources which the enemy possessed they could have been crushed in a day[4]. Here Kaye has not been fair to the Indians, for Europeans had the advantage of the Enfield rifle but racial obsessions fogged the path of history and loud was the spirit of the people, as Kaye records, at the prospect of ultimate success.

The waiting game under constant exposure showed that the English had lost nothing of their old variety[5]. The emphasis on British action and on the qualities of the English people grows more and more as the story advances towards the consummation of the assault. The 'invigorating counsel' of Neville Chamberlain, the 'staid intelligence and mature manhood' of captain Norman, the 'high courage' and personal activities of Baird Smith, the 'unbounded energies and unfailing spirit' of Alexander Taylor, combined with the presence of John Nicholson the 'full brained and lion-hearted soldier', were the factors which turned the siege of Delhi into an epic of British national character. Kaye's account increasingly takes the form of an applauding observer shouting his men to victory ;

1 Ibid. p. 550.
2 Ibid. p. 552.
3 Ibid. p. 556.
4 Ibid. p. 658.
5 Kaye, III, p. 545.

Marfat.com

as every gun for the final assault had now reached its destination.[1] Then began a work almost unparalleled in the history of modern warfare. The historian gives elaborate details of the construction of the batteries specifically on the priority of the erection of batteries between number two and three[2]. A word of praise is given to Indian non-combatants also. It was an exciting time 'a turning point in the life of our Anglo-Indian Empire' unsurpassed by any incident of history in the boldness of conception and execution[3]. The historian feels he is writing a great history, he takes a shot at Baird Smith mapping out an oil paper of the plan for each commander, notices Medley examining the breaches and again watching Wilson who was dying many times before death. Then the time for marching arrived. The fall of Delhi with all its attending circumstances are graphically described, but Kaye's treatment of the Delhi massacres and other vindictive acts of vengeance are tainted by racial pretensions and imperialist obsessions.

The Rising at Cawnpore is one of those strange mutations of the Indian Mutiny which overtook all, both the actors in the scene and the writers as well. Early views on the revolt and its course including those entertained by Kaye have been found to be untenable in most cases. On Cawnpore the variety of source-materials were such that want of acquaintance with these sources will make the investigation imperfect. Kaye writes that Nana Sahib accompanied the mutineers to Kalyanpur[4]. Had he made the statement by a reference to the views of other writers on the subject including the account of Indian chroniclers like Nanakchand, his statement would have been quite viable, but he makes no use of all the published opinions by different writers on the subject. Similarly, the story of Sitaram Bawa along with the prediction of Nana's guru Dassa Bawa and a concurrent testimony of Nana's alleged seditious

[1] Ibid. III p. 549.

[2] Ibid. p. 560.

[3] Ibid. pp. 570, 574 ff. In a book on the Siege of 'Delhi' by Alexander Llewellyn recently published (1977) the author observes : 'Here were fought the battles which Sir Charles Crosthwaite, the Anglo-Indian historian, aptly called 'the epic of the Race' (p. 169).

[4] Kaye, II, p. 310.

Marfat.com

intentions do not in the least support Kaye's views about the Nana's complicity with the troops or any intention of the Cawnpore sepoys to make him their leader[1]. He does not refer to the crucial question whether the sepoys waited on the Nana and no critical examination is attempted of Tatya's statement that Nana acted under compulsion. The various issues of the revolt at Cawnpore have been investigated to a great extent by the later historians like Forrest, Holmes, Sen, Majumdar and Gupta. Kaye's contribution to the Cawnpore episode is significant only in matters of non-controversial issues. He was graphic on the frightful confusion of the night of 21 May when the Europeans entered the barracks[2]. His description of the miseries of the besieged in Wheeler's Barracks which had 'never been exceeded in the history of the world'[3] is an exquisite piece of historical literature. On matters of details he criticised the action of Wheeler in sending fifty men of the 84th out of his small force to Henry Lawrence early in June and regretted that a single white soldier had been allowed to leave Cawnpore[4]. Kaye also commented that Wheeler ought to have chosen the magazine as the line of defence though the process involved in the occupation of the magazine might have led to an immediate rising[5] and the possession of priceless military stores by the enemy if at all stored in that arsenal beyond the knowledge of the general[6]. The controversy about the messenger sent to Nana was not of much consequence to the historian[7] but he records an impression that through a female, general Wheeler approvingly sent Nana Saheb something over one lac of rupees and authorised him to keep the amount[8]. The historian regretted that he failed to extract the truth regarding the circumstances of general Wheeler's death from a mass of conflicting evidence[9].

[1] Kaye, I, pp. 578-79, 651. Appendix, pp. 645-48 ; Majumdar, *Sepoy Mutiny* etc. pp. 183-191.
[2] Kaye, II, pp. 296, 300-01, 316.
[3] Ibid. pp. 316, 322-23.
[4] Ibid. p. 305.
[5] Ibid. pp. 294-5.
[6] Ibid. p. 308.
[7] Ibid. p. 333 fn.
[8] Ibid. p. 340-1 fn.
[9] Ibid. pp. 337 fn.

Marfat.com

But it was left to Kaye to unfold the enormity of the massacres at the Satichaura ghat unparalleled in the history of Indian duplicity. So monstrous an act of treachery was typical of the Marathas. The historian asserts that Nana must have had Sivaji in mind, who, under false pretext of friendly embrace dug his wagnuck into the bowels of the muhammadan envoy. 'A thousand claws of this wagnuck was now in the hands of the man who aspired to be the founder of Maratha Empire'. Tatya was the master of the ceremonies and 'all orders regarding the massacre issued by the Nana were carried into execution by Tatya Tope'[1]. Kaye's account of the massacres at the Satichaura ghat with deft touches of remorse and grief at the cruel immolation of the Christians had a tremendous impact on Indo-British relations. He showed an abhorrence to tell the details of the slaughter even with all the authentic particulars before him[2] which naturally took the readers by storm and influenced the trend and tone of British historiography on the Indian Mutiny.

It appears that the Ghat massacres left the historian disconsolate and made him oblivious of the cause and effect relations in history and even unmindful of the promptings of 'historical conscience'. He refers to the atrocities committed by the British military officers at Benares in June 1857, of hanging people indiscriminately as though they had been 'pariah dogs or jackals or vermin of a baser kind'. One could see a 'row of gallows' and also 'volunteer hanging parties' and 'amateur executioners' in action. 'The Act of Legislative council' as Kaye writes, 'fed the gallows with equal prodigality'[3]. Similarly, in Allahabad which witnessed 'manifold terrors' in the months of June and July, Neill and his stout hearted English executioners were ready at once to strike and kill. Soldiers and civilians alike were holding Bloody Assize, or slaying natives without any assize at all, 'regardless of sex or age'. Englishmen taking part in this blood-feud enjoyed 'amazingly' the killing of the niggers[4]. It was sickening indeed to narrate these doleful acts of inhuman barbarities and Kaye felt that he was not equal to the

1 Kaye, II, pp. 339-41.
2 Ibid. pp. 341-42.
3 Ibid. pp. 235-37.
4 Kaye, II, pp. 268-70.

Marfat.com

occasion of exposing this human weakness which may better be left to the 'Almighty Wisdom' to decide. He merely stated these things, but at the back of his mind there was that call to maintain morality as the sole impartial criterion in human relations. So he continues : 'There is a dreadful story to be told in another chapter. God only knows whether what has been told in this contributed to the result to be presently recorded'[1].

The story to be told is the massacre of the Europeans at the Satichaura ghat and so there was no mistake that 'God' knew that it was the result of British excesses committed previously in Benares and Allahabad. On his own showing, therefore, Kaye ignored the decision of "Almighty Wisdom" when he accused Nana Sahib of committing an act of treachery in the style of Sivaji. But it is the plea of provocation and Kaye alludes to the Delhi massacre which invests the most sanguinary acts of white man with a righteous justification[2]. The black man also might have similar justification. Renaud's advance from Allahabad to Cawnpore also bore traces of the retributory operations of the English in desolate villages and in corpses dangling from the branches of trees, which according to Kaye, could not have been justified by the Cawnpore massacre because these operations took place before that diabolical act.[3] Here Kaye was referring to the Bibigarh massacre of 15 July. Renaud marched on the evening of 30 June in ignorance of the Ghat massacre of 27 June and within two days of his march forty-two men were hanged on the roadside. These were purely retributory measures of an avenging army having no connection with either of the massacres[4].

In regard to Lucknow Kaye maintained some firm views. He referred to the conduct of Martin Gubbins, the financial commissioner, with greatest displeasure. Gubbins was a thorn in the flesh of Henry Lawrence, who it is said was never happy without a hitch, who even if left alone, would have quarrelled with himself[5], 'a Martin with

1 Ibid. II, p. 270.
2 Ibid. pp. 270-71.
3 Kaye, II, p. 284, fn.
4 Martin, II, p. 282 ; Sen, p. 150 ; Adams, *Episodes*, p. 336 ; Campbell, *Memoirs*, I, p. 280.
5 Kaye, III, p. 493-4.

Marfat.com

Gubbins' or the latter with the former as was said of 'John Lilburne'. The chief-commissioner Henry Lawrence knew that Gubbins 'hungered for the empty chair' but according to him none was more unfit to have supreme control. So Henry Lawrence made an arrangement with major Banks as chief-commissioner and colonel Inglis in command of the troops to run the administration during the period of his enforced rest on medical grounds but during this period Gubbins at the head of the Provisional Council eliminated the Poorbeah element wholly from the garrison of Lucknow. This made it impossible for Henry Lawrence to be on leave and he at once joined his duty to counteract in his own way the evil effect of Gubbins' anti-Poorbeah policy. Herman Merivale in his 'Life of Sir Henry Lawrence' writes that these people served the government most loyally during the siege. Kaye points out that Merivale had taken it from that excellent memoir written by colonel Wilson the author of 'Defence of Lucknow'—the Staff Officer's Diary. The historian's account of Lucknow is also based on the discussions he had with Sir George Couper[1]. Martin Gubbins being disgruntled adopted a more bellicose attitude in propagating the view that Lawrence's policy was feeble. Kaye remarks that ultimately Gubbins' irrepressible ardour prevailed over the policy of inaction. The disaster at Chinhat that followed are described by him from the authorities on the spot, such as, the staff officer Wilson, Inglis, George Couper, Dr. Fayrer, Rees, Bonham, Gubbins, Hutchinson and Lady Inglis. The historian discusses in full the death of Henry Lawrence who, as he estimated, was a 'lustrous combination of endearing qualities—a fusion of Sir Philip Sydney and Oliver Cromwell'[2]. However, the siege of the Residency and all such matters received more close attention and were carefully investigated by later writers. Forrest, in particular, wrote with much more elaboration the first stage of the history of Lucknow from June to September 1857. In the affairs of the Holkar of Indore, Kaye could not resist the conviction that he was thoroughly true to the British cause. He had access to all the

[1] Kaye had in his possession the draft in the handwriting of Sir George Couper and signed by Henry Lawrence (Ibid. III, pp. 495, 498-99).

[2] Kaye, *Lives etc.*, II, p. 348.

Marfat.com

official records and was in possession of all the private papers of Canning and Durand in none of which he could find any plan of a charge against Holkar or anything to verify the vague imputations of disgraceful conduct by which the maharaja was injured. He admitted that Holkar was deprived of grant of territory due to the prejudices raised by colonel Durand in the highest places of the supreme government. These prejudices were never overcome and there can be no question that Holkar was sacrificed to the justification of Durand[1].

About Jhansi, Kaye maintained a strictly objective attitude. He did not believe in many of the evil things said of the rani of Jhansi[2], and was surprised at the fatuity of the commissioner captain Alexander Skene who could not anticipate any disaffection in Jhansi[3]. The historian also did not state clearly that the rani instigated the atrocities. He only stated that it will never be known to what extent she was implicated in the rising of Jhansi, if at all. But whatever the position was, she attained her object ; Jhansi was won. But Kaye left out many intricate questions about the rising at Jhansi which were discussed in full by R. C. Majumdar[4].

The critics of the 'Sepoy War' of Kaye were not many but they were men of eminence. The observations of the Duke of Argyll had been noted. Sir George Campbell who was the lieutenant-governor of Bengal in 1874 strongly criticised Kaye in his book 'Memoirs of my Indian Career'. He observed that Kaye 'was not in India at that time and that his history was a compilation, but the facts he presented were correct. The fault of his work was the fault of a professional historian of overpainting the colours, making heroes too heroic and a tendency to be over-sensational in describing grave situations. All these are matters of opinion but Campbell says that Kaye did not deduce his opinions from facts but sought to make his facts fit his opinions which implies that he made a selection of facts for the purpose. This is a difficult question for there are thousands of facts in a given situation and a selection is inevitable and the historian

1 Kaye, III, pp. 347-350 ; Bell, *Last Counsels etc.* pp. 71 ff.
2 Kaye, III, pp. 361-62.
3 Ibid. III, pp. 362-63.
4 See chapter vi.

Marfat.com

alone is the best judge to select his material from the standpoint of objectivity and importance. But Campbell was emphatic, he was all for cutting off the first volume of Kaye which deals elaborately with the political foundation of the Mutiny 'constructed out of his inner consciousness'. He argues that there is not one little evidence in support of Kaye's political theories of the cause of the Mutiny : '...none of the results which legitimately ought to have followed the political circumstances which he depicts did follow. The ill-used native princes who ought to have lost all faith in us, remained in the main faithful or at worst temporised and so played our game'[1]. This is a strange proposition. It will be curious to regard the causes of a movement as true; if the course of the movement follows legitimately from the causes. That the much hated and despised natives of India did not rise in a body is not a proof that hauteur and insolence assumed by the civil and military officers of the Company in their dealings with the Indians was not a factor which caused the outbreak. Since the Bombay and Madras army remained in the main faithful it would not necessarily follow that the discontent of the sepoys was not the main cause of the Indian Mutiny. On the other hand, the fact that the much favoured village proprietors who should have remained faithful to the British government joined the dispossessed talukdars showed that the course of a movement always does not legitimately follow the political and economic circumstances which give rise to a movement.

The most serious challenge to Kaye, however, came from the *Calcutta Review*. He might or might not have replied to the charges framed against him but the review of his book made in that journal does not at all appear to be appropriate, pertinent and accurate. The reviewer draws a line between a story-teller and a historian ; the latter was to draw conclusion from facts and it was there that Kaye stopped short and fell[2]. Furthermore, it was stated that he showed no individuality, left no impress of the mind of the author. This cannot be the opinion of one who has closely studied the works of Kaye. No other writer in the Sepoy War wrote so competently and accurately

[1] George Campbell, *Memoirs*, I, p. 210-11.
[2] *Calcutta Review*, 1865, vol. 41, pp. 95 ff.

Marfat.com

and with such strength of conviction and emphasis as Kaye did on the land settlement policy and the manner in which the government alienated the higher classes throughout India. Even otherwise, he would not feel shy in describing Wellesley as a despot. Bentinck, according to him, was a man of unsurpassed honesty and justice[1]. The way in which he pleads that the excesses committed by the British soldiers at Delhi and at Cawnpore deserve special consideration, points to his assured mastery of the historical medium, while for the glorification of the British manhood, a historian of his position could not have been more extravagant. It is difficult to say how Kaye could have been more forceful, communicative and pragmatic, how he was afraid to speak out and point to the logical conclusions. The other charges that he was the mouthpiece of a party, that his intimacy with men of influence prevented him from writing impartially, that he showered praises on men indiscriminately are all too sweeping and do not stick. It has been seen that though an admirer of Dalhousie and Canning, Kaye did not refrain from criticising both. The fact was that the whole Anglo-Indian community was furious that he had not espoused the cause of Napier in condemning Dalhousie's attitude to the army, but it was strange that the *Calcutta Review* which was founded by Kaye, in a sense, should have come out with such a motivated writing on his work. Such other remarks that he was constitutionally unfit to be the historian of the Mutiny, that the work itself was not a history, that it lacked those distinct and mature opinions which were expected of one who was supposed to have mastered the subject are only a reflection of the partisan spirit of that time. In contrast it would be refreshing to know what an English historian writes about Sir John Kaye quite a century after. Alexander Llewellyn in his book 'Siege of Delhi' recently published (1977) observes : Sir John Kaye is 'one of the greatest and most neglected of English nineteenth-century historians—without, perhaps, the self-assured eloquence of Macaulay or the profundity of Acton, but with an eye for detail and a sane and unerring judgement of men and motives."[2] . In fact his unerring judgement is apodictic.

[1] Kaye, I, pp. 115, 123.
[2] Llewellyn, p. 4.

Marfat.com

Kaye was the first among the mutiny historians to write that there were fears and discontents which had no connection with the greased cartridges and uprisings not motivated by the spoils of the treasury, that in many places the 'first attack came from the disaffected communities' and that everywhere the reign of annexation and innovations was threatening to crush the very hearts of the nation. Elsewhere he wrote that it was not due to the instigation of the sepoys but a 'great movement from within was beginning to make itself felt upon the surface of the rural society and all traces of British rule were rapidly disappearing'[1].

The moral anatomy of the great revolt so factually analysed only shows that a great and mature mind was at work, a master-mariner in the ocean of mutiny historiography, who explored the dimension of the great revolt both in its breadth and depth and gave it an elevation. In fact, no one felt the magnitude of the movement till he read Kaye. The title of his work was the 'History of the Sepoy War' which emphasizes the historian's interest in the concrete realities of human character, and not the history of the Indian Mutiny. He treated the risings as a great historical phenomenon, the sepoys spearheading a movement which had its root deep in the soil. Armed with a tranquil judgement and a critical knowledge of the sources, Kaye entered on his narrative and adorned it with wealth of information and the objectivity of treatment. He writes with an apparent ease and states his facts with so little air of research that the spontaneity of his knowledge and his complete identification with the subject of his study leaves no doubt about the authenticity of the work. He depicted the epoch not as an era of decay but as a period of India's helplessness in its confrontation with the West and presented a picture of gathering of the forces which were to lead to a change. The history of the Sepoy War written in the style of classical antiquity is a great work of a great movement. Without attempting flights of eloquence his luminous and measured style of the account produces an effect of real powers, an 'apercus,' before which the gates of the history of the Revolt sprang open.

1 S. B. Chaudhuri, *Civil Rebellion etc.* Intro. pp. (xviii-xix), 278.

Marfat.com

Sir John William Kaye could not complete his work. He left his third volume with a longing idea to embrace in one consecutive narrative the story of the campaigns of Havelock and Outram and the operations of Sir Colin Campbell for the relief of Lucknow. He seems to have contemplated to finish his work in his next volume, the fourth one, which would contain besides the topics mentioned above, also such other essential developments of the rising of 1857 as the trial of the King, the campaigns of the Central India Field Force under Sir Hugh Rose, later events in Agra and Rajputana, the risings in Western India, the affairs in the Deccan, concluding with a chapter on the fall of the East India Company, the Queen's Proclamation and the general pacification of the country[1].

Unfortunately, Kaye could not complete his work which was continued by Colonel G. B. Malleson. Official or other reasons for entrusting Malleson with the responsibility of undertaking the work have not been disclosed. Malleson says that on the very day on which he returned to England after his retirement from service he was asked to continue and complete Kaye's 'History of the Sepoy War'. But the change in the title of the work from 'Sepoy War' to the 'History of the Indian Mutiny' has not been accounted for as the period he covered was more of the war than of the mutinies which preceded it and in fact from the standpoint of military involvements on which he concentrates, a change in the title was not called for. The real war of the Sepoy Mutiny began with the fall of Delhi as even the siege of Delhi and its recapture was 'not a war in the strict sense of the term'. The historian's preparedness for taking up the work has been convincingly stated. He was in India from the commencement of the Mutiny and had collected on the spot materials for such a work which he had already 'thrown into a shape.' He was also acquainted with many of the actors and had many opportunities, he avers, of having direct knowledge of the many points of controversy which came into surface in the backwash of this armed conflict.[2] Besides this he was the famous author of the 'Red Pamphlet', a work which was more in demand than his bulky three-volume history of the Mutiny.

[1] Kaye, III, Preface, p. x.

[2] Malleson, I, Preface, p. viii., in 'The History of the Indian Mutiny' by Malleson in three volumes of the size of 21. 5 cm. each covering 1694 pages.



Marfat.com

Colonel Malleson professing to write in continuation of Kaye's history thought it necessary to re-write the third volume of Kaye. He explains that in the opinion alike of the actors and spectators of the drama, the third volume of Kaye failed to render to those of whom it treated that impartial justice which their deeds, good or evil, had deserved. He also added that the letters which appeared in the English newspapers controverting many of his points (third volume) reflected but a fraction of the dissatisfaction felt for it. How far Kaye was liable to the charge of narrating misleading events was, however, not manifestly clear from Malleson's work, but there were obviously some disadvantages in continuing the work of a writer from whom he differed in some essential points. Thus he included in the first volume of his work the story of the relief of Lucknow which according to him represented the revised version of Kaye's third volume. Similarly, the history of the storming of Delhi treated by Kaye in his third volume was taken up by Malleson in his second volume. The historian gives the impression that he undertook the work mainly for the purpose of contradicting Kaye and reversing his judgement and setting up heroes those whom Kaye had condemned and pulling down those whom Kaye had praised.[1] It seems 'History' should be written to order regardless of objective considerations and that the historian should write like a partisan and treat his work as a means to an end.

About authorities on which his work rests, Malleson refers to letters and journals and official documents written in 1857 which he thought would be the means of great value in reconstructing history and also memoirs, chronicles and correspondence of the actors themselves. His emphasis was strictly on contemporary sources which he considered to be the best authorities and were of more value than accounts of later age. History, according to him, cannot be written long after the event and so he distrusted all works produced from memory after a lapse of many years. There is nothing new in his attitude that the nearest witness to the events was the best, but the historian was not possibly aware of any antidote against the distracting influences of the passing exigencies to which contemporary witnesses become an easy prey, and also against the faulty observations of

[1] Malleson, *History*, I, Preface, pp. viii-ix, xi.

Marfat.com

common persons who offer to bear witnesses. The racial bias was so strong that those who were not directly involved in the war also could not remain unaffected. The infallibility of contemporary sources of the Mutiny thus stand exposed and in fact the racial overtones, of Malleson's writings on the Mutiny cannot be ignored.[1] It appears that the historian was not critical and discerning in selecting those contemporary sources which were not infected by passions and prejudices, in his exalted mission of rendering impartial justice to the dead as well as to the living. There was the further inhibition that Malleson's 'justice' has to be understood in a strictly limited sense as applying to the Europeans only, and any idea of rendering justice to the Indian leaders did not disturb the skyline of his work. In his Preface to the second volume, he stated that there was not any published document relating to the mutinies to which he had no access. But curiously enough there is hardly any reference to these original sources in any of his three volumes, excepting some very few letters and correspondence. It is not improbable that he based his work on contemporary publications which he considered reliable and indeed the major portion of his second volume was based on articles published in the *Blackwood's Magazine* as he himself admitted[2], but mostly he wrote under the impression of his own experience recorded either during the time of the Mutiny or in the following years supplemented by published works.

Colonel G. B. Malleson opens the first chapter of the book on the Indian Mutiny by exposing the state of affairs in Bengal and 'pulling down those whom Kaye had praised'. The author of the *Red Pamphlet* could not be expected to have any sympathy with the civil service then existing and mounted an attack on Cecil Beadon's 'jaunty confidence', Canning's indifference to the real situation and on Sir Patrick Grant's incompetence.[3] He then turns to Behar to set up a hero in William Tayler, the commissioner, just the man whom a 'Wellesley or a Napier would have employed in a difficult situation,' a man of character, courage and clearness of vision who guided a 'province through the

[1] *Infra*, pp. 118, 119 ff.
[2] *Supra*, pp. 38-9.
[3] *Supra*, pp. 10, 46.

Marfat.com

storm and brought it into the the harbour of safety'. The historian wonders if there is any story which appeals more to their admiration than the misfortunes of the Patna commissioner whose case bears resemblance to that of the French general Dupleix[1] who was similarly treated. Kaye also thinks that Tayler was subjected to harassment.[2] But Malleson ignored the fact that Tayler hanged nineteen persons without sufficient evidence and his detention of the Wahabi Maulavis on 19 June was not in accordance with 'faith and honour'[3]. Major-General Lloyd of Dinapore comes in for sharp criticism as also the government for its fatuity as they would not order Lloyd to detain the 5th Fusiliers of Dinapore on its way to the up-country. Together, the 10th Foot and the 5th Fusiliers could have disarmed the native regiments but the government ignored the warning in a manner like the 'writing on the wall at Belshazzar's feast' and Lloyd also was not equal to the occasion. The mutiny of the troops on 25 July, the disaster that overtook Dunbar's ill-fated expedition, the scene at Arrah with particular reference to the position of Kunwar Singh and the defence of Boyle's house by the European residents and Rattray's Sikhs[4] on July 28 are described in proportion to their importance not strikingly different from Kaye's treatment of the episodes in his third volume. But the exploits of Eyre 'who comes as it were from clouds', relieves the beleaguered inmates of Boyle's small house and clears Arrah of the mutineers, overwhelms the historian. He, however, does not mention that the government visited the conduct of Eyre with displeasure for destroying the Hindu temple at Jagadishpur. In the style of nineteenth century historiography he writes, 'It is not every day that nature brings to maturity the mould of a Vincent Eyre.' He belonged 'to the first category of greatness in the model of Dr. Channing's analysis of the character of Napoleon' but like Dumouriez opportunities came late in his life.[5] Malleson's estimate of Eyre as brigadier of the artillery was a little high who certainly did not outshine Olpherts

1 Malleson, *History*, I, pp. 39-42, 48-60, 78, 104-24.
2 Kaye, III, pp. 164.
3 Sen, pp. 249-50 ; Forrest, *History*, III, pp. 391-401.
4 Malleson, I, pp. 45-47, 61-75, 78, 84-89.
5 Malleson, I, pp. 93 fn, 192-93, II, p. 120. Malleson also writes an article in the *Calcutta Review* on V. Eyre (1866. vol. 44).

Marfat.com

or Maude or a Brasyer.[1] Lord Derby's resolution adopted by the parliament, offering thanks to the mutiny heroes makes no reference to Vincent Eyre.[2] However, his assessment was correct that the safety of British rule in Eastern India was maintained more by those four persons, Frederick Gubbins of the civil service, Neill, Tayler and Eyre than by the supreme government in Calcutta.

In his treatment of the subject the historian follows a pattern in which the account of the rising at the different stations from the beginning to the end does not emerge. In general, he does not refer to the mutinies of the different places but concentrates on military operations conducted against them in widely separated regions. A single unified treatment of a particular station or of a group of stations gives the total picture a focus. The absence of any emphasis on local or regional aspects gives the appearance of the Indian Mutiny as a mass of military movements. The details furnished about the mutineers are much the same as elsewhere. He was critical of Colvin's Proclamation of 25 May. The Gwalior prince Maharaja Jayaji Rao Sindia was a living example of the 'wisdom exercised by the paramount power over the princes'. Mutiny at Gwalior did not find him unready but officers were killed including captain Stewart whose wife 'fair and bright as a morning star' did not long survive him. And all the while, the theory is repeated that the Mutiny was caused by the simulated reliance of the government on the sepoys--a policy, timid, irrational and even provocative of disaster.[3] The case of the rani of Jhansi seems to have been very clear to him and admitted of no special attention. The Meerut revolt beaconed her to be ready and captain Skene utterly unconscious of the impending danger could not see through her simulated loyalty. The mutiny of 6 June and the massacres of 8 June bear proofs of her complicity. She instigated the slaughter to get rid of the English and seize the principality taken away from her.[4] Malleson's account of Jhansi is utterly useless as a sober

[1] Malleson, op. cit. I, pp. 76-77, 80-103.
[2] Ball, II, p. 653.
[3] Malleson, I, pp. 146-76.
[4] Malleson, I, pp. 178-179. Forrest says that the mutineers threatened the rani with instant death if she refused to throw her lot with them (Forrest, *History*, III, pp. 4-9). Also see Sen, p. 279. For the views of Kaye see *Supra*, p. 109.

Marfat.com

account of the Jhansi rising. He made incriminating statement about the rani which were found to be baseless on a close scrutiny of the relevant materials[1].

He then turns to Agra. The reverses suffered by the British army at the battle of Shahganj on 5 July 1857 near Agra was due to wrong strategy followed by brigadier Polwhell but the historian does not miss any opportunity of showing his racial proclivity. In the battle-field, Polwhell could not make up his mind to give orders to advance but kept up pounding enemy positions and holding his own for two hours. It was fatal not to let loose the European infantry as Eyre did. Malleson remarks : 'There is but one plain simple mode of beating Asiatics, and that is to move straight onwards'. However, the enemy came sweeping on and drove the British to the fort[2]. The historian covers many pages on the death of Colvin and on the eulogies[3] paid to him. He follows his own course of action in describing the rising of the different places but does not seek to analyse the social and economic aspect of the revolt like Kaye and dwells mainly on its political and military aspects. In dealing with Oudh he had no difficulty in stating his views with clarity and emphasis as it was a subject of so many writings by previous authors. He states that every class in India was alienated from the British on this issue. The annexation of Oudh combined with the introduction of the revenue system which had the effect of depriving the territorial aristocracy of a country of one half of its estates and many other such factors of grievous impositions on the peasantry brought about a condition in which the greased cartridges with its threat to caste acted like a dangerous spark. He was convinced that the annexation of Oudh and its consequences had prepared the minds of the people of Oudh to 'accept any absurdity which might argue want of faith on the part of the British'[4].

On the affairs of Henry Lawrence at Lucknow Malleson's treatment was nearly the same—Henry's defensive measures and many

[1] See chapter six.
[2] Malleson, I, p. 266.
[3] Ibid. pp. 270-86, 288-91.
[4] Ibid. pp. 321-23, 348-359 ; Joshi, p. 17.

Marfat.com

other matters of internal administration. He interpreted Henry Lawrence's march to Chinhat as the foresight of a general confronting the Asiatics, that to await an attack would have been an invitation to a general insurrection and that it would be possible to reply to Cawnpore (Satichauraghat) by Chinhat. It was a wrong estimate, the historian was not equipped to handle the controversy about Gubbins' role in involving Sir Henry to a forward policy[1]. But the Indians took no advantage of the debacle at Chinhat in making a determined onslaught on the Residency which would have fallen for it was really indefensible. He writes that the 'natives' were averse from an attack on a fortified position defended by Europeans whom they considered to be enormously superior. The prolonged defence of Lucknow Residency by the British garrison pointed to the same conclusion, while from a military point of view, the siege of the Residency prevented the rebel army from joining the war at Delhi. To Malleson the situation had a striking similarity with the 'Plevna' of Russo-Turkish war in that for four months Turkey was able to neutralize two Russian armies and in either case this helped the besieged powers to organise their resources[2]. The historian, however, shows a tendency to draw a moral on racial superiority in describing every incident of the failure for the besiegers. The defenders of the Residency fought like the soldiers of Wellington not only against their opponents but also against all sorts of privations[3]. All the details about the entry of Havelock and Outram into Lucknow and a graphic description of the reception of the British avenging army at the Residency on 25 September 1857 are given. He also describes in imitation of the famous writing : 'From every pit, trench and battery.....rose cheer on cheer'[4], but the losses sustained by the incoming force was so terrible that the question of defeating the enemy just could not be thought of. In eighty-seven days the garrison had been reduced to by three-eighths.

1 Kaye, III, pp. 493, 495.
2 Malleson, I, pp. 439-41.
3 Malleson, I, pp. 451-2.
4 Ibid. p. 478.

Marfat.com

A feature of Malleson's work is that the chronological order of the narrative is not uniformly maintained. After describing the first relief of Lucknow he introduces Havelock making his first bivouac at Mangalwar on 24 July. He made a fatal attack on the enemy position at Unao, following the motto of 'move straight forward', a principle which according to him never failed when tried by British troops against Asiatics. But the enemy position could not be taken even by the infantry charges of the 78th Highlanders and the Madras Fusiliers. At this point Havelock followed the strategy of 'Old Frederick' at Leuthen and pushed on to Bashiratganj on 29 July[1], but the main body of the enemy had escaped and Havelock fell back. Malleson quotes lieutenant-colonel Fraser Tytler's telegraph of 31 July stating the difficulty in reaching Lucknow[2]. He writes strongly on the situation. Neill is represented as a remarkable man who saved Benares and Allahabad and made the Madras Fusiliers equal to any in the world. The retirement of Havelock produced consternation and Neill who assumed the command of Cawnpore on 24 July received the news of Havelock's retrograde movement on 31 July. Malleson could not conceal his feeling that Neill should have assumed the command when 'men had begun to stake all their hopes' on him, but was upset when Neill was suddenly superseded by Havelock. The presumptuous tone of Neill's letter to Havelock seems to indicate that a section of the British public actually favoured the idea of placing Neill above Havelock. The matter was dropped when Havelock asserted his position. The historian, however, felt that it was impossible to put any one above Neill who by the 'law of desert' stood foremost among those to whom the Indian Mutiny gave an opportunity of distinction.[3] Havelock started a second time against Bashiratganj. The complexion of the Mutiny was fast changing with the retreat of Havelock—it was turning into a revolt of the people. Of all the historians, Malleson brings to light facts of involvements of non-

1 Malleson, I, p. 493. Malleson was wrong in making this statement. (See Forrest in chapter vi).
2 Ibid. pp. 492-96.
3 Ibid. pp. 497-502.

Marfat.com

military classes in the upheaval of 1857[1]. The failure of repeated attempts of Havelock to reach Lucknow is described but the nomination of major-general Sir J. Outram to the military command of the country made him angry. Though he favoured Neill's command, he appreciated Havelock's efforts to reach Lucknow. Rome treated her generals, the historian writes, in a different way. He seeks a parallel in the case of Terentius Varro who was honoured by the Romans though he fought against Hannibal rather rashly[2]. But the technical point of supersession apart, the historian yielded to none in his appreciation of the greatness of Sir James Outram 'a paladin of the days of chivalry and romance', a 'Bayard of the Indian Army' who bore the highest character[3].

Malleson also kept an eye on the political situation of the country. His analysis of the situation in the middle of August 1857 was realistic. The affairs were seemingly at their worst ; the North-West Provinces, Delhi, Rohilkhand and Oudh were lost, the Punjab and Central India were in a state of veiled rebellion, the Southern Maratha Country was passing through a ferment, Agra was cut off and isolated, while a small British force was shut up in the Residency at Lucknow. And every day that passed increased the difficulties of Sindhia to restrain his troops while the government was feeling difficult to maintain its hold over the princes of Rajputana and Bundelkhand. Equally apprehensive was the position in regard to the loyalty of the Sikhs, 'the very existence of the English in India was at stake'. The only relieving feature was that the British held Allahabad and the important cities of Benares and Patna and kept open the river and road communication between Calcutta and Allahabad. Malleson wrote not merely from personal knowledge but also on the authority of the writer of an article in the *Blackwood's Magazine* of October 1858 that the stores ran short of Enfield rifle and other accoutrements. The first relief of the Residency on 25 September 1857, according to the historian, was no relief at all, it was only a reinforcement of the garrison[4].

1 Malleson, I, pp. 502-5.
2 Ibid. p. 513.
3 Ibid. p. 519.
4 Malleson, II, pp. 119-23.

Marfat.com

The second volume of the work begins with the siege of Delhi. His account was based on the authority of contemporary writers. Details regarding tracing of battery and plans of the engineers in Delhi siege operations have been taken from the work of lieutenant-colonel J.G. Medley, R.E. entitled 'A year's campaign in India'. The other sources of the historian are an article entitled 'Bengal European Fusiliers in the Delhi Campaign' contributed to *Blackwood's Magazine* of January 1858 and Major Norman's narrative in the Blue Book No. 6 1858[1]. He does not give any new information regarding the siege operations and excludes many important questions raised by previous writers like Ball and Kaye. His treatment of Hodson's performance was very attractive. It is the most objective estimate he had made of British officers in the whole range of his work and is perhaps the best of its kind in historical writings on Hodson. The picture he presents of Hodson is vivid : 'daring, courting danger, reckless, he was a condottiere of the hills, a free-lance of the Middle Ages. He joyed in the life of camps and revelled in the clash of arms. His music was the call of the trumpet, the battlefield his ballroom. He would have been at home in the camp of Wallenstein on the sack of Magdeburg'[2]. The exciting story of how he murdered the Delhi princes is described in detail. Malleson quotes no authority but states convincingly that Hodson made the pressure of the mob upon his horsemen a pretext for stopping the cart. The princes were ordered to dismount and he killed them. 'In the history of the Mutiny there is no more painful episode than that connected with his name on this occasion'. This episode showed the British character in its most ignoble form[3]. Montgomery who subsequently became the chief-commissioner of Oudh con-gratulated Hodson in a letter. 'My dear Hodson,' he writes, 'all honour to you for catching the king and slaying his sons. I hope you will bag many more : In haste, ever yours, R. Montgomery.'[4] Well, not many months after, while trying to 'make a good bag' at Begam Kuthi, the sepoys gained at him at close range and

1 Malleson. II, pp. 38-48.
2 Ibid, II, pp. 74-75.
3 Ibid. pp. 77-81.
4 Martin, II, p. 449.

Marfat.com

finished him.[1] Malleson stuck to the same view about Hodson while recording his death at Begam Kuthi.

The fall of Delhi generated a series of British campaigns in different parts of the country. Special mention may be made of the battle of Narnul in Haryana on November 16 which was a sequel to the exploits of Showers who captured the nawab of Jajhar and the raja of Ballabhgarh. A near relative of the nawab of Jajhar took the lead at the battle of Narnul, details of which are taken from an article in the *Blackwood's Magazine* of June 1858. The writer himself was present on the scene. It was a hard contest, the cavalry conflict was spectacular. 'Never was there a charge more gallant and certainly, never were the British cavalry met so fairly or in so full a swing by the rebel horse'[2].

The war situation as sketched above serves the purpose of a back-drop to the historian to introduce Sir Colin Campbell who arrived in Calcutta on 13 August 1857. In the first place, Sir Colin adopted various measures to streamline the commissariat. It has been fondly believed that the fall of Delhi would terminate the revolt but the historian writes that it did nothing of the sort. No doubt, India was regained and the Punjab brought under control but the fall of Delhi only added to the dimension of the revolt ; risings became general and pockets of resistance were now reinforced by hardened warriors. Sindhia was in great difficulty in controlling his restive soldiers who now broke loose and went over to the side of the rani of Jhansi and Tatya. Had the Gwalior soldiers placed themselves under the order of Tatya at an earlier period the shape of things would have been different. The Gwalior troops were now moving towards Cawnpore. It was a critical situation, Campbell had to choose between Lucknow and Cawnpore. But he had 'a way of always striking at the decisive point'. Oudh was the 'uicer' and it was also a question of prestige, the general resolved to relieve Lucknow. Colin reached the outskirts of Lucknow and on 10 November received Kavanagh of the Residency whose highly exciting adventure

[1] Martin, op. cit. p. 454.
[2] Malleson, II, pp. 107, 109-11, 114.

Marfat.com

sent a thrill of pleasure and wonder in the British camp[1]. On November 11 1857, he inspected his force and received a tremendous ovation from the 93rd Highlanders, 'a waving sea of plumes' and the 2nd and the 4th Punjab infantry, tall of stature. This description was based on an article of an eye-witness[2] in the *Blackwood's Magazine* of October 1858.

Of all the operations connected with the second relief of Lucknow, the storming of Secundrabagh was the most controversial. Malleson's chief authority was the writer of the Magazine article of October 1858 on this subject who was himself an actor in the campaign. The historian states that when all ran towards the hole a Sikh of the 4th rifle reached it first but he was shot dead as he jumped through. A Highlander in his track met with the same fate. A young officer of the 93 Highlanders Richard Cooper was, however, more fortunate in jumping through the narrow hole followed by colonel Ewart who also leapt into the enclosure. Then followed a bloody and desperate struggle, more than 2000 rebel soldiers lay dead all around[3]. Forrest gives a different version of the story[4]. The storming of the Shah Najaf in the afternoon of November 16 was the most dangerous and daring feat of arms and the most critical of all the actions of the campaign. Najaf was a large mosque situated in a garden enclosed by a loopholed wall. The decision of Sir Colin to carry it at the fag end of the day was later on criticised. Malleson again falls back on the article referred to and gives a description of the encounter for he read nothing which conveyed the scene more vividly to his mind and nothing which could surpass it in the vigour of touch[5]. The position was seemingly desperate, 'even as the fate of the French empire hung at Wagram'. England's honour was at stake for retreat was impossible. Colin harangued the 93rd that Shah Najaf must be won with the bayonet. Under the

[1] Malleson, II, pp. 146-49. Forrest writes that Sir Colin left Cawnpore for Lucknow on 9 November, 1857 (Forrest, *History*, II, p. 120).
[2] Ibid. II, pp. 162, 163, 167.
[3] Ibid. II, pp. 182-87. Malleson omits to mention Captain Lumsden accompanying Ewart and Cooper (Forrest, *History*, I, p. 147).
[4] See chapter vi.
[5] Ibid. II, p. 189.

Marfat.com

cover of Middleton's battery and Peel's guns the 93rd 'rolled on in one vast wave' but only to remain exposed to the heavy fire of the Indians. British soldiers began to drop fast before the loopholed wall which could not be breached and British officers were rolling on the ground with their horses shot under them. In this critical situation Adrain Hope, fortunately enough, detected a fissure in a portion of the wall. The opening was enlarged through which the Highlanders rushed in[1]. Campbell's withdrawal of the garrison from Lucknow was carried out neatly and effectively leaving Outram at Alambagh, but Havelock passed away during this time. Malleson pays high tribute to the departed general taking the help of a parallel to illustrate his hero. He is compared to Scot-Austrian Marshal Loudon, the one Austrian general whom the great Frederick respected[2]. According to him, Havelock also bore a strong resemblance to Massena, a marshal of the First Empire[3]. The affair at Cawnpore attracted the critical attention of the historian. Windham who was left in charge of the Cawnpore Station during the absence of Sir Colin, did not possess the *coup d' oeil* of a general but he admitted that Windham's plan of aggressive defence cannot be questiond. 'This is the Judgment of those best qualified to form an opinion'. The safety of his force was menaced by the immense superiority of Tatya's artillery. At a time when Sir Colin was burdened with the miserable remnants of the garrison, Windham, by his military instincts saved the country from disaster[4].

Malleson criticises the strategy followed by Campbell at the battle of Generalgang on 6 December 1857. The British general took a great risk in attacking Tatya's forces with only five thousand men. Undoubtedly, it was a great achievement, the Gwalior contingent was completely defeated. It was all due to the tactics adopted—Greathed feigned an attack on the centre and left of the enemy and kept them engaged while the right was being destroyed. Keeping a weak brigade at the centre, Greathed even massed the rest of his army against the right of the enemy. It was a faulty tactics.

1 Malleson, II, pp. 191-94.
2 Ibid. pp. 218-22.
3 Ibid. I, p. 35.
4 Malleson, II, pp. 227, 229, 233, 249, 256.

Marfat.com

Malleson pointed out that a Napoleon or a Frederick would have taken advantage of the opening so created. But after all, a great thing for a general is to know all about his enemy.[1] The historian follows Hope Grant's 'Incidents' etc. and Verney's 'The Shannon's Brigade' in presenting the subsequent developments of the winter of 1857-58. The battle of Kalinadi (Khodaganj) fought on January 2, 1858 ended in a complete defeat of the enemy. The success of British arms raised the spirit of the Highlanders and an incident is narrated which reflected the high spirit of the 53rd. They were determined not to be deprived of the honour of delivering the assault and so when a drum boy sounded advance, at once they rushed for the toll house. Sir Colin turned upon them furiously but only to be greeted lustily 'three cheers for the commander-in-chief', every time he tried to reprimand them. The incorrigible Irish men made Campbell laugh. The writer in the *Blackwood's Magazine*[2] depicts a stirring sight of war when at the end of the battle an ovation was given to Sir Colin much in the fashion of the old days of chivalry with the 9th Lancers marching in procession with the captured standards and all waiving their bonnets. The Mutiny at the hands of the British historians was turned into a great show-box of Anglo-Saxon traditions, the last of the wars England fought in the style of her imperial image.[3]

Meanwhile, a great controversy was going on regarding the advisability of launching the final attack on Lucknow. Malleson says that politically also there could not have been a more opportune moment to strike the rebels early in March 1858. The Gwalior contingent reeling under the defeat of 6 December would scarcely challenge British position any more, more so because, Sir Hugh Rose with the Central India Field Force in their rear was coming up close on their heels. Kanpur was effectively guarded by Inglis, the line of supply was made safe under the care of brigadier Carthew, Benares was protected by a brigade under Franks while colonel Seaton, a great self-sacrificing soldier was commanding Fatehgarh and the neighbouring districts.[4] Malleson's sources in the treatment of the

1 Malleson, II, pp. 279-80.
2 October, 1858.
3 Malleson, II, pp. 302-305.
4 Malleson, II, pp. 307-11.

Marfat.com

final Capture of Lucknow were official despatches of Campbell[1] and Outram and works of officers of the army, Hope Grant, Medley, Mac. Gregor. He also refers to the 'Shannon's Brigade' and A. Hope's 'Twelve years of a soldier's life.' The historian, it seems, ignored many other important works on Lucknow. But his observations on the defective strategy of the rebels cannot be disputed. It is really surprising why they should have neglected to throw up defences on the northern side and should have left the Gomati line open and instead concentrate on the routes previously followed by Havelock, Outram and Campbell. The mistake was fatal. This time also the canal was crossed ; Colin advanced with his main force across the canal to turn the enemy's position and move by Hazratganj on the Kaisarbagh. But at the same time he sent across the Gomati a division of his force under Outram, which, marching up that river, should take the enemy's position in reverse. The assault on the Begum Kothi was the sternest struggle. But the storming of Kaisarbagh was a critical and crucial point in the war. At this point, before the attack on Kaisarbagh was made, Outram on the other side of the river proposed to cross the river across the iron bridge to penetrate into the very heart of the enemy.[2] The wisdom of this move could not have been doubted. It would have been fatal to the retreat of the enemy and it was not improbable that Oudh would have succumbed. But the proposal was refused. Outram was forbidden to cross if he would lose a single man. It was an extraordinary provision. Malleson, like many other historians of the Mutiny, could not account for this conduct unworthy of Sir Colin Campbell ; to tie down the hands of a trusted general with a policy of inaction. The motives causing this 'prohibition have never been published'.[3] The capture of Lucknow, according to the British historian, was a splendid achievement and the strategy of the commander-in-chief was a marvel of British military history. The idea of the rebels that the British force would follow the same line as formerly was completely belied by the masterly movement across the river which placed an enemy on their flank completely

1 Campbell's Official Despatch to Canning dated Lucknow, March 22, 1858. Quoted in Ball, II, pp. 271-74.
2 Malleson, II, pp. 365-8, 386, 394-95, 397-8.
3 Malleson, II, pp. 398, 406, 408. See *Supra*, p. 67.

Marfat.com

shattering their defences. Enfiladed from the opposite bank the rebels could not meet their foe, the British, with courage and determination.[1]

The historian writes exhaustively the full history of the operations which followed after the fall of Lucknow. All the details of the warfare in Bareilly, Shahjahanpur and of the risings at Behar and Rajputana are given. Very few writers of the Mutiny, indeed, paid any attention to the affairs of the South during this period. The scant attention so paid gave rise to a distorted view about the extent of the theatre of the Sepoy War. Actions in South India could not have any political potential like those at Delhi, Cawnpore and Lucknow, but many risings that took place in peninsular India had a great piquancy and relevance to the course of the war as a whole. Malleson had done well in presenting a very exhaustive account of all these affairs of the South, particularly the spectacular campaigns of Sir Hugh Rose across the peninsula thus showing for the first time the actual dimension of the war. Indeed, his thesis was that while Delhi and Lucknow represented two wings of the rebel army, Gwalior represented the Central wing of the great uprising which, if allowed to move either way, could have thrown the English back to Calcutta. Thus his account of South India is full of descriptions of British generals and administrators whose contributions in saving the 'Empire' at a time of crisis were immense. For other reason also, mutiny-war in Central or Peninsular India had a special appeal of its own as no part of the Indian Mutiny, according to the historian, was more remarkable for the display of higher quality of British character as was shown by a galaxy of administrators and generals, such as, Lord Elphinstone, colonel Durand, Sir Hugh Rose, Sir Robert Hamilton, Sir Robert Napier, generals Stuart, Roberts, Michel, Whitlock and others. Together, they wrote a page of the history of the Indian Mutiny, which every Englishman will read with pleasure and pride[2]. The third volume of Malleson is mainly a work on the military history of the Mutiny. Many little known incidents, serious uprisings and deep-seated conspiracies have been recorded but the

[1] Malleson, II, p. 412-14.
[2] Malleson, III, Preface, p. ix.

Marfat.com

whole has been treated in the background of the heroic role played by British officers and their men. George Berkeley Seton-Karr, magistrate of Belgaon showed remarkable abilities in dealing with seditious chiefs or *desais* of Nipani, Jamboti, Kittur, Nirgund, Wantmuri. A plot of the muhammadan population of Belgaon having its ramifications at Kolhapur, Hyderabad and Poona was also discovered by him which he successfully handled by a combination of firmness and tact. Major-General Sir George Le Grand Jacob was another distinguished officer of that time. At Bombay brigadier-general Shortt was a tower of strength to the government, but the superintendent of police C. Forjett was regarded as one of the most remarkable men brought to the front by the events of 1857[1]. The British Resident at Rewah, lieutenant Willoughby Osoorne through whose gallant exertions the rebel cause found no footing in Bundelkhand was another officer who received high praise from the hands of the British writers[2]. Malleson writes highly of Salarjung, the minister at Hyderabad through whose effort the British resident major Cuthbert Davidson was able to maintain their position. Davidson was intelligent and resourceful. When the Rohilla troops in the service of the Nizam rose up on 17 July major Davidson was in all readiness to confront them.[3] For three months, the historian writes, the fate of India was in the hands of Nizam and his minister[4]. The campaigns of Sir Hugh Rose and the great battles of the Mutiny at Jhansi, Kunch, Kalpi and Gwalior are most graphically described. The details of these operations have been taken from Lowe's 'Central India' but Malleson had his own way of overlaying his narrative with military matters at great length. He also gives in full the whole history of the flight of Tatya Tope and his pursuit by the British generals[5]. He has been meticulous in the treatment of the subject ; not only the game played by the British was foul but the trial leading to Tatya's execution was not 'above reproach'. 'The punishment was greater than the offence. The clansman had obeyed

1 Malleson, III, pp. 42-52.
2 Ibib. pp. 110 12.
3 Ibid. pp. 122-23,
4 Ibid. p. 130.
5 Ibid. pp. 318 ff.



Marfat.com

his lord and had fought with fair weapons'. He refers to Napoleon who was condemned by posterity for causing Hofer to be shot. The analogy somehow clicks[1]. His estimate of Tatya Tope cannot be questioned that it would have been admirable had Tatya combined the capacity of the general and the daring of the soldier. But fighting was not in his line.[2]

The foregoing resume of Malleson's work will tend to show that the 'History of the Indian Mutiny' in three volumes is mainly a record of military events, of the battles and sieges, marches and counter-marches. The book is mostly devoted to a description of battle arrays, army manoeuvres and the commissariat ; soldiers and military officers of Her Majesty's government come and go and crowd the stage. The historian shows a tendency to survey events too much from the parade ground overlooking the presence of the Indians. One knows a lot of the doings of the English rulers and their generals and subalterns, but the people, their passion and their character remain in shadow. He has very few words of appreciation for the heroism of the large number of sepoys who sacrificed their lives and even of many others who took up arms heedless of consequences. The Sepoy Mutiny is turned into a story of British army in action, the Highlanders and Fusiliers who dominate the stage and elevate the image of Britain and dwarf the mutiny and rebellion both.

Malleson confesses that as the English knew it as a mutiny, he has accordingly dealt with the mutinous proceedings of the sepoys and military operations conducted to suppress the insurrection[3]. He has, therefore, clearly vindicated his responsibility as a historian to place the movement in its military perspective. So in dealing with this movement, he had to produce a work of exhortation, a pantheon, stuffed with memorials of the illustrious soldiers who crushed the Indian Mutiny and saved the British Empire. The performance of every British soldier or civilian is trimmed by magnificent eulogies and adorned with paeanic panegyrics. To him it became a ritual to sing the song of the victorious army as he did after describing the

[1] Ibid. pp. 378-81.
[2] Ibid. pp. 382-83.
[3] Malleson, III, p 400.

Marfat.com

relief of Lucknow[1], fall of Delhi[2], the battle of Generalganj[3], the reconquest of Rohilkhand[4], the South Indian campaign[5], and even in matters of limited interest as in the skirmishes of Chotonagpur[6]. No institution or individual of eminence escaped his notice. The Indian Civil Service was a bastion of power and strength against the deluge ; he pays a tribute to the English officials which they highly deserved. He writes, 'The members of the Indian Civil Service, untrained to arms, as they were, displayed the characteristics of the island house of their birth—the cool courage, the firm resolution, the devotion to duty, well becoming the descendants of men who had made an Empire on which the sun never sets'[7]. Major James Brind who took charge of Delhi after its fall was a man other than whom a more highminded and merciful officer never lived[8]. Neill, the author of a bloody Assize, was appreciated because he stayed the plague[9].

The subject was like a vast arsenal which furnished the historian with weapons of attack and defence and he wielded his pen, regardless of any consideration, to inject a racial feeling at every step to demonstrate the superiority of the British mind over the Asiatic spirit. Malleson did not aspire after lofty functions of history but utilised the Mutiny to build up colossal prejudices against the Indians and Asiatics. From the Mutiny to the military reverses suffered by the sepoys, his hatred of the Indians extended to race. On every incident of confrontation he is aglow with national pride and aflame with racial predilections. The history of the Indian Mutiny was to bear witness that the British alone, from the strength of character and prowess, was fitted to build up an empire. In an age of the ascendancy of England it was natural that such a book will be warmly

1 Malleson, I, pp. 466, 487.
2 Ibid. II, pp. 84-86.
3 Ibid. II, pp. 261-80.
4 Ibid. II, pp. 493-529.
5 Ibid. III, Preface, p. ix.
6 Ibid. II, pp. 416-40.
7 Malleson, III, p. 399, 458.
8 Malleson, II, pp. 81-83.
9 Ibid. I. 519-539.

Marfat.com

received. A reviewer of the book in the *Examiner* writes, 'Posterity will recognise in this book a great and true exposition of one of the crisis through which his countrymen have fought their way by characteristics, truly British, to wider empire and greater fame'[1]. The *Times* commented that the author desired to be impartial[2]. In a sense what the *Times* stated was possibly true. In his whole work the historian hardly found fault with any British Officer. To him the death of Anson was 'a most sensible loss'[3], and Henry Lawrence showed the foresight of a general[4]. Furthermore, Tayler of Patna was a man whom a Wellesley or a Napier would have liked[5], that Lloyd of Dinapore or Polwhell of Agra are not to be judged by their failure for there was no mistake about their patriotism[6]. Windham at Cawnpore saved the country from disaster[7] and Walpole was not so much responsible for the reverses at Rooye. The historian's innate sympathy for the mutiny veterans prevented him from making an objective assessment. He flew into anger when Neill was going to be superseded by Havelock[8], yet Havelock was highly eulogised[9]. He criticised the government for replacing Havelock by Outram yet he yielded to none in his appreciation of the greatness of Sir James Outram[10]. His statement in the preface that he will pull down those who have been raised, which by itself was a wrong historical perspective, was not manifestly clear in his books. It is very difficult to find out if any British officer was criticised by the historian. Excepting perhaps Sir Patrick Grant, who, according to him, was a misfit for the position, there is hardly any one else whom he condemned for malversation or inefficiency, not even general John Jones the avenger, 'Gun Cotton' or Renaud and C. Forjett

1 Malleson, III, pp. 524 ff.
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid. I, p. 16.
4 Malleson, I, pp. 423-428.
5 Ibid, I, pp. 39-51.
6 Ibid. I, pp. 510-16.
7 Ibid. II, pp. 227-56.
8 Ibid. I, p. 502.
9 Ibid. I, p. 35.
10 Ibid. I, pp. 519 ff.

Marfat.com

of Bombay have been adversely commented on by the historian. Even on Canning the eulogy pronounced on him as the governor-general was hardly less euphuistic than what was attempted by Kaye[1].

The history of the Indian Mutiny by Malleson was essentially a work of reaction. The historian believed that action alone is history and not the circumstances attending each and every action. He had no liking for prolegomena nor had he shown any insight into the chain and depth of events. Possessing little interest in the structure of Indian society he did not look intently on the factors which govern outward transformations. His study of the causes of the Mutiny in the concluding chapter of his last volume[2] is only a rehash of the stuff known from previous writers. The investigation of facts, the study of their relations, the production of their form and motions which constitute history do not emerge in the volumes of Malleson. He does not seem to have realised that the main duty of a historian is not composition of eulogy or invective but interpretation of the complex processes and conflicting ideas in the most objective way. While Kaye's research-oriented work looks so serene and composed, and Forrest's highly documented work shows a degree of circumspection and caution and Holmes' methodological investigations into the many problems of the Indian Mutiny reflect his eruditions and scholarship, Malleson's 'History' does not reveal his resources of research, judgement and scholarly accuracy. But Malleson's volumes really constitute a significant contribution to the history of the Indian Mutiny in the totality of its scope, extent and dimension. He opens up a wider field of the War in his third volume which deals with the affairs of the Deccan and Western India and the campaigns of Durand and others. In other respects also Malleson was the first of the mutiny historians to write the most comprehensive account of the exploits of Kunwar Singh, his march to Jagadishpur and the war at Shahabad. He also gives the fullest account of the Oudh Proclamation, the Queen's Proclamation and the war of the landlords which followed the fall of Lucknow. Besides these, none of the historians offered a more authentic version of the Terai campaigns of 1858-59

[1] Malleson, III, pp. 491 ff.
[2] Ibid. pp. 469 ff.

Marfat.com

than Malleson. The detailed accounts of the movements of Tatya Tope and the hectic activities of the British army to apprehend him constitute another remarkable contribution of Malleson.

Malleson's 'Indian Mutiny' is also the most exciting work in mutiny literature, the most challenging of historical narratives of the revolt. He loved long surveys, liberal generalisations and war-oriented actions. The Indian Mutiny at his hands took the shape of an epic with the spacious, opulent and diffusive treatment of two peoples facing each other in battle array. The canvas on which he worked was wide as the whole drift of his mind was towards the treatment of large phenomena bringing under his focus the distant regions of India which added to the super-structural variety of the Revolt of 1857. The planning of the volumes also follows the familiar epic pattern of dealing with a particular episode in widely separated chapters, each of which terminates at crucial points so that excitement and interest of the reader is maintained. To match it, the whole style of the book is eloquent, remarkable for its literary beauty and its loftiness of diction.

Marfat.com

## CHAPTER FIVE

# ENGLISH WOMEN IN MUTINY LITERATURE

If Kate Moore broke the news of the 'Revolt', Queen Victoria terminated it ; English women were always there in the annals of the Indian Mutiny and Rebellion of 1857. A young girl of eighteen living with her brother, the postmaster of Meerut, despatched a telegraphic message to her relative at Agra which was received at that station 'at nine o'clock, night of 10th May 1857'. Mrs Flora Steel well known for her book, 'On the face of the Waters' described it as the 'strangest telegram that ever came as sole warning to an Empire that its very foundation was attacked'[1]. Colvin the lieutenant-governor of the North-West Provinces transmitted this telegraphic message to the secretary to the government of India from Agra on 11 May 1857. The message transmitted from Meerut ran to the following effect : 'The Cavalry have risen setting fire to their own houses and several officer's houses, besides having killed and wounded all European officers they could find near the lines'. All this is also recorded by a chaplain in H. M. India service, J. Mackay in his diary published under the title 'From London to Lucknow' in 1859[2]. So it was that an English woman became the first ever reporter on the great uprising of 1857. Kate Moore gave a graphic description of the orgy of murder that took place on that fatal night. She wrote, 'So passed the whole night of Sunday the 10th of May...The European cavalry and infantry were under arms, patrolling the station, but general Hewitt would not sanction their firing a single shot at the mutineers, saying the poor misguided men would return to their senses and their duty 'tomorrow'. So the wretches were allowed to carry on their murderous work all through the night until they were perfectly satiated with European blood, more than forty of whom had been murdered when morning dawned on the 11th of May[3].

1 *The Nineteenth Century and After*, 1903, vol. 54, Nov. 1903, p. 826 ff.

2 Mackay, I, p. 122, and also pp. 132-33 for Colvin's telegram to the governor-general dated Agra, May 14, 1857 on the 'authentic intelligence' is a letter from the King that the town and fort of Delhi and his own person are in the hands of the insurgents.

3 *The Nineteenth Century*, etc., op. cit. p. 829.



Marfat.com

English women staying in India with their relatives during those traumatic days of 1857 contributed not a little to the historical writings on the Indian Mutiny. The diaries and journals kept and books and letters written by them have been found to be of great historical value. They shared the trials and tribulations of the situation like others, and tried to serve their country and people by writing letters and transmitting news to home or by keeping notes or planning a book in the midst of this sanguinary war. It was never the idea with any one of them to win glory or renown as an authoress, but it was a sheer sense of service to their country and people that prompted them to collect and disseminate authentic intelligence about the rising so that the people at home may be aware of the very great crisis through which the British Empire in India was passing. The letters of English women in India were published mostly in the *Times* and also in other dailies of London and attracted the grateful attention of the British public. Besides being deeply interesting and full of variety, these letters also bore a stamp of authenticity for identification of the writer, whether the lady was related to a commander of troops or a civilian or attached to a missionary organisation enabled the readers, particularly the mutiny historians of England to make a proper assessment of the historical value of these doleful missives and to make a correct appreciation of the evidence thus offered. In many instances, as at Meerut, English women were the first to report about the local situation.

The first of the lady news writers of the Sepoy Mutiny was the wife of captain Henry Craigie of the 3rd Light Cavalry of Meerut whose graphic and succinct narrative of events preceding the 9th of May 1857 was published in the *Daily News* of London of 29th July 1857. The despatch of 6 May printed in the Appendix to the first series of Parliamentary Papers on the mutinies, the first parliamentary document to be published containing any reference to the events of the pre-mutiny period, was evidently based on the detailed and informative narrative written by Mrs Craigie dated 30 April 1857. She disclosed that general Hewitt was bitterly blaming colonel Smyth for having ordered that parade and bringing matters to a crisis. She writes : 'Ordering the parade at all under the present excitement was a lamentable piece of indiscretion ; but even when that had been done,

Marfat.com

the colonel might have extricated himself without humiliation. Henry feels convinced that he could have got the man to fire, or the parade might have been turned into an explanation of the new cartridge, without any firing being proposed'[1]. Mrs Craigie's letter dated 14 May on the Meerut scene of 10 May is regarded as an authoritative description of an eye-witness which bears strong internal evidence of truthfulness and is corroborated by contemporary official and private statements[2]. But Mrs Dunbar Douglas Muter, wife of an officer of Meerut, was not, however, very correct in her report about the incidents. She wrote a book on the 'Recollections of the Sepoy Revolt' describing the events of Meerut from the beginning of the Mutiny to the fall of Delhi. In many cases the materials she collected were not verified by other statements, she only heard about them. Thus she gives a description of the city of Delhi after its fall which had no relevance to the actual conditions.[3]

At Delhi Mrs Fanny Peile, the wife of a lieutenant in the 30th who was then living close to the lines, watched the 54th pass the house. She was deluded into believing that they would go forward and fight for them, but her news letter published in the *Times* of 25 September 1857 unfolds the pitiable condition of the European fugitives from Delhi[4]. Lieutenant Peile and his wife encountered extreme peril, aggravated for a time by separation from each other as well as from their child. Mrs Peile's whereabouts on 11 May had a bearing on the time of the arrival of the Meerut mutineers to Delhi. Later on, in 1870 she published her book 'The Delhi Massacre.' Charles Ball again has preserved a letter from a lady written from Camden Villa, Simla on July 22 which is eminently descriptive and embraces much of real historical interest. She writes that the insurgents from Meerut reached the bridge of boats at Delhi about 7 a.m. on 11 May. She wondered why major Knyvett, who was in command of the 38th, did not

1 Martin, II, p. 144 fn.

2 Ball, I, p. 63 ; Martin, II, p. 148.

3 Published in 1911. In her 'Travels and Adventures etc.' published in 1864, she describes the life at Delhi after its capture which also was an entirely misleading account.

4 Martin, II, pp. 160, 163-4, 168.

Marfat.com

mobilise his Corps[1]. Another lady, presumably wife of L. Barkeley, the principal *suddar ameen* describes the general departure from the Flag Staff Tower as taking place at about six-o-clock in the evening[2]. Martin brings to notice letters from the wife of a Delhi officer who afraid of being late for the post the next day, sits writing to her relatives in England at night under a leaky roof when the rain was pouring and her husband and children were in their beds. Martin thinks that not one of the host of admirable letters written for home circles to gratify the longing of the British nation for Indian intelligence furnish a more charming picture of the quiet courage and cheerfulness under circumstances of peril and privation which characterised the British women of that time[3]. Mr Wagentreiber of the Delhi Gazette fled with his wife and daughter, but were attacked five times, in one of which both the mother and daughter fired with so much effect that the fugitives succeeded in making good their way to Karnal[4]. Mrs Wagentreiber also wrote a short account of their escape from Delhi which was published in 1894. Another woman Julia Haldane wrote a similar story of her escape from Delhi in 1857, which was published in 1888. A very important contribution was made by Mrs Greathed who edited the letters of her husband H.H. Greathed, the political agent, attached to the Delhi Field Force. Greathed's Letters written during the Siege of Delhi contain excellent primary source-materials on the war at Delhi. Elsie Greathed, the widow, included a brief account of events up to 28 May including the mutiny at Meerut. Another book of original importance was Keith-Young's 'Diary and correspondence on the siege operation at Delhi'. It was edited by Sir H.W. Norman in collaboration with Mrs Young. Similarly, lady Emma Edwardes edited the 'Memoirs and Letters of the Life of Sir H.B. Edwardes', who suppressed the mutiny in the Punjab and remained there through the siege of Delhi. Mrs Flora Steel's 'On the face of the Waters' is an excellent work. She cannot claim any authority for her treatment of the work in a technical sense but every

[1] Ball, I, p. 86.
[2] Martin, II, p. 164.
[3] Martin, II, p. 175.
[4] Ibid. p. 169.

Marfat.com

page of her book was factually oriented. Her work was considered by many as the best story ever yet written of the Indian uprising. She had intimate knowledge of the life in Delhi and her access to sources close to important centres of activity and the sharp and incisive nature of her enquiries and investigations enabled her to throw light on many episodes which were not well known in the chain of the whole story. The intense romance and horror of the wild war between the British and Indian forces over the capture of Delhi, so full of pathos for both sides, was never written with so much effect.

From Lucknow came a crop of annalists and diarists. In the Residency there were more than a hundred ladies and children. The letters and diaries of some of these English women who lived there throughout the siege are particularly valuable as social documents indicating many a feature of the revolt and its incidents. Mrs Katherine Harris, wife of the Residency Chaplain, estimated that as many as eight or nine ladies with a dozen children were in one room though the heat was awful. Her book, 'A Lady's Diary of the siege of Lucknow' gives a graphic description of the life in the Residency and many other allied matters. She arrived at Lucknow with her husband from England in March 1857. Her original idea was to enlighten her friends and relatives about the situation in Lucknow and actually she described the condition of the Residency in her book for the period extending from 15 May to December 1857. Mrs Harris was both house-maid and nursery-maid in the house where she lived. She refers to the pitiable condition of the hospitals where many died and suffered. She gives a description of the death scene of Henry Lawrence. 'I shall never forget', she writes, 'the miserable feeling of despair which seemed to take possession of us, as if our last hope was gone'. She gives poignant touches to the arrival of the 'First Relief' of Lucknow under Havelock, 'long-looked-for and so often despaired of'. The soldiers meeting the English women at the Residency jerked out in joy : 'Thank God it is better than Cawnpore'[1]. When strictest economy was maintained in the use of stores Mrs Harris bore all -privations quietly. 'Nothing for breakfast this

[1] Ball quotes in full *Lady's Diary* to describe the confusion and excitement of the times (Ball, II, p. 42).

Marfat.com

morning', she records in her journal, 'but chapatties and boiled peas'. Lucknow was abandoned and she found the going too exciting ; when she reached Allahabad she did not know how to describe the feeling of rest and peace so luxuriously in abundance after the excitement, and anxiety and turmoil of the last six months[1]. Another very interesting work containing information of a primary character came from the pen of Mrs Adelaide Case. Case was the widow of colonel Case of H.M.'s 32nd who died a soldier's death at the battle of Chinhat on 30 June 1857. Her journal, 'Day-by-day at Lucknow', an episodic and empathetic diary of the miserable days made a tremendous impression in those exciting times. Written from the view-point of a woman and depicting a picture of the conditions during the siege of Lucknow, she incidentally included many other materials of historical importance. Sir Henry realised the difficulty of his position and proposed to draw up his little army near the bridge across the Kookrail, a small stream intersecting the Faizabad road, on that fateful day before the battle actually began. The following is on the evidence of 'Day-by-day' : 'Sir Henry was on the point of returning to the city but unfortunately he was persuaded to advance, and it was said the enemy could not be in great number'. This accounted for the disaster of Chinhat, but Mrs Case does not disclose the name of the councillors of Henry Lawrence. The British retreated to the Residency hotly pursued by their enemies so closely that 'Poor Mrs Case' heard the whistling of round shot in the air first before she got the news of her bereavement. The story of the British women at the Lucknow Residency adorned a tale and beautified a legend. The official report of brigadier T. Inglis preserves a little of that experience of grim resolve and deathless courage which immortalised them. The brigadier writes : 'I cannot refrain from bringing to the prominent notice of His Lordship in council, the patient endurance and the Christian resignation which has been evinced by the women of the garrison. They have animated us by their example. Many, alas ! have been made widows and their children fatherless, in this cruel struggle'. Inglis referred to, 'honoured names' of Birch, of Pole-hampton, of Barbor and many others who after the example of Miss

[1] Dodd, p. 326.

Marfat.com

Nightingale constituted themselves the 'tender and solicitous nurses of the wounded and dying soldiers in the hospital'[1]

From a purely narrative point of view the works of Julia Selima Inglis, the wife of brigadier Inglis, the second in command at Lucknow was considered very authoritative. L. E. R. Rees, the author of the 'Personal Narrative of the Siege of Lucknow', whose account compared to that of Gubbin's work was more circumstantial, had access to the journal kept by the wife of brigadier Inglis. The authority of Rees carried weight with the historians of the Mutiny and he was frequently quoted as such. Lady Inglis is credited with two works : the first one was 'Letters containing extracts from a journal kept by Mrs Julia Inglis during the Siege of Lucknow' which was privately printed in 1858. Her account of the retreat to the Residency after the disaster at Chinhat is graphic and certainly the most authentic a historian could have had. Kaye quotes from her journal : 'you may imagine our feelings of anxiety and consternation. I posted myself and watched the poor men coming in ; a melancholy spectacle, indeed—no order, one after the other ; some riding ; some wounded, supported by their comrades ; some on guns ; some fell down and died from exhaustion. The enemy followed them to the bridge close to the Residency,...I could see the smoke of the musketry and plainly discerned the enemy on the opposite bank of the river'[2]. The other work of Julia Inglis, 'Siege of Lucknow, a diary', was published in 1892. It gives an account of the daily events during the siege of Lucknow. Ladendorf writes that extensive notes of colonel F. M. Birch are added to lady Inglis' own diary[3]. The volume was continued after the first relief of Lucknow, and her husband's death, and eventually W. Forbes-Mitchell of the 93rd Highlanders took up the work where lady Inglis laid it down. It was hoped that his 'Reminiscences' of the great Mutiny published in 1894 would prove an acceptable continuation of her (lady Inglis) touching narrative of the defence of Lucknow, and that as a record of the great mutiny, it may furnish another thrilling chapter in that unparalleled story of suffering and heroism of man's bravery and of woman's devotion'[4].

1 Report of T. Inglis quoted in Ball, II, p. 53.
2 Kaye, III, p. 511 fn.
3 Ladendorf, p. 59.
4 Forbes-Mitchell, *Reminiscences*, etc., Intro.

Marfat.com

There were quite a few other works on the Lucknow episode. Mrs R. C. Germon's work gives many interesting anecdotes of the Residency. The diary kept by Mrs R. C. Germon at Lucknow between the months of May and December 1857 was published in 1870. Ladendorf traces a manuscript of R. C. Germon's work entitled, 'Journal of the siege of Lucknow'[1]. She also refers to the work of one Maria V. Germon, 'Journal of the Siege of Lucknow' which was edited and published by M. Edwardes in 1958. It is noticed as a 'Personal Account of the Siege of Lucknow' which flatly details events in the life of a woman[2]. Mrs K. M. Bartrum, widow of a medical officer with Campbell's force was the author of a work entitled 'A Widow's Reminiscences etc.' The book gives a short account of her involvements in the siege of Lucknow. There were other works of Mrs Bartrum such as 'An original Diary of the Siege of Lucknow' and 'Letters from Lucknow, Allahabad and Calcutta,' the materials of which were perhaps incorporated in her 'Reminiscences'. The 'Original diary' of Mrs Bartrum on the 'Siege of Lucknow' was supposed to be more complete than other works[3]. On Lucknow various other publications appeared such as Mrs A. Huxham's 'A Personal Narrative of the Siege of Lucknow' and Mrs Hamilton Forbes' 'Some Recollections of the Siege of Lucknow' published in 1905 which deal mainly with personal matters. The diary kept by Mrs Soppitt during the siege of Lucknow as reproduced by Fitchett in his 'Tale of the Great Mutiny' is apparently a document of a woman's life but one which runs parallel to the situation outside.

On Cawnpore we have two lady news writers whose correspondence regarding the position of the European residents at the station during the later part of May constitute sources of great importance. They described in detail the thrilling incidents of that eventful period between the 15th of May and the surrender of the intrenchment, and the foul massacre that followed to which they fell a victim. In their letters they supplied many particulars of information not otherwise

[1] Ladendorf, p. 157 ; Sen, pp. 200, 223, Edwardes, *Battles*, p. 207.

[2] Ladendorf, pp. 55. Sen writes that the original manuscript of Mrs Germon's Diary acquired by the India office Library agrees with the printed text (Sen, p. 420). Evidently he was referring to Mrs R. C. Germon's work.

[3] Ladendorf, p. 137.

Marfat.com

available from official sources. One is Mrs Hillersdon, wife of Charles Hillersdon, magistrate and collector of Cawnpore, the other is Mrs Ewart, wife of lieutenant-colonel Ewart of the 1st Bengal native infantry who was killed on the way to Satichauraghat. His wife accompanying him was also similarly slaughtered. Both these ladies were alert and watchful but at the back of their mind they realised that the hour of doom was approaching. Mrs Hillersdon wrote to convey the news about the crisis at Cawnpore to her friends and took a detached view of the situation as far as it was possible[1]. On 15 May she stated that the situation though quiet may take a different turn if Cawnpore troops come into contact with their mutinous brethren and on the next day she wrote about a very controversial matter regarding Nana's assurances of protection. All her writings were informative in character but her last note brings to light the acute misery and distress of the situation and the near certainty of the impending death-duel that was to overtake them all. She writes that they were in a state of siege passing the nights in barracks with guns behind and before. It was extremely trying but it was only the presence of the children that gave her strength and courage to face the situation[2]. Mrs Hillersdon was killed by bricks and plasters falling on her while in confinement in the intrenchment in a few days after the death of her husband. Mowbray Thomson writes about her, 'Mrs Hillersdon was a most accomplished lady and by reason of her cheerfulness, amiability and piety became a favourite of all'[3]. In the same strain J. W. Sherer refers to her cultural refinements. She was a pianist and delighted her guests with her charming music. 'A favourite pupil of Ascher, she was also fond of Mendelssohn's *Rando Capriccios*'[4]. Mrs Ewart's letters are lengthy and covers a wider field of public and private affairs. She gives a correct picture of the situation following the incidents of 21 May when a rising of the native troops was in contemplation. In a letter dated 27 May she writes that in the evening they all repaired to the 'melancholy night quarters', the

1 Martin says that her letters were published in deference to public feelings by the parties to whom they were addressed (II, p. 250).

2 Dodd, pp. 125-26.

3 M. Thomson, p. 107.

4 Sherer, *Daily Life during the Indian Mutiny*, p. 4.

Marfat.com

barracks, of which she gives a graphic description. Harrowing thoughts came crowding in her mind, Aligarh and Etawah were gone, they had no more than 150 European soldiers, the Marathas of Bithur could not be trusted. She felt intuitively that her husband will be the first to fall and shrank in agony to think that her dear child will perish before her eyes. She invoked strength to meet the situation with a truly Christian courage. Yet she thought that Delhi might be retaken in a short time and aid might be sent to them. Mrs Ewart was a very sensible lady, unselfish and sweet in her disposition. Her letter of 30 May furnished many useful information. Mrs Murray, a survivor, the widow of a bandsergeant of the 56th N. I. who perished at Cawnpore gave a version of what she saw and heard but her version was not regarded very dependable like other accounts of this nature ; it was a mixture of facts and fiction. Several of Murray's positive assertions, as if seen by the lady herself, were contradicted by lieutenant Thomson[1]. Another lady Mrs A. Bennett published in the 'Nineteenth century'[2], her experience of the Cawnpore affair entitled 'Ten Months captivity after the massacre at Cawnpore'. It was a belated publication which raises doubts about the authenticity of the narrative.

There were many other accounts of English women in the Rebellion showing firmness and devotion to the call of the situation. The wife of lieutenant Monckton of the Bengal Engineers at Fatehgarh in the district of Farrackabad wrote to her friends and relatives in England on 16 May in a perfectly unruffled manner like Mrs Ewart of Cawnpore, about the near certainty of death which awaited her, her husband and child. She would not ask anybody to pray for them nor grieve for them because she felt sure that they would be going to Jesus if they were cut to pieces. Her last words were 'Goodbye my own dear parents, sisters and friends ; The Lord resigns !' In another letter she gave a description of the panic-stricken people maddened by fear whom she met in the Church ; every countenance was pale, death was staring them in the face. On 1 June she wrote home for the last time which, according to Martin, 'deserved

1 Martin, II, p. 252.

2 *The Nineteenth Century and After*, June-July, 1913.

Marfat.com

a place in the history of a great national epoch, as illustrating the spirit of grateful, loving trust, in which our Christian countrywomen awaited death... .' She continues, 'I am so thankful, I came out to India to be a comfort to my beloved John, and a companion to one who has given his heart to the Lord'. The same spirit of surrender and resignation was reflected in a letter of Mrs Freeman, the wife of one of the four missionaries stationed by the zealous and munificent American Presbyterians at Fatehgarh. 'He may suffer our bodies to be slain', writes the lady, 'and if He does, we know He has wise reason for it'[1]. Incidentally, she also gives an idea about the attitude of the native Christians. Of various other accounts by British ladies, Miss Ursula Low's 'Fifty years with John Company' published in 1936 was made up of letters of general Sir John Low, her own contribution being only two chapters on the Mutiny which also were drawn from secondary sources[2]. Mrs Matilda H. Ouvry's 'A lady's diary before and during the Indian Mutiny' published in 1892 mainly describes the personal life of an officer's wife. Ladendorf commented that it was an unedited diary of an officer's wife whose husband was stationed at Ambala[3]. A. Madeline Jackson's 'A Personal Narrative of the Indian Mutiny' published in 1880 was one of the most popular escape stories of mutiny literature. She was the sister of Mountstuart Jackson and niece of the famous officer Colville Coverley Jackson discussed by Sir William John Kaye in his 'History of the Sepoy War'. She escaped from Sitapur with her brother at the outbreak of the Mutiny. The book describes her flight and imprisonment[4].

Of the other stories we have quite a few from the other side of the Jumna. Ladendorf describes the death of Dr Mawe and his family, refugees from Naogaon. Following the news of the massacre at Jhansi an explosion took place at Naogaon. Dr Mawe, his wife and child were killed by the sepoys. This is mentioned to introduce Thomas Mawe's 'Letters written from Naogaon' May 1857, now in the private collections of Mrs K. M. Minns, Manchester[5]. Martin, however,

1 Martin II, pp. 321-23.
2 Ladendorf, p. 63.
3 Ibid. p. 68.
4 Ibid. pp. 141, 158.
5 Ibid, p. 142.



Marfat.com

refers to the 'Narrative of Mrs Mawe' and describes the story of her escape. Leaving the dead body of her husband, 'for there was no haste to bury him' she walked barefooted for miles and eventually found her way to Banda where the *begum* received her kindly and through her kindness she went to Calcutta and thence to England[1]. According to the *Red Pamphlet* Mrs Mawe's 'Narrative' was sent by Lady Canning to the Queen[2]. Similarly, Mrs Blake's 'Escape from Gwalior' printed for private circulation[3], offers a painfully interesting account of her suffering and experience. She was the wife of the commanding officer of the 2nd Infantry of Gwalior, major Blake, who was shot through the chest on 15 June, but the men of the 2nd professed their loyalty to the commander and assisted Mrs Blake in various ways to proceed towards Dholpur, the chief town on the way to Agra, along with her party which included among others Mrs Campbell, a beautiful lady known as the 'Rose of Gibralter' and Mrs Coopland. Mrs Blake later on devoted herself to the nursing of the sick and wounded at the Agra Fort.

But of all such books, Mrs R. M. Coopland's 'A Lady's Escape from Gwalior and life in the Fort of Agra during the mutinies of 1857' published in 1859, was very lively and exciting. It throws light on several points which the authorities would have preferred leaving in darkness. It also includes materials on life in the Agra Fort which supplement official information on the subject. Mrs Coopland was the widow of the clergyman killed at Gwalior in June 1857. She recounts the events which led her to escape from Gwalior in the party of Gwalior fugitives including Mrs Blake. The stress and strain and the tension of the situation arising from the upsurge and the consequent panic felt by the Europeans was described with a vividness which was very telling. But Cooplands had 'unreasoning antipathy to all Indians' which rendered their position insecure in those difficult times. They suspected foul play in every thing, in every man surrounding them, the rifle was kept loaded and a dress to

[1] Martin, II, pp. 313-14. A letter from Mhow dated Aug. 1857 published in the *Times* of September 26, 1857 attracted considerable attention. It went in the name of the worthy daughter and wife of soldiers. (Martin, II, pp. 345).

[2] *Red Pamphlet*, p. 115 fn.

[3] Martin, II, pp. 340-42.

Marfat.com

escape was always ready at hand. In some ways the Maharaja prevented the women from being killed at Gwalior, yet Coopland had no feeling for this 'doubly-dyed traitorous Maratha'. The strong prejudice against the Indians of the wife of the chaplain of Gwalior tends to invalidate the credit due to her otherwise keen perceptions. Mrs Coopland writing from Gwalior on 16 May wrote like a swaggering Anglo-Saxon, that the outbreak at Meerut and Delhi was a 'divine punishment upon all the weak tampering with idolatry, and flattering vile superstition', and suggested sanguinary and impracticable measures for the suppression of the Mutiny[1]. Mrs Coopland evinced the same attitude. Malleson, however, says that it is a pleasure to read Coopland which cannot escape the attention of the mutiny scholars for its charming power of assimilating human sensibilities with sober history[2].

Other accounts written by English women are useful for their personal knowledge of some episodes of the Mutiny they described. Mrs Leopold Paget's 'Camp and Cantonment' published in 1865 is a personal diary of the wife of an officer of the Royal Artillery Force sent out from England in the middle of July 1857. She describes her book as a journal of life in India in 1857-59. In fact, the work is in the nature of a traveller's diary and hardly includes any matter of importance relating to the incidents of the Mutiny excepting some ancillary details recorded by her husband major Leopold Paget R.H.A. in the pursuit of Tatya Tope. Her description of the fauna and flora is interesting and she also took many sketches of the Indian scene. In between these literary exercises she made observations on the situation around her. Her information was that by November 15, 1857, more English soldiers had fallen already than during the whole Crimean War[3]. By the end of May 1858 the whole of the Southern Maratha country was ripe for rebellion and was only kept from breaking out by the presence of the large British force. Death of the British Resident Manson at the hands of the rebels from Nurgoond about 800 in number, and the fall of the fort of Nurgoond are described,

1 Martin, II, p. 335.
2 Malleson, I, pp. 176, 286.
3 Paget, p. 44.

Marfat.com

but to Mrs Paget it was perfectly incomprehensible as to why the raja provoked a revolt when he was not prepared to hold his fort. The rani and the raja's mother drowned themselves in the Malaprabha and the Europeans freely looted the gold and silver of the palace. Mrs Paget took delight in taking a share of the spoil—a tiny chest containing reels of gold and silver thread and a beautiful silver-handled *chowrie*[1]. Meanwhile hangings, and executions continued daily. She also describes how the city of Mehidpore was destroyed completely by the British forces[2].

Augusta Becher's 'Personal Reminiscences in India and Europe' was another interesting work which offers a good picture of Anglo-Indian life in Bengal, like the sketches drawn by the Hon. Emily Eden in 'Up the Country'. Becher was in Meerut in June 1857 but her diary does not give the impression that she was very much alive to the situation. She was more attentive to the social side of Anglo-Indian life than anything else and except for some descriptions of camp life and grave domestic afflictions she suffered, there is hardly anything of historical interest in the writing. But she was sensitive and felt strongly that her husband failed to respond to the needs of the time when 'men were taking their fate or opportunities into their own hands'.[3] When other ladies envied her lot in being the wife of Septimus Becher she doubted her happiness : 'I was a soldier's wife to the heart's core, and there were not a few of us who felt a longing to be in the fight, women though we were'[4]. H. G. Rawlinson who

[1] Ibid. pp. 177, 185, 197-8.

[2] Ibid. pp. 201, 447.

[3] Augusta Becher the writer of this diary was one of the 'Prinseps' of India's Anglo-Indian community. Her husband Septimus was a grandson of the great Richard Becher an admirer of Clive and was the Resident of Murshidabad. From this time onwards the Bechers made India a second home. Septimus Becher married Augusta in 1849. He was next in rank to colonel Chester who was killed in action and was to have succeeded him, but 'Norman was much too farseeing and managed to get into the position' (Becher, p. 139). Ladendorf takes notice of a book by Augusta Becker entitled 'Personal Reminiscences' etc. edited by Rawlinson published in 1930 which contains several lengthy entries concerned with Becker's escape from the mutiny in Ferozepore (Ladendorf, p. 49).

[4] Becher, p. 142.

Marfat.com

edited the book writes : 'Mrs Becher gives an extraordinarily vivid picture of what our ancestors in India suffered in the killing time of 1857-58 ; more than that she tells us about all those petty details of everyday life, the 'doolies, the dinner parties etc.' Rawlinson also reflected that as former generations pass all too quickly into oblivion, attempts may be made to rescue these memorials of the lives of our predecessors in India[1].

The most famous of the English women contributing to Mutiny literature was Mrs Henry Duberly of Crimean fame, the wife of one of the officers who accompanied the field force. In her book on the 'Campaigning Experiences in Rajputana and Central India etc.', she ventured 'to put before the public a faithful record of the services and sufferings of one portion of the army occupied in the suppression of the Mutiny'. The book published in 1859 also encloses a map showing brigadier Smith's plan for surrounding Tatya Tope dated 7 October 1858[2]. She set sail on 8 October 1857 and after seventy days of sea voyage reached Bombay. Of all the women writers introduced so far none had actually seen the campaigns of the British regiment in the suppression of the Mutiny outside of Oudh. Mrs Duberly offers the singular instance of how a British lady could march along with her husband from camp to camp enduring all the hardships of such perilous marches with extreme fortitude. In the Indian sun, she covered a distance of 2,028 miles, more than 1,800 of which she accomplished on horseback[3]. She thus draws a good picture of the field operations of rebel congregations on all sides and the British parties marching and counter-marching to confront them.

The intimate touches she gives of the actual scenes visited by her, made her book popular. She found the palace of Sindhia an *Italian Palazzro* and disclosed that the part of the palace assigned to major Macpherson was occupied by Tatya Tope during the brief period of the eclipse of Sindhia's rule. But no act of vandalism was committed. The British Resident's drawing room furniture were not touched ; they consisted of, Mrs Duberly writes, 'large massive mirrors with

[1] Ibid. Intro.
[2] Duberly, *Campaigning Experiences* etc. Preface.
[3] Ibid. p. 225.

Marfat.com

their frames of crimson gold ornamented with gilt lions and horses and carpets and chandeliers were of exquisite type' agreeably with the fashion of the victorian age[1]. The Prime Minister of Gwalior, Dinkar Rao was, according to the authoress, a noble study for *Fra Angelica*[2]. She vividly describes the ceremony of Sindhia returning in state to occupy the palace from which he had fled ; Sindhia entered his palace and 'ascended the Durbar leaning on the arms of Sir Hugh Rose'[3]. Sir Hugh Rose, in her estimate, possessed in an eminent degree, what the French termed *un talent pour la gloire*[4], while the story of the rani of Jhansi was to her such an instance of fierce and desperate type and courage that she could only listen to it with wonder. Duberly seems to have believed the current rumour about the end of the rani. She writes, 'Sir Hugh Rose told me that although mortaliy wounded the rani was not actually killed on the field, but was carried off the ground, and ordered a funeral pile to be built, which she ascended and fired with her own hand while almost in the act of dying...'[5] But Mrs Duberly like others of her country could not refrain from showing strong prejudices against Indians as evinced in her observations. She quotes (lines of vengeance) from Dr Maginn's 'Taking of Magdeburg'[6]. Every chapter begins with a couplet emitting fire and fury as the following will show :

And sword and shield
In bloody field
Doth win immortal fame[7].

Another of this class, a little more thick, runs thus ;

Trait'rous knaves. with plots designing,
Trembled at our sheathless sword,
Knowing that its splendrous shining,
Was the glory of the Lord[8].

She gives an exquisite description of the city of Chanderi, and its glorious past, but after it was bombarded a profound and beautiful desolation reigned over it which reminded her of the exclamation of

[1] Duberly, op. cit. p. 150.
[2] Ibid. p. 159.
[3] Ibid. p. 138.
[4] Ibid. p. 116.
[5] Ibid. p. 145.
[6] Ibid. p. 33.
[7] Ibid. p. 87.
[8] Ibid.

Marfat.com

Jeremiah lamenting over Jerusalem : 'How is she become as a widow' ![1]. But Duberly had the candour to admit that although in the rebellion extreme severity could not be discountenanced 'yet on the other hand there have been cases of ruthless slaughter, of which perhaps the less said the better'[2]. Even so, the 'Crimean heroine' did not hesitate to identify herself with the excited Anglo-Indians of that time. In the Preface she wrote, 'When I think upon this terrible insurrection and recollect how deeply the rebels have stained themselves with English blood, the blood of English women and of little helpless children, I can only look forward with awe to the day of vengeance, when our hands shall be dipped in the blood of our enemies and the tongues of our dogs shall be red through the same'[3]. The *Calcutta Review* while commenting on the book of Mrs Duberly recorded the view that she had nothing new to impart. 'We look in vain for a connected narrative which the advantage of her personal presence in a battle would have motivated'[4].

There were other works which also deserve mention. Margaret Spencer's 'Personal Reminiscences of the Indian Mutiny' deals mostly with the military movements in and around Benares. The lady was the daughter of a Benares missionary and married one Spencer towards the end of December 1857 at Calcutta about which she records much that was personal[5]. Ladendorf similarly refers to a diary by Anne Harden entitled 'A diary of the Indian Mutiny'[6]. One Eliza Looker (formerly Phillips) published a book on Havelock and Lord Clyde[7]. Miss Alicia Cameron Taylor wrote on general Sir A. Taylor and his times, and Lucy Taylor on Sir Henry Havelock and also on Sir Henry Lawrence. A 'Narrative' by Mrs Marriott appeared in the Westminster Gazette of 1907 dated 28th and 30th May[8]. The 'Timely Retreat' by two sisters, an anonymous publication, was not, however,

[1] Ibid. p. 118.

[2] Ibid. p. 232.

[3] Ibid. pp. 25-26.

[4] *Calcutta Review*, 1859, vol. 33, p. lxii.

[5] Publishers : J. Baker & Son, The Mall, Clifton. Messrs. Dawson and Co ; Cannon House, Bream's Buildings, London, E. C.

[6] Ladendorf, p. 127.

[7] See Bibliography.

[8] Ladendorf, p. 130. See also 'Englishwomen in the Rebellion' by Miss C. Mackenzie in Calcutta Review, September 1859, vol. 33, pp. 100 ff ; vol. 33, pp. 116-7 ; *United Service Magazine*, vol. 175, 1916.

Marfat.com

very well received[1]. Rev. Henry S. Polehampton's Diary which ended with his death on 20 July 1857 was continued by his wife in a narrative form in her letters. She closed it on 13 February 1858[2].

The writings of English women on the Indian Mutiny and its antecedents are too many. It is difficult to offer a comprehensive account of their contributions from the sporadic references available here and there. As a daughter or as a wife they assisted their father or husband, as the case was, in composing their works and even editing them. Thus Lady Barker saw through the work of general Sir G.D. Barker and Isabel Chalmers added a biographical sketch to the work of colonel John Chalmers. Mrs H. M. Groom contributed to the work of her husband W.T. Groom and major W.T. Johnson's book, 'Twelve Years of a soldier's life' was edited by his widow[3]. The autobiography of Sri Douglas Forsyth was edited by his daughter Ethel Forsyth, the work of Sir W.M. James by his daughter Schwabe James, and the 'Letters and Memoirs' of Charles Kingsley by his wife Mrs F.E. Kingsley. Similarly, Lady MacGregor edited the work of major-general Sir Charles MacGregor, Miss Mary Sturges worked in collaboration with O. Sturges in his 'Reminiscence' and so also Alice Medows Taylor who completed 'The story of My life' of her father, Philip Medows Taylor[4]. Sir George Le Grant Jacob even dedicated his work on Western India to his talented and adopted daughter but for whose help he could not have published his work in his old age in 1871. Many other writings of English woman on the Indian Mutiny have been brought to light which will have added to the value of contemporary sources of the revolt. It would be realised that the works of English women in this field were mainly confined to their respective regions for obvious reasons. No one could possibly have contemplated to write an account of the rebellion in other regions beyond their own stations, and far less, write a full history of the Mutiny and Rebellion of 1857. It is again quite evident that these

[1] *Calcutta Review*, 1859, vol. 33, p. 45.

[2] Henry Polehampton's book is described as heart touching, and withal, manly and Englishlike (*Calcutta Review*, 1858, vol. 31, Misc. Notice, p. xiv). See also Ladendorf, p. 69.

[3] See bibliography.

[4] Ibid. ; Ladendorf, p. 76.

Marfat.com

notes and diaries in some cases seem to be some dolorous document of a woman's life but essentially all these works are of great importance as they ran parallel to the political and social events of India of that time. The most striking thing which arises from this vivid montage of personal and historical life is the quality of English character, their perfect equanimity and unperturbed fortitude in the face of death and destruction. However, as for works in 'Private Collection', Ladendorf refers to an interesting work, Mrs C.M. Brydon's 'Diary of the Siege of Lucknow', May-December 1857. Her husband William was stationed with the garrison at Lucknow. Other such works traced which were not known before, were 'Memories of the Agra Fort' by Miss Edith Sharpley, 'Indian Mutiny Reminiscences' of Shahjahanpur by Mrs Elizabeth Sneyde and Nasirabad Mutiny Narrative by Miss Agnes Timbrell. Another work, 'Narrative of the Siege of Agra Fort' by Lucy Innes[1] was particularly valuable. Ladendorf has also brought to light Mrs Philip Goldney's 'Narrative of the Escape from Sitapur' and the 'Picture and Description of massacre at Aurangabad' by Mrs Elizabeth Sneyde. Reference also has been made to the letters from Mrs Archibald-Lorne-Campbell from the fort of Sialkot, and the narrative of Jane O' Donnel about her escape from Sidampur[2]. In the public archives in British Isles manuscripts of equal importance have been traced. Mention is made of works by Mrs Amy Haines and Miss Sutherland on their 'Experiences during the Mutiny[3]. Other works of equal importance were the eight diaries dating from 1842 to 1858 of Mary Amelia Vansittart wife of Henry Vansittart.

Besides those mentioned above, the contributions of Lady Canning to the historical literature of the time testify to the deep involvements of the vicereine in the crisis of her time. In all her writings she gives a mass of information and shows her analytical power. She left behind her many letters and also a diary in two bound volumes and a 'quantity of journal-letters addressed to her mother and sister'. These were used by A. Hare and John Cuthbert in compiling 'Two Noble Lives'. Lady Canning was an accomplished artist and botanist ; some

1 Ladendorf, pp. 138, 141, 143-144.
2 Ibid. pp. 140, 152-53.
3 Ibid. p. 151, 157.

Marfat.com

of her letters, diaries and notebooks are enlivened by beautiful sketches[1]. The French writer E. De Valbezen also records his appreciation of the noble contributions of this great lady. He writes, 'It would be unjust to pass by in silence the noble and grateful figure of Lady Canning, the companion and partner of her husband's perils. In the hour of trial the great Court-Lady gave proof of the almost virile firmness peculiar to Anglo-Indian women'[2].

It will be realised that most of these works came from the pen of those who actually suffered and were exposed to grave risks during the time of crisis. The historical value of their contributions cannot be questioned as they were local witnesses of scenes enacted before them. Their works have widened the basis of our knowledge of the Revolt and the sacrifices they made had enlivened the history of the Indian Mutiny. They were amply rewarded as they could claim Queen Victoria also as one in their company, who, true to the noble tradition of English womanhood, could not refrain from showing her sensibilities like the other daughters of England, as a writer on this grave crisis which England faced. The many letters going in her name show her anxiety to share the perils and difficulties of the Indian situation and bear the stamp of her personality more indelibly than many of the writings of this period[3]. The Queen's Proclamation was originally drafted in the office of Lord Derby and was submitted to the Queen for her approval. The Queen in a Memorandum raised some objections in the original draft and wrote to Lord Derby : 'The queen would be glad if Lord Derby wrote it himself bearing in mind that it is a female sovereign who speaks to more than a hundred millions of her Eastern people... Such a document should breathe feelings of generosity, benevolence and religious toleration and point out the privileges which the Indians will receive in being placed on an equality with the subject of the British Crown[4].''

[1] Ladendorf, p. 150 ; Maclagan, *Canning*, p. 354. The book, 'Two Noble Lives', deals with Charlotte Countess Canning and Louisa Marchioness of Waterford.

[2] Valbezen, p. 173.

[3] See Bibliography 'Victoria'.

[4] Malleson, III, p. 390.

Marfat.com

## CHAPTER SIX

# G. W. FORREST, HOLMES, SAVARKAR, SEN, MAJUMDAR AND OTHERS

The three famous historians of the Indian Mutiny, Kaye, Malleson and Forrest, taken together, covered the entire course of the rising of 1857 in all its different manifestations. But none of them, indeed, offered any continuous and connected narrative of the mutiny-war with their observations from the beginning to the end. They wrote in parts, and so particular phases of the movement or periods of the war were omitted by one or the other. Thus Kaye could not complete his work, and Malleson and Forrest also dropped out many episodes and aspects of the movement. It would be necessary to identify the areas of the war and phases of the movement which have been left out or briefly touched upon by them. Malleson was not supposed to have dealt with the greased cartridges, the land settlement and other socio-economic factors which gave rise to the movement for they were so adequately covered by Kaye. Even Forrest does not enter into any elaborate discussion about the greased cartridges, their make-up, their distribution, the revised drill and many other problems connected with the subject. Secondly, neither Malleson nor Forrest attempted any comprehensive account of the insurrections and the military movements for the suppression of the mutiny in the Punjab, particularly in Peshwar, Lahore and all other places. This was perhaps due to the fact that Kaye completed a full history of the Punjab during this period in all its details. Thirdly, Kaye also gives a graphic description of the mutinies of the different places all over the North-West Provinces and in the neighbouring areas in the initial stages of the movement which may account for the omission of such accounts in the works of Malleson and also partly in Forrest. But it is not very clear why Forrest though equipped with the knowledge of state papers did not enter into any elaborate discussion about all these subjects as his work was not a continuation volume like that of Malleson. But he gives a very authoritative description in the light of original sources, of the rising at Allahabad and particularly of the



Marfat.com

movement at Cawnpore. His treatment of the Meerut episode was only marginal as compared to that of Kaye, and later writers added many more particulars about this great outbreak, which ushered in the revolt. But in other aspects, Forrest's account of the movement at Cawnpore was by far the most critical and comprehensive than that of Kaye and may be considered as equal to the later contributions made by other distinguished historians. Malleson drops out the Cawnpore episode altogether presumably because it was covered by Kaye. But on Delhi, both Kaye and Forrest were very exhaustive and comprehensive, and in fact on Anson and on the subsequent actions of the siege-army of Delhi and the whole course of the war the treatment of Kaye and Forrest was decidedly the best that could be expected in the historiography of the Mutiny but none of them dealt with the trial of the king, and the state of affairs after the fall of the city which were described to some extent by Malleson who took up the story of the siege of Delhi from 14 September 1857. But he also was silent about the plunder and sack of Delhi. There is, however, some similarity in the selection of topics in the works of Forrest and Malleson. The various phases of the mutiny-war in the Deccan, in Eastern India, in the North-West Provinces after the fall of Lucknow, and the Terai campaigns in particular, and also accounts of the risings of Rajputana are discussed by both of them. A special feature of Malleson's work was that though he was not expected to deal with the movements of Eastern India and the affairs of the Supreme government at Calcutta which were dealt with by Kaye, he occupied himself fully with these subjects and gave much more detailed information on the Calcutta government and on the risings at Patna, Dinapur, Arrah and Chotonagpur. Forrest also furnished accounts of the risings in all these places[1] but they lacked in fulness of details though on the war of the people of Shahabad he was very exhaustive in recording the incidents of the struggle and gave a vivid description of the suppression of this prolonged jungle war at Jagadishpur.

However, on one particular episode, all the three historians, Kaye,

[1] The defence of the Arrah house by that daring garrison directed by Wake and Boyle has been characterised by Forrest 'as a noble exploit shining on a by-path of history of the Indian Mutiny' (Forrest, *History*, III, Intro, pp. ix, 432, 436).

Marfat.com

Malleson and Forrest offered the best possible account of the situation. On Oudh and Henry Lawrence, the battle of Chinhat, the siege of the Residency of Lucknow and on the first relief on 25 September, all the three historians described the situation in a way which show a combination of a mastery of details with a large and critical view of the impending crisis. While Kaye and Forrest made an excellent treatment of the materials at their disposal and gave a graphic description of the plight of Henry Lawrence, Malleson paid no attention to Gubbins-Lawrence issue but rendered an account of the military aspect of the fighting that now ensued. Forrest's account of the Residency during this period in the light of some original sources was highly valuable. Between Malleson and Forrest, who dominated the field after the death of Kaye, it is difficult to distinguish the areas of the war covered by them as both dwelt with the same topics and concentrated on military actions. But while Forrest deals at length with the careers of the British officers, Malleson elaborated on the strategical and tactical aspects of British actions in the Sepoy War. As between the two, the treatment of Forrest was critical and research-oriented and free from racial and other biases. He was at his best in describing the operations of Havelock, Sir Colin Campbell, and particularly the spectacular campaigns of Sir Hugh Rose. The third volume of Forrest's history of the Indian Mutiny is acclaimed to be the most readable volume for its breadth and comprehensiveness which gives a stimulating account of the operations of the Central India Field Force. Malleson's account of the campaigns of Sir Hugh Rose including his encounters with the leaders of Central India, the great wars at Jhansi, Kalpi, and at Gwalior with the rani of Jhansi which are discussed from military aspects, are the most original contributions of Malleson to mutiny studies[1].

G. W. Forrest, son of Lieutenant Forrest was the Director of Records, Government of India. Lieutenant Forrest was one of those who were assisting lieutenant Willoughby at the time of the explosion of the Delhi magazine on 11 May 1857. Lieutenant Forrest was asked to report on this magnificent exploit. G. W. Forrest, son of lieutenant Forrest, obviously shared the legacy of those hectic days.

[1] See also *Supra*, p. 129.

Marfat.com

The son dedicated the first volume of his work to the sacred memory of his father, captain George Forrest, V. C. one of those gallant nine who defended the Delhi Magazine. While dealing with this great event Forrest gives a vivid description of the danger to which his father, Buckley and others were exposed. They continued to load and fire the guns in rapid succession. The historian puts the episode in a sharper focus : 'those Nine Englishmen had earned a more lofty estimate for themselves than those three hundred Spartans who sat in the pass of Thermopylae'[1]. To Forrest, the Indian Mutiny was not a mere ordinary incident of Anglo-Indian History but an event of great intellectual and emotional sequence, a noble epic 'which speaks to every Englishman wherever he may be, and calls up past and glorious memories.'[2]

It has been stated that Forrest does not enter into any critical discussions about the greased cartridges and other events leading to the outbreak. But he admitted like Hedayet Ali that the Bengal Sepoy at Dum Dum had substantial grounds for believing that improper fat had been used in their manufacture.[3] Even so, he refers to some statements which would support the contention maintained by some in the Supreme government that there was not much to worry about the political situation. He refers to the report of John Lawrence to Canning after his visit to the rifle depot at Sialkot. 'All were highly pleased with the new musket and quite ready to adopt it'. It is surprising that Forrest makes no comment on the statement which certainly did not reflect the actual position on his own showing about the general sense of discontent and frustration which persisted on the eve of the Mutiny about the cartridges and fables of bone dust. On the contrary, he introduces general Barnard of Sirhind and general J. R. Hearsey of Barrackpore as holding the same view and sending a favourable report about the behaviour of the troops to Canning.[4] This was misleading in the extreme as those faulty observations would have made Canning still more complacent, but Forrest makes no

1 Forrest, *History*, I, p. 16.
2 Ibid. I. Preface, pp. vii-ix.
3 Forrest, *Selections*, I, pp. 64-67 ; *History*, I, p. 412.
4 Forrest, *History*, I, pp. 28-29.

Marfat.com

attempt to resolve the issues. While Malleson exposed the 'Jaunty confidence' of the administration of Cecil Beadon,[1] Forrest wrote that during the month of April and the early part of May, no military or civil officer, however conversant he was with the country and the people, could have suspected that the revolt of the Bengal army was in the offing. Accordingly, it would appear that the incident of 23 April 1857 at Meerut when the men of the 3rd Light Cavalry refused to receive their cartridges, also went unheeded. And if things were so tranquil even up to 6 May what happened in the interval that on 10 May fanaticism, bigotry, and discontent 'blazed out', as Forrest himself writes, and 'flames of consuming fire swept over the land[2].

An idea about the phases of the movement covered by Forrest has been indicated ; it will not be possible to discuss all the issues he raised excepting some special controversial points which were not discussed in the works of either Kaye or Malleson. In the final assault on Delhi, Nicholson headed the first column. The generally accepted view that he was the first to ascend and reach the breach as stated or implied by major-general A. Wilson, captain W. Brookes of the 15th regiment and Cave-Browne, is at variance with the opinion of field-marshal Sir Henry Norman who was convinced that Nicholson was not in a position of being the first to assault the breach. 'It would be contrary to all usage for a general to lead the stormers. Had he done so, he would certainly have been killed'. Forrest's reading of the state papers does not show that Nicholson had not placed himself at the head of the 1st Fusilier but this is very different from what was said that Nicholson was the first to escalade the left face of the Cashmere Bastion which is not even half so explicit in the bare statement of Wilson that Nicholson led his column to assault[3]. Kaye refers to colonel Sir Edward Greathed who commanded the Eighth under major-general Jones. Greathed in a letter to Jones pointed out the mistake in Wilson's Delhi despatch. He says that as he was close to Jones from the time they got to the top of the breach together he was perfectly aware that the clearing of the walls, ramparts

[1] *Supra*, p. 115.
[2] Forrest, *History*, III, Intro. pp. xxxii, 303.
[3] Forrest, *Selections*, I, p. 400 ; *History*, I, pp. 136-7.

Marfat.com

and bastions was performed solely under his orders and that Nicholson did not join them until some time after, at the Kabul gate, when the work had been accomplished[1].

According to the historian, the great siege of Delhi was one of the most memorable in the annals of England. Like Malleson, Forrest showers praise on English soldiers, their steady discipline and stern resolve. He affirms that the effective force at Delhi never amounted to 10,000 men. Malleson also calculated that the total strength of the British force numbered less than ten thousand men[2]. In his account of Oudh, the historian introduces the main characters of the episode, Outram, Coverly Jackson, Henry Lawrence and Gubbins and gives a short description of the revenue system, which is not very analytical. On Henry Lawrence he writes with a kind of infectious sensitiveness but not farfetched and attempts to vindicate his policy. Military historians point their accusing finger to Henry Lawrence as one responsible for Chinhat, the grievous instance of an administrator getting lost in a military debacle. Forrest's reading of the diaries of Fayrer and Fulton does not help him to throw any further light. He only comments that direct evidence of a trustworthy nature regarding Chinhat is difficult to get[3].

About Henry Lawrence the description is much the same as in other books but Forrest adds something new which deserves attention. Henry Lawrence was in Dr. Fayrer's house in the last days of his life. In his manuscript diary which Forrest used he states that he had many dialogues with his ailing patient mostly on the causes of the Mutiny and every time Sir Henry kept on emphasizing that it was the John Lawrences, Thomasons and Edmonstones who brought India to this trouble in which they were then involved. Joseph Fayrer heard this distinctly. Henry Lawrence also spoke of the injudicious method in which the native landholders had been dealt with and in fact he was known for these views which are confirmed by his dying utterances. Forrest's description of the death of Henry Lawrence is suggestive of pathos and serenity of the

[1] Kaye, III p. 595.
[2] Malleson, II, pp. 9-10 ; Forrest, *History*, I, p. 150. 154.
[3] Forrest, *History*, I, pp. 229, 232-33.

Marfat.com

situation evocating Angelic presence on death bed[1]. However, like Malleson, Forrest also narrates the Havelock phase of the War in the reverse order. The narrative of the first relief of Lucknow is followed by a flashback to Havelock at Allahabad ready to take the offensive against Cawnpore. But the historian cuts across many other matters before he takes up the thread of Havelock's campaigns. Havelock is introduced with all the aura of the famous European generals, Alexander, Caesar, Marlborough, Frederick, Wellington and Napoleon whom he studied. But basically Havelock was made of a different stuff ; he professed to fear God and honour the Queen, to be a saint and soldier at once, approaching not very remotely the examples of Gardiner, Cromwell and Gustovas Adolphus[2].

His treatment of the Cawnpore affair is a remarkable contribution to mutiny studies. He takes the level of investigation and approach to a stage higher than that attempted by previous writers. Suppression of the Mutiny at Benares and Allahabad are also graphically described. At Benares, according to the historian, Neill and Olpherts saved the situation at the time of disarming of the 37th regiment, when the Sikhs apprehensive of treachery began to fire at their officers. There is a controversy about the mutiny of Benares but Forrest quotes general D. T. Dodgson who was present. According to the general, Olpherts did not open fire on the Ludhiana regiment until the Sikhs had fired on the British infantry. At Allahabad when the mutiny broke out on 6 June, the 400 Sikhs, about whose attitude gravest apprehension was felt, remained staunch under the spell of captain Brasyer, a man whose rare qualities attracted the admiration and confidence of all. The story of Arthur Cheek, a lad of sixteen, fresh from England, who was a tragic casualty of the mutiny of Allahabad was very much lamented by all British writers. Forrest writes, 'At that time all England rang with the story. Of all the most glorious actions which make the Indian Mutiny the epic of our race none better deserves a place in its annals'. He, however, had nothing to say about the atrocities committed by Neill and his troops in restoring order at Allahabad. Neither does he say anything about major Renaud's

[1] Forrest, *History*, I, pp. 261-62.
[2] Forrest, *History*, II, pp. 326-7, 338.



Marfat.com

infamous march ahead of Havelock's troops. On the contrary, Renaud is praised as a 'jealous daring general whose courage and fortitude were proverbial'. Havelock arrived at Allahabad on 30 June and started for Cawnpore on 7 July. The narrative is made on the basis of Lord North's Journal which bore testimony to the indomitable energy of the British force who rose superior to every trial and uttered no complaint.[1] On 16 July Havelock and his men marched 16 miles to Maharajpur. Nana Saheb had chosen a formidable position some seven miles from Cawnpore. His left was covered by the Ganges, on the right lay the railway embankment. The historian says that the scene was magnificent, banners were flying, bugles sounding, drums beating. Nana's army is computed at ten thousand highly trained men, but later works put it at 5,000 men.[2] Another statement of Forrest is significant. He says that at the battle at Cawnpore, Havelock, who was a student of the great Frederick's campaign, was determined to pursue the tactics adopted by 'Old Frederick at Leuthen.'[3] But strangely enough, Malleson, who left out this part of Havelock's campaign in his book, represents that Havelock's action at the battle of Unao on 29 July was similar to the tactics adopted by old Frederick at the battle of Leuthen whom he suddenly recollected.[4] It was Kaye who first drew the parallel that Havelock remembering old Frederick at Leuthen debouched to the right and advanced in open column against the enemy's left flank at the battle of Cawnpore.[5] However, Forrest gives a good description of the battle of Cawnpore in all its details[6].

Havelock's brush with Neill has not been discussed in the style of Malleson nor does Forrest find anything of a gross breach of military rule in the appointment of major-general Sir J. Outram to the military command of the country. He writes that it was no supersession, for Havelock did never hold the command of the Cawnpore division. His rank did not entitle him to command a division, he was only the

[1] Forrest, *History*, I, pp 356-83.
[2] M. Edwardes, *Battles of the Indian Mutiny*, p. 77.
[3] Forrest, *History*, I, p. 385.
[4] Malleson, I, pp. 493-94. Also *Supra*, p. 120.
[5] Kaye, II, 375.
[6] Forrest, *History*, I, pp. 385-93.

Marfat.com

brigadier-general commanding a field force. Outram was welcomed as Godsend by Canning and official correspondence of that period pronounced his eulogy, the 'Bayard of the East', of whom it was said that a 'fox is a fool and the Lion a coward by the side of Outram'. Outram's offer to serve as a volunteer under Havelock elicited high praise from Canning and from his biographer Goldsmid who characterised it as a deliberate act of self-sacrifice. Minute details of military operations leading to the relief of Lucknow have been recorded. The historian uses the word 'relief' and not merely 'reinforced' as Malleson harps. His heart-felt sympathy for the three sepoys, who were mistaken for rebels in the excitements of the movement at the Bailey Guard and bayoneted as such, was highly humane. 'It is all for a cause', said one to his comrades while life ebbed away. For the narrative of Campbell's operation at Lucknow, Forrest has taken the help of many works previously published, but he does not offer any account of the scene intervening between one episode and another.

The assault of Secundrabagh during the operation of Sir Colin Campbell is another interesting issue. Forrest makes no reference to Sir Colin's statement that it was a Sikh who made the first assault, the main point of dispute. Malleson clearly states[1] that the Sikh was followed by two Highlanders, Cooper and Ewart who were the first to jump through the narrow hole. The stormers who followed might be a mixed body of Sikhs and Europeans. In that way what Forrest says that it was a gallant race between the Highlanders and the Sikhs was true, which indeed is the version of all the many authorities he quotes. But the statement of lieutenant-colonel W. Gordon-Alexander of the 93rd Highlander that there was no question of any Punjabi having entered the breach points to the implausibility of the action at Secundrabagh. As they could not venture to argue that question with His Excellency the commander-in-chief, his statement that a Sikh made the first assault remained uncontradicted.[2] Malleson, it may be remembered, actually stated that it was a Sikh who made the first attempt but he fell dead. The resolve of the commander-in-chief for extricating the garrison at Lucknow arose from various

[1] Supra p. 124.
[2] Forrest, *History*, II, p. 147.

Marfat.com

military reasons also as Sir Colin had no doubt that the position taken up by Henry Lawrence was a false one, a view which was acknowledged by Sir Hope Grant and others. Forrest quotes field-marshal Lord Roberts as saying that the chief was right,[1] but previously the historian represented Roberts as stating : 'It was out of the question retiring from Lucknow. Had it been attempted not a soul would have survived'[2]. However, his description of the abandonment of the Residency leaves an emotional edge. The removal of the garrison consisting of 4,000 men was a skilful movement which merited every praise.

A very striking feature of Forrest's history of the Mutiny is that he begins by composing an account of the career and activities of the British officers engaged in the conflict which became almost a ritual with him. The defect of this banal system was reflected in his account of the third relief of Lucknow so much that the historian did not mention about the route taken up by Campbell which was the basic factor behind the success of the final relief. The points of strategy and skill, of deployment and manoeuvres of the war have not come within his purview but he has not faulted to defend Hodson against the charge of looting at the time of his death. The points he adds to the narrative of Malleson on the operations of Lucknow are not many. He begins by counting the actual strength of the British army, the largest and most effective army that had ever assembled in India but the figure of the total strength of the army recorded by him differs from that of Malleson who stated that the total strength of the force at the disposal of the Sir Colin inclusive of the division under Outram amounted to twenty thousand men and 180 guns. Forrest computed the effective strength of the army nearly to twenty-five thousand, six hundred and 64 man with 164 pieces of artillery exclusive of Jung Bahadur's force of eight thousand men.[3] But appropriately enough, the historian also did not fail to record that on the Indian side the aggregate of hostile force in Lucknow on 26 January 1858 was not less than 120,000 men of all arms, the armed forces of the talukdars amounting at the lowest calculation to 20,000 men.[4] He also gives a graphic

1 Forrest, *History*, II, pp. 169-70.
2 Forrest, *History*, I, pp. 189-90.
3 Malleson, II, pp. 364 ; Forrest, *History*, II, p. 317.
4 Forrest, *History*, II, p. 273.

Marfat.com

description of the sack of Kaiserbagh by quoting from Gubbins and by a reference to Russell's description of the wealth and grandeur of the palace which was nearly equal to that of Tuileries, Louvre, Versailles, Scutari and the Winter palace all blended together.

The third volume of Forrest's 'Indian Mutiny' which covers the far-flung operations of Sir Hugh Rose's famous Central India Field Force is a gem of historical composition, very readable with a simple and lucid style and imaginative sympathy. Here the original sources and state papers have not eclipsed the human involvements of the struggle but plenty of fresh air is inducted to relieve the congestion of historical contortions. The reader is taken across a distance of one thousand miles from the confines of Western India to the waters of the Jumna across dense jungles and rugged plateaux. The vast panorama of peninsular India was opened up with all its mediaeval glory which the historian has treated with a kind of sympathetic proneness to the heroic age of India. Here the Mutiny took a grim and stern course, and not a mere accumulation of emotional fury, a compact mass of stubborn struggles fought at depth on both sides for attacking or defending impregnable fortresses, impenetrable gateways, intricate battlemented walls, banquettes and extensive embrasures. From the siege of the Fort of Dhar on 27 October 1857 to the fall of Gwalior on 19 June it was a thrilling episode of heroic exertions displayed on both sides for retention or conquest of those citadels of India's power. The continental character of the Mutiny and the intensity of the struggle nowhere came into sharper focus than in the campaigns of Sir Hugh Rose and his redoubtable Central India Field Force. The storming of Garhakota, Chanderi, Jhansi, Kalpi, Gwalior redolent of the patriotic valour of the Indians and the ruthless determination of the British, constitute a chapter of Indian history to which there was hardly any near resemblance. 'The whole chapter reads like an episode of mediaeval fantasy played in a far off age of castles and forts'.

Forrest does not agree with Sir Hugh Rose's estimate of the rani of Jhansi who said that she was the bravest and best military leader of the rebels. He very much resented that some thought of the rani as Indian 'Joan of Arc'. This, he considers, is a 'libel' on the fair name of the Maid of Orleans. He comments, 'the rani of Jhansi was an

Marfat.com

ardent, daring, licentious woman' and though appropriate regard should be paid to her memory, she cannot be absolved from the responsibility of the massacre of the Europeans at Jhansi. In the third volume the historian deals with all other matters relating to the last phase of the struggle, such as, the Oudh Proclamation, the war of the talukdars, the struggle at Jagadishpur, the Terai campaigns, all of which are more or less similar to Malleson's treatment of these topics. He concludes his great work by a reference to Tatya Tope's flight and his eventual execution on 18 April 1859. He writes, 'on 27th June 1857 at Satichauraghat, Cawnpore, Tatya massacred the Europeans. The cries of the slaughtered women and children were in Thy book recorded'[1]. The historian could have made himself less extravagant in point of spirited retribution. He must have seen that to Malleson the game played by the British in apprehending Tatya was 'foul'. Long before him, Charles Ball while dealing with Tatya's fate reminded the readers of the double treachery played by Robert Clive in founding England's empire in India. This trait of English character, in Colonial matters, it appears, had not disappeared down to 1858.

Sir George Forrest's 'History of the Indian Mutiny' is a very large book which produced in easier sequence[2] what Kaye and Malleson have written without the aid of 'State Papers'. The voluminous state papers on which the three-volume history of the Indian Mutiny was based furnish not many new facets ; he deals with his subject in much the same style as books by other British writers. Forrest's work is a purely external narrative essentially limited to accounts of the various military campaigns. The constitutional, economic, intellectual and social elements are almost wholly neglected. The historian adds little to the interpretation of events and excepting on Cawnpore, Delhi and some other episodes, he has nothing to say about the popular character of the Uprising. Many also complained that his work was too official. Like other historians of the Indian Mutiny he was chary of paying attention to the rank and file of the Indians in arms, their leaders, their plans of attack

[1] Forrest, *History*, III, p. 568.

[2] Mac Munn says that Forrest merely follows the line of the earlier two, Kaye and Malleson (Mac Munn, Introduction).

Marfat.com

and movements. The people as a whole are designated either as enemies or rebels, so much so, that in some accounts except for the occasional references to place-names it would have been hard to realise that the war was against Indians in the land of India. But documentary study of the Mutiny was for the first time seriously undertaken by Forrest. Hence the merit of his work stands conspicuous. It is written with a mastery of the sources that no historian has ever approached and is perhaps the most 'adequate' of the British histories on the Mutiny[1]. Written fifty years after the Mutiny, Forrest's work also tends to be less partisan and does not reflect any violent racial temper even in the description of provocative scenes or in the sketches of conflicts and confrontations. The excesses committed by both the belligerents do not loom large in his book. The spirit of revenge has not tainted his writings and only occasionally he could not restrain his feelings.

As already stated Kaye could not complete his work. Malleson's emphasis was on the military aspect of the movement and Forrest made his work a biography of mutiny veterans. There was thus a clear need for a one-volume history of the origin, course and results of the Mutiny, complete in itself, and superior to other works in points of comprehensiveness and critical analysis of the controversial points of the 1857 uprising.[2] This was attempted by Rice Holmes in his 'A History of the Indian Mutiny', the latest edition of which appeared in 1913, a year after the publication of the revised edition of Forrest's three-volume 'History of the Indian Mutiny'. Holmes 'aimed at completing the solution of the real historical problems connected with the Mutiny' and further added that his object was not to write a short history or a popular history so much as to write the 'best history' as far as it was possible to do. He acknowledged that but for Kaye and Malleson he would not have been able to find his way through the tangled mass and maze of details but he enlists the authorities on which his book was based[3] which show that he covered a wide range of public records and papers in his investigations. He found the

1 Ladendorf, p. 4.
2 Ladendorf, Preface, p. 4 (Introduction by Thomas Metcalfe).
3 Holmes, pp. 632-34 (Appendix).

Marfat.com

*Enclosures to Secret Letters* highly valuable and so also the *Calcutta Gazette* and the *Annals of the Indian Rebellion* and articles notably in the *Blackwood's Magazine* and in the *Calcutta Review*. Of the published works there were not many which he did not consult and in particular he drew heavily from colonel Vibart's 'Richard Baird Smith' and colonel Bosworth Smith's 'Life of Lord Lawrence'. He also made a critical use of the Indian sources.

Holmes' historical narrative is admirable, terse, vigorous and accurate. It is analytical in approach, includes much interpretation and concentrates on controversial points. British historiography on the Indian Mutiny seems to have had a promiscuous trend. Writers wrote independently and in disregard of the methodology of historical studies. Views of the former writers which are usually examined by later writers is a process of objective studies. This is not very much in evidence in the whole mass of historical writings on the Mutiny; there is hardly any acknowledgement by writers of the opinions of the former writers on various aspects of the movement. It will be seen that even Kaye gives an impression that he was not aware of other writings in the field of his study? Of all the British historians Holmes alone studied the subject in a very critical way by appropriate references to all competent opinions and existing views on the many aspects of the Revolt[1]. In the Appendix to his book he takes up all the disputed points of mutiny studies for a free criticism with reference to relevant sources. His treatment of the case of Colvin, Hodson and of Gubbins and of other such topics is a distinct feature of his work. His factual analysis of the events at Meerut, Cawnpore and other such places is an innovation in the right direction for a better understanding of these problems. In a sense his book constituted an advance in the objective treatment of the Sepoy Mutiny. According to Vincent Smith the compact one-volume history of the Indian Mutiny by Rice Holmes is the best book on the subject.[2] One British historian, however, held the view that Holmes was capricious, garrulous and illogical, and often downright silly.[3] Such an impression

[1] Holmes, p. 213 fn. (An account of the Mutiny at Benares by a reference to the views of Martin and Kaye).

[2] V. Smith, *History of India*, p. 731.

[3] Edward Thompson, *The other side of the Medal.*

Marfat.com

can only originate from a limited knowledge of mutiny literature. On the question of greased cartridges Holmes was fully alive to the sensibilities of the sepoys and observed : 'Let Englishmen think whether they could have resisted the terrors of social ostracism and religious excommunication before they condemn the poor ignorant Asiatics'.[1] Regarding the responsibility of the rani of Jhansi in the massacres he showed the circumspective consideration of a historian.[2]

Yet the merits of the book are perhaps a little below its reputation, it is not 'splendidly impartial'. Holmes is scarcely stronger in judgment than in research. His views, in most cases, are one sided when the British case appeared to be lost, as in the case of cow's fat in the tallow for the grease of the rifle, in his reference to the splendid achievement of Cooper in the second Black Hole at Ujinala,[3] and in showing the same attitude towards Neill who inaugurated a reign of terror. Holmes says that Neill achieved more extraordinary results in the course of the Indian Mutiny than it was possible for any individual at any epoch of history. To the historian, apparently, this was a strong justification, and he would not hesitate to say that Neill was not wrong in issuing the instructions to Havelock to which he took exception.[4] Again on the question of civil rebellion in the Indian Mutinies, British historians, in general, have tended to ignore it and Holmes was not an exception. He compared the activities of the people in rebellion to the condition which would arise in London if the police go out of duty. In the concluding portion of his book he has been obdurately partisan in his approach to this question,[5] very much unlike the standard of scholarship maintained by him in all other important discussions in his work. His theory on the behaviour of the talukdars of Oudh, an aspect of the same question, has been found to be untenable.[6] However, it is altogether a new experience to land in Holmes' 'History of the Indian Mutiny' after passing through the maze of Malleson-Forrest combine of thousands of pages full of the

1 Holmes, p. 95.
2 Ibid, p. 493.
3 Ibid. p. 363.
4 Holmes, p. 295.
5 Ibid, p. 560.
6 Chaudhuri, *Theories* etc. ; pp. 91 ff.

Marfat.com

din and bustle of the avenging army in action. The style of the book also adds popularity to the work of Holmes.

It will thus appear that even up to the first decade of the present century, British historiography on the Indian Mutiny could not be free from a 'partisan spirit'. The historians of the Mutiny seem to have disregarded England's great heritage of respectful sympathy for the nations struggling for constitutional freedom and political accommodation. This invited a challenge from India. All the assumptions and prejudices of the British writers were for the first time questioned by Vinayak Damodar Savarkar in his book, 'History of the War of Independence' the object of which was to 'inspire his people with burning desire to rise again and wage a second and a successful war to liberate their motherland'[1]. If the purpose of history is to stir a nation to action Vinayak Damodar Savarkar was a historian. The spirit of historical studies on the Indian Mutiny deflected from the proper course of its evolution by the imperialists of British School began to be critical of other aspects of the question. Savarkar was the product of an age when Indian politics under the aegis of the Indian National Congress was impregnated with nationalist ideas and political extremism. Overthrow of an alien government by an appeal to violence appeared to him to be quite possible and so in the backdrop of the mutiny-war of 1857, and as a sequel to it, he portrayed the Sepoy Revolt as the nearest approximation to an Indian war of independence to inspire the people to armed revolt. From a historical point of view the book is exposed to the criticism that the author started with a preconceived theory based on evidence selectively used and ignored inconvenient facts. Like other English writers he also made too much of the *chapatis* and *lotuses* which had not much of a significance. But these weak spots never really mattered. Savarkar's forceful language and the adroit selection of context against which statements by British writers were intelligently inserted rendered his thesis fairly convincing. Few book had a more far-reaching influence

[1] Embree says that Savarkar's book was printed in Holland and was immediately proscribed by the British authorities ( p. 39 ). But Mac Munn states that after its confiscation it was printed in Paris and appeared on the Indian book stalls, wrapped in a cover labelled 'Random papers of the Pickwick Club'. Mac Munn, *The Indian Mutiny* etc. Intro. p X.

Marfat.com

on historical outlook of the uprising of 1857 than the work of Savarkar. A book, dynamic and truly national, it rang with a noble indignation against the alien rulers. No writer has done so much to point to the plausibility of the revolt of 1857 being regarded as a movement expressing desires for freedom and few have done so much to leave a legacy of noble ideas which inspired the national struggle for freedom of India. Savarkar's 'History of the War of Independence' is an epoch in Indian historiography and though oriented by subjective sentiments it was least harmful. We read what Savarkar said not as the sentence of a judge but as a theme worthy of itself, a revelation, a yearning that was wishful. The *Indian War of Independence* proved to be a turning point in the historiography of the Mutiny as a whole. The field of study so long dominated by British writers began to change hands ; after Forrest and Holmes very few works of a similar standard appeared from British sources. Savarkar's work (1909) was currently contemporaneous with the works of Forrest (1912) and that of Holmes, the latest edition of whose book appeared in 1913. The First World War and its impact on the Indian scene seem to have made the British historians chary of writing on the Mutiny and in fact excepting Thompson, Gimlete and Mac Munn, hardly any book, narrative or critical, appeared in the decades preceding the centenary year of the Mutiny.

Mutiny studies progressed with the advent of the independence of India. A number of works on the great Indian Mutiny under a variety of titles by the celebrated historians of the country appeared around the fifties of the present century. Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, the then Minister for Education of the Government of India, in his 'Introduction' to S. N. Sen's 'Eighteen Fifty-Seven' describes the position with such intimate touches as none else could. He writes : 'The events we are to study are already a hundred years old. The poignancy which attached to them when they were fresh has been largely lost. We can look on the hates and strifes of the actors with the detachment born out of distance in time. In addition, the incentive to make political capital out of these far-off events is gone. The political problem between India and Britain has been resolved...and the bitterness which characterised Indo-British relations in the past is no more ; the atmosphere today is such that the events of 1857 can be

Marfat.com

studied dispassionately and objectively and without seeking to condemn or condone the faults of either party to the struggle'[1].

By and large, books produced with the advent of independence and in the post-independence period were sophisticated research works which gave a new elevation to mutiny historiography. Undoubtedly, many patriotic studies with extreme nationalistic view-points as well as works which substituted ideologies for historical accuracy also appeared, but Richard Collier, the author of the *Sound of Fury* (1963), one of the latest to write on the Sepoy War assessed : 'Three Indian Scholars, Dr. Surendra Nath Sen, Dr. R. C. Majumdar and Dr. S. B. Chaudhuri have in recent years added much needed fundamental research and shrewd interpretation to the earlier synoptic accounts of Forrest, Kaye, and Malleson and Thomas Rice Holmes'[2]. Of these S. N. Sen's 'Eighteen Fifty-Seven', published on 10 May 1957, exactly after a century of the revolt, was an official publication of the government of India, but it was not in any sense, as the author urged, an 'authorised version'. A very illuminating 'Foreword' by Maulana Azad in which he maintains an excellent balance on the controversy of this great struggle reflects the standard of Indian historiography on the Mutiny. He doubts if the revolt of the Indian Army can be regarded as the 'result of the nationalist sentiments alone for medievalism as an active force and religious passion was no substitute for patriotism'. It was the desire of Moulana Azad that S. N. Sen who had been commissioned to undertake the heavy task should write from the standpoint of a true historian and offer an objective account of the Mutiny.

The single one-volume history of the Mutiny, 'Eighteen Fifty-Seven' by S. N. Sen was in many sense a remarkable work. It is perhaps the closest Indian counterpart of Rice Holmes' work on the same subject but unlike Holmes, Sen does not enter into minute investigation and scrutiny of the many controversial issues which made the book of the British historian so scholarly. What he offers is an excellent narrative of the Mutiny from the beginning to the end rendered highly readable by the style of his treatment and his characteristic critical approach. Sen was severely stiff about the sources

[1] Sen, *Eighteen Fifty-Seven*, Foreword, p. *vii*.
[2] Collier, *Sound of Fury*, Intro.

Marfat.com

he utilised, almost puritanic on this point. Thus in regard to the Cawnpore phase of the Mutiny, while Kaye found the depositions taken by major G. W. Williams absolutelydependable, Sen was not impressed as he considered them to be depositions of 'men who felt the rope round their neck'. He also refers to Forrest who expressed doubts about this 'hearsay evidence' of people who acted from the fear of British vengeance but he ignored the fact that Forrest himself made extensive use of the 'Depositions' in showing Nana's complicity in the massacres at Cawnpore. Still Sen would not accept the 'Depositions'. He cavils at Sir George Trevelyan and Rice Holmes who did not feel inclined to examine the evidence, he enters a caveat against the implicit faith of the historians in Nanakchand's 'Journal'. He finds Mowbray Thomson more reliable than Shepherd for the latter was a mere clerk and had not much access to information and accuses Fitchett for making a false statement, though he was almost an eye-witness to the slaughter at Bibighar and presented the most consistent version which Kaye was also inclined to accept as authentic.

Sen's chapter on Jhansi is exhaustive on the narrative side of the history of the revolt. He gives a full account of all the involvements of the rani with the sepoys, the British, and the neighbouring powers. Her movement at Kalpi and her brilliant encounters in Gwalior and in other fields are also very impressibly suggested. The historian unfolds the various stages of her career in the most objective process without any premeditated plan of showing her weakness as a national leader to which she never aspired. On the contrary, the historian was convinced that there was nothing clandestine in all her activities. It is only in the interest of her country and her people that she subscribed to the rebel military chest, took up the responsibilities of administration and invited the government to send troops to maintain law and order[1] and even assured the government, as Pinkney says that she was holding Jhansi as a trust. Erskine instructed the rani to 'collect revenue to raise the price and to do everyting in her power to restore order'. Sen points to many such temporary transfers of power which took place during this time. Her government was recognised by the constituted authorities, but there were various other critical phases

[1] Sen. pp. 278 ff.

Marfat.com

of British policy towards the rani which have not been made clear in 'Eighteen Fifty-Seven.'[1]

Sen's description of many episodes of the Mutiny is graphic. Sack of Lucknow is described by the mutiny historians in general after Russell, but none had tried so far to show, as he had done, that the notes of lieutenant-colonel Gordon-Alexander, Forbes-Mitchell and of lieutenant Majendie may be nicely blended to complete a tale so painfully vivid. He also throws light on the activities of the rebel leaders in the last phase of the struggle, of Firuz Shah and others which has not been featured by other historians excepting Martin. A very refereshing feature of the historian's style of writing is the way he takes a trudge round the suburbs of his subject and makes a close examination of the environment in the most unconventional way. On the fateful morning of 11 May 1857 when the Meerut mutineers were crossing over the Jumna to Delhi, the city was still unaware of the outbreak at Meerut. Sen writes : 'In the summer, the local college met early in the morning and Professor Ramchandra had gone there, not knowing what the day had in store for him. Munshi Mohanlal, the famous explorer, was leisurely conversing with an English friend. Papers had arrived from Calcutta the day before. Kashi Prasad, the Jhajjar Nawab's agent, went out for his usual morning ride and found nothing unusual to warn him of the impending troubles. Munshi Jivanlal had paid a visit to captain Douglas in the palace with a copy of his diary, and after returning home, had ordered his *palki* for going to the court. Mainuddin Hasan, the officer-in-charge of Paharganj Police Station, was already in collector's court in connection with a criminal case. Simon Fraser, the commissioner, was still in bed. Suddenly an alarm spread that horsemen from Meerut were at the city gates'.[2] This is not a mere scholastic panache but an evidence of the author's complete identification with the actual Indian scene.

It had been noticed that the historian was allergic to the recognised sources on the Cawnpore rising. He had perhaps an idea of exculpating Nana Saheb. He accepts as true Tatya Tope's version that Nana

[1] See *infra*, p. 181 ff. for Dr. R.C. Majumdar's views.

[2] Sen, p. 70.

Marfat.com

was not a free agent but was compelled by the sepoys to join them, a statement that is not mentioned by many other Indian chroniclers writing on the subject. He disputes Nana's responsibility in the massacres at the Satichauraghat by raising all sorts of puerile questions as to who fired the first shot and when did the Carabineers open their fire etc., and introduces one John Long to show that Nana was not the author of this widely condemned treachery. He had his own ideas in other matters also. Sen had not been even half so eloquent in recording the performance of the Indian leaders, such as, Mehendi Hussain, Banda Hossain, Rao Sahib or even of the Fyzabad Maulavi and Kunwar Singh as he has been of their British counterparts. The sepoys were no match before the Highlanders but an impartial historian should have observed that at many battles, such as, Shahganj, Mandori Chanda, Sultanpur, Khajwa, Narnul, Amorah, Ruiyh, Nawabganj and at many other battles of the Mutiny they displayed qualities of their fighting powers which surprised many in the British ranks. The historian also does not refer to the 'Civil Disturbances' of the pre-Mutiny period which unfolds the history of unrest and distempers generated by British rule in India prior to 1857, against which the rising of that year could have been studied in its proper perspective. While R. C. Majumdar acknowledges the importance of these movements breaking out in widely separated periods of time and place as affording a clue to the understanding of the 1857 upsurge,[1] S. N. Sen makes no attempt to relate by skilful inter-weaving the social and economic disturbances of the pre-Mutiny period with accounts of civil rebellion of the mutiny-war. It may be presumed that the historian had the idea to bring under historical focus the military character of the movement only. His statement that there would not have been any movement at all in 1857 if the Meerut conflagration could have been localised only ignores the complex multiplicity of the earlier manifestations of the revolt at Berhampur, Barrackpore, Lucknow and Ambala.

Basically, Sen's 'Eighteen Fifty-Seven' is very much a continuation of the tradition of British historiography. We know a lot of doings of the English people fighting heroically against odds but the people

[1] See also K. K. Dutta, *A Survey of Recent Studies on Modern Indian History*, pp. 115-16.

Marfat.com

of India as a whole do not make their presence felt. He had no respect for the Indian fighters for he says that no moral issue was involved in the revolt. This may look somewhat strange that so many people sacrificed their lives without the promptings of a lofty ideal. He had no word of appreciation of the struggle of the talukdars and the little that he says of the war at Oudh and Shahabad appear to be only an attempt to close up the narrative according to a schedule. The moral of his work is the utter lack of political and economic viability of India. Quite a good portion of Sen's work is devoted to a description of the mournful stories of the European fugitives and also of other such topics as Havelock-Neill-Outram-episodes, Mrs Bartrum's widowhood, Angad's encounters, Kavanagh's exciting mission, the besieged at the Lucknow Residency, the nocturnal visits of supernatural elements at the Agra Fort and many more thrilling sidelights of the mutiny-war. More purposeful would have been to discuss the nature of the talukdari war. He also could have shown if the colonial policies of the British government created condition of economic servitude for the masses, for the sepoys actually belonged to various professional and economic groups in their home front and so the impact of these conditions might have tended to prolong the war even after the suppression of the Mutiny.

Some of the observations of Sen are found to be either contradictory or not properly developed in his book. He expands the idea that the English government had imperceptibly affected a social revolution. 'They had removed some of the disabilities...they had tried to establish the equality of man in the eye of the law, they had attempted to improve the lot of the peasant and serf. The mutiny leaders would have set the clock back, they would have done away with the new reform...and gone back to the good old days when a commoner could not expect equal justice...when tenants were at the mercy of the talukdars. In short, they wanted a counter-revolution'.[1] This anti-Indian theory of setting the clock back was not projected by Sen for the first time. Even Canning, as Kaye represents, wondered if the old man would not resent the intemperate zeal of the new in pushing their progressive ideas.[2] It is very striking, as already noticed,

[1] Sen, p. 412.
[2] Kaye, I, p. 617.

Marfat.com

that an American missionary was also very explicit on this point that if the movement had succeeded it would have thrown India back to the anarchy which followed Nadir Shah's invasion.[1] However, Sen's presumption about a counter-revolution which the leaders and people of the 1857 uprising were staging showed his innate disregard of India's capacity for any struggle of national importance. Joshi was disgusted to find that the Indian historians of the Mutiny should have thought in that way and only sniggered back that if we had such a faith in the 'social revolution' which the British introduced then we should have no reason in forcing the British rulers to quit India.[2]

Some of his other statements also suffered from a kind of infirmity. He considered that the Mutiny was inevitable as no dependent nation can for ever reconcile itself to foreign domination. But in the same page he suddenly breaks out without stating any reason that the Mutiny was not inevitable in 1857.[3] One wonders if the annexation of the Oudh in 1856 was not a factor sufficient by itself to provoke a rising as stated by hundreds of contemporary writers. This combined with the introduction of greased cartridges in the same year created a situation which possibly could not be contemplated for any other period. The historian accepts that in Oudh the revolt assumed a national dimension but he hastened to add that the conception of Indian nationality was yet in embryo.[4] But this is a vexed question and has been adequately dealt with by many.[5] In 1857 diverse factors operated in the growth of this feeling of national unity. People felt that they had something in common as against the Englishmen which accounted for all these risings. What Charles Ball thought, was widely accepted by other writers and even Sen gave pointed expression to the growth of a feeling of unity and political consciousness in the following words : 'What began as a fight for religion ended as a war of independence for there is not the slightest doubt that the rebels wanted to get rid of the alien government and restore the old order of which the king of Delhi was the rightful representative'.[6] In view of this categorical assertion about the character of the revolt, the theory of counter-revolution may not be considered to be a very viable propo-

1 *Supra*, p. 16.
2 Joshi, pp. 181 ff.
3 Sen, p. 417.
4 Ibid. 411.
5 Chaudhuri, *Theories*, p. 176.
6 Sen, p. 411.



Marfat.com

sition. The author's doubts and misgivings relating to social, religious and political issues were reflected in the concluding chapter. A discussion on all these issues was subsequently made in the work of Joshi and of some others. However, a very pleasant feature of the book is the lively sketches of men and things he inducts here and there. He moved with consummate ease across the vast tracts of the mutiny-war and though the ardent nationalist might lament the tranquillity of his approaches and neutrality of his outlook, his 'Eighteen Fifty-Seven' will stand out as a lasting contribution to the history of the Indian Mutiny.

The most outstanding book about the character and nature of the Indian Mutiny was Dr. R. C. Majumdar's 'Sepoy Mutiny and the Revolt of 1857' published a month previous to Sen's work. Regarded as 'one of the first really scholarly studies of the Mutiny'[1], the book is undoubtedly a great achievement of historical research. Many controversial episodes of the revolt, very much known to early British writers and referred to as such, mostly without any comment[2] have been focussed by Majumdar in the light of newly discovered authentic materials and interpreted with his wonted skill and objective flare. This helped him to reach identical conclusions about the Uprising already advanced by the British historians in general. Circumstances narrated in the 'Preface' of his book, his difference of opinion with the authorities at Delhi on the question of writing the history of the revolt independently of any preconceived theory and his eventual withdrawal provide the backdrop to his work. This may also account for the nature of the book which was not a narrative history of the revolt but a critical and objective study of the nature and character of the upsurge. But in discarding the 'pre-conceived theory' of the government it is doubtful if the historian was not opting for the opposite view quite unconsciously.

Majumdar is an opponent of the theory that the Sepoy Revolt was in any sense a national war of independence and the main object of his work, was to consider whether there is any reasonable ground for regarding it as such. In deciding that the Mutiny was a national

[1] Ladendorf, p. 15.
[2] Cf. Rotton, p. 214.

Marfat.com

war of independence the historian, he thinks, must imply that it was a premeditated revolt against foreign rule, that it commanded the support of the people at large. But according to him there is no authentic basis for these theories that there was an organised plot and that it was a war of independence. The historian contends that a national war of independence cannot mature or break out without a premeditated plan. But the Meerut conflagration which lighted the tinder box was just casual and accidental and yet very spontaneous and fearful in its intensity, once it broke out independent of any plot or understanding, though some would argue that a definite plan was there for a simultaneous rising on 31 May which was rendered infructuous by the premature rising at Meerut. The most important question according to Majumdar was whether those who led the people could lay any claim to national leadership and had the freedom of the country in mind. In this context, the part played by Bahadur Shah either for organising the Mutiny or contributing to its success or failure came in for consideration. The historian asserts that the King of Delhi was unfaithful to the cause of the revolt, but others may regard it as an overstatement for Bahadur Shah never made any claim for organizing the mutiny and from the beginning he made it clear that he had nothing to do with the mutineers. This is also clear from the evidence of Kashiprasad, Jivanlal and of Muir who recorded their impression that the first reaction of the king was one of surprise and he sincerely begged the mutineers to let him alone. At about twelve-o-clock on 11 May when the rebels put the king on the throne he pleaded his inability to function as he was a pensioner. The situation went out of control and the murder of the Europeans in the palace created such a revulsion of feeling that he was obliged to send a letter to the lieutenant-governor of Agra forwarding the intelligence as we know from Colvin's telegram to the governor-general dated 14 May that the town and fort of Delhi and his own person are in the hands of the insurgents. This was only a very natural reaction to the scene of rapine and bloodshed. The message which the king had sent was the least he could do to see that he was not misunderstood. But Majumdar makes a great ploy of the secret message and states that even while Bahadur Shah had accepted the throne of Delhi he was begging for help in the shape of 'European

Marfat.com

troops'. The historian possibly had not seen the original form of the message as preserved in Ball's history and also reproduced by J. Mackay in his book 'From London to Lucknow' published in 1860[1]. In both these source-books there is hardly a word about any request for any assistance of any sort from the British sources. He refers to the Hakim's statement at the 'Trial' which must have been a pure fabrication designed to improve his relationship with the English. The other more serious charge against Bahadur Shah was that he was secretly intriguing with the British generals offering to admit the British troops into the city even while the sepoys were shedding their blood for him. The story of Bahadur Shah's overtures was widely circulated by British historians and Majumdar was satisfied that the letter T. Reed wrote to the chief commissioner of the Punjab, Sir John Lawrence, contains the conclusive evidence that Bahadur Shah 'hailed as a leader of the First Indian War of Independence' betrayed the cause not only of the mutineers but also of the whole country. But it is a little astonishing that the historian who is so very circumspective on historical evidence should implicate Bahadur Shah in sordid negotiations with the English simply on the basis of Reed's letter which only contains the report of an irresponsible 'gomastha' who had no direct contact with the king. The gomastha, it is alleged, was informed of the intentions of the king through his agent, another tout, who also it is alleged waited on Hakim Ashanullah Khan and was told that the king was most desirous of making terms with the English. This kind of historical investigation may tend to imply that 'Sepoy Mutiny and Revolt of 1857' was written to bring into disrepute the leaders of the Revolt.

But there is more about Bahadur Shah which attracts attention. The whole affair was so secretive and deeply embedded in Parliamentary Papers that British historians in general also did not pursue the matter.[2] This is not the place to enter into an elaborate discussion on this point, but a reference may be made to what Charles Ball recorded about Earl Granville's statement in the British Parliament. Granville made a statement about negotiations being

1 Mackay, I, pp. 122, 132-3. *Supra*, p. 135.
2 Ball, II, pp. 639-40.

Marfat.com

carried on with the insurgents at Delhi by Sir John Lawrence, but as it was considered inadvertent to divulge the matter, the noble Earl presented a different version of the situation in the next session of the Parliament by representing that negotiations were not carried on with the insurgents but were proposed by the King of Delhi himself to general Reed. Granville's resilience only makes it too clear that his first statement was a statement of fact, the extremely precarious position of the British at the Ridge in June 1857, as admitted by Granville, prompted the ardent imperialist John Lawrence to come to terms with Bahadur Shah on promise of restitution of his status, territory and title if only that could have saved a chunk of the 'Empire' still left in their possession much in the same way, though from a different motive, he had negotiated with Dost Mahammad for surrender of Peshwar. The course of history, however, took a different turn but it is quite clear that there was a time when the British came very near to an acknowledgement of the position of the King of Delhi in all its form in which situation the presence of British troops in the city alleged to have been agreed to by Bahadur Shah would not have been anything more than a routine measure. In any case we have no reason to believe that overtures originated only from the Indian camp and that official versions of these clandestine transactions were not garbed or guarded to give the impression that the British were only at the receiving end of these feelers and not their originators. In fact, such proposals were so often floated by interested parties that it becomes difficult to identify the original part of a particular initiative and to find out whether any move was only a side-issue merely of an original proposal and not the original proposal itself. As we shall never know the links between the different types of intrigues, as the historian also writes, it is only fair to conclude that there is no clear and direct evidence to prove Bahadur Shah's involvement in any anti-revolt transactions of the time.

No part of Majumdar's book is more brilliant than the chapter on the rani of Jhansi which offers a contrast to the perfunctory nature of the treatment of the subject by both Kaye and Malleson and will remain unsurpassed as a standard of historical scholarship. Alike in the wealth of archival materials he consulted, and in the superb

Marfat.com

skill and craft shown in examining this vast mass of evidence, his study of the Jhansi episode will remain a monumental contribution to mutiny studies[1]. He does not attempt a narrative history of the mutiny at Jhansi but concentrates on a critical assessment of the position of the rani and the attitude of the British towards her. The main question to decide was whether the rani instigated the rising of the sepoys and was responsible for the massacre of the Europeans on 8 June 1857. On this question the biases of the British writers were strikingly in evidence and the historians and responsible British officers both had shown an unaccountable prejudice even when they had obtained perfect knowledge of facts by impartial enquiry. It is strange that so many books were written on the Mutiny but none pointed out so long how the British writers had substituted subjective elements for historical accuracy in their accounts of the Jhansi episode. Sober work on the Indian Mutiny started with Kaye but he also made some wrong statements. Thus he relies on captain Pinkney's report in stating that in the outbreak on 6 June the rani led the procession, but Majumdar found to his surprise that Pinkney never made a statement like this that the rani accompanied the procession. Secondly, Kaye's reference to the report of captain P.G. Scot that the rani was personally responsible for the murder of Scott and the two Purcells sent by captain Skene on 7 June to her to solicit assistance is also not based on convincing evidence. The sources of Scot's information were three 'natives' who made their depositions separately in three different places. Of these three, it is shown that one was a *khansamah*, the other was a Bengali clerk and the third man's name was not known, but none of them had the remotest opportunity of any access to sources close to the rani about this murder. Beside this their versions differed widely. It is not a little curious that almost all the writers of the history of the Mutiny including Kaye, Malleson and Holmes blindly accepted the report of Scot as the sole basis of their account.

It will be interesting to observe that Malleson who was supposed to have made changes in the work of Kaye made exactly the same statement like his predecessor in implicating the rani with the slaughter

[1] Majumdar, *Sepoy Mutiny*, pp. 137 ff.

Marfat.com

of the three envoys sent by captain Skene and also repeated the further charge made by Kaye that the rani secretly caused to be unearthed heavy guns which were used to reduce the fort in which the English took shelter. This statement had sinister implications as it represented the rani as much too willing to help the rebels but the other part of the transaction has been carefully suppressed. The fact is that the rani was forced to lend the guns to the sepoys under duress and actually she communicated this matter to W.C. Erskine. This only shows that Kaye made a discriminating use of Scot's report. But Kaye and Malleson also took no notice of another circumstance in favour of the rani, the statement of Mrs Mutlow who said, 'Mr. Gordon went to the ranee and got about fifty or sixty guns, and some powder and shot and balls, and she sent about fifty of her own sepoys in the fort to assist us'. This finds corroboration from another source also. It is surprising that Malleson does not refer to the famous letter of colonel T.A. Martin who was present at that time in Jhansi. The letter he addressed to Damodar Rao was revealing in the extreme. It runs : '.....On the contrary she supplied them with food for two days after they had gone into the fort, got one hundred matchlockmen from Kurrura, and sent them to assist us.'[1] The question of Kaye utilising the letter does not arise but Malleson should have seen it, if it was his idea to make any impartial enquiry.[2]

All such views have been examined by Majumdar. It appears that while Kaye expressed doubts about the rani's complicity in the massacre, Malleson did not question her involvement in the affair as she was profited by the 'slaughter of the Europeans'. As against this assumption the historian refers to three incontestable evidence proving the contrary. Captain Gordon's letter containing the first authentic information about the mutiny of the sepoy at Jhansi contains no reference about rani's hostile intention. Secondly, the evidence

1 Majumdar, op. cit. p. 145.

2 The letter was addressed to the adopted son of the rani, Damodar Rao from Agra dated 20 August 1889. Sen quotes the letter from Parasnis who claims to have seen the letter (p. 280). A Bengali historian Rajani Kanta Gupta reproduces the letter in full in his *Sipahi Yuddher Itihasa* (Vol. V, p. 455) published in 1900.

Marfat.com

collected by Sir Robert Hamilton in April 1858 do not adduce any reasonable ground for the belief that the rani of Jhansi either instigated the mutiny in June 1857 or even took part in the subsequent proceedings. Thirdly, colonel T.A. Martin, already referred to, made a categorical statement : 'Your poor mother.....took no part whatever in the massacre of the European residents of Jhansi in June 1857.' More important was the acknowledgement of her position by major W. C. Erskine, commissioner and agent, lieutenant-governor, Sagar Division. In response to her letters of 12 June and 14 June 1857, the commissioner requested her 'to manage the district for British government, collecting revenue, raising such police as may be necessary, and making other proper arrangements.' This was followed by a government proclamation to the same effect, which was a clear recognition of her government by the constituted authorities and establishes beyond doubt the stand taken by her that she had neither instigated the mutiny nor the atrocities that followed. In fact, the rani confirmed her position by stating that 'she only held the Jhansi district till the British government could make arrangements to reoccupy it'. It was exactly this situation which Pinkney had in his mind when he reported that all the while the rani had represented to the government that she had no concern in the late risings and that she was occupying Jhansi only as a stopgap arrangement.

But Kaye had some confusion on this point. He writes, 'but I have searched major Erskine's exhaustive report and in the four hundred and forty-four paragraphs to which it extends, I can't find a word upon the subject'.[1] Majumdar points out that even Pinkney does not mention the reply of Erskine to the rani. All these indicate, as the historian rightly suggests that there was a 'conspiracy of silence' to prevent the leakage of any such impression that the government had cleared the rani of all charges in connection with the mutiny at Jhansi. It is very likely this policy was effectively implemented, otherwise Kaye who had all the official documents at his disposal would have found out the relevant communication on Erskine's 'clemency' to the rani. It also appears very clear that even Erskine was steadily withdrawing himself from his former position and was

[1] Kaye, III, pp. 369-71.

Marfat.com

adopting a hostile stance. Thus when Erskine adverted to the subject in his first report to the government dated 22 June, the secretary to the government in his reply dated 23rd July expressed the view that the consideration shown will not protect her if her account turns out to be false. In fact, there was a tendency to look upon her as a suspect and a pretender ; an official communication dated 18 August 1857 states that 'it is the general impression that the sepoys were instigated by the rani to attack the Fort' and even Erskine described the rani as a 'rebel' in his report dated 25 November and sent no help to her when she was attacked by Orchha. The prejudice against her is further reflected when her letter dated 1 January 1858 to the agent, governor-general, Central India, for help against her invaders was not even attended to. On the contrary, the secretary to the government of India in a letter dated 3 March 1858 appreciated the attitude of the local government in remaining silent and further instructed them to collect evidence regarding the part played by the rani in the late rising. Canning also had sent instructions to Hamilton on 11 February 1858 to hold a preliminary enquiry into her conduct. The enquiry was accordingly conducted but nothing was found to support the intention of the British bureaucracy to incriminate her. The official view was so perniciously obstinate that even in November 1858, long after the death of the rani, Pinkney, in his report, implicated the rani with the murder of Englishmen. However, all this forced her to take a final decision. She must have realised that the authorities of the British government are adamant in their attitude and despite her attempts to maintain the best of relations with the British, she was unable to remove the suspicion of the government. In her dire distress she addressed an appeal to Sir Robert Hamilton in which she stated that she had written to all British authorities at Jabbalpur, Gwalior, Jalaun, Agra and also to major Ellis.[1] Colonel T. A. Martin also attested : 'She sent *khareetas* to Colonel Erskine at Jubbulpore, to Colonel Fraser, Chief-commissioner of Agra, which I handed to him with my own hand to hear her explanation but No ? —Jhansi had been a byword and was condemned unheard.'[2]

[1] Sen, p. 280.

[2] Rajani Kanta Gupta, op. cit. V, p. 455.

Marfat.com

In the circumstances, the historian observed that it was not surprising 'that the noble rani of Jhansi chose to fight the British rather than submit to a trial'. Thus faced with the alternative of trial for the murder of the English at Jhansi and with the foregone decision of an honourable death in the battlefield she chose the latter. But once she decided to take the field she showed courage and resourcefulness in her encounters with the avenging army led by Sir Hugh Rose. He further observed that 'she was the only leader who died in the battlefield in that great struggle, and the valour and military strategy she displayed entitle her to a unique place in the history of that movement.' But Majumar was very critical of her career and wrote firmly that any attempt to associate her name with a struggle for independence either of Jhansi or of India would be hardly befitting the rani. This, however, is a view which can neither be accepted nor left without any comment. He points out that she was unable to keep the Sepoys at Jhansi under her control which makes it clear that she had no intention to rise against the British. He contends that her past association with the English was tainted by a 'course of hypocrisy, treachery, and fraudulence' which will tarnish her reputation as a heroic and patriotic lady.[1] Such a view seems to be erroneous, the historian goes back on what he himself had written. All along he had placed convincing arguments in favour of the rani's innocence and gave it as his verdict that she had no share in instigating the rising at Jhansi and the subsequent massacre. It cannot be denied that all throughout this period she had been trying to maintain friendly relations with the British and showed a pliant and loyal attitude under all conditions as the letters and exchanges would show.

No single instance of hypocrisy or treachery on the part of the rani is recorded. On the contrary, it may be asserted in the light of facts that it is the British government which played false with her, after according recognition to her title, position and claims. If anybody had been a victim of treachery and betrayal it was the rani, 'for Jhansi had been a byword and was condemned unheard'. Nationalist sentiment in India was particularly attracted to this noble picture of

[1] Majumdar, op. cit. p. 154.

Marfat.com

a helpless queen taking up arms and fighting single-handed to save her little principality against the aggressive offensives of the alien power which failed to honour their commitments and subjected her to a systematic and deliberate course of 'unjust suspicion and animosity' despite her loyal submissions. There is also no reason why the historian should feel that the early phase of her carrer will not bear any relevance to her real greatness as manifested in her heroic decision to fight against the English. S. N. Sen was right in poining out that there was nothing clandestine or disgraceful in all her involvements in the early part of her career. It is in the interest of her country and her people that she subscribed to the fund of the sepoys to turn them away and leave her alone and subsequently took up the administration of her country and invited British troops to help her against the acquisitive designs of her neighbours. In the circumstances, she possibly could have done nothing better.[1] Majumdar says, 'it is a common human failing to judge a man's previous character in the light of his subsequent conduct.' It will be appreciated that the reverse also was true ; previous affiliations are held out to denigrate the image of a self-sacrificing fighter who fought for the freedom of his country most heroically.

On the situation at Cawnpore, Majumdar's observations have been largely interpretative as new materials on the subject were not many. But Cawnpore during the mutiny acquired an historical infamy which rendered the many controversies about the rising in that station sensationally infectious. Original studies on the mutiny at Cawnpore began with Kaye but he was not exhaustive and Malleson following Kaye left it outside the scope of his work. It was Forrest who gave a turn to the studies on Cawnpore and explored its depth by a reference to the materials of Indian sources, and together with Holmes, he pressed the European point of view with considerable force holding Nana Sahib acting deliberately to destroy the British. Majumdar is the first of the Indian historians to open the subject for discussion in his book in the centenary year of the Mutiny but excepting some points of source-materials, his reliance on the statement of Tatya Tope and his distrust of the evidence of Nanakchand,[2] he seems to have

[1] *Supra*, pp. 173-74.

[2] Majumdar, *The Sepoy Mutiny etc.* pp. 130, 131.

Marfat.com

been aware of historical constraints in expressing doubts about Nana's responsibility in the massacres at Cawnpore which other scholars like Sen and Gupta did not acknowledge. While Nana Sahib's direct participation in the murderous attack at the Satichauraghat is at best doubtful though it is easily proved by circumstantial evidence,'[1] the historian had no inhibition in stating that Nana perpetrated the horrible massacre of the British prisoners at the 'Beebee Ghur.'[2] About other matters he completely exposed Kaye's story of Sitaram Bawa as a proof of Nana's seditious intentions and showed that Nana did not organise a conspiracy against the British which was opposed to his known conduct.[3] His unwillingness to go to Delhi also indicates that he played a part for himself alone and had no plan to build up a united front against the British.[4]

Thus after an extensive study of official records, the historian comes to the conclusion that none of the leaders was cast for the role of a revolutionary hero. There was no account about any other insurgent who might be regarded as having organised the conspiracy against the British. Having disposed of this question he takes up the third point, the extent of rebellion, and makes a survey of the affected areas to show that it was limited only to a portion of Upper India.[5] It has been seen that quite a century ago a Western missionary argued against the popular character of the revolt on much the same line having regard to his own finding about the extent of the rebellion.[6] However, Majumdar finds no foundation for the view that the movement bore the character of a popular rising or evoked any sense of national feeling or was regarded as a freedom movement either by the leaders or by the sepoys.

This contention that the civil character of the rebellion in some areas was due only to a natural reaction to the disappearance of the civil authority and not in any noticeable degree to a sense of national

[1] Ibid. p. 100.
[2] Ibid. pp. 100 01, 135
[3] *Supra*, pp. 104-5.
[4] Majumdar, The *Sepoy Mutiny etc.* p. 191.
[5] Ibid. p. 224.
See Joshi (p. 176) for the area covered by the upsurge.
[6] *Supra*, p. 16.

Marfat.com

feeling, was taken up for discussion by the present author in his book on 'Civil Rebellion in the Indian Mutinies'. This book depicted the epoch of 1857 not merely as an era of mutiny only but as a time of intense popular activity advancing to realise the object of putting an end to British rule as reflected in the many proclamations of revolt. But the historian could not accept this accent on the popular aspect of the war and the informative elaborations of the socio-economic forces. To re-enforce his views as propounded in the 'Sepoy Mutiny etc.', he made a more critical discussion of the points made out in the 'Civil Rebellion in the Indian Mutinies' in volume nine of the 'History and Culture of the Indian people' (Part I—British Paramountcy and the Indian Renaissance). There was no mistake about the objectivity of his attitude. The historian writes : 'It would be the endeavour of the present editor to follow three fundamental principles...firstly, that history is no respector of persons or communities ; secondly that its sole aim is to find out the truth by following the canons commonly accepted as sound by all historians, and thirdly to express the truth without fear, envy, malice, passion or prejudice.' But despite this specification, the *British Paramountcy* attempted to arrive at the same military foundation of the Indian revolt with new strength and emphasis. The historian mounted a severe attack on the relatively novel concept of popular participation in the Sepoy War as shown in the 'Civil Rebellion' by an extremely critical analysis of all the issues raised in the book, point by point. The materials he used were carefully marshalled and thoroughly re-oriented to a posture of strength to prove, from the point of view of a military revolt, the weakness of the foundation of the opposite school of thought. In the circumstances the author of 'Civil Rebellion' could only take it as an obligation to confront the question. He published a monograph, 'Theories of the Indian Mutiny' to counteract the claim of the historian to the infallibility of his convictions by presenting evidence and examining his arguments in the light of newly acquired perspectives.[1]

R. C. Majumdar, the great historian of India, is a profound scholar of ample learning, perfect research and rare intellectual vigour. But popular participation in the Indian Mutinies seemed to have filled him

[1] Chaudhuri, *Theories etc.* p. 12 ; K. K. Datta, *Reflections etc.* pp. 8 ff. ; Joshi, pp. 120-24.

Marfat.com

with indignation. He lost sight of the reasonable impressiveness of the movement, its sweep and breadth and made little effort to fathom the depths 'on which the pageantry of events float like the shining foam'. He pelted the rebels with abuse and even warned the readers against the seductions of mutiny ideas. 'Be it remembered', he harangues in defence of *status quo*, 'The fight they (Talukdars) fought was for retaining the wealth and privileges which they had unlawfully secured and not for gaining freedom for the whole of India'.[1] But whatever may be his attitude to the mutiny-war of 1857 the great historian could not but be sensitive to a far-reaching effect of the Revolt and the unique place it occupied in Indo-British history.[2]

At this stage was published P. C. Joshi's 'Rebellion 1857 A symposium' in which he inducted the marxist perspective with admirable sobriety and scholarship. The book is a collection of papers, results of painstaking research but instead of becoming a series of historical essays, the articles dovetail nearly into one another and represent a 'supreme effort to filter the truth of the 1857 uprising out of an ocean of writings both of British and Indian sources'. The contributions are based partly on documentation from older books on the Indian Mutiny by British writers which were interpreted to support their view-point both in approach and evaluation. He refers to the controversies but he candidly admits that in such a venture differences of opinion would not be less than a virtue[3] which is not to say that the spate of work on the Indian Mutiny and colonial matters from British sources were not of much use to them. In fact Joshi's work shows how accommodation of views with a different slant is also available in English writings on the Mutiny. The archival materials do not come to much use. However, within the limits of source-materials he draws together into a synthesis, the views of Marx which are blended better by his perceptive analysis of the historical patterns. He refers to the marxist theory that the instrument of retribution is forged by the offender himself. As in the French Monarchy which was attacked first by the Nobility

[1] Chaudhuri, *Theories etc.* p. 106.
[2] Ibid. p. 178.
[3] Joshi. p. 120.

Marfat.com

so also the Indian Revolt commenced with the sepoys who were fed and pampered by the government and not with ryots stripped naked by the British.[1] Joshi controverts Majumdar's views that the people were not inspired by any high ideal[2] and exhibits a wonderful collection of materials on the revolt.[3] It is a unique experience to go through these ballads which vibrate with a 'Call of the Revolt' and illustrate the idea that the tendency to survey events of history from the 'windows of the council Chamber' and the style of speaking through official documents do not adequately unfold the historical nuances of an age.

The chapter on the impact of the revolt in some foreign countries contributed by keen and intelligent scholars undoubtedly puts the revolt in world perspective. James Bryne writes on 'British opinion and the Indian revolt' but his slant on the attitude of the labour towards the policy of the government is highly misleading. There was no other attitude of the people of England than the cry for terrible retribution to destroy the 'whole of this foul craven mob', that on the standard of England vengeance and not justice should be inscribed.[4] It is not worth reading labour's mind where it was completely eclipsed by other forces. The same holds good with regard to France about whose attitude to the revolt there was no illusion.[5] Stray remarks in some obscure papers that the real cause of the Indian Revolt was a general resurgence of nationalism do not show any originality of information unless supported by the attitude of the historians[6]. Deep sympathy was felt for England 'the cradle of liberty and its individual bulwark' as well, in the continent and in America in her hour of trial. Relations of Christian Europe with the rest of the world of the time of the Crusaders seem to have been revived. Pope Pius IX made a liberal subscription on behalf of the English sufferers in India.[7] Any attempt to point

[1] Joshi. p. 160.
[2] Ibid. pp. 120-24.
[3] Ibid. pp. 271 ff. cf. also 'Jhansir Rani' by Mahasweta Bhattacharya (Bengali) for the ballads current during the period of 1857-59.
[4] *Civil Rebellion*. p. 265.
[5] See Chapter Eight.
[6] K. K. Sen Gupta, *Recent writings etc*. p. 48.
[7] Chaudhuri, *Civil Rebellion*, Intro. p. XX.

Marfat.com

to the importance of foreign reactions of the Indian Revolt without reference to the colonial involvements of England and other European powers would be misleading.[1] But the article on China and India by Yu Sheng-Wu and Chang Chen-Kun was meaningful. It was not unlikely that China's attitude was sympathetic towards India. In this chapter in question (Part III) Joshi makes no reference to German reaction to the Indian Mutiny. The martyr Mangal Pandey kindled the flame of liberation, the light of which spread across the great oceans. The Germans in those days also had their contradictions with the British colonialists. The Leipzig illustrated paper the *Illustrierte Zeitung* had its own correspondents and artists everywhere in the world and the German newspapers published the 'Sketches during 1857-58'. It should be remembered that in those days there were no photographers to do the job and it was done by artists most of whom remained anonymous. The Russian artist Verashchegin also made some sketches but all these, as A.B. Guha who had the privilege of examining half-a-dozen sketches in the personal collection of German Indologist Professor Heinz Mode states, were not shown in the government of India Album '1957'[2]. On Russian reaction to '1857', K.K. Datta gives a more detailed information than what is contributed by P. Shastiko in the *Symposium*. Datta finds that emotions evoked in the Czarist Russia flowed in two distinct lines of thoughts ; the people in general were opposed to the Czarist regime and sympathised with the Indians. But the loyalists held the opposite view though initially they had a sneaking sympathy with the Indians for having put the British in jeopardy as in the Crimean War of recent memory. Datta also refers to N. A. Dobrolyubov who made the deepest analysis of the Revolt which was published

[1] Dr. K. K. Sen Gupta (*Recent writings etc.* pp. 48-50) refers to K. Majumdar's article on Anglo-Nepalese relations during the Mutiny which were also recorded by Dodd and Ball. Pudma Jung's Biography of his father Rana Jung Bahadur also has an important bearing on the subject. Dr. J. C. Jha's study on the impact of the revolt on the development of Trinidad (West Indies) is very interesting. Terrible retribution produced disastrous results. Migration of the Indians overseas commenced from this period. Terror struck, the people migrated especially to Mauritius. The number of the refugees rose from 12562 in 1856 to more than a lac in 1858 (*Civil Rebellion*, p. 260).

[2] A. B. Patrika, March 30, 1966.

Marfat.com

in September 1957 in 'Sovremenik'. He regarded it 'not as a chance explosion of discontent but an event of historical inevitability', result of the colonial policies followed by Britain.[1] Another great Russian revolutionary democrat, Gerstsen, was a bitter critic of the bourgeoisie which was advocating merciless suppression of the upsurge. Datta writes that the attitude of the Russian liberal press towards the Indian uprising was not uniform. There were articles critical of British policies and effects of British rule and expressing sympathy for the rebels in India. One article even opposed the views of English and French writers who regarded the uprising as an 'armed mutiny' but many others expressed sympathy and admiration for England.[2]

However, Joshi's work is invaluable in stating that no rational interpretation of the events of 1857 was possible by overlooking the pressure of economic forces. He examines the economic drain as it existed on the eve of the 1857 revolt and quotes Montgomery Martin to show that for half a century four million pounds sterling a year had been drained from India. In the circumstances when nearly half the annual land revenue collections were squeezed away, the economic order of India went out of gear and the very springs of production of Indian economy were dried up. He also observes that almost all the classes were deprived of their productive professions. Such unprecedented destruction of a whole economic order and of every class within it could not but produce a great social upheaval and that was the national uprising of 1857[3]. In historical perspective this bears a near relation with the picture depicted in the famous wide-spectrum proclamation issued by the king and addressed to the zamindars, public servants, merchants, artisans and others.[4] The Badshahi manifesto adequately reflects the economic condition of the country which resulted from the acquisitive policies of a colonial power. It is not extravagant to say that Joshi's work was a major

[1] For Dobrolyubov see chapter Eight.

[2]. Datta, *Reflections etc.* pp. 54-59. See also 'Echoes of 1857 in the Russian Press' by N. P. Verma in the *Journal of Indian History*, Golden Jubilee volume (p. 623).

[3] Joshi, pp. 139. ff.

[4] Ball, II, pp. 631-33 : Joshi, p. 147 ; Chaudhuri, *Theories*, pp. 28-29.



Marfat.com

contribution to mutiny studies. The sections on the failure of the movement and feudal revivalism are critical and scholarly and the work as a whole formed an antidote to the orthodox views of British and Indian historians on the subject.

Towards the end of 1947 was published H. P. Chattopadhyaya's 'The Sepoy Mutiny : A social study and analysis'. The author attempts an analysis of social factors motivating the course of the revolt. This envisages a study of the nature and extent of participation by various social groups in the revolt which, however, was not clearly reflected in the work. The frequent references to groups and classes in the work suggest that the author had in view a clear idea about the identity of each of these units in so far as the part played by them in the revolt was concerned. He seems to assume that 'such social groups' as territorial aristocrats, the middle class, the Hindus and Muslims had each a distinct role to play. The first group mentioned had a plan of work but it will be difficult to articulate if the activities of a middle class Hindu differed from that of a Muslim of the same class or that the peasants of each of these communities had other interests to serve than following their leaders. Even professional groups were not so much the avengers of professional grievance as the exponents of general discontent.[1] Indeed, of the rebellion as a whole, it is not quite easy to present a uniform pattern as it differed considerably from region to region, and political and social motives, and class or group interests got mixed up in the process before the general cry for the extinction of the foreign rule. The more positive aspect of the 1857 uprising was that the people of various castes, tribes, nationality and religions who lived under different kingdoms rose up together to end British rule. Sen rightly observed that no community, class, or caste, as such, was entirely for or against the government.[2] Within Indian Society, Joshi remarked 'those productive forces, social groups and classes had not yet grown' and were not viable enough to be regarded as a factor to be reckoned with.[3] The author supports R. C. Majumdar's

[1] The wage earners and factory workers were in some cases avengers of professional grievances (*Civil Rebellion*, pp. 282-83).
[2] Sen, p. 406.
[3] Joshi, pp. 150-51, 177.

Marfat.com

conclusion on the nature of the revolt and states the views of the English educated Bengali intelligentsia of the Kissory Chand group of writers of that time.[1]

The centenary year of the Indian Mutiny and the period that followed also witnessed the publication of quite a few books from European sources. Major-General Richard Hilton's 'Indian Mutiny' is a monograph written in defence of British attitudes and the soldiers who upheld British prestige. The author also gives a critical account of the activities of Tatya Tope, a guerilla leader of the front rank and makes a comparative estimate of his abilities with reference to the exploits of Christian De Wet at the end of Boer war and Von Lettowerbeck in German East Africa.[2] A. T. Embree's '1857 in India' is an anthology of mutiny literature not attempted by any one before. The writing is clear, the view-point profoundly informed, detached and fair. The introduction he writes is critical on many points of British historiography on the character of the revolt. All the assumptions about the benefits of British rule, 'the stock in trade of early nineteenth century accounts were suddenly called in question', he writes, 'when sepoys and civilians...began killing both military officers and government officers'.[3] The Azamgarh proclamation, as an Indian explanation, with which the author introduces his work, at once gives a new tone and direction to mutiny studies and points to the author's mastery of the historical perspective. The collection of opinions and selection of articles from Benjamin Disraeli to Hugh Tinker and of many others including the views and opinions of Karl Marx give us a glimpse and an insight into the problems of this multicoloured rising. Richard Collier's 'The Great Indian Mutiny', the English edition of which was entitled 'The Sound of Fury', 'combines exciting reading and careful research' and is regarded as the 'best of the modern popular histories of the 1857 uprising'. He has covered a new ground of the old story of the Sepoy Mutiny by his massive research in which he exhausted a kind of material hitherto unread and, indeed, not explored by professional historians,

1 Chaudhuri, *Theories*, p. 124 fn. Also see Bholanath Chunder (*infra*, pp. 232-3).
2 Hilton, pp. 194, 196, 198.
3 Embree, Intro. p. viii. ; S. B. Chaudhuri, *Theories*, pp. 18 ff.

Marfat.com

—a bunch of 'letters, diaries, memoirs of those on the spot.' He has offered 'a new and personal picture of what it was like to experience the Indian Mutiny,' and manages to tie all his investigations together in many vivid touches to project the impression of a small group of people about their involvements. The author has not attempted to write a definitive history, but he offers a narrative of events with emphasis on the siege of Delhi and the relief of Lucknow with an impressive skill. His intellectual affinity and intensity of interest in the great revolt of India is clear from his reference to the works of the Indian historians on the Mutiny.[1] Another book, 'The Aftermath of Revolt' by T. R. Metcalfe, an American, is an excellent study on an aspect of the Mutiny which has not so far received the attention it deserved. The English writers mostly gave a side glance at the backwash of the upsurge, and if at all interested, offered suggestions for army reform and reorganisation, but the wider issues of the effect of the Mutiny were not indicated. The author provides illustrative materials for his subject and discusses various aspects of this question with striking clarity and detail. He writes a chapter on the causes of the revolt and their varying interpretations which is profoundly critical and intensive. He takes up a very interesting point, the influence of the Mutiny on the whole concept of the British Empire and attempts to develop the idea in his own way. But the author maintains a definite Anglo-Saxon slant throughout and underestimates the views of Marx as filtered through the correspondents of the New York Herald Tribune. Marx wrote some of his most perceptive essays on the 1857 uprising and even admitted that for a period the 'Empire' played a progressive role. While the Indian historians who denounced the movement because of its feudal associations were highly credited by Metcalfe, the ideas of Marx were dismissed as little theoretical analysis. J. A. B. Palmer's 'The Mutiny outbreak at Meerut in 1857' is a scholarly work of exceptional value. It is a specialised study in depth and offers a close interpretative analysis of the Meerut Mutiny and the Delhi revolt. The author also offers his views about the causes of the uprising and its character. He finds evidence to support the theory of a premeditated organisation and planning

[1] *Supra*, p. 172.

Marfat.com

behind the outbreak though it was not firmly set. But the critical study of the initial stages of the revolt with reference to original sources and authoritative works which he offers is one more proof of the excellence that continues to characterise the finest scholarship of British historiography on the Indian Mutiny. His book is an invitation to other scholars in the field to work out problems of the Indian Mutiny in the same process. But all the controversial points he raises will require a full discussion which for obvious reasons cannot be attempted here.[1]

On biographical side, books which appeared during this period were quite a few.[2] The most outstanding are the 'Biography of Kunwar Singh and Amar Singh' by K. K. Datta, 'Clemency Canning' by M. MacLagan and Nana Sahib and the rising at Cawnpore by P. C. Gupta. All stand high from the point of view scholarship and deal with the controversial aspects of the respective subjects. Datta places Kunwar Singh fully in the context of his political and financial involvements and gives a long sustained narrative of Kunwar's exploits and the subsequent activities of the Shahabad rebels after the death of Kunwar. The book is seriously documented, a mass of materials have been sorted out to present this great figure of the 1857 uprising in the full light of history but some points still remain obscure. The part Kunwar played at the battle of Generalganj on 6 December 1857 or whether he at all participated in that battle is not definitely known excepting what Nanakchand says about his presence in the battle at Cawnpore. It is also somewhat unaccountable why he did not combine with Mehendi Hossain in his confrontations with general Franks who was fighting his way to Lucknow in the month of February 1858. MacLagan's book is most comprehensive, lively and authentic yet published on Canning, the leading figure who was at the helm of affairs in India in 1857. The work throws light on Canning's official decisions and the wide range of controversy which they stimulated. Based on Canning papers and all other relevant official materials available at Calcutta, Delhi and London, scholarly use of

[1] A book on Mutiny Studies is under contemplation by the present author.

[2] K. K. Sengupta gives a list of the recent publications on the Indian Leaders including Abdul Karim, Walidad Khan and Rao Tularam (pp. 41 ff). For short biographical accounts, V. L. Srivastava's 'Poets and Traitors' and S. Lutefullah's 'The Men behind the War of Independence' may be consulted.

Marfat.com

the work have been much enhanced by the inclusion of cross references, index and explanation of sources. From the 'Red Pamphlet' to Kaye, controversy about the selection of Canning as governor-general and viceroy of India in 1856 has been echoed and re-echoed and MacLagan has done well in closing this chapter. Against the demand for revenge and retaliation Canning resolved not to govern in anger, but British historians from the time of Charles Ball have not shown any consistency in their estimate of the governor-general. A chapter on Canning and the historians would have been effective against many polemical writings on 'Clemency Canning'. Gupta's 'Nana Sahib' is a book of substantive biographical interest.[1] The scholarly apparatus is flawless, but 'Cawnpore' was quite the most controversial episode in the whole range of the 1857 Mutiny. The current accounts of those bizarre events were based on such contradictory evidence that S. N. Sen found the going baffling.[2] To the Mutiny historians, 'Cawnpore' was really a 'Fort of Despair' but Gupta brought a measure of compromise in many of the conflicting interpretations that continue to complicate the history of the rising at that station. In general his findings are judicious and balanced and in many cases they lend some additional plausibility to the views of Sen. His reliance on the statements of Tatya Tope that Nana was not a free agent is, however, open to grave objection. Doubts about Nana's complicity in the massacre are carried too far. Even North's statement about the blood at Bibigarh is doubted. Like J. W. Sherer, Gupta also considered that it was not that thick,[3] but Neill found the pool of blood 'still two inches deep' on 21 July.[4] There are 'cleaners', as Mac Munn says, who come to the stage of history to wash away the sins of assasins and murderers.[5] But this has not been convincing enough in the case of the Nana. The chapter on Nana Sahib in Nepal is an example of fine scholarship, but one wonders if the

[1] Another book on Nana Sahib written by A. S. Misra is a voluminous work meant for general readers. Facts and conclusions are presented from an emotional point of view.
[2] Sen, p. 137.
[3] Gupta, p. 143.
[4] Ball, I, p. 390.
[5] Mac Munn, pp. 119, 136.

Marfat.com

enquiry has not partaken the character of a criminal investigation. If it was the aim of the author to ascertain the probable date of the death of the Nana in the light of responsible and authoritative opinions, he should have quoted the views of J. W. Sherer, who, according to the author, was a knowledgeable source. Sherer writes : 'It was in the winter of 1859-60 that the Nana died in the jungles of Nepal. It may be doubted whether the Nana did die as reported. I think the doubts are unreasonable'. Jwalaprosad admitted that he attended Nana's funeral.[1] The historian of Nana Sahib may as well take note of it that general Pudma Jung Bahadur Rana in the biography of his father Maharaja Sir Jung Bahadur attested to the same view.[2] There is yet another point in regard to Gupta's book. The title of his work, 'Rising at Cawnpore', is a misnomer for he hardly says a word about the other aspect of the 1857 rising at Cawnpore.[3]

A work of a different nature but very much allied to mutiny studies was the book of Jagadish Raj 'On the Mutiny and British Land Policy in North India in 1856-58'. The author credits the British Government with an enlightened intention of improving the position of the tenants and cultivators. He refers to the views of British officials who felt the necessity of reinforcing by legislation what Dalhousie had attempted to do for the cultivators before the Mutiny. In other words, his main theme is a defence of the village system, which, as the author contends, gave much wider protection to the tenants than did the Rent Act of 1868. But the village system was discredited by the circumstances of the talukdari wars in which the peasants and cultivators made a common cause with their former chiefs against the British. The government steadily moved away from Dalhousie's Land policy despite Lawrence's attempt to check that drift. The Rent Act of 1868 was a victory for the talukdars and a fatai blow to the tenant and peasantry. The author's idea that the settlement of 1856 had not made the position of the talukdars very destructive appears to be strange having regard to the government

1 Sherer, *Daily life during the Indian Mutiny*, pp. 181-2.
2 Ed. by Abhoy Charan Mukherjee of the Muir College, Allahabad.
3 In the Bibliography, Dr. Gupta makes no mention of the work on 'Civil Rebellion in the Indian Mutinies'. See also Chaudhuri, *Theories*, p. 86 fn.

Marfat.com

policy of abolishing the aristocracy of the land as a means of conferring benefits to the people.[1] Kaye's study of the land policy clearly shows how the settlement swept out the landed gentry from their baronial possessions and a race of peasant-proprietors were recognised as legitimate inheritors. The recklessness with which it was introduced was followed by a terrible retribution.[2] The author's reference to the views of Innes regarding the time when the talukdars joined in the mutiny-war to show that many of the talukdars had little cause to complain does not agree with known facts for both Holmes and Innes evinced a certain disregard for historical accuracy on the behaviour of the talukdars in the 1857 uprising.[3] Jagadish Raj fails to see why the Punjab remained loyal 'though stripped of their possessions' while the talukdars of Oudh behaved differently 'though lightly hit'. 'The magnificent success of Sir John Lawrence's government during the rebellion', writes G. W. Forrest, 'must be in a large degree attributed to the measures carried out by Sir Henry Lawrence for upholding the Jagirdars (landlords) in their ancient right'.[4]

Conciliation with the talukdars, after the Revolt had been suppressed, was justified on grounds of military and political expediency. In a letter of November 1859, the government of India seemed to have suggested that the maintenance of landed aristocracy in India even at the cost of the rights of the cultivators of the soil had become imperative.[5] Gubbins maintained the same view and admitted that even while the revolt was in progress many talukdars of Oudh were won over by a restoration of their lands on terms more favourable than formerly.[6] Thus the alliance between the British imperialists and the Indian landlords, the 'new pillars' of British power, became a settled

[1] Kaye, I. p. 179 ; Thornhill, pp. 33, 332 ; Forrest, *History*, I. p. 162 ; Rees, pp. 34-5 ; Gubbins, p. 73 ; Sen, pp. 34-35 ; *Civil Rebellion*, p. 294.

[2] Kaye, I, pp. 157, 165, 179.

[3] Chaudhuri, *Theories*, pp. 91 ff.

[4] Forrest, *History*, I. p. 172.

[5] T. Khaldun in Joshi, p. 55.

[6] Gubbins, p. 58 ; Forrest, *History*, II, p. 29. Some 22,658 out of 23,453 villages in Oudh were restored to talukdars in return for submission and loyalty (S. Gopal, *British Policy in India*, p. 6 ; Chatterji, *The Making of India Policy*, p. 348 ). Also see *Infra*, p. 238 for George Campbell's views on the surrender of Oudh and the talukdars.

Marfat.com

fact of British policy after 1857. However, Jagadish Raj's analysis of the problems of the tenants in connection with the policy of Sir Charles Wingfield, the commissioner of Oudh, who did not accept the traditional rights of the occupancy tenants was critical,[1] but the whole book itself deals only with a pro-tenant land policy of a short period which was rejected and did not mature. This could have been related with the agrarian crisis of a later age from the point of view of historical construction.

Recent years have witnessed the publication of many regional histories on the 1857 uprising. K. K. Sengupta has brought to our notice a spate of work on the Mutiny by Indian writers[2] but the author commented that this 'Craze' for writing 'region-wise micro-accounts' of the revolt has given rise to a tendency on the part of the writers of the respective areas to prove that their country had also participated in the great struggle for freedom of 1857[3]. There may be tons of materials on many cases of local distempers and skirmishes but they may not approximate to a viable case of the revolt of an organised people to demand the attention of the historians. But the Indian writers are trying to make a meaningful use of these materials. K. C. Yadav in his book 'The Revolt of 1857', recently published, enunciated the view that the Revolt of 1857 against the British government started at Ambala on May 10, 1857, and not at Meerut as popularly believed. He writes that at about 9 a.m. on Sunday May 10, 1857 the sepoys of the 60th N. I. at Ambala left their lines *en bloc*, seized arms from the regimental armoury and arrested their officers. But as the authorities were previously informed by a sepoy of the 5th N. I. they could easily suppress the demonstration[4]. But it is difficult to appreciate if there was anything new about this piece of writing. Long back, Martin, referring to this incipient mutiny at Ambala quoted the letter of an officer of the Lancers of Ambala dated 14 May which gives exactly the same description. The total strength of the European officers at Ambala was about 2,290 Europeans as against

[1] For details see Chatterji, op. cit. pp. 206-7, 348.
[2] K. K. Sengupta, pp. 26-40.
[3] Ibid. p. 57.
[4] Statesman, 18 October, 1975.

Marfat.com

2,819 natives.[1] Charles Ball, also refers to the outbreak which seemed 'imminent'. He quotes the same letter and observed that by the judicious interference and counsel of some of the native officers backed by the influence of the Europeans the men gradually calmed down and returned to duty.[2] There is nothing, therefore, to suggest except the accidental coincidence of dates, that the revolt of 1857 started at Ambala. It so happened that it only fitted with the trend of events, but it stopped short of its objectives and went off like a damp squib as at Berhampore and Barrackpore. We have also the work of colonel T. N. Walker, 'Through the Mutiny etc.' which contains his reminiscences of 30 years of active service. He was at Ambala when the emeute took place on 10 May 1857 at about 10 a.m. He gives only a brief account of this incident and says that he along with another colonel suppressed the commotion[3]. A very interesting work, perhaps the latest from British sources (1977), is the 'Siege of Delhi' by Alexander Llewellyn, a lecturer in History at the Southwark College, London. Llewellyn introduces his book in the context of the wars of the mid-Victorian England which gave an impulse towards a change in the organisation, structure and leadership of the Queen's Army. He refers to the class composition of the service gentry of Victorian England who had built the Raj and gives a comprehensive account of the sweeping changes in the Indian Army which came in the wake of the Mutiny out of the 'fires of Cawnpore, Lucknow and Delhi.' His account of the 'Siege' is no doubt very readable and a degree of deference to the mutiny veterans informs the book.[4]

1 Màrtin, II, pp. 176-177.
2 Ball, I, p. 115.
3 Walker, *Through the Mutiny etc.* pp. 20-27. For a critical discussion of Yadava's views on the Ambala incident see S, B. Chaudhuri in the *Indian Historical Review* ( Indian Council of Historical Research), Vol. VI, No. 1.
4 For a review of the work see S. B. Chaudhuri in *Bengal Past and Present*, July-December, 1977, pp. 165-69.

Marfat.com

## CHAPTER SEVEN

# MILITARY HISTORIANS

It appeared to Sir Colin Campbell that nothing more surprising, more terrible, more dangerous to the real supremacy of Great Britain in India, than the Indian Mutiny of 1857, could scarcely be pointed out in previous history. The Crimean war and its aftermath, no doubt, added to the difficulties of Great Britain, but a still more striking episode was afforded by the revolt of the Bengal Army[1]. One captain Sedgwick, of the Royal Field Artillery, writing at the beginning of the twentieth century, characterised it as one of Britain's 'three greatest small wars of the most varying types which England had been waging for more than a century and a half on the ever widening frontiers of her empire'. These three 'small wars' are the American Revolution, the Indian Mutiny, and the Boer War of 1899-1902[2]. Lieutenant-General Mac Munn writing in 1931 observed that no other period of the history of England did more to bring out the hero in those who participated than this great revolt of 1857. The gallantry and suffering of the British people in this mutiny-war which furnished a store of exciting, venturous and chivalrous doings will endure wherever the British exist[3]. The story was necessarily dominated by military officers as Kaye also pointed out,[4] and the whole movement when viewed from the military point of view only reinforced their racial-imperialist perceptions. Malleson was even more specific in stating that it is the mutiny of the sepoys which demanded all the attention of the English. And so both as regards the Uprising and its suppression 'his book has necessarily dealt almost entirely with the marches and battles, with clang of arms and

1 Campbell, *Narrative* etc. p. 1.

2 Sedgwick, p. 8. It will be interesting to see how it is looked upon by a mutiny scholar of the present day. Thus A. Llewellyn observes : 'Two wars of mid-Victorian England were fought, for the first time, under the glare of publicity. One was the war in the Crimea and the other the mutiny in India. These were the first major military undertakings since the invention of the electric telegraph' (p. 167).

3 Mac Munn, *The Indian Mutiny etc.* pp. 2, 256.

4 *Supra*, p. 92.



Marfat.com

the bustle of the camp'.[1] Writings on the military aspects of the Indian Mutiny were also inspired in most cases by the glorious tradition of services left by reputed generals of the past for the Empire in India which created a strong background for the heroic achievements and phenomenal success of British Arms. The Indian military service which produced a Clive, a Coote, a Lawrence, which taught even Wellington how to win battles, to which the name of Lake, of Hasting, of Ochterlony, of Napier, of Pollock, of Nott could be included had undoubtedly become a respectable and lustrous institution to which the Britishers could look back with pride. The legacy of this tradition was not lost. British officers of the Sepoy War proved to be worthy successors of great generals of the past and rose to greater heights by dint of their indomitable will and unfailing energy. Mutiny was thus transformed into a 'noble epic', as Forrest said, 'which spoke to every Englishman'.[2]

A wider canvas than the story of the Indian Mutiny could not have been found to depict the heroic exploits of the soldiers of the Victorian age. The task was exciting enough, and exhilarating too, to dwell upon ; Sir Henry Havelock marching against heavy odds for the relief of Cawnpore. Others of the same group were Neill, the stern Avenger, saviour of Benares and of Allahabad, Outram, 'the Bayard of India', the daring and intrepid guerilla chieftain, Hodson, Warden of the Marches, general John Nicholson, 'a knight of the time of King Arthur', the great commanders Lords Clyde and Strathnairn. To this category also belonged the celebrated officers of the Punjab, Chamberlain, Herbert Edwardes, and Sydney Cotton. There were other instances of men rising to the emergency and evincing character and conduct which it was out of all calculations to expect. Thus Brasyer by his dauntless courage and uncommon tact secured the loyalty of the Sikhs at Allahabad, Eyre by his consummate skill and leadership saved Behar from insurrection, Venables with his retainers held the frontier of Jaunpur and Azamgarh[3], Longden with his handful of the 10th held out against

[1] Malleson, II, pp. 56. ff.

[2] Forrest. *History* I, p, 115. The Edinburgh Academy in India published a list of brave Academicals like captain W. S. Beatson of the Bengal cavalry (Kaye, II. p, 285) who took part in the Sepoy war.

[3] Malleson, II, p. 318.

Marfat.com

countless foes[1], Crommelin inaugurated a new era in subterranean warfare[2], Baird Smith planned, and Taylor carried out the design for the capture of Delhi[3], Tombs worked his six-pounders as Artillery at Delhi as never worked before[4], Roberts had shown how to baffle an ubiquitous foe[5] and Napier how to accomplish the most crushing pursuit of the enemy[6]. Many more may be counted who honoured their countrymen by their inspiring presence and leadership. such as, captain Fulton, the 'defender of Lucknow'[7], the adjutant-general Norman who was a sort of steam-engine[8], captain William Peel of the Naval Brigade who was like 'a polar star of honour for future heroes'[9]. There were others also who were standing on the periphery of this glorious company of 'Mutiny Veterans',[10] so dear to every British house and together they conducted the Indian campaigns of 1857-59, 'one of the proudest chapters ever recorded by history'.[11]

It has been seen that the accounts of the war at Delhi from military sources were quite a few.[12] On Lucknow lieutenant V. D. Majendie was one of the earliest writers. He was a spectator and also a combatant of the war at Lucknow and gives a reliable account of the day to day fighting and of the incidents of the final stages of the operations leading to the fall of the city in his book 'Up among the Pandies'. Like a millitary officer he gives a graphic description of the Gumati during the siege of Lucknow, and explains how this trans-Gumati movement enabled the British to take the enemy's defence in reverse. It exposed them to a severe cross-fire and threatened their left flank and also closed their line of retreat.

1 *Civil Rebellion*, pp. 44-45.
2 Malleson, II, p. 159.
3 Malleson, II, pp. 4-5 ; Edwardes, *Battles*, p. 39.
4 Kaye, II, pp. 184, 577-79 ; Malleson, II, p. 20 ; *History of the Siege of Delhi*, pp. 107-8.
5 Edwardes, op. cit. pp. 188 ff.
6 Ibid. p. 188.
7 Forrest, *History*, I, p. 319 ; Malleson, II, p. 481.
8 Forrest, *History*, II, p. 301 ; Innes, *Sepoy Revolt*, pp. 301-02.
9 Ibid. II, pp. 319 ;; Malleson, II, p. 546.
10 Malleson, II, pp. 508-20, III, pp. 458 ff ; Knight, *The Romance* etc. p. 285.
11 *Supra*, p. 38 (The Campaigns of 1857-59).
12 *Supra*, pp. 50 ff.

Marfat.com

Later on Malleson wrote exactly on the same lines regarding the operations at Lucknow. As for the order passed by Sir Colin Campbell on general Outram not to cross the iron bridge on 14th March 1858 which was so much criticised by historians[1], Majendie hinted that there was a chance of losing people if the attempt to cross the bridge would have been made as the enemy had a nine-pounder gun sweeping the bridge[2].

Lieutenant-General McLeod Innes, who took part in the defence of the Residency and was a part of the garrison all through in the siege of Lucknow, wrote a number of books on the mutiny-war. In 1857 he published a 'Rough Narrative of the siege of Lucknow' which was supplemented in 1858 by the 'Diary of the Staff Officer'. His second book 'Lucknow and Oudh in the mutiny' came out in 1896 and was well received as a valuable work on the Indian Mutiny. Rice Holmes wrote that Innes' *Lucknow and Oudh in Mutiny* is one of the most valuable not only of the recent, but of all the narratives written by actors in the Mutiny. For the history of the Rising at Lucknow, it was an original authority of first-rate importance and of particular interest was author's critical sketch of the Mutiny as a whole.[3] Next year in 1897 Innes published his third book 'The Sepoy Revolt' with the object 'to give a detailed account primarily of the siege of Lucknow and the operations connected therewith'. Innes marshalled his facts with consummate skill but his observations were not acute and historically oriented. He commented that the vital struggle closed with the capture of Delhi and Havelock's succour of Lucknow[4]. As an army man he should have known that Havelock's performance at Lucknow was far from a relief, far less a reinforcement, if not a defeat camouflaged by emotional upsurge. With his military knowledge, Malleson regarded it as merely a relief. The fall of Delhi was no doubt a central event but its effect on the course of the revolt was not at all considerable. However, Innes made a distinct contribution to the military history of the Mutiny, the only history by a soldier of standing, as general

1 Malleson, II, p. 347 ; Forrest, *History*, II, pp. 356-7.
2 Majendie, p. 100, See also *supra*, pp. 67, 77, 127.
3 Holmes, p. 634.
4 Innes, *Sepoy Revolt*, p. 210.

Marfat.com

Sir George Mc Munn said, which may be regarded as admirable. 'It is concise and succinct and tells the story as it should be told and is free from the tragic details of the happenings which naturally clog the fuller narratives'[1]. Captain R. P. Anderson also published his work on the siege of Lucknow which was edited with a preface by T. Carnegy Anderson. The book based on the author's personal impression is not free from racial and political overtones. The editor observed that the siege of Lucknow stands unparalleled because of the extraordinary circumstances of its siege and the bravery of its garrison including the ladies and women whose patience and strength surpassed even the bravery of the celebrated Spartan ladies who cut off their hair to make bow-strings.[2]

Brevet Major Octavious Anson's book 'With H.M. 9th Lancers during the Indian Mutiny' is a collection of letters written to his wife under trying circumstances of those times which were carefully selected by the editor. The letters were found to be accurate and stood the test of critical scrutiny. The entries are not necessarily of great historical interest as they were mixed up with all sorts of private matters. Anson was deeply religious and was disgusted with the butchery and the horrible carnage that followed the fall of Delhi. In one of the letters he writes, 'you can't imagine how completely the city has been plundered'. Elsewhere referring to the barbarities practised by the English he commented, 'the only real wonder to me in this land is that all do not at once rise upon us and exterminate the hated feringhees who so grievously oppress them[3]. George Digby Barker was another young lieutenant with the 78th Highlanders. He was with Havelock from first to last and also took part in the final relief of Lucknow and later held the post of deputy-assistant-quarter-master-general. His 'Letters from Persia and India, etc.' addressed to his mother contained some interesting information about the military operations though some of the letters are found to be sketchy, mixed up with many domestic notes and personal matters. He writes, 'Havelock was proud of his 78th Highlanders and so also

1 Mac Munn, p. 3.
2 Anderson, *A Personal Account etc.* pp. viii-ix.
3 Anson, pp. 7, 160, 178.

Marfat.com

was Outram[1] and the writer had the satisfaction of serving both of them. He describes the scene of desolation at Allahabad, of bodies of rebels hanging by half-dozens from the boughs of trees on the road-side. He also stood before the well at Cawnpore[2]. On 15th August 1857 he writes to his mother that they found it impossible to reach Lucknow, 'the whole country of Oudh being up on arms against us', and some 50,000 if not 80,C00 men, regulars and irregulars, and armed countrymen with fifty guns, disputing 'every inch of ground'. He gives a vivid description of Lucknow on 25th September and of the hazards of this operation, 'some 20,000 were firing showers of musketry on our advancing troops.'[3]

Similarly the book, 'Letters from India during the Mutiny, etc'. by John Chalmers offers a chronological sketch of some events. Some of the letters suddenly discovered in an old box in 1904 added with the letters addressed to his mother and to J. M. Mackenzie and Henry Bruce, his relatives, are the materials of the book published to keep 'green the memory of one who helped to save India and win the empire'. Chalmers acted as field-engineer throughout the siege of Delhi and commanded the 'ladder party' with general Nicholson. He had a 'strong dash of erratic originality' and used provocative language to excite the interest of the people at home in Indian affairs. In a letter dated 13 June 1857 he referred to the 'foolish attempt of General Anson to interfere with the caste of the men by greasing the bullets of their cartridges with beef suet and pig's fat mixed.' He gives a horrid picture of the Delhi massacres, of Europeans being slaughtered, ladies violated, and 'children tossed about from bayonet to bayonet'[4]. He writes of the high spirit which animated every European and of Sir John Lawrence 'who would save India, if India is saved'. On 10th July he found that things are much worse and if the reinforcement did not arrive soon it would be 'good-bye to English rule in India'.[5] Various other matters came to his notice ; of special significance was his remark about Hodson

1 Barker, pp. 57, 104.
2 Ibid. pp. 46-7, 52.
3 Ibid. pp. 63, 79.
4 Chalmers, pp. 8-9, II, 18, 24, 26.
5 Ibip.

Marfat.com

when he was mortally wounded, that he had no 'business to go there'[1]. Chalmers participated in the loot at Lucknow and regaled his people with his 'booty of solid gold bracelets, good pearls and decorated shawls.'

The well known work of F. S. Roberts, 'Forty-one years in India', in two volumes was published in 1897. The first volume deals with the Mutiny and covers the Punjab, Delhi and Lucknow in a narrative form. He also writes on the causes of unrest leading to the Mutiny. The whole book is based on official report and public records and not on his personal impression. His 'Letters written during the Indian Mutiny' published in 1924 is a collection of thirty such writings which reflect his views on many incidental matters of the Mutiny including his remarks about the Sepoys.[2]

The most famous work of the military historians is 'Incidents in the Sepoy War 1857-58' by James Hope Grant compiled from the private journals of general Grant together with some explanatory chapters by Henry Knollys. His work published in 1873 is by itself a history of the mutiny-war. The writer deals mainly with Campbell's march to Lucknow and several independent expeditions after the relief of the city, but he was the only general who saw the Sepoy War to the last and remained in the field even in the early months of 1859. Sir Colin Campbell, otherwise very critical of his men, was sincere in his warm appreciation of Grant's qualities as a general. The despatch of Clyde, dated 7 January 1859 to viscount Canning records : 'Sir Hope Grant's despatches during the last six months have told the story of the admirable part taken by him in this war. I cannot say too much in his praise. He has the rare merit of uniting the 'greatest boldness in action, a firm and correct judgment and the most scrupulous regard for orders and instructions'[3]. Field-Marshal Sir Evelyn Wood also regarded Grant as one of the 'grandest characters' he had ever known. Tall and spare he was a tireless worker and although not well educated he was a good and cultivated musician.

[1] Ibid. p. 66.

[2] Roberts' observation on the Meerut situation was faulty (Llewellyn, op. cit. pp. 166-67). For other views on the position of the Residency, *infra*, p. 212.

[3] Ball, II, p. 566.



Marfat.com

Morally courageous and physically brave, 'he had the best instincts of the soldier.'[1] His *Incidents etc.* is characterised by striking clarity and detail and is priceless as a source-material of mutiny history. Like his personal attainments his book is a bright spot in the annals of the Indian campaign of 1857-59. Other writers like Sir George Campbell and C. R. Low also paid high tributes to the activities of Hope Grant in the mutiny-war of India.

Various other works on different aspects of the army organisation and the Mutiny came out latterly[2]. Windham's operations at Cawnpore called forth a number of polemical treatises. Adye's *The Defence of Cawnpore* gives a detailed account of three days of battle during which Cawnpore was defended. He supported Windham's actions and attempted to remove many erroneous impressions respecting the conduct of operations by Windham and inserted many official despatches to support his contention. It is a controversial issue which was properly treated by Forrest. But Windham continued to publish several booklets in defence of his position as supplements to Adye's 'Defence'. An interesting work 'Stirring Times Under the Canvas' by Herford gives some side-light about the march of the soldiers up the country. Herford was in the 90th Light Infantry which was rushed from the China force to Campbell's command. The volume is more a collection of anecdotes than an actual journal of events[3]. An anonymous work entitled 'Great Battles of the British Army' without the date of publication refers to the first relief of Lucknow which resembled, according to the author, the taking of Buenos Ayres or of Saragossa[4]. Sir John Jacob's *Western India before and during the Mutinies* contains very little military information but is valuable for his observations on Indian political life and social changes and reform. Captain T. Carnegy Anderson's work on the Victoria Cross is a work on establishment of the rank and position of the army personnel. Bayley in his 'Assault of Delhi' states the case of 52nd Light Infantry in the 3rd column against the views of Kaye

1 Wood, p. 34.

2 Mention may be made of some of these authors and works as Red, White and Blue, G. M. Sherer, Rupert Stewart, T. Thackeray, F. H. Tyrrell, and Williamson.

3 Herford, pp. 30, 230, 246.

4 p. 557.

Marfat.com

regarding their performance as stated in his 'Sepoy War'. Burgoyne's 'Historical Records of the 93rd Sutherland Highlanders' is a history of regimental formations. As Campbell's force in the second relief and final capture of Lucknow it had won a status of its own. The 93rd became a watchword of quick action and success. Forbes-Mitchell of the 93rd gives an excellent impression of his regiment in his 'Reminiscences'. Another work of this nature was Butler's 'King's Royal Rifle Corps', but somewhat different was Cardew's 'Hodson's Horse' which took part in the siege of Delhi and in the final capture of Lucknow. On Hodson, the balance was tilted in the estimate he made of the leader. But Cardew's sketch of the 'Services of the Bengal Native Army' provides a short account of the military history of the Uprising substantiated by background sources of original importance. Cardew also wrote a regimental history of the native army. A work on the 'History of Rifle Brigade' by Cope is only a short sketch of the part played by the regiment in the campaigns of 1857-59. Similar are the works of Cromb on the 'Highland Brigade', its battles and heroes and of H. Davidson on the 78th Highlanders. Ladendorf has furnished a list of all such works of regimental history bearing a connection with the operation of the mutiny-war and of the army movements during that time[1]. In this connection mention may be made of Wylly's 'Neill's Blue Caps' which also contains four chapters on regimental history. The Royal Madras Fusiliers were a part of Havelock's force and later participated in the final capture of Lucknow.

A book of importance is captain H. L. Nevill's 'Campaigns on the North-West Frontier' which gives an account of the troubles which arose with the border tribes to the north-west of Rawalpindi beyond the Indus. He refers to the series of outbreaks which broke out in different parts of the frontier assisted by men and money from India. According to the author, these outbreaks were mainly inspired by Indian agents. The insurgents were held in check by the fort of mardan, but disturbances were widespread[2]. Two works on the purely military events of the great struggle appeared in 1908, one by

[1] Ladendorf, pp. 95 ff.
[2] Nevill, pp. 38 ff.

Marfat.com

captain F. R. Sedgwick and the other by Sir Evelyn Wood. Sedgwick justified the publication of his work to remedy the deficiency of a brief account on the military aspect of the outbreak of 1857-59 despite the immense mass of literature dealing with the subject. His authorities are Kaye, Malleson, Forrest and Roberts. As mentioned before, he characterised the Indian Mutiny as one of England's three great 'Small Wars'. The author describes in detail the strength of the army in respect of the major operations and to the movement of the British troops and the measures taken to bring reinforcements from overseas. He estimates the strength of the British position at Meerut and Cawnpore. At Delhi the effective strength was 7,794 on 11 September and at Lucknow the garrison consisted of 1,008 British, 762 natives, 1,280 non-combatants of which 600 were British and Eurasian women.[1] He thinks that it was most unfortunate that Wilson, the brigadier at Meerut, did not follow up the mutineers and Wheeler did not retire with all the Europeans to the magazine, six miles away from Cawnpore. At Chinhat, Henry Lawrence, the administrator, was in the wrong place and so too was Sir Patrick Grant in Calcutta[2]. From a military point of view, Havelock showed that the bayonet charge by the British troops was a certain solution of the most difficult tactical problem. Sir Colin did the right thing in withdrawing the garrison from Lucknow, if only because a force tied in the Residency would be a target for the enemy. The Residency was no fortress, it was merely an entrenched camp. The skilful withdrawal of the whole garrison was an achievement almost unique[3]. General Windham's operations at Cawnpore were not a masterpiece, for 1,200 men without cavalry to attack 25,000 was to court a failure, but the battle of Generalganj near Cawnpore on 6 December 1857 was a 'fine example of Sir Colin Campbell's combination of forethought and audacity'. The other general, Sir Hugh Rose, according to him adopted one of the boldest manoeuvres made in the whole history of the Mutiny at the battle of Betwa on 1 April 1858[4]. If a military

1 Sedgwick, pp. 20, 31, 71, 79. He also estimated the strength of the rebel army which opposed Sir Colin at Lucknow (p. 112). Also *Supra*, p. 164.
2 Ibid. pp. 20, 30, 35, 39.
3 Ibid. pp. 43, 94, 96.
4 Ibid. p. 132.

Marfat.com

history is to be concise and precise, Sedgwick handled his subject quite efficiently. He recorded his admiration of British character of which he and his descendants would be proud of[1] but he also incidentally remarked that the Mutiny was more than a mutiny, it was part of a rebellion[2].

Sir Evelyn Wood's book 'The Revolt of Hindusthan' dedicated to the memory of the Europeans and Asiatics was a more comprehensive work than that of Sedgwick, though the title of his book was misleading as Hindusthan was nowhere in the picture in his book. Wood was one of the band of three British field-marshals who took part in the great struggle and like his distinguished colleagues, Wolseley and Roberts, he proved himself a spirited chronicler. The book was published in 1908 practically after half a century of the Uprising, but the author wrote in a style which comes from personal recollections and experience. His effort to write fairly of the contending races was highly appreciated by the *Times* which wrote a long article about the work. It is no small authority that the veteran field-marshal writes of action in which he took part himself or of which he heard from the mouths of comrades as eye-witnesses. But it is a plain narrative in a small compass mainly descriptive of military movements and actions, and the treatment is neither analytical nor critical. It does not pretend to place facts in historical perspective. It is only a record of procession of events and a work on the career of British generals, their regimental strength. In the back drop of the Mutiny they all looked like a crowd of people yelling for a fight. Wood deserved to be appreciated because he was exceptionally free from racial or Indian bias. He has no word of condemnation of atrocities committed on either side. In regard to the details of the war he made out some new points. According to Wood, at Shah Najaf, Peel's 24-pounders battered for three hours the thick wall in vain, the charge of the 93rd Highlanders proved infructuous, and Colin Campbell reluctantly admitted failure and retired at nightfall. The situation was, however, saved by the brigadier-general Adrian Hope[3].

[1] Ibid. p. 25.
[2] Ibid. p. 55.
[3] Wood, pp. 214-15.

Marfat.com

About Indians, the author speaks glowingly of the fidelity of those who remained in the British camp. Finally, he concluded that the struggle for supremacy in Hindusthan had evoked some of the best characteristics of the Anglo-Saxon races but 'it could have been difficult for the British if their enemies had been commanded by capable leaders'.[1] But writing in 1908 it is strange how Sir Evelyn could have furnished a list of books on the Mutiny equating Dr. Fitchett's work with other standard volumes on the Indian Mutiny like the works of Kaye, Malleson and Forrest.[2] Another remarkable work on military intelligence and engagements on the Indian Mutiny was colonel J. R. J. Jocelyn's 'History of the Royal and Indian Artillery in the Mutiny of 1857'. The book published in 1915 gives a narrative containing letters, tables and orders of battles by means of a wider range of extracts skilfully arranged and presented.

Lieutenant-Colonel G. H. D. Gimlete of the Indian Medical Service in introducing his work 'A Postscript to the Records of the Indian Mutiny' writes, 'No military revolt in the world's history has had so many chronicles as the Indian Mutiny'. Gimlete's book is a most attractive and informing work which tells the story and eventual fate of every unit of the Bengal Army. It is an excellent supplementary for the whole course of the Mutiny with an introduction and objective commentaries. The Indian Mutiny was such an extraordinary series of events that Gimlete's book most necessarily filled up a gap. He might not have brought to light anything hitherto unknown but he certainly explored very interesting aspects of the Mutiny. His work is not so much a book, as a series of notes on the different Indian Units of the Bengal Army arranged in their numerical order as they stood in 1857. In general, he traces the activities and fortunes of the rebel regiment, but the behaviour of other corps which did not mutiny at all, such as the 33rd, the 43rd, the 59th, the 63rd, and the 70th N. I. and the greater portion of the 31st who stuck to their loyalty with the British has also come into prominence. The '350 men of the 13th N. I.' who held Bailey-Guard at the Lucknow Residency afforded another instance of contrasted

[1] Ibid. pp. 146, 260-01, 348.
[2] Ibid. p. 355.

Marfat.com

episodes with which the Indian Mutiny was full. Some units went through the whole process of murder and assassinations, some did not slay their officers and some even protected them without any obligation. Again, quite a few of the regiments wavered, and in the absence of a strong officer to hold them to duty eventually revolted. It also happened that some revolted because they feared reprisals owing to a previous act of delinquency while others were kept with the colours by their commanders. Amidst all these vicissitudes and tensions when every bazar was full of rumour of the collapse of the English rule and when every Indian was a suspect to the Englishmen, it was unaccountable how some like the 13th still persevered in their loyalty to their masters. In fact, the Mutiny caught the sepoys in an emotional squeeze. Forrest observed : 'The struggle in the sepoy breast between fidelity and regard for his officer and the wild Bacchic impulse to fight for his faith is one of the most tragic features of the Mutiny'.[1] The author's observations on other matters must also carry weight as he had before him the whole picture of the army in revolt. He considered it certain that the Meerut rising was premature by some weeks as the conspirators had planned a general simultaneous rising at all stations on 31 May 1857.[2] However, it is pointed out that a list of officers belonging to Cavalry regiments but absent from them would have shown how far the practice of seconding officers for civil or staff employment was a contributory cause of the Indian Mutiny even as a special case in the case of special units.[3] There were many other works of military officers which directly or indirectly dealt with the Indian Mutiny. Fortescue in his 'History of the British Army' offers a detailed narrative of the campaigns of 1857-59 in volume thirteen of his work.

But the most representative work of military historians of the Indian Mutiny is lieutenant-general Sir George MacMunn's 'The Indian Mutiny In Perspective' published in 1931, which is a 'Study of the real military aspect of the rising'. In the Introduction the author writes that he was 'struck with the inadequacy in certain

1 Forrest, *History*, III, p. 108.
2 Gimlete, p. 48.
3 The *Times* Literary Supplement, November 24, 1927.

Marfat.com

military aspects' of the historians of the Mutiny. He points to the lack of military knowledge of civilian historians, to their usual faults that they overpaint their materials, make heroes too heroic and situations too sensational. They had failed to comprehend the disasters resulting from the mishandling of troops at Chinhat and the consequences of the faulty assumption that the ammunition was destroyed by the blowing up of the magazine in the Delhi arsenal. They also, he adds, were ignorant of the existence of two companies of native artillery among the mutinous troops at Cawnpore. Even before his book appeared in 1931 general MacMunn published a long article in the *Blackwood's Magazine* of October 1928 on exactly the same issue. As 'Histories', only two books held the field, he said, the semi-official history by Kaye and Malleson, and that of T. Rice Holmes. But both these accounts according to him were singularly wanting in any treatment of some of the essential facts though filled with other details and the later history by Sir G. W. Forrest merely follows the line of the earlier two.[1]

His main point of attack against the professional historians was that they had no conception of military requirements. He argued that none of the historians commented on or made any ploy with the really important factor, that while the governor-general and all officers of his government were in Calcutta the whole of the military machine was in Simla. This paralysed the government and accounted for the ineffectiveness of the civil side of the military machine to cope with the situation.[2] He further states that there was no arrangement in Calcutta for the reception and organisation of those reinforcements which came as units and there was no adequate system either for their transport, equipment and movement. The country was divided into divisional areas, and it is to be presumed that the divisional headquarters functioned, but it is astounding, MacMunn says, that very few historians had any knowledge of these governing factors. He fell foul with those who criticised Sir Patrick Grant of Laswaree, Meanee and Jallalabad fame, a tower of strength to that impetuous old soldier Sir Hugh Gough. Grant, he stressed, was better known to the

[1] *Blackwood's Magazine* 1928, vol. 224, p. 433.
[2] Ibid. pp. 435-36 ; MacMunn, pp. 4-28.

Marfat.com

Bengal Sepoys and had more influence with them than any man of his age save perhaps Sir John Hearsey or Wheeler. His name was one to conjure with and it was fondly believed that Sir Patrick was only to move quickly up-country with any British troops he could scrape and it would at once recall the Bengal Army to its allegiance. That Grant was not appointed to succeed general Anson, was not, according to the author, a wise decision, for Sir Patrick, it was believed, would have brought things to a conclusion far sooner than Sir Colin Campbell,[1] the "Old Khabardar" as the army came to call him.

MacMunn, it seems, was labouring under a wrong impression. He should have known that despite these difficulties, Canning made all arrangements for bringing reinforcements from all quarters. The government also was not effectively paralysed. General Peter Low was a military member of the governor-general's council whose position corresponded in a way to the position of the secretary of state of war and the departmental office was also in Calcutta. No historian had stated that the military machine was not defective. They also contended that the government failed to adopt some measures like the enlistment of volunteers and the timely despatch of the 84th on 6th May towards the up-country and other such immediate measures which could have forestalled some of the developments in the early stages of the outbreak. The government might have been guilty of fatuity in trusting that the sepoys would not yield to temptations even in such a crisis and allowed the Bengal Army close to Calcutta and the garrison at Dinapur to remain armed. But it may be pointed out that the military historians had also shared the 'jaunty confidence' of Cecil Beadon expressed on 25th May that all was quiet within six hundred miles of the capital. This kind of fatuity could not be ruled out[2] and MacMunn himself draws a picture of relaxation and rest in the British camp in April 1857. In general the British mentality accepted the lull as a sign that the storm was over.[3] Even if the historians had considerable knowledge of military affairs they could

[1] Blackwood's Magazine, op. cit. p. 438 ; McMunn, p. 68.
[2] Malleson, I, pp. 1-9 ; *supra*, pp. 158-59.
[3] MacMunn, p. 34,

Marfat.com

not have maintained like MacMunn the untenable position that the revolt would not have occurred or spread its influence if Anson would have been at the beck and call of Canning.

It cannot be argued that the historians were ignorant of the presence of Sir Patrick Grant who was summoned from Madras to take over on the demise of general Anson. But what was his performance ? Malleson rightly says that he had wasted great opportunities which never appeared before any of the mutiny generals to take the initiative in confronting the rebels when the revolt had not spread very far. Sir Patrick reached Calcutta on 19 June when a field of immense possibility lay open before him, but he would not lead the army and remained in Calcutta under the plea of reforms and reorganisation. So another officer had to command the army in the field and he was major-general Havelock while Sir Colin Campbell was appointed to succeed general Anson.[1] The people of England, as Malleson says, divined correctly that Patrick Grant was not the man who could have delivered the goods. He had not been endowed with the 'slightest spark of genius.' He could carry out the details of a campaign but he had not the capacity to plan one.[2]

MacMunn's infatuation for mutiny generals knew no bounds. He offers a laboured defence of Hewitt and of Archdale Wilson, head of the Bengal Artillery in India, and challenges what the historians wrote about the 'Night of Horror at Meerut' from Wilson's Diary published in 1923 and even supports the inaction at Meerut on the basis of Lord Roberts' opinion that there was very little to be done as nobody believed that the army was mutinying.[3] All these are no doubt very controversial issues but the general, it seems, was not well read in mutiny literature. For the 'night of horror' the historians had many more convincing evidence than the diary of the discredited brigadier who had to defend his conduct by writing that within an hour the whole disturbances were over. Kate Moore, the Meerut girl who sent the famous telegram to Agra giving the news of the outbreak at Meerut wrote, "so the wretches were allowed to carry on

[1] Malleson, I, pp. 29-31.
[2] *Red Pamphlet*, p, 101.
[3] *Blackwood's Magazine*, op. cit. p. 439 ; MacMunn, p. 41.

Marfat.com

their murderous attack all through the night until they were perfectly satiated with the blood of Europeans."[1] For the inaction at Meerut it would be ridiculous to accept the argument of Roberts against the views of hundreds of writers and the considered opinions of Kaye, Gough, Mackenzie, Forrest, Canning, and many others that the Meerut mutineers could have been easily overtaken before they reached Delhi.[2] Similarly, on Anson, MacMunn refers to the views of Sir Henry Norman and Lord Roberts to show that he could not, under the circumstances, have been more prompt. Malleson also was an admirer of general Anson. About him he writes : 'this "Horse-Guards' General" who had gained honours at "New Market" nevertheless made himself a master of his profession. The plan of operation he drew up was the one which was carried out by his successor, a Crimean warrior, rejecting as ridiculous all that the Collective wisdom of Calcutta could offer'.[3] But Malleson also was not quite sure about Anson's antecedents. Montgomery Martin, one of the very sober historians of the Mutiny, pointed out that Anson did never make any single representation to the directors of the Company on any disaffection among the troops up to May 1857. A man who had never commanded a regiment could not be selected at sixty years of age to take charge of the Indian army unless he had some special influence in some quarters which obviously was of a very sordid nature. A clerk of ordnance, an expert on racing matters, and a first-rate cardplayer, Anson by his acts of commission and omission 'contributed to bring the Mutiny to a head.'[4] Mac-Munn could not possibly have refuted any of the points as stated above. He also was not correct in stating that the mishandling of troops at Chinhat by Henry Lawrence and a heavy loss in British lives which it caused are little emphasized by historians.[5] Rice Holmes whom he considered to be a standard authority exposed the myth of Henry Lawrence[6] though Kaye and other writers were inclined to restrict adverse comments on the disaster. Martin and

1 *Supra*, p. 135. See also Ball, I, pp. 60-3.

2 The latest to write on the subject, Alexander Llewellyn considers it very strange that Frederick Roberts was to justify the inactivity of Hewitt (*Siege of Delhi*, pp. 166-67).

3 *Red Pamphlet*, p. 100.

4 Martin, II, pp. 135-36.

5 MacMunn, p. 4,

6 Holmes, *History*, Appendix.

Marfat.com

many others also criticised Henry Lawrence for his failure at Chinhat.[1] MacMunn's contention that the historians have not cared to enquire whence the mutineers got the inexhaustible supply of ammunition even after the blowing up of the Magazine in the Delhi arsenal[2] was also a travesty of truth. Kaye discussed the whole story of the removal of the ammunition to a fortified building three miles above the city by Napier a few years earlier.[3] Again, all he writes about Meerut are highly controversial and can only be discussed separately in an independent work on Mutiny studies. That the night of horror at Meerut was not so terrible, that the mutineers could not have reached Delhi early in the morning of 11 May, that Hewitt and Wilson have been needlessly blamed, that Meerut was not a case parallel to that of Gillespie and his Dragoons galloping from Arcot to Vellore, that cross-country riding by night in pursuit of the flying mutineers was not possible and also his other charge that there was much of sensational over-colouring in the works of Kaye and other civilian historians would not bear any critical scrutiny.[4]

On general matters, MacMunn offers his comments about Dalhousie whom he considered to be the only man who could have gripped the crisis. He was satisfied that the Punjab was controlled by John Lawrence. The people there were also largely those who had come to the front in the difficult time of the Afghan and Sikh Wars. British garrison was far more numerous than in the Lower Province between Calcutta and Meerut. He explains the distribution of the army in the cantonments on the Jumna and the Ganges and observes that the drain of the Punjab and the Frontier as well as of the Crimea was such that even the great fortress of Allahabad was without any European garrison though Sir James Outram pointed to the insecurity of this position in 1856 when Oudh was annexed. MacMunn says that the historians who called themselves original writers had completely ignored the vital effect of this error on the whole course of the Mutiny. The absence of a European garrison at Allahabad

[1] Martin, II, p. 241.
[2] MacMunn, p. 4.
[3] Kaye, II, p. 17 fn ; *Supra*, pp. 99, 109.
[4] Mac Munn, pp. 41-44. It seems J. A. B. Palmer in his book on the Mutiny at Meerut had not taken notice of MacMunn's views.

Marfat.com

was directly responsible for the tragedy of Cawnpore, the fall of Lucknow and, remotely perhaps, created a situation for the reconquest of Oudh.[1] A close study of the army movements of this period, May-July 1857, bears out the factual basis of this contention. The treatment of the history of the Mutiny from a sectional and regional point of view may lead to the oversight of this central issue in the chain of developments.

The central issue was the weak position at Allahabad. MacMunn writes, 'Alas ! again the whole edifice fell with the outbreak of the mutiny at Allahabad'. Major-General Sir Hugh Wheeler's position at Cawnpore was strengthened by the arrival of reinforcements towards the end of May. One hundred and ten of the 84th and fifteen of the Fusiliers had come from Calcutta via Allahabad and Wheeler was told confidently of 'more behind'. But the outbreak at Allahabad on 6 June stopped the flow. No more of the troops were to come through[2]. On the Cawnpore situation the author maintained that the Nana persuaded the mutineers to return to Cawnpore and all the developments that followed were due to the fierce, racial spirit of the Bengal Army. He comments, 'Let the blame rest on those who first banished all truth from the face of earth'[3]. MacMunn's anti-civilian stance finds expression all along from one event to another. He hints that it was not properly recorded that Havelock's advance to Lucknow commenced two months after his first crossing the Ganges. This had one specially disastrous effect which turned the war from a military rebellion to a national outbreak[4].

The historians, according to MacMunn, also had overlooked the fact that half the famous defenders of the Bailey-Guard were Bengal Sepoys, and that the civilians had made much of a Council of war at Lucknow[5]. The siege of Delhi is narrated in detail but he considered that the failure of the plans for the assault of Delhi on 13 June was

1 Ibid. pp. 67, 69, 81.
2 MacMunn, p. 112.
3 Ibid. pp. 116-18.
4 Ibid. pp. 140, 142, 151. Similarly, M. Edwardes commented that Havelock's withdrawal across the Ganges had a disastrous effect, the Mutiny was turned into a National uprising (*Battles*, p. 190).
5 MacMunn, op. cit.

Marfat.com

singularly fortunate. He wonders that no master-mind as military leader was thrown up by the Sepoy army but it was not surprising that the effete seniority system of the Bengal army should throw up no leader. Yet there should have been some soldier of commanding character[1] in the irregular cavalry. The general maintained very interesting views about others, that Hodson had a dual character, that Havelock was not so much a commander as a leader—a soldier to his finger tips, that Outram's command was amusing because he had not indeed acted as a volunteer but as a higher commander[2], that the war-bred Sir Colin was no favourite of fortune, he made his career at cannon's mouth, that the slaughter of vengeance at Secundrabagh was a pity, a tragedy, a necessity and yet a sight—'the holocaust of 1800 sepoys lay dead in her majesty's scarlet coats'. MacMunn gives his own idea about the strategy of the war ; 'the importance of the line of the Ganges as the main artery of recovery and operations'. He refers to Sir Colin's plan of attack on Lucknow and then hurrying to Cawnpore and securing it against the Gwaliors and giving priority to operation against the nawab of Farrakkabad in December 1857 and clearing the Doab along with Seaton. These intricate matters of military movements are little noticed by historians, as also Outram's stay at Alambagh from November 1857 to February, 1858. It has not been noticed also that for the final relief of Lucknow in March 1858 Campbell had assembled a force that was the largest that the British had ever had in the field since Waterloo[3]. MacMunn's narrative of the third relief was exhaustive. He makes no comment on the death of Hodson and also on the order that prevented Outram crossing the river, but he remarks that the war was kept prolonged for twelve months more and caused the loss of one thousand British lives. Sir Hugh Rose's task 'was no less than an advance across India to the Jumna.....it is a story which has not lost on the telling.' The

[1] Ibid. pp. 154, 165. Ball was the first of the historians to refer to this point. He writes it was certainly surprising that opportunities so extensive should not have brought forward any one exemple of political or military ability in the ranks of the insurgents. ...No Sivajee ! ...no Hyder Ali ; ...no Runjeet Singh had appeared on the scene (Ball II, p. 363).

[2] MacMunn, pp. 186, 191-2 ; M. Edwardes, p. 95.

[3] MacMunn, pp. 202-8.

Marfat.com

astounding exertion and the spectacular nature of the march across the peninsula 'combined to make his operations something of a myth'[1]. All other operations of the Central India Field Force are minutely recorded as examples of energy and endurance. MacMunn concludes his book with a "Retrospect", in which he touches on many sundry matters. According to him the Third Relief of Lucknow and the marching of a retributory force across central India were the actual wars of the Mutiny. He also observed that the Mutiny coincided with the march of science and many progressive forces, and all these climaxed by the Independence of India were all in a piece[2].

In this vast body of military accounts of the Indian war it is not perhaps intended that any attempt should be made to select a few which would appeal to the most. To MacMunn, McLeod Innes was the best. He had also a liking for Mrs. Flora Steel's 'On the face of the waters'[3] but this was a historical work with a difference. He was angry with the 'Red Pamphlet' which was famous but 'sensational and inaccurate', the work of a young captain in the Bengal commissariat. But despite these blemishes the 'Red Pamphlet' is still regarded as the first milestone of historical writings on the Indian Mutiny, a well-knit composition with a mixture of fact and explanation which tells the story of 1857 within a short compass but with the most engaging effect. Another book which has kept to its exquisiteness and popularity for years is 'Reminiscences of the Great Mutiny' by W. Forbes-Mitchell of the famous 'Ninetythird' of Sir John Campbell who attempted this work from the 'most unusual position for a military historian—the ranks'. He covered the entire period from the second relief of Lucknow to the battle of Bareilly, 5 May 1858 and describes the scenes in which he himself was an actor. It is a straightforward and soldier-like story, a continuation of lady Inglis' work, told effortlessly with a charm of its own. The many amusing incidents of camp life, interesting anecdotes and various other involvements which afford glimpses of the milieu combine to make this 'Reminiscences'

1 MacMunn, p. 227.
2 Ibid. p. 264. It is not clear if he had anticipated the independence of India (Author).
3 Ibid. p. 48.

Marfat.com

so interesting and so exciting.[1] Forbes-Mitchell reminds the mutiny historians of a type of British soldiers susceptible to wider contacts, that the Indian Mutiny brought to the fore, a tribe now extinct but not forgotten.

It will not be out of place to include in the list another book 'My Journal', an anonymous publication of W. O. Swanston. He was one of that band of Eighteen who formed Havelock's cavalry and was present through all the operations which led to the first and second relief of Lucknow and then with Outram at Alambagh. It is a modest work, it has no pretension to literary merit, evidently being the first work of a young writer. From the historical point of view also it scarcely touches on questions of military strategy or political issues and contains no vivid or picturesque sketch of sieges or battles. The style of the 'Journal' was also simple, unaffected, almost prosaic, but there was a certain quality about the book which tended to excite passion. The tremendous humanising appeal of the Sepoy Mutiny generated an emotional upsurge among all, whether a sophisticated officer or not, and everywhere, whether in the barracks or in the hospital, no book was more heartily praised or more eagerly sought for. Swanston 'writes down with his own sensations from day to day, with a frank, truthful sincerity, until you feel as if you were his comrade on the march and saw all that he saw, stood with him by the well at Cawnpore', and charged with him when Outram set out against the enemy knocking them down[2].

A very important work on 'military appreciation' of the events of the Mutiny appeared in 1963. The author Michael Edwardes in his 'Battles of the Indian Mutiny' likewise complained that the story of the Mutiny has been overlaid with social and political causes and consequences at the neglect of military aspects ; the military point of view has been effectively obscured in the hundreds of works dealing with the subject. And yet the British had 'to sustain nearly two years' hard campaigning and a succession of bloody engagements before their rule was finally restored. Edwardes gives compact and

[1] Forbes-Mitchell says that Khan Bahadur Khan was captured by the Bareilly police early in July 1858 and was hanged in the presence of the author (p. 263). So he could not have held out in the Terai until the close of 1859.

[2] *Calcutta Review*, 1858, Miscellaneous Notices, p. IV.

Marfat.com

comprehensive accounts of the battles and sieges regionwise as Lucknow, Cawnpore, Delhi and Allahabad. The role of the British military leaders is described in an attractive perspective, acute and informative, avoiding the usual practice of praising British generals. Thus on Hodson's crime of killing the Delhi princes he writes, 'The pros and cons of Hodson's action were the subject of much controversy throughout the remainder of the nineteenth century'[1]. The Bibigarh massacre of 15 July inflamed the British 'into becoming even more ruthless...as they moved they carried with them a Bloody Assize, without, in many cases, even a pretence of the form of justice.' Nana Sahib was blamed for this slaughter of women and children. Edwardes quotes an author to explain that the savagery of the British 'left their foe without inducement to show mercy, since he received none, and made even women valueless as hostages'[2]. He also found fault with the commissariat, and observed that the direction and execution of plans suffered from military incompetence, feeble leadership and chronic indecision[3]. He leaves out important questions like the storming of Secundrabagh in the second relief, the battle of Shah Najaf and the Terai campaigns of 1858-59 but he explains the circumstances leading to the termination of the war. He closes his account with the Queen's Proclamation and the counter-proclamation issued by *begam* Hazrat Mahal of Oudh and adds a chapter on the pursuit of Tatya Tope.[4] Edwardes' book is a good narrative of the battles of the Indian Mutiny but as a work on military appreciation of the events, his approach to the subject raises some questionable points of strategy. While Mac Munn discovered a central link in the chain of developments behind these scattered and far-flung actions, Michael Edwardes writes, 'it must be understood that the Mutiny was not a homogeneous affair but a series of mutinies which militarily had very little to deal with each other'[5]. Such a view was also totally against Kaye's treatment of the subject. However, Edwardes concludes : 'There is no doubt that fear of another greater mutiny

[1] M. Edwardes, p. 51.
[2] Edwardes, p. 67.
[3] Ibid. p. 102.
[4] Ibid. p. 196.
[5] Ibid. p. 8.



Marfat.com

had its effect upon the negotiations that ended with India's Independence in 1947.[1]

The military despatches of the Indian Mutiny as a class of official documents are invaluable though there are shortcomings in many such despatches. Hewitt's Report on Meerut is misleading in the extreme if not a distortion of facts. The report of Inglis certainly does not supply all the details as are found in many contemporary accounts and books of reminiscences. Sir Colin's reports about Secundrabagh and Shah Najaf on the second relief are much too condensed. The report of brigadier-general Walpole dated 16 April 1858 on the capture of the fort Rooya omits many significant details. On the contrary, the letter of an officer in the Highland Brigade from Rooya was very sharp and critical and supplied many details not mentioned by Walpole.[2] In general, these despatches are very readable. The style is quite that of military literature—lively, racy, and manifesting due regard to the correctness of details. Thus major-general Henry Barnards' report dated from the cantoment at Delhi on 8 and 12 June, 1857 is an extremely detailed despatch. He possibly set an example of how military actions are to be reported. He showed courtesy and consideration to every constituent element of the force with benign grace and acknowledging with pleasure his indebtedness to all for their wilful co-operation.[3] Another such despatch was the one sent by Havelock from camp Fatehpur dated 12 July 1857. The British practice of paying courteous compliments to all added to the cohesion and solidarity of the fighting elements. He refers to the coolness of Renaud, courage and skill of Maud, the spirit and devotion of Hamilton, the conduct of Stirling, and also to others, such as, Ayrton, Brasyer, Barrow and Pallisar.[4] Havelock's despatches seem to have been the very best in military despatches of the Indian Mutiny. Kaye writes that the general was a practised writer of despatches and general orders, 'for years he had been doing for others what he was now doing for himself. Few men knew better the use of words or

1 Edwardes, p. 202. See also *Supra*, p, 223.
2 Ball, II, pp. 309-17.
3 Ball, I, pp. 197-200.
4 Ball, I, p. 365.

Marfat.com

was likely to make a slip in any public manifesto. There was, in truth, no ingratitude and no inadvertence...there was only too much justice and too deep a meaning'.[1] The report of brigadier Inglis on the siege of Lucknow which lasted eighty-seven days was another precious document.[2] Apart from the historical details of action and counter-action the report showed extraordinary perception about the depth of humaneness which made the history of the Residency of Lucknow in 1857 what it was. The brigadier writes of 'labours in which all ranks and all classes-civilians, officers and soldiers have all borne an equally noble part. All have together descended into the mine, all have together handled the shovel for the interment of the putrid bullock...owing to the extreme paucity of our numbers each men was taught to feel that on his own individual effort, alone depended the safety of the entire position.'

Sir Colin Campbell was a hard task-master. All his despatches show remarkable application of his knowledge of details and his will to enforce compliance with the plan of his campaigns. The affairs of battle of Khajwa may be cited as an example. Lieutenant-Colonel Powell of H. M's 53 regiment, in charge of a siege-train proceeding from Allahabad to Cawnpore, was intercepted by the Dinapur mutineers at Khajwa, 24 miles distant from Fatehpur on 1 November 1857 inflicting a severe loss on the British amounting to 95 killed and wounded. Captain Peel G. B. R. N. who commanded the British column was exposed to the displeasure of the commander-in-chief who characterised the action as hazardous in which British position was imperilled by exceeding the limits of caution.[3] The draft was a model of military accommodation. The skill of the writer is evident in reminding officers of the failure and yet appreciating their services in the most cordial way. It shows how Campbell had streamlined the entire military machinery as an instrument for the effective implementation of his strategy and plan[4].

1 Kaye, II, p. 384.

2 Ball, II, pp. 48f.

3 Ball, II, pp. 76-77.

4 According to Charles Ball the narrative of the exploits of young Hills of the artillery of 9 July 1857, at the Ridge, Delhi, was regarded as powerfully descriptive (Ball, I, p. 479 ).

Marfat.com

Among the military historians of the Indian Mutiny Sir Henry Marion Durand, Agent to the governor-general in Central India was another very competent writer on military affairs. Kaye considered him to be the best writer of military history whom he had ever known. 'He had not the fire and enthusiasm of William Napier, but no one ever understood more fully and explained more easily great military operations than Henry Durand'.[1]

[1] Kaye, III, p. 325.

Marfat.com

## CHAPTER EIGHT

# MINTURN, BUTLER, CAMPBELL, VALBEZEN, DOBROLYUBOV

Here an attempt may be made to represent the views of two Americans, an eminent British Administrator of India, a French Diplomat, and a Russian intellectual and publicist, a curious ensemble though, but all of whom excepting the last one and Campbell, presenting an attitude of racial superiority and colonial arrogance.

Reference has been made to the views of R.B. Minturn who stayed in India for a period of six months. The American missionary was in America during the years 1857-58 but published his book from New York in 1858,[1] under the title 'From New York to Delhi.' Not being satisfied with the rumbustious expletives he discharged against the Indian rebels he goes on to tell many things more. The Indian states disgusted him very much and he wondered if any thing worse would have happened had Gwalior been swallowed up by an earthquake. There is nothing to appreciate in Indian history, it is all a piece with the 'Horrors of Sordom' practised over the years, and as for a 'native being called a gentleman', even a convict in an American prison would not sink so low to commit crimes which Indians are habituated to do. The revolt in India now in progress should not be taken as a proof of the injustice of the British policy for the tyranny of its administration. The revolt was not a popular revolution like either the French Revolution or the Uprising in America. It would be a folly to regard it as such, as the 'natives had always been under the yoke of the strangers and no popular resistance had been called forth...the oriental mind looks upon tyranny as the normal manifestation of power'[2].

William Butler, a missionary of the Methodist Episcopal Church of America, who landed in Calcutta on 23 September 1854 to found a

[1] *Supra*, pp. 15-16.

[2] Minturn, pp. 339, 423-24, 449-50, 453, 455-56, 458-60.



Marfat.com

mission in India, wrote a book, 'The Land of the Veda' in which five chapters were devoted to the Sepoy Rebellion. Though his views were much similar to those of Minturn, Butler had an inquisitive mind and tried to get at the bottom of things. He has left a good account of India of that time. The book was published in 1871 based on notes taken during the time of the Revolt. He was a confirmed evangelist and believed that the Oriental races will be redeemed by the son of God, Jesus Christ, Who was Himself an Asiatic by birth. Butler was in Agra and passed through Lucknow in November 1856 in 'blissful ignorance of a volcano of wrath that was silently acquiring strength beneath their feet.'

Butler refers to the baneful effects of Muslim rule in Asia Minor and India[1] and in his attempts to comprehend the great rebellion of the sepoys he traces its origin to the position of the Emperor of Delhi. His investigations into the subject and his keen observation enabled him to write authoritatively that the emperor was 'still to be the fountain of honour' and the British ambassador went to 'House keeping' of the emperor on his $675,000 per annum which was felt to be so insufficient that the grant was increased twice from 13 to 18 Lacs so that in 1857 they were receiving $9000,000 per annum. The Imperial Court was still in debt, but the English would not increase the yearly allowance any further. In the 'Heaven in earth Paradise' at Delhi all was in a pandemonium as he found it in 1856. Here was crowded hundreds of kings and queens, 'Sultannes' with their retinues and followers, 'like broods of vermin,' all fastened like so many parasites upon the old emperor's yearly allowance. The licence of a sensual creed which permitted unlimited polygamy multiplied the crowd of hungry *Shahazadahs* who were 'literally eating up each other' and hastened the destruction of the House of Taimur. Perhaps 'the Eye of God', as Butler wrote, 'did not look upon a mass of humanity' more wretched.[2] Butler's impression also found support from the account of Alamah Fazle Huq who was associated with Bahadur Shah and his court. The Alamah refers to the flood of debauchery and a life of dissipation which overtook the leaders of the rebel forces

[1] Butler, p. 107.
[2] Butler, pp. 170-75.

Marfat.com

who passed their nights with mistresses instead of guarding the army.[1] Butler also refers to the hostility of Zeenat Mahal to British Government who would not recognise the claim of her son to the throne and this was in conjunction with the object of the sepoys to overthrow the English power.[2] 'Thus the Court, Emperor, Begums, Sultans, Sultanas, Shahazadahs, eunuchs and followers', as the author writes, 'were all in a ferment of hatred of the English Rule.' Very significantly he also observed that the different members of the Imperial family were 'fast becoming rallying points for the disaffected and insurrectionary elements'[3].

But Butler was a missionary and looked at things from that point of view. He quotes 'Memorial to Parliament' of Christian missionaries and holds the view that anti-evangelism of the company's administration was mainly responsible for the Sepoy Rebellion. The rebellion was 'Heathenism, vile, selfish and cruel, a conflict of light with darkness', a conspiracy of the malignant forces to offset the progress of Christian civilisation which the English in India had brought upon themselves by their neglect of Christian teaching and their overt acts of infidelity. He recounts how Lord Clive presented an ornament to the idol of Conjeeveram worth 1,050 pagodas ($1,850). Similarly, Auckland who visited a shrine at Mathura, and Ellenborough who brought back the gates of the temple of Somnath, and even Dalhousie, who is said to have paid reverence to an idol at Amritsar by changing his dress had encouraged heathenism and the Revolt was a contrite acknowledgement of this apostasy. But the rebellion had kindled high hopes in the mind of Butler. 'The hour had come', he writes, 'when the inevitable conflict between human barbarism and divine civilisation was to take place, and the words of Christ were to be realised in India. He calculated that Christianity was both invincible and inevitable for India, that the value of Indian evangelization could be immense, for by virtue of her position in Asia, she would hold

[1] Quoted by Joshi (p. 171) from the *Journal of the Pakistan Historical Society*.

[2] Butler, p. 110. Butler says that Zeenat Mahal was the daughter of the raja of Bhatner and that Bahadur Shah had another wife named Taj Mahal.

[3] Butler, p. 176.

Marfat.com

the key to the salvation of all the neighbouring countries including China.[1]

The American missionary, it seems, was conversant with the attitude of the Bengali intelligentsia and refers to the statements made by the 'Bengali Babus' to deprecate the Sepoy Rebellion. In general, the 'Babus' adverted to the blessings of British rule and the humanitarian aspect of Christianity possibly as a reaction to the scorching tyranny of eight hundred years of muslim rule. Thus he quotes Babu Duckinaranjan Mookerjee, secretary, British Indian Association, who was an exponent of the ethics and moral order of Christianity which according to him was very much appreciated by the Hindus. Mookerjee was also of the view that the British government had done nothing to interfere with their religion. Butler also refers to Satyendra Nath Tagore and Keshab Chandra Sen and to Bholanath Chunder, in particular, who was full of praise for British rule and its merits 'higher by far than the Moghul gifts of limestone' or travelling stations, as De Quincey is said to have remarked. Chunder goes deeper and finds that nothing less than British phlegm and imperturbability could have created the mood of one compact nation in the discordant masses of India and also commented what was appropriate to the context of Butler's thesis that the Revolt was premature and anticipated national independence 'at least two centuries before its time.' Much have to be learnt before such a leap is hazarded and positively the exit of British rule would have resulted in the erosion of all the good that was slowly paving the way for India's regeneration.[2] But nothing was more suitable in Butler's perspective than the following lines of Chunder which he quotes in full. Chunder writes, 'the oriental mind is decidedly wanting in the knowledge of the construction of a civil polity. It has never known, nor attempted to know any other form of government than despotism. Political science and political reform appear like the oak and the elm to be the plants of the soil of Europe and America.'[3] It is no wonder that at a time when Indological studies had not advanced and Kautilya's *Arthasastra* and other such works were not widely known,

[1] Butler, pp. 359, 402-4, 466.
[2] Butler, pp. 360-61, 365, 367-70.
[3] Chunder, *Travels of a Hindu* (II, p. 408) quoted in Butler, p. 429.

Marfat.com

the 'Babus of Bengal' growing under the spell of Western education should entertain no better idea of the past of India than what was portrayed in this specimen of the cultural outlook of the Bengali Babus. All these provided enough materials to Western writers and missionaries to support the pretensions and assumptions of British rule in India which were for the first time challenged by the 1857 uprising. It is strange, had it not been true, that a Bengali writer should luxuriate on the theme of the 'oriental mind' much in the style of Minturn and Butler and deprecate the character of the Revolt like the Western missionaries. But Minturn, Butler, Chunder, and also a French intellectual, Valbezen, were not alone in the field ; even after a century we find echoes of the same attitude in the works of other writers, who, along with an Englishman, general Hilton, seem to have been intellectual successors of the missionary writers on the Indian Mutiny of 1857 and exponents of the military character of the 1857 revolt.

Butler does not profess to give the history of the revolt as a whole but touches on many interesting sidelights. He presents a picture of the Nana as drawn by major O' Gandini and describes his palace at Bithoor which was adorned by massive chandeliers and immense mirrors that had come direct from Birmingham. He refers to Trevelyan and gives a striking account of Azimullah Khan. The massacre of Cawnpore of July 15 has been described as the blackest crime in human history with a far deeper stainthan Sicilian Vespers or St. Bartholomew massacres for the deed was prompted neither by misguided patriotism nor by the madness of superstition—it was a mean, cowardly and treacherous execution.[1] The author refers to the high qualities of the heroic women of Lucknow and Cawnpore and describes the defence of the Residency, and the destruction of the invaluable collection of oriental manuscripts of Dr Haye and many other such things.[2] As for the Indian Mutiny, the writer was categorical that the appointed day 'was 31 May' but the sepoys of Meerut 'struck 21 days too soon'. His book is full of personal feelings of fright and terror mixed with evangelical outpourings. He charged R.M. Martin with having indulged in cynical criticism of such a man as Sir Robert Montgomery,

[1] Butler, pp. 186, 294 ; Trevelyan, *Cawnpore*, p. 52.
[2] Butler, pp. 316, 319, 323.

Marfat.com

judicial commissioner of the Punjab and of such other men whom he considered to be his intellectual inferiors. Montgomery, it may be remembered, congratulated Cooper and Hodson .and later on he replaced Sir James Outram at Lucknow. Butler says, Martin will not increase his fame by his 'conceited assumption' of impartiality towards blood-thirsty wretches in questioning the expediency of capital punishment and gladly recorded that Outram had been superseded by the evangelically courageous Sir Robert Montgomery.[1] Butler's 'Land of the Veda', written from the angle of vision of a missionary, gives details of those features of the Mutiny which admitted of scriptural orientation. In conclusion he writes : 'God alone saved the English, the mighty overthrow of 1858 was a high act of "Mercy" of which India should be grateful'.[2]

Sir George Campbell, I. C. S. was the lieutenant-governor of Bengal (1871-1874) whose brief three years of rule was very much appreciated by the *Hindoo Patriot*. He was a man of progress, Bengal owed to him more than what she did to the twenty that preceded him.[3] He served in various capacities as a private secretary to Lord Auckland in the Punjab after its annexation. In the early part of 1857 he was secretary to the government of North-West Provinces under J.R. Colvin and then became commissioner of the Cis-Sutlej states subordinate to the chief-commissioner of Punjab, Sir John Lawrence.[4] He was also engaged in some operation of the Mutiny and after the capture of Lucknow he was appointed by Canning as judicial and finance commissioner under Outram. Though his functions were civil while Outram managed the political and military affairs, he had opportunities of seeing and hearing a great deal of the events of 1858. Formerly, in Cis-Sutlej states he had great opportunities for watching the events of the Punjab and Delhi.[5] Towards the end of his career he

[1] Butler, pp. 444-45.

[2] Ibid. p. 428.

[3] *Statesman*, 18th January 1876 (Editorial Notes).

[4] Campbell, Memoirs, I, p. 145. See Buckland, *Dictionary*. p., 69.

[5] Campbell seems to give the impression that he was in Cis-Sutlej states in 1855 (*Memoirs*, II, p. 3. ; I, pp. 214-15). Buckland states that he was a provisional commissioner. But he wrote letters to the *Times* and an official account of the Mutiny for Lord Canning (*Dictionary*, p. 69). Campbell writes that he collected information about the events at Ambala and reducing it all to a narrative published it in two successive numbers of the *Times* (I. p. 215).

Marfat.com

wrote his 'Memoirs of my Indian Career' and was engaged in the work up to three weeks before his death in 1892. A highly valued contribution to the modern history of India, the *Memoirs*, contained critical discussions on the 'Sepoy Mutiny'. Campbell was noted for his grasp of great affairs and for his many-sidedness. He does not offer any connected account of the history of the Mutiny, as a whole, but his reflections on the part played by the mutiny veterans and his illumina-ting observations on many sidelights of the war were something quite new in the whole range of mutiny studies.[1]

About Meerut his impression is that local events led to an attack there and a flight to Delhi was a sort of 'unprepared accident' for the sepoys never showed much organisation and design, and if their target was to occupy Delhi they were likely to have mutinied in the first instance there. But his observation that he did not find any excessive panic there[2], contrary to all known evidence, was evidently a distorted notion. In the early phase of the Mutiny he was in the Cis-Sutlej states and did not see the Mutiny or take part in any action. Similarly, his statement that he had no knowledge of any execution going on in the city of Delhi after its capture is a faulty observation,[3] for he was not really more competent than other eye-witnesses to offer correct information on the point.[4] He writes that the conduct of the native regiments at Delhi did not show any pre-arranged conspiracy, they seemed to have been taken by surprise by the coming of the Meerut troops.[5] But he ignores that the 38th at Delhi was particularly active and contumacious. He remarks that the destruction of the Delhi magazine must have been partial which explains how stores of every kind fell into the hands of the rebels.[6] Campbell was not possibly aware of the fact that the new fortification, three miles above the city, where all the ammunition was removed also fell into the hands of the Sepoys. Kaye was of the view that Willoughby had done little to

1 In the Appendix to Vol. II of his *Memoirs*, Campbell gives many extracts from articles on the Indian Mutiny published in the *Times* of December, 1857, by eye-witnesses and contemporaries.

2 Campbell, *Memoirs*, I, pp. 218-19, 221.

3 Campbell, *Memoirs*, I, p. 246.

4 Index : Delhi, Sack of.

5 Campbell, 1, p. 374.

6 Ibid.

Marfat.com

diminish the resources of the enemy.[1] The theory of the legitimacy of the Revolt and its political aspects as reflected in the position of the 'ready-made' King of Delhi who was proclaimed the Emperor has been clearly elaborated. The author rightly observed that within a few hours,the Mutiny found itself a strong political power.[2]

The constitution of the rebel government at Delhi outlined by Campbell agrees with Colin Campbell's description of the Delhi Constitution and the one recorded by Charles Ball.[3] The camp iife at Delhi on the Ridge according to the author found the Europeans in the most exuberant spirit ; supplies came in abundance ; and they were kept alive by all sorts of canards about massacres and counter-massacres which gave the war a painfully 'internecine character'. But it was realised that in spite of all reinforcements British Artillery proved altogether unequal to cope with that of the enemy.[4] The author introduces a fresh perspective in relating the services rendered by the Cis-Sutlej states to the siege-army at Delhi. Campbell as the commissioner of the Cis-Sutlej states maintained the uninterr-upted communication of the Sikh chiefs, their troops and followers. The Sikh levies were particularly helpful by virtue of their local knowledge and the command of their resources to carry supplies to detached posts, escort parties and keep open lines of communication by putting down refractory villages which the small European force would have failed to do. The active services of the raja of Patiala and of Jhind, in particular, was the life-line of the British offensive without which they could not have held their position before Delhi. The author was convinced that the loyal co-operation of the Sikhs became the means of saving the 'Empire'. He .goes further and emphasizes

[1] Kaye, II, p. 17 fn ; p. 549. Campbell and Mac Munn have underestimated the importance of the exploits. Vivart quotes Lt. Forrest in defence of the operation. Forrest says, 'it does not detract the least from the merits of this gallant defender that the blowing up of the magazine did not prevent large quantities of stores falling into the hands of the enemy. It was not a precau-tionary measure but a deed of defence' (Vivart, *The Sepoy Mutiny*, p. 44).

[2] Campbell, I, p, 375-76

[3] Campbell, *Memoirs*, I, p. 356 ; Colin Campbell, *Narrative*, p. 172. See also *Supra*, p. 75.

[4] Campbell, *Memoirs*, I, pp. 384-86.

Marfat.com

that the British Punjab had saved India for if the Punjab had not been conquered 'we must probably have succumbed in all parts of the country'.[1]

The author provides historical insights on many other issues. The actual Mutiny, according to him, was for the most part a Hindu affair, the Muhammadans were not the main elements in the formulation of the Mutiny.[2] Campbell's sympathy with the oppressed and afflicted, as the editor of his book Sir Charles E. Bernard observed, was profound. The much-slandered 'Jack Sepoy' appeared to him to be clean, orderly, who looked well on parade. Among them there was no scramble for plundered treasure, no disposition to return home sated with booty as was the common practice among other races, nor to break out into every excess. 'Indeed, the quiet, orderly, and peculiar character of sepoy,' as Campbell writes, 'has been throughout the rebellion our difficulty...the bloody Hindus maintained the order, which is their greatest security'.[3] He resented the violent feeling entertained against natives and mutineers and the policy of 'a vigorous and consistent exercise of severity and retribution' that was pursued. Large proportion of stories, circulated with an 'ingenious circumstantiality of horror,' have been proved to be false. Campbell firmly believed that all such stories about mutilation, torture and dishonour to British women are absolutely unfounded and cannot 'pretend to anything like authenticity'.[4]

Campbell was in Lucknow in 1858 and claimed a knowledge of the complex and variable trends of the position of the talukdars. He seeks to analyse the problems of landed rights and to present his conclusion in historical perspective. Civil rebellion of the mutiny-war is traced exclusively to the massive transfers of landed rights which had taken place under the British system. The ousted proprietors still resided on the spot possibly in the character of tenants and remained discontented and sullen. So with the eclipse of British rule, these old proprietors had, as a matter of course, resumed their own again with the

[1] Ibid. pp. 212, 384.
[2] Ibid. I, pp. 375, 392.
[3] Ibid. pp. 377, 380.
[4] Ibid. pp. 295, 391-92, 400-401.

Marfat.com

disappearance of the auction purchasers and English collectors. But the author seems to be straining his insight a little high when he says that if the land of the Punjab had been subjected to the same system as in the North-West provinces, the Sikhs would have risen against the British and instead of recovering Lucknow, Cawnpore, or Allahabad, Havelock and his Highlanders would have been thrown back in the defence of Calcutta.[1] The author writes like a civilian of his time that in Oudh general rebellion was not so immediate as it might have been. It was not till the failure of the Havelock-Outram relief that the talukdars generally joined the rebellion, and not till the retreat of the commander-in-chief in November 1857 that the whole mass of them became absolutely committed.[2] But Campbell admits that Oudh was not settled till the beginning of 1859. He had a reflective mind and often got beneath the surface with a really telling observation. He refers to the reading of the historians about marches and counter-marches that were going on and the surrender of this or that fort to the commander-in-chief 'but it cannot be too plainly stated that Oude was settled by arms and not chiefly by diplomacy...things had come to that pass that peace was obtained by yielding to rebels with arms in their hands and all they wanted.' By the spring of 1859 the Mutiny ended.[3] The reaction in favour of the landed elites, specially in regard to land tenure, was one of the significant changes which came in the wake of the Mutiny. The pre-Mutiny settlement was declared to be wrong and so as a sequence to rebellion the talukdars were not only restored to their former position but also got back many things more. The primary condition of all land tenures in Oudh, as the author suggested, was the recognition of the superior right of the talukdars. He discussed the confiscation Proclamation of Canning and its aftermath and also offered a very expansive but an original study of the talukdar's rights and land settlement of Oudh in the post-Mutiny period.[4]

Campbell's observations on the excesses committed in the period of the mutiny-war were based on a close examination of the Indian

[1] Campbell, *Memoirs*, I, p. 279.
[2] Ibid. 1, pp. 211, 12, II, p. 13.
[3] Ibid. I, p. 303.
[4] Ibid. II, pp. 8 ff, 13 ff, 21, 29 ff.

Marfat.com

scene. There is a distinct impression that he did not share the fierce Angle-Saxon racialism of the general British writers. He takes a very enlightened view of the emotions of the time and writes : 'The Mutiny must always be a time of horror to which I do not think that either party can ever look back with any feeling other than that one way and another great crimes were attended with a great deal of retribution.'[1] He held Canning responsible for not preventing the commission of atrocities at their end. An act passed on 30 May 1857 gave summary powers to officers to deal with the situation. This was superseded by the Act of 6 June which proclaimed martial law and prescribed much more extreme and unnecessary severity in the exercise of summary powers. It was under this act that appalling barbarities were committed without semblance of judicial procedure. The author contends that strictest executive control should have been exercised to suppress the fury of the officers when such engines of oppression were set in motion, but Canning's government did nothing of the sort. He appreciates that Sir John Kaye exposed the sanguinary scene of Benares and Allahabad but regrets that his hero, Canning, despite his adherence to the principles of clemency, failed to rise up to the occasion. It was not till nearly two months later that on 21 July an order was issued, intending to check the severity of the special commissioners and the court-martials[2]. He refuted the idea that the natives alone are guilty of deeds of blood and affirms that particular things related by Kaye did happen. Campbell gives a graphic account of the bloodshed attending Neill's irruption at Allahabad. There were far too wholesale executions and people were put to death in the most reckless manner. The way Neill compelled the convicts to lick 'the blood with their tongues' before they were hanged was something more excruciatingly painful than massacre. All these are known from Neill's own letters published by an unfriendly person in an Ayrshire journal from which Kaye derived his materials. In those letters Neill affected almost a 'religious call to blood' and even gloated over the acts of pitiless vengeance he executed and yet there were English writers who elevated him into a 'hero'. 'I can never forgive Neill for

[1] Ibid. II, pp. 28-29.
[2] Campbell, *Memoirs*, I, p. 232.

Marfat.com

his bloody work,' writes Campbell who also observed that they could not be much too happy at the part Neill played at Benares, while at Allahabad he had almost succeeded by his violence in turning the Ferozepore regiment against the English but for the influence of Brasyer.[1] But Campbell also was not liked by a section of his people who criticised him for his pro-Indian feelings as a 'small self-conceited pigmy of a Scotchman.'

Campbell had not much of an impression about other episodes of the mutiny-war and recorded very little of the events of Eastern India which did not loom very large in his eyes.[2] It has been noticed that the author had a liking for the sepoys. He refers to the erratic behaviour of the Gwalior contingent who only wavered and did not take the field at a critical period of the war. Had they joined the mutineers at Delhi they could have turned the scale against the English.[3] Throughout the crisis in the Punjab, full advantage was taken of the ill-feeling between the Sikhs and the Hindusthanis which rendered the position of the rebels weak and there were other factors also which reduced the chances of a successful uprising there.[4] But the author, like other writers, also pointed to the same defects of the Indian army which accounted for their failure and showed the vast differences between the two belligerents. The sepoys were wanting alike in all the arts and resources. There was no organisational skill. There was no individual action among them, they attempted no guerilla system and started no move to cut off British supplies or to intercept their line of communications. Even convoys were constantly moving up to the very gates of Lucknow without being interrupted which would appear to be very surprising when the sepoys were fighting against the British.[5] But this appears to be an overstatement for Wheeler was withering away at Cawnpore closely besieged as he was, and Sir Henry Lawrence found it absolutely impossible to send a single man from Lucknow so strong was the enemy's command of the river. Sir George Digby Barker of the 78th Highlanders felt that they were in a state of siege themselves and could not get their baggage even after the

1 Campbell, *Memoirs*, I, pp. 281-82.
2 Ibid. p. 283.
3 Ibid. p. 287.
4 Ibid. p. 382.
5 Ibid. II, p. 345.

Marfat.com

first relief of Lucknow.[1] However, Campbell's conclusion cannot be disputed : 'In short in every way, physically and morally, it then appeared clear that we were up and the rebels were down.'[2] About the character of the revolt he remarked that though the Mutiny was a monstrous one, it was only a sepoy revolt and not a Hindu rebellion, and referred to the excellent position of the crops everywhere and, incredible as it may appear, the annual revenue collection 'was almost entirely saved'[3]. This bears a family likeness to the thesis of William Muir, who propounded the view later on more elaborately in 1902, that in 1857, there was no controversy between the people and the Government.[4] In the 'fearful storm' of 1857 the author contends, the best qualities of Englishmen were displayed. Contrary to all rules of war and other calculations of chances, the Englishmen upheld the prestige of their country and saved the empire.[5] Campbell also referred to Kaye's history and criticised some of his views.[6]

What is very interesting, he provides some sketches of the familiar British characters of the time. According to him Sir John Lawrence was an educated civilian, the best type of the class he represented and though a little hard on the upper classes he was solicitous of the welfare and happiness of the masses. The means by which he saved India in the Mutiny were right in principle. He never had a single letter from Lord Canning about the part he should play and in fact he had no proper authority in military matters at all. 'He simply acted on his own responsibility in an irregular way.' The whole question whether India is to be retained or lost depended on the siege of Delhi. Campbell thinks that there cannot be any question that Lawrence was right in advising about the expediency of making over Peshawar to Dost Mahammad if only to march to Delhi the large force locked up[7] there.

1 P. C. Gupta, *Nana Sahib*, pp. 92, 98-99 ; Barker, *Letters etc.* p. 86. Wood writes that supplies at the garrison were all through sufficient (Wood, p. 175).
2 Campbell, *Memoirs*, II, p. 345.
3 Ibid. I, p. 366.
4 *Civil rebellion*, p. 284.
5 Campbell, I, p. 345.
6 Ibid. p. 210. Also *Supra*, pp. 109-10.
7 Campbell, 1, pp. 68, 234-36, 245.



Marfat.com

Whatever Nicholson might say of Lawrence that he was 'an old woman' it was Lawrence who made the Punjab the means of taking Delhi and saving India. He realised that it was the only chance, for by enlisting the Punjabis in the army and by sending them to Delhi, he not only strengthened the position of the siege-army but also rendered Punjab safe from the risk of a trouble from there. But Henry Lawrence was a man of different sort, no doubt very popular, and a man of 'heart' but 'he had a very limited civil experience.'[1] Charles Napier was a 'very rampant person', only a strong man like Dalhousie could have tackled him.[2] Herbert Edwardes was undoubtedly a man of brilliant ability and did much excellent service, but his sudden rise tempted him to performances which attracted the displeasure of Dalhousie.[3] Dalhousie was most admired by Campbell who held the view that had he been the governor-general of that time, things would not have been allowed to drift so much. He must have sent down a European Regiment from the hill-stations to Delhi for the protection of the magazine.[4] John Colvin, another controversial figure of the Mutiny, is not discussed but about Hodson the author prefers to keep an open mind. He knew him well and even asked him about the way the princes were killed and got the same reply the desperate attack upon him which compelled him to do so. But Campbell maintains the view that Hodson was a man of great energy and talent. The way in which he raised a wonderfully effective regiment out of the most unpromising materials was a great achievement and so he deserved to be treated more leniently after his death, though he was not a 'saint' as his brother made him out to be. At Begam Kuthi, Lucknow, where Hodson lost his life, he had no military function but 'plunder was not so valuable as was expected.'[5] Outram was not personally known to Campbell but he realised that charm of temperament had made him so popular.[6] Campbell was very critical of the British generals

[1] Ibid. p. 68.
[2] Ibid. p. 202.
[3] Ibid. I, p. 400.
[4] Ibid. p. 217.
[5] Ibid. I, p. 247 ; II, p. 4.
[6] Campbell, I, p. 282. II, p. 3. MacMunn was critical of Outram that he was not a practised soldier, that he had not been employed in a military capacity,

Marfat.com

excepting Hope Grant who was of a different type. The old regiments accustomed to Indian life did better service than the newly arrived forces and Hope Grant's 9th Lancers were a model that way. That apart, he was one of the very few who served in the Mutiny period from the beginning to the end without being sick or sorry. 'Not a brilliant man though, he was an unfailing soldier, dutiful and conscientious'.[1] Havelock, the 'religious soldier', was no doubt 'the most excellent man in all relations of life' and appealed to the English people most but the author found nothing particular in him which could attract attention. He was not 'bloody enough' by the standard of the Old Testament and very much unpopular with his soldiers, only a 'martinet and very formal and precise'[2]. Nicholson was the man best fitted to command and control the Punjab regiments and deserved great praise for his qualities and tremendous energy but Campbell points out that military opinion was not altogether unanimous about his performance at the battle of Najafgarh, the only action outside Delhi which he conducted. There he had 'over-marched' and altogether used up one of the best of the European regiments.[3] Even otherwise, he was violent, behaved badly with John Lawrence and whatever Bosworth Smith might say like other British writers about Nicholson and his glorious career, he was positively insubordinate, and it redounds to the credit of Lawrence that he kept him under control. Nicholson was a great soldier and rendered a great service to his country, but Campbell disliked the disposition 'to a sort of deification of him as the incarnation of vigour.'[4] Very interesting was Campbell's estimate of general Wilson, the slow, cautious, calculating artillery officer who won Delhi. He was the right man in the right place, 'neither a square man nor a round man but a very peculiar man' who steadily held his course and at last triumphed.[5]

and somewhat irregularly selected to command the expedition to Persia (pp. 198-200).

1 Campbell, 1, pp. 277, 284.

2 Ibid. 1, p. 282.

3 A. Llewellyn in his book 'Siege of Delhi' recently published (1977), however, records that the battle of Najafgarh had cost few in casualties—twenty-five killed, seventy wounded (p. 85).

4 Campbell. *Memoirs*, 1, p. 248-249.

5 Ibid. I, pp. 354-55.

Marfat.com

About the commander-in-chief no British writer had possibly written so bitterly as the present author. It seems that George Campbell was at feuds with Colin Campbell. In many frequent reference to him in many pages he criticised every aspect of his movement, and every episode of his action ; the commander-in-chief is shown to have faulted on each count whether in policy matters or in movements. He was not a 'man of any size of intellect or force of thought, but simply a good downright soldier risen to be a general' who was notorious for his civil approaches to Russell, the great correspondent and was more interested in truckling to high-flaunting military correspondents than to beat the enemy.[1] In the Crimean War he never attained a chief command and only recently he commanded the troops in the frontier valley of Peshawar and always insisted on an overwhelming force. Lord Dalhousie is reported to have said that he carried caution to the verge of something else and it appears incredible sometimes that he should have carried delays to unbearable points. The author's contention is that on the 1st of November 1857 Sir Colin had before him six months of weather favourable for him. Had he rushed to the relief of Lucknow immediately or even at the time he did, had he continued for another day, Lucknow must have fallen and the British might have easily done in November and December 1857 what they were obliged to do in May and June 1858. But Sir Colin carried caution to a monstrous pitch, the 'carpet knight', as he calls him, decided to retire to the surprise of the army and though the retreat was executed in a masterly style and was also perhaps justified by *ex post facto* mishaps of Windham, the withdrawal from Lucknow was productive of excessively bad result. The tone and character of the mutiny-war were changed and talukdars became confirmed rebels, a native court was established at Lucknow and the Gwalior contingent became restive. Sir Colin Campbell, according to the author, was no 'politician, no financier, he looks not to broad views beyond his strict and immediate military bearing of the case'.[2]

[1] Ibid. II, pp. 23, 341, 344-45, 347-49, 352-53.

[2] Campbell, *Memoirs*, I, pp. 286, 295 ff., 301-2, 304, 343, 346-48. But the present generation of writers look upon Colin Campbell in a different light. A. Llewellyn in his book 'Siege of Delhi' observes: '*he* stands out as

Marfat.com

George Campbell ignored V. Eyre,[1] the hero of Malleson and was silent about Sir Hugh Rose. On Lord Canning he had firm views, a man who had a calm and just mind and remarkable passive courage but was not certainly 'a man of very exalted genius nor such a hero as Sir John Kaye makes him out to be.' The author refers to his morbidly slow and dilatory nature, his imperfections as an administrator. It is abundantly true, he says, that for a long time Canning did not at all realise the seriousness of the Mutiny and his well known telegram to the commander-in-chief on 31 May, full three weeks after the crisis, shows a lamentable want of appreciation of the situation.[2] However, George Campbell's 'Memoirs' is a distinctly original work characterised by many penetrative insights on the great revolt of India.

Valbezen's book 'Les Anglais et l' Inde etc.' translated into English under the title 'The English and India, New Sketches' from French by a 'Diplomat' is an invaluable contribution to mutiny literature from foreign sources. The diplomat who signed his name as 'HL' introduces the translated work with this remark that Indo-British relations have a special significance of their own, more so, in the face of this crisis, 'L' insurrection des cipayeś du Bengale'. The translator also makes the position clear that the book was meant for the English readers and seeks justification for the admiration and sympathy felt for England on the ground that Frenchmen at least cannot be suspected of partiality to England. England's former rival in India had turned an admirer, a very exciting thing for an Englishman to contemplate and a cultural development for the French Académie to approve and appreciate. But in truth the book is the familiar product of a Western mixture of colonialism and racialism which unfolds the romance of British Empire and a bilateral understanding of the benefits of British rule. The author furnishes a sombre background of the political situation against which he places the Rising of 1857. According to him the Revolt was not merely a 'ground-swell' but constituted a challenge to

the only truly great general of the highest rank in the dark period in the army's history that separates the age of Wellington from the age of Wolseley' (pp. 156-7).

[1] For V. Eyre, see article in *Calcutta Review*, 1866, vol. 44.

[2] Campbell, I, pp. 230, 351-53.

Marfat.com

the British power as serious as that when Philip II's Armada set sail from Cadiz or when Napoleon was organising his legions on the coast of Boulogne or when the remnant of the Guards was awaiting the arrival of the Prussians on the heights of *La Haye Sainte* on 18 June 1815. The parallels are to some extent overloaded, but what Valbezen wanted to impress was that the rebellion had to be crushed. It was an imperial necessity because India added not merely to the military strength and diplomatic prestige of Great Britain but also afforded honourable means of existence to thousands of English families who were flourishing in official positions or in indigo, and tea plantations and houses of business all over the three presidencies. While Java furnishes a yearly tribute of ready money to Holland, and Cuba to Spain, British India is not a tributary colony but provides a base for the investment of British capital and if that be lost, Britain will fall into the rank of a small power like Holland or Denmark. The supreme struggle for the vindication of the empire has given English history a new elevation, a glory to the heroic personages, Henry Lawrence, Havelock, Nicholson, Neill, Hodson a brilliant constellation of illustrious soldiers, who fell on the field of honour in defence of the cause of civilization. 'Let us, children of modern and liberal Europe', writes Valbezen, 'bow with respect and without reservation before their tombs'.[1]

His admiration for English life and institutions was effusive. Referring to the assumption of direct rule of India by Queen Victoria, he considers it worthy of the sovereign of the great nation, 'which as yet, alas, is the only one in Europe capable of reconciling respect for the past with liberal institutions'. Still more, the pet European conception about the 'blessings of British Rule' in India was also enunciated in an insolently self-righteous way. The author refers to the casualties of nearly 200,000 Indians in consequence of the rising but this stream of Indian blood notwithstanding, he delights in observing : 'Impartial history must still recognise that India did not pay too dearly for the triumph of foreign rulers who alone could give her order, peace and progress'.[2] This also was not enough, the

[1] Valbezen, pp. 1-3.
[2] Ibid. p. 339.

Marfat.com

shock of the revolt seems to have created a hysteria of contempt for the Asiatics. The author was completely boozed : 'Never before had the superiority of the white man over the black, of the Caucasian over Asiatic race asserted itself so triumphantly'.[1] From this line of logic it was not difficult for the author to expatiate on the lack of political consciousness of the Indians. He writes that the Indian population is not a fusion of races but only an aggregation. 'In fact in this strange land, patriotism does not exist ; the feeling of nationality, of independence finds no echo in the population'.[2] Therefore, the author concluded that the Mutiny of 1857 cannot be called a national movement in the full sense of the word, as only a portion of India took an active part. Events of 1857 also proved that it had nothing of the character of a patriotic movement.[3] He also argues that religious prejudices had nothing to do with the origin of the Mutiny as Madras, where Christianity made perceptible inroads, remained silent. It is equally untrue to ascribe the crisis to the intrigues of the native princes, as it is so, to connect the Mutiny with the proceedings of the King of Delhi who also had not taken any part in the revolt of the Bengal Army.[4]

But there were some passages in his book which give the impression that the French dignitary was an acute intellectual who studied the problems of Indo-British relations at depth. Unchangeable Indians who remained impervious to the impact of British rule withdrew themselves to an interior life of their habits and traditions and rendered themselves inaccessible to the 'exterior circumstances of

[1] Valbezen, pp. 370,
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid. pp. 373.
[4] Ibid. pp. 376-77. But in a different context Valbezen writes that with the exception of fortress of Ajmir, Mhow, Saugor, by the end of July not a trace of the English rule remained in the vast districts comprised between Nerbudda and the NW. Provinces (p. 266). Again he says that the fall of Delhi filled every heart with joy but a bitter delusion followed. In Central India the war was not merely a mutiny but a national uprising though the great princes did not join. 'Sustained by religious and military enthusiasm to the very last, the whole population *clung to the national cause* with a fervour' productive of many heroic acts of devotion (pp. 262, 334). Italics of the author.

Marfat.com

politics' and created a situation as complex as any Westerner could rationalise and comprehend. Nothing that England did in India to absorb all the fissiparous tendencies in an intergated political structure for the benefit of the Indians had been of any avail. Between the English ruler and his subjects there are no points of contact. An impassable barrier separates the two and not 'even a fringe of the Indian society has been affected by the beliefs and customs of Europe. Modern civilization has passed over the soil of India without making any impression on it as the sun rays pass over the earth'[1]. With all the pomp and pageantry of the East, Great Britain maintains a territory of 1,400,000 square miles and a population of 150,000,000, but with all the living forces of civilization she 'stopped before barriers, which neither brute force nor intellect can surmount'. Even the meanest of the beggars will not accept a mouthful of rice from the hand of a European. India had not responded to the century-old rule of a christian and liberal government which had scarcely touched the surface of its society. Hence Valbezen affirms 'that the uncontested power of England has not, and never will have any other solid basis but that of European bayonets'[2]. The analysis was correct that the tenure of British rule in India was a tenure of the sword[3], an old hangover of the colonial imperialists that India was conquered by the sword and will be maintained by the sword.

Valbezen does not enter into any elaborate discussion about the causes, but only observes that the Mutiny was the work of the army and cannot be attributed to any anterior and external intrigues. The deciding cause was the introduction of greased cartridges and the terror of the loss of caste alone explains the passion and weakness which characterised the Mutiny[4]. The author refers to the secret mission sent by Bahadur Shah to the Shah of Persia during the siege of Sebastopol, to the movement of Nana Sahib in the first days of 1857, and to the absence of any proof positive enough to show that in the early part of 1857 the dispossessed rulers and their agents had not neglected all means to excite disaffection in

[1] Ibid. p. 370.
[2] Ibid. p. 5.
[3] Chaudhuri, *Civil Disturbances*, pp. 210-11.
[4] Valbezen, pp. 375-77.

Marfat.com

the army. All these, according to him seem to suggest a kind of mutual understanding in order to be ready for any eventuality. Some people might have been aware of certain premonitory signals of the coming storm in the circulation of the chapatis which made people bury their treasures, but 'no trustworthy discovery either during or after the mutiny served to confirm the existence of any plot to overthrow the British from India'.[1]

No connected account of the Mutiny is offered but the author's critical observations on some points deserve notice. The ferocity and wildness of the appeals of the Anglo-Indian Press for vengeance struck him as extraordinary. They demanded the destruction of Delhi or of the Jumma mosque, the wholesale transportation of the muhammadan population to Australia. More than three thousand men were condemned and executed at Delhi including twenty-nine members of the royal family. 'These immense hecatombs cannot be compared to the horrors committed by the Spaniards in America nor to the atrocities of the pro-consuls during the wars of the Vendee' as the mutineers were traitors and deserved severest punishment. But the wholesale executions according to the writer was not only revolting from a humanitarian point of view but had the undesirable effect of prolonging the struggle and making it more sanguinary. Once the fate of arms had been decided it was not necessary to drown the Bengal Army in a sea of blood. Similarly, at Allahabad repressive measures were exercised on the simple ignorant population. Anglo-Indian papers of that day published letters of both spectators and actors of those horrible butcheries in a spirit of animation. Valbezen says that nowhere during the Mutiny was blood spilt so abundantly and with such levity as at Allahabad and in its environs. These cruelties worthy of the worst days of Tamerlane and Nadir Shah cast a slur on the conduct of the English.[2] Repression was carried out pitilessly, the writer reproduces from Parliamentary Papers the number of sepoys killed in various processes.[3] He also refers to the massacres of Ujinala.

[1] Ibid. pp. 18, 21-22, 26.

[2] Ibid. pp. 126-7, 158-59.

[3] Ibid. p. 74. The sepoys blown out from guns by order of the military authorities were 628, by order of the civil authorities 1370, hung by order of the military authorities 86 and by order of civil authorites 300, all told 384.

Marfat.com

All military codes would certainly have condemned to death deserters but nothing can justify the light and easy tone in which the christian judge, the perpetrator of this awful massacre, recorded the events in his book[1].

Valbezen could not restrain himself on the Cawnpore affair. His feelings vibrated in unison with all others who stood before the fatal well at Cawnpore. A soldier gave out the words 'Remember Cawnpore' and that was all. All the fury of the elements, all the plagues of earth were let loose. To men burning with the desire for vengeance nothing mattered. 'Forward, Ye Avengers. The Indians shall never fill another well at Cawnpore with dead'.[2] The author's admiration for British action was the theme of his work. He was constantly straining after it though it appeared inappropriate in some cases. He admitted that the hope of oriental treasures attracted major Hodson to the scene of action at Begam Kuthi but the bullet of a soldier concealed in the corner of a room cut short his glorious career. 'Posterity must overlook the slaughter of the Delhi princes and place on Hodson's brow a crown without thorns.' Valbezen pleads that considering the desperate situation he confronted impartial history will doubtlessly extenuate Hodson for murdering the princes.[3]

In other matters also he offered value judgements. He refers to John Lawrence as the undisputed master of the Punjab, his personal ascendancy over a whole nation over the lions of Khalsa and his statesman-like plan of evacuating Peshawar from which he had to turn away owing to the solicitations of Edwardes and Cotton.[4] The vigilance of the government over the activities of the people drew from the author the comment that a thousand-eyed Argus spied out the slightest movement of the population.[5] Sir James Outram's career was excitingly

[1] Ibid. pp. 72-73.

[2] Ibid. pp. 178-80. He says that the monument raised over the remains of the Nana's victim is from the design of Col. Yule of the Engineers, and is composed of an Octogonal colonnade in the Gothic style in the midst of which is the fatal well. The orifice closed with a stone slab serves as pedestal to a white marble statue representing the Angel of Mercy.

[3] Ibid. pp. 126 324.

[4] Ibid. pp. 36, 63.

[5] Ibid. p. 65.

Marfat.com

excellent, rightly adorned by the title, 'Bayard of the India Army' by Sir Charles Napier.[1] Havelock is considered as man of the moment when a terrible crisis was shaking British rule in India to its foundations. He and his army suffered 'every species of privation and suffering, a pitiless sun and tropical rains' to save the empire[2]. The author also gives a full description of the besieged Residency of Lucknow, this stress and strain, the filth and dirt and all the virtues and qualities of the character of the besieged that make for the story along with the exciting stories of Angad's exploits[3]. Sir Colin Campbell's position resembled that of Q. Fabius Maximus who was appointed Dictator and Commander against Hannibal by the Romans. Like him, Sir Colin was styled *Cunctator* or 'Lingerer' by the Anglo-Indian Press but the new Fabius, the author says, was not inactive. The army he collected in the latter part of February 1858 for the final relief of Lucknow was the most formidable army ever known in India. Valbezen gives a detailed account of various component parts in its different branches and a vivid picture of the army on the march to Lucknow. The whole thing seemed to be carefully provided by a skilful commissariat which gives a glimpse of the British resources and their striking power[4] towards the beginning of the year 1858.

The other general Sir Hugh Rose gave a brilliant display of British prowess and strength. Valbezen writes that the appointment of this soldier diplomat, the only member of the English aristocracy to be so appointed, excited much sharp criticism in the Anglo-Indian public as the claims of one Griffin is said to have been ignored. But this born general was ever fertile in resources. His military talents did not fail in the emergency caused by the occupation of Gwalior by Lakshmibai the 'modern Semiramis' and others. Rose prevented Gwalior from becoming 'a second Delhi.' The British once again showed their keenness in putting the right man in the right place, much to the envy of the French, the author says, for there could not have been a better military diplomatist than Sir Hugh Rose to command the adventurous expedition against Central India.[5] Lord Canning, according to the

[1] Ibid. p. 175.
[2] Ibid. p. 237.
[3] Ibid. pp. 200 ff.
[4] Ibid. pp. 282, 285, 290.
[5] Ibid. pp. 334, 355-56.

Marfat.com

author, was the real hero who avoided the alienation of India from her European masters by refusing to authorise monstrous reprisals as were clamoured for by thousands of voices of the Anglo-Indian community. While Canning's government showed no want of initiative in enlisting the services of valiant auxiliaries of European traders, planters and lawyers, he himself firmly resisted all appeals for vengeance and earned the surname so derisively given. But 'Clemency Canning' indeed constituted his highest title of glory in the eyes of posterity. Valbezen says that the insolent official reprimand, administered to Canning on the Oudh Proclamation, at once took the English people by storm. The former sympathy for the landowners of Oudh, yielded to a craze for showing love, affection and admiration to the great man who courageously withstood a terrible storm amongst the most trying events and gave way neither to weakness nor to anger. 'Thanks to him and to him alone, a military insurrection had not become a war of races.'[1]

It will be of interest to learn that despite what he wrote about India, Valbezan was an ardent admirer of Hindu society with an acuteness of intellect, characteristic of his people. He realised that the Indian institutions had survived the deliberate onslaughts of the power that ruled India before the coming of the British. With all their cruelties and fanaticism they hardly succeeded in shaking the society to its foundations. 'For 800 years', he writes, 'the sacred races bore the yoke of the impure conquerors' who did not leave any trace of their rule except some tombs and mosques when they fell. It is surprising also that in total disregard of the influence and strength of Western civilisation the Hindu Institutions had survived the challenge of alien faiths.[2] But the war ended ingloriously for India. The sepoys disappeared without producing a single military genius of any sort. None in their ranks also could be credited with showing any conspicuous bravery in the battlefield.[3]

French writings on the Indian Mutiny were copious. There were other writers known for their thoughtful views which were not

1 Ibid. pp. 172, 308. On the Indian side the author gives a detailed account of the career of Jung Bahadur (pp. 286-88).

2 Ibid. p. 4.

3 Ibid. p. 356.

Marfat.com

similar to those of Valbezen. M. de Montalembert and M. de Tocqueville had a reputation for impartiality of their attitudes on current affairs. Montalembert's character, his scholarship and his knowledge were highly esteemed. But according to contemporaries his public career at home had not been either successful or consistent as to make him a 'political miracle for the world'. About the Indian revolt he had no special means of knowing the truth and made no special enquiry into the subject. His sources of information were some of the English journals. In his book *Un debat sur l' Inde au Parlement* he discusses the parliamentary proceedings over the causes of the Mutiny and repeats the hackneyed idea that the insurrection was entirely the work of the sepoys. He too, like Valbezen, makes the East India Company the object of his eulogy and admiration. But M. de Tocqueville, 'a master of political science' looked at the movement from a different angle. Tocqueville made an acute but profound observation in a short sentence. Referring to the Indian Mutiny he wrote, '*Je crois que les horribles événements de I' Inde ne sout en aucune facon un soulévement contre I' oppression ; c' est une revolte de la barbarie contre L' orgueil.*[1] Although a very concise description of the Revolt of India, it enters into the depth of the problem. The revolt was a protest in a barbaric way against insolence and pride, the struggle of the despised Asiatics against the arrogance of western civilization. The uprising of 1857-58 in India, as already stated, did not go unnoticed in Russia.[2] The necessity of taking a position in this respect in Russia was dictated not only by the fact that the liberation-uprising in India had evoked lively discussion in foreign and Russian press but also by the circumstance that this question touched the domestic and foreign policy of Russia. The leading journal of the day, *Sovremennik* (1857, No. 9, Section II, pp 51-92), published an article under the title *Vzglyad na istoriyu i sovremennoe sostoyanie Ost-Indii* [A View of the History and Present Condition of East-India], signed as 'N. Turchinov'. The author of the article was N. A. Dobrolyubov (1836-1861), the well known Russian literary critic, publicist and revolutionary democrat. Besides an analysis of the national-liberation uprising in India, this article gave

[1] Quoted by Evans Bell in *Retrospects and prospects*, p. 230. Also *Supra*, p. 97.
[2] *Supra*, pp. 192-93.

Marfat.com

rather substantial facts of the history of India and dwelt upon the attitude of Russian revolutionary democrats towards the question of colonialism in general and British policy in India in particular.

Dobrolyubov saw the cause of the uprising in the 'very course of history of India,' and affirmed that the hostility of the Indian people was the result not so much of civilization by itself as of the 'British method of applying this civilization.' In Dobrolyubov's own words, 'this phenomenon is, in any case, not sudden or unexpected. State officials of England, officials of the East-India company, and even sensitive travellers who have had the opportunity of having first-hand knowledge of the present state of India had long prophesied that the British power would be facing a strong danger from the native population. They had noticed the administrative mismanagement, suppression of the inhabitants,...and sensed discontent, which sooner or later had to find an open expression, because there is a limit to all human patience[1].... Now the British newspapers are acknowledging that the uprising had nothing accidental in it and that it had to occur seeing from the natural course of the British affairs in India. The consensus of opinion is that the current flare-up is far more important than all the preceding disturbances that had broken out in the British dominions in India, and, in such a case, we can, in the historical order of things, consider all the preceding events a sort of a preparation for the great uprising now unfolding.[2] In fact, everything makes us look on the East-Indian uprising not as a chance explosion of discontent but as a matter of historical inevitability. Its explanations are to be sought for, not in one or the other influence but in the whole history of India'. He continues : 'Though it cannot be expected that India could, at this time, liberate herself from the British dominance, there is, in any case, no doubt that the present uprising would lead to great changes in the present position of the affairs of the East India company... . It appears that the view expressed in the 'Times' that India has to be conquered again, now is fairly close to the true state of things. There is at least, no doubt

1 For an illustration of the views of Dobrolyubov see also Chaudhuri, *Civil Disturbances*, pp. 206 ff.

2 For the preceding Disturbances see S. B. Chaudhuri, *Civil Disturbances*.

Marfat.com

that, for ultimate suppression of the uprising, far more forces would now be required as compared with those employed by the Company on its first ingress into East-India...'.

'The aim of the British would already be not the exploitation of the people, but their education. British officials have already observed that India must be ruled from India and for India, and not from England and for England...'[1].

[1] Dobrolyubov writes without any reference to his sources. His writings were edited and published by the State Publishing House of Literature, Moscow. The editor makes interesting comments on the Indian situation about the number of Europeans in India and furnishes statistics. Shri Harish Gupta, Head, Russian Division, National Library, Calcutta translated from the Russian original, the writings of Dobrolyubov for the use of the author who acknowledges with thanks the help so received.

Marfat.com

## CHAPTER NINE

# THE TREND OF ATTITUDES

The great outbreak of 1857 is a memorable episode of Anglo-Indian relations. In Enland in the first moments of sorrow, in the first paroxysms of indignation, there was uprising of the instincts for revenge. The people gave way to incoherent transports of rage and despair which fed by wild rumours and aggravated by the news of the frightful massacres of Delhi and Cawnpore assumed enormous proportion. The case against India appeared to be so convincing that even the wisest had been obliged to keep silence in the presence of the appeals for vengeance and extermination which were heard on all sides. It will not be possible to refer to even a fraction of the incriminatory writings of this period, nor is it necessary either, but excerpts from a piece of such inflammatory material may be reproduced to point to the anger and agony of the people. The outburst was so terrible that even the famous *Punch*, otherwise a sensible periodical, wrote to such lengths : 'History shudders at the recollection of the terrible Spanish fury which desolated Antwerp in the days of William the Silent, but English fury was more terrible still. With the grim determination and dogged pertinacity of the race, men went forth over the face of the land to shoot and sabre, and hang and blow from guns till the work should be accomplished'. That this was the mood of the English people was also reflected in a debate at the Union Society when one speaker concluded with these words : 'when every bayonet creaks beneath its ghastly burden, when the ground in front of every cannon is strewn with rags, and flesh, and shattered bones then talk of mercy ! This peroration was very much applauded by an audience whose temper was generally characterised by mild humanity.[1] All ranks of society, military, mercantile, official and non-official, and chaplains were penetrated with the same feeling. On 6 May 1958 there was published a London Gazette, an extra-

[1] Quoted in *Calcutta Review*, 1864, vol. 39, p. 328. Alexander Llewellyn in his book 'Siege of Delhi' recently published gives exactly the same impression of the situation (pp. 167-8).



Marfat.com

ordinary issue which gave a list of the victims of the Indian massacres. It was termed the Gazette of Blood, and was printed in order that it may be made a 'pillow in the bivouac and a watch-word in the battlefield'. Every word of it was red with blood and spoke of the gibbet, rack, and stake. A tremendous commotion followed. Europe offered examples of such movements, it had its Crusades of the Albigenses, its Sicilian Vespers, its massacres of St. Bartholomew, the Inquisition, and its French Revolution but all these sanguinary duels seemed to have been surpassed by the fiendish outburst of the Bengal sepoys. The sepoy comes out 'as the incarnation of every passion that blackens earth and enslaves hell' and sleek Hindu appears 'blacker in his soul than his skin', and from them both they would require the blood of the victims of Delhi and Cawnpore. To discharge this most sacred obligation they made a solemn compact before God and Man by the honour of their countrywomen, and the blood of their slaughtered comrades.[1]

In India the fury of the Anglo-Indians was still more fulminating. The articles published in the *Calcutta Review* during the mutiny period were an evidence of the spirit of the time. There were contributors with whom counsels of passion were strongest. They scattered coals of anger and malice, spoke of racial superiority and the imperial image of Great Britain. It will be necessary to exhibit these writings if only to show the mordant strands of the European mind on this point. Macaulay's nostalgic contention that the British adventurers had founded in Asia an Empire not less splendid and certainly more durable than that of Alexander, inspired many writers.[2] Even if Warren Hastings had fallen at Benares or had Wellington been defeated at Assaye the shock to 'our' prestige would not have been so great as it would have been if India had been lost to 'us' during the Mutiny. The same spirit was manifested in other articles. One writer wrote that India had failed to comprehend their rulers, they had not taken note of a remarkable feature of English character, British energy and pluck, that the spirit of Clive

[1] Colburn's *United Service Magazine* (London, Hurstd Blackett Publishers), 1858, Pt. II, pp. 203 ff, 309.

[2] *Calcutta Review*, 1858, vol. 31, p. 431.



Marfat.com

still animates them.[1] "Our Jam and Jelly policy" has failed and an era of stern justice should follow.[2] A more pompous article reads : 'British influence moral and spiritual shall roll on across the Indian ocean·····Lord of the sword and the pen, supreme from the confines of Siam to the borders of Kabul England will stay.'[3] The same writer continued : 'India has been a mere field of conquest to a succession of rapacious invaders and her teeming population a mere horde of debased and fawning slaves'.[4] Another writer compared India to a vast stagnant lake where all that is absurd has been accumulating for centuries. All attempts 'to waft from the West, the breath of high-toned' ideas have gone in vain. 'Under the Company, as the embodiment of civilisation of the West a system of mining operations has been going for the last hundred years, destined, we believe, to blow up in one vast wild confusion, the accumulated follies that have become rampant.'[5] Such ideas bear a similarity with those of Buckle who is quoted from his 'History of Civilisation in England'. About Indians Buckle wrote that their business was only to labour, their duty to obey.... 'Their annals furnish no instance of their having turned on their rulers, no war of class, no popular insurrection, not even a popular conspiracy—all changes from above, none from below ...no revolutions among the people'.[6] The denunciation of the Indians in the *Calcutta Review* of the mutiny period was quite in keeping with this tone. 'For falsehood the Indian mind seems to have a natural affinity', wrote another European writer. He further continued, 'their whole conduct is influenced by principles diametrically opposed to those known to the English people and so John Bull will naturally lose all patience with such subjects and had to be stern at times... What the *Saturday Review* can see with regard to the people of the Ionian Islands he should learn to see of those of Hindustan'—that Britain is entitled to keep them in *statu pupillari* to save them from evil to which they will fall a victim should John Bull evacuate and

1 Ibid. 1858, vol. 30, p. 110.
2 Ibid. p. 113.
3 Ibid. pp. 120, 165.
4 Ibid. p. 168.
5 Ibid. p. 116.
6 *Calcutta Review*, 1860, vol. 35, p. 294.

Marfat.com

leave the country to its fate.[1] Another swaggering Anglo-Saxon while reviewing an infamous book on the Mutiny, otherwise very popular with the 'whites' of that time observed, 'England should beware of showing too much magnanimity in a country where compliance is understood to mean fear and with a people devoid of patriotism and for whom we believe the *pressure of the heel upon the neck* or in other words, a strict yet just despotism was the normal government.[2]

All these gave a sharp edge to the charged mood of the people. To them the accusation of cruelty to the natives would not arise for the treachery of capitulation and the brutality of the massacres called forth sternest retribution, but to call such slaughter 'as fearful revenge' would be mere maudlin sentimentality.[3] So black life was never so cheap as in 1857 in India and writers freely quoted from Martin Tupper, the English poet of the 'Rebellion', 'whose popularity was a most astounding fact advocating rigorous repression'.[4] One such verse of Martin Tupper runs as follows :

'And England, now avenge their wrongs by Vengeance deep and dire,
Cut this canker with sword, and burn it out with fire ;
Destroy those traitor legions, hang every Pariah hound,
And hunt them down to death, in all hills and cities round'.[5]

Tupper was taken as the representative of the mass of the English at home. There was much more fury and vengeance in his writings than in any other comparable literature of the period. His other couplet : 'who pulls about the mercy ?—The agonised wail of babies hewn piecemeal yet sickens the air...', took the people off their feet in a delirium of frenzy ; the lurid glare sparked off by the fires of hate and vengeance eclipsed their sensibilities.[6]

Impartial history cannot be based on over-excited passions but the spirit was infectious and tainted mutiny historiography. It is no use

[1] Ibid. 1858, December, p. 550.
[2] Ibid. 1860, vol. 34, pp. 196-7. Italics of the author.
[3] Ibid. 1858, vol. 31, pp. 330-31.
[4] See Martin on the crusade led by Martin F. Tupper (II, pp. 410-11).
[5] *Calcutta Review*, 1858, vol. 31, pp. 73, 363.
[6] Ibid. 'Poetry of the Rebellion'.

Marfat.com

projecting an objective image that much of what England had heard both at home and in India was grossly exaggerated and similarly of what the Indians heard of the excesses committed by the British, and that much must be deducted from books written by both Indians and Europeans for high colouring. Yet there still remains a terrible residuum of fact, very painful to think of, to realise and to believe for which either belligerent was responsible. Lieutenant Majendie's 'Cawnpore dinner and six inches of steel' and his bayonet reeking with the blood of 'a dog or some venomous, loathsome reptile' may point to a close approximation between the voice of the people of England and the British soldiers in action. Majendie's 'Up among the Pandies' is no doubt a wild savage book 'born in blackness', but it is not clear if the Mutiny alone could have been the ground for the outburst of such malice and hatred of the British writers, unless an incurable deepseated racial feeling of contempt towards the Asiatics and Indians was not lying latent in their minds for years. The part played by the evangelists in representing Asiatics and Indians in the most ignoble way was notorious. Missionary writings ascribed the Mutiny to the failure of the British Government to evangelize. They had their adherents among the mutiny writers like Rotton, John Lawrence, Henry Beveridge, J. C. Marshman and many others. With these promptings, writings on the Indian Mutiny could not be either restrained or objective.[1] J. Mackay, otherwise not very jealous of his profession, who even denounced proselytising efforts of colonel Wheeler was none the less fiercely hostile to the Indians—their want of every noble quality made them contemptible in war as their treachery and cunning made them dangerous to negotiate with.[2]

It is a very surprising feature of writings on the Mutiny that not merely the British but the Westerners in general also showed the same racial proclivity and expressed their intense hatred and disgust for everything that was Asiatic or Indian. There was such a similarity of their views with the British writers that one is tempted to believe that racial arrogance and imperial-colonial pretensions in so far as India was concerned was instinctive in their minds. The views of the

[1] *Supra*, p. 18.
[2] Mackay, *From London to Lucknow* (A Chaplain), I, p. 432.

Marfat.com

American missionary R. B. Minturn on the Indians have been noticed[1]. He collected his materials on India during a period of six months tour. He was impressed by the size and population of India, its immense capabilities of production and the possibility of holding an important place in the economy and commerce of the world. He was amazed that such a country with myriads of men of most opposite national character could be held in subjection by fifty thousand Englishmen. The rebellion that was shaking their rule in India was not a strong one and did not possess, he thought, either unity or organic vitality to become aggressive. Like other British writers Minturn held the sepoys responsible for the outbreak. They were much too petted, their pay was higher than of any army in Europe having regard to their standard of living[2]. On the situation at Cawnpore he was satisfied that black treachery was followed by pitiless slaughter and that gallows and cannons were ready to punish the cowards and the traitors[3]. Then he reflected, 'the repulsion between the two races (English and Indian) is almost entirely moral, and arises in great part from the scorn felt by the blunt, brave, open, and truth-loving Englishmen for the cringing servility, the abject cowardice, the unfathomable duplicity, lying and hypocrisy of the native character.'[4] The atrocities committed by the sepoys were of the usual Asiatic type, hellish barbarity, which almost surpasses the belief of more civilized and Christian nations[5]. He referred to the trial of Charles the First and draws a comparison of the spirit that motivated this trial with that of the trial of Bahadur Shah. The trial of the English King was not merely his individual condemnation but a condemnation of the 'Divine Right' policy which had to be abrogated in favour of democratic ideas while the sentence of exile pronounced upon the king of Delhi was not only the decree of a British court, but it was the verdict of the civilized world upon the whole line of Moghul Kings. Still more 'it was the decision of Humanity in the grand trial between Christianity and Paganism for

[1] *Supra*, pp. 15-16, 229.
[2] Minturn, *From New York to Delhi*, pp. 100-1, 105.
[3] Ibid. p. 177.
[4] Ibid. p. 206.
[5] Ibid. p. 207-8

Marfat.com

supremacy in the East'.[1] In this flight of historical fancy the American missionary reached out to a new dimension of the Indian Mutiny, that it demonstrated the inherent inferiority of the 'East'.[2] Nothing better illustrated the 'immense moral superiority of the European over the native' than the way the King of Delhi was taken prisoner by captain W. S. R. Hodson. Hodson coolly rode by the side of his captive with drawn sword. The procession moved at a foot pace, the road was bad, on every side there were tombs and ruins. 'All around were thousands of armed men, anyone of whom might shoot that lonely Englishman...but not a man dared to lift his hand ; all were cowed by the calm courage and undaunted confidence of his expression. 'That was the grand triumph of Anglo-Saxon blood...no single action is so thoroughly characteristic of British pluck, as the capture of the king of Delhi by Captain Hodson.'[3]

There is something in this graphic description, an appeal of the real situation which puts the whole history in a spectacular perspective. The absence of panic in his mind, the pervading nonchalance, the tendency not to be upset by a crisis which characterised the British, had certainly endowed them with the required courage to confront impossible situations. But strangely enough, British historians had not been so opulent in their estimate of Hodson, neither very eloquent in drawing morals from this daring achievement. One British writer, for instance, refers to the way Hodson put his captives to death. He writes, 'The deed is one which history will not attempt to defend or even to excuse ; and who will not regret that with so dark a record we must close the narrative of one of the most glorious episodes for our race, the siege and capture of Delhi'.[4] On the contrary, the French writer Valbezen, already referred to, was even more effulgent and flavorous than Minturn in describing

[1] Ibid. pp. 234, 227-8.

[2] But Minturn had a turn for history of India. He refers to Feerooz Shah-Ki-Lat of Delhi and its inscription by one Dhuma Asoka piyadasi (p. 232).

[2] Ibid. p. 234. Dodd is the earliest of the British writers to describe the scene in detail from a very authentic source (p. 313). Kaye seems to have followed the same authority. The writer of the 'History of siege of Delhi etc.' also records his impression of this scene, of Hodson bringing in the King of Delhi, which was almost without a parallel.

[4] Adams, *Episodes*, p. 320.

Marfat.com

this most dramatic incident of the Indian Mutiny with its gorgeous historical background. It was truly a grand historical picture—the last of the house of Tamerlane surrendered and placed his sabres in the hands of a single British subaltern, captain Hodson, a most remarkable transition, history ever produced in its wildest mutations. 'It was a strange and sad procession', writes Valbezen, 'worthy of chronicles of former days'. The palanquin which advanced contained within its gilded frame 'the legitimate heir of the highest earthly dignities'. Valbezen describes the whole scene with all its detail and reflects : 'A man of foreign race, a simple cavalry major was presiding over this species of entombment ; but he represented all the living forces of modern civilisation, Christian faith, military discipline, political intelligence, science and industry. Hodson, as the instrument of destiny, was merely executing the decree of that irresistible law of progress which condemned the decrepit monarchy of Asia to pass under the sway of free and happy England'.[1] A kind of apotheosis which British writers would be very chary of accepting, but independently of them, such ideas of racial and imperial complex were taking shape as a concept of the Indian Mutiny and gradually widening its impact on various aspects of mutiny literature. But Minturn had not yet exhausted his emotive content of Hodson's action. According to him 'Asiatic courage is of one kind ; European of another, and the former bows before the latter...If one thing has been demonstrated by the recent mutiny, it is the indescribable moral inferiority of the Asiatic races... May Heaven bless the British Nation ! May God save the British Queen ! Aa Yes ! and let every lover of liberty and civilization...in our own happy America, say, from the depths of his heart, Amen' ![2]

On this question of moral and political infirmities of the Indians, the British writers in their treatment of the Indian Mutiny did not in general descend into such unalloyed racial garrulity, though quite a few of them were equally fierce and extravagant in point of spirited racialism. But apart from these writings, in other works, the tendency to applaud British excesses was covered by a subtle and sophisticated approach. It was the characteristic British mix of

[1] Valbezen, pp. 121-22 ; Kaye, II, pp. 646 ff.
[2] Minturn, op. cit. pp. 258-60.

Marfat.com

nineteenth century utilitarianism and the phantom of a Greco-Roman past to which they thought they were heirs, that made the attack on the Indian mind so positive and stingy. Sir George Otto Trevelyan, son of Sir Charles Edward Trevelyan, governor of Madras was the author of the 'Competition-wallah' (1864). He was a typical representative of this class of British thinkers who had scant regard for Indians and their culture. A thoroughly cultivated intellect with predilections for classical culture and utilitarian ideology, he made use of his time in writing about the Indians in telling English with a skill and effect not unworthy of his kinsman Lord Macaulay, the great essayist and historian. Quite in keeping with the tradition of the East India College at Haileybury, he firmly believed in the benefits of the British rule in India and was impressed by the unmistakable signs of England's handiwork in the material progress of the country as in the opening of the railway lines. The brilliant exploits of major Eyre filled his mind with an overwhelming sense of gratitude to Almighty God, not so much because he saved the European garrison at Arrah, but because His Mercy so arranged the order of the world that 'civilization should prevail over brute force, fair dealing over treachery and manly valour over sneaking.....'. The Mutiny showed the failure of Indian intellect. It had no organisation in the sense Europe understood it, the sole bond of union 'in the unreasoning fear of the depri--vation of caste' was no substitute for an organisation with a common cause or object and with leaders and a settled programme of time and season. 'The fact is that this excessive proneness of native society to sudden universal movements.....precludes the idea of organisation in the sense it is known to Europe'. According to him organisation is a process of the highest reason while these movements are unreasoning and the suddenness of these outbursts when contrasted with the peaceful daily occupation of the people excites the horror of the situation.[1]

From this mood to a contemplation of the qualities of British character was only natural, that the British recognise values more than anything else. Locomotives, powerlooms, and gunny clothes and every conceivable benefit which trade and science had brought to the English

[1] *Calcutta Review*, 1864, vol. 39, pp. 321 ff.

Marfat.com

people had not unnerved their wrists. Trevelyan transports himself to his Hellenic heritage. 'There is much in common between Leonidas dressing his hair before he went to his last fight, and Colvin laughing over his rice and salt while bullets pattered on the wall like hail. As in the days of old Homer, cowards gain neither honour nor safety. Still as in Londonderry of old, the real strength of a besieged place consists not in the scientific construction of the defences, nor in the multitude of the garrison...but in the spirit which is prepared to dare all, and endure all, sooner than allow the assailants to set foot within the wall...but as long as Englishmen love to hear of fidelity and constancy and courage...there is no fear lest they forget the name of the little house of Arrah'[1].

But as every mail got a fresh story of horror and disaster a change came over to him and indignation mounted high. The news of ladies being dragged along under a June Sun in hourly expectation of death and of babies being hewn to pieces made them wild. 'Then from the lowest depths of our nature emerged those sombre, ill-omened instincts ...the intense wrath, the injured pride of a great nation which surged upon the agitated community.....It was tacitly acknowledged that mercy, charity, the dignity and sacredness of human life—those principles which are recognised as eternally true must be put aside till our name is avenged and our sway restored'[2]. With the character of the English in India, specially to that character as developed by the mutinies, there might have been a temporary erosion of values, but John Bull had hardly changed whether in peace or war and maintained the same contemptuous stance as before towards the subject people. What Macaulay wrote about the Spartans is illuminating as an example of Anglo-Saxon's bitter contempt of the Asiatics. Thus he writes with his wonted flair : 'The Spartans smitting and spurning the wretched Helot moves our disgust. But the same Spartan calmly dressing his hair and uttering his concise jest on what he knows well to be his last day in the "Pass of Thermopylae" is not to be contemplated without admiration. To a superficial observer it may seem strange that so much evil and so much good should be found together

[1] Ibid.
[2] Ibid. p. 327.

Marfat.com

.....It was because the Spartan had been taught to revere himself as one of a race of sovereigns, and to look down on all that was not Spartan as an inferior species', that he had no feeling for the miserable serfs who crouched before him and that the thought of submitting to a foreign master never crossed his mind.[1]

It appears that Mutiny literature at the hands of English historians was influenced by classical ideas. It became a point of acclaim with them to treat men and things of the Indian revolt in the background of the classical past. It may be that the writers had in view a class of readers who would comprehend things better with the help of an analogy of European significance or a character of Greco-Roman civilisation. But these historical parallels, though not suitable in every case, pointed to an excessive measure the desire to extol the exploits of the mutiny veterans. Thus of those who along with Willoughby, blew up the arsenal at Delhi, Forrest observed : 'these nine Englishmen had earned a more lofty estimate for themselves than those three hundred Spartans who sat in the pass of Thermopylae'[2]. Similarly about the British camp at Delhi the historian found that in the men's tents they made merry and like the Greeks before Troy, they had their sports.[3] On the eve of the final assault at Delhi words uttered '2573 years' before against Nineveh were read in all the tents in the Delhi camping ground : 'Woe to the bloody city ! it is all full of lies and robbery ! Behold, I am against thee, saith the Lord of Hosts'[4]. In the deep sobs of a woman at the Lucknow Residency for her dead husband, Forrest heard the wails of Andromache.[5] And on the eve of the assault on the fort and city of Jhansi the historian felt that the day of vengeance had come and uttered the Biblical curse in the name of the Lord God, 'woe to the bloody city'.[6] Similarly Kaye found it impossible to write without

[1] Ibid. pp. 343-44.

[2] Forrest, *History*, I, p. 47.

[3] Ibid. I, p. 150. Another writer quotes Raikes stating that in the Agra Fort young officers lived in the same style of a happy jovial mood (Birks, I, p. 90).

[4] Cave-Browne, II, p. 156.

[5] Forrest, *History*, I, p. 331.

[6] Forrest, History, III, p. 192-3. But it will be difficult to share Forrest's bantering comments on Bahadur Shah, at whose court 'even Darius might have served as a door-keeper' (Forrest, *History*, III, p. 500).

Marfat.com

emotion the wonderful episode of the last stand taken by remnant of the Cawnpore garrison, Mowbray Thomson, Delafosse, Murphy and Sullivan. Like the famous 'three' they 'kept the Bridge' as in the days of early Rome[1]. In Wheeler's garrison at Cawnpore, captain Moore of the 32nd attracted his attention as the Agamemnon of defence,[2] while Trevelyan compares him with Clearchus.[3] In the death of Henry Lawrence, Kaye feared that 'a master in Israel was little likely to be seen again'.[4] Not the least appealing was the famous couplet on Henry Lawrence which runs thus :

> 'Not once or twice in our rough island story,
> The path of duty—
> has been for Lawrence,
> the path of glory'.[5]

Many other writers wrote under the same classical spell. Low in his 'Soldiers of the Victorian age' recalled that in the field of Marathon the Athenian army numbered only ten thousand men, but the genius of Miltiades triumphed over the Persian host.[6] The analogy fitted so well with Rose's action at the battle of Betwa on 1 April 1858. In the life story of a heroic English soldier, Thomas Bland Strange, a parallel, is drawn between the siege of Corinth and the siege of Lucknow.[7] W. H. D. Adams in his 'Episodes of Anglo-Indian History' eloquently describes that no Cornelia or Portia of the old Roman days ever manifested a truer courage or more admirable patience than the British ladies in that intensely tragic situation, in

[1] Kaye, II, pp. 347-9.
[2] Kaye, II, p. 319.
[3] Trevelyan, *Cawnpore*, p. 103.
[4] Kaye, II, p. 602.
[5] Adams, p. 341.
[6] Low, *Soldiers of the Victorian Age*, I, p. xxvii.
[7] 'The Walls grew weak,
and fast and hot,
Against them poured the ceaseless shot,
with unabating fury sent
From battery to battlement.'
*Gunner Jingo's Jubilee*, p. 169.

Marfat.com

the defence of the intrenchment at Cawnpore.[1] According to an American missionary, Delhi in December 1857, was like a tomb in Herculaneum. In its stern desolation the imprecation as applied to the city of Nineveh as of old was also applicable to it.[2] Cooper of Punjab found a similarity between flight of the unstable hordes of Darius before the Macedonian Phalanx and the ignominious failure of the rebels before the British bayonets. 'The British do not know when they are beaten' even the lustre of a 'Xenophon' scarcely influenced anybody.[3] Similarly the story of De Kantzow of the 8th N. I. of Mynpuri who stuck to his post at grave risk to his life was adorned by a parallel with the Roman character Regulus. And on those who have gone through much tribulation the tower of Siloam had fallen and had crushed them completely.[4]

Very few Englishmen could have regarded the events of 1857 without prejudice, but what mattered was that the colonial complex of the British when mixed up with the events of the Mutiny took a fixed pattern of sophistication. Quite early in the Mutiny epoch when a correct narrative of events was difficult to get, the *Red Pamphlet* found occasion to enliven the narrative with adverse comments on all that was Asiatic, that the Asiatics had in fact 'all the wickedness and all the irresolution of Macbeth'.[5] In his later work on Indian Mutiny which dealt with the subject expansively after many works had already appeared, and passions and emotions had considerably subsided, the historian G. B. Malleson was still very demonstrative, if not explosive, on racial-imperial questions. On every occasion he was ready to inject a racial spirit and to preach a sermon on the qualities of British character and emphasize incidents which marked 'emphatically the fathomless distinction between the European and the Asiatic in the qualities of a real soldier.'[6] He finds it a relief to turn from the baser and darker emotions of the rebellious population to a contemplation of a noble act of self-abnegation on

1 Adams, p. 326.
2 Butler, *Land of the Veda*, p. 415, Cave-Browne, vol. II, p. 156.
3 Cooper, pp. 245-46.
4 *Calcutta Review*, 1858, vol. 31, p. 333.
5 *Red-Pamphlet*, p. 93.
6 Malleson, I, pp. 451, 459.

Marfat.com

the part of Outram in waiving his rank in favour of Havelock.[1] As a historian of the Mutiny his main idea was to exhibit the glories of the British Empire and expose the debasement of the Asiatics[2]. After the first relief of Lucknow he simulates regret that the British were exposed to the taunts that they never knew when they were beaten and writes: 'The spirit that had animated Raleigh, that had inspired Drake, that had given invincible force to the soldiers of Cromwell, that had dealt the first blow to the conqueror of Europe, lived in these men—their descendants. It was that spirit born of freedom which filled their hearts with the conviction that, being Englishmen, they are bound to.....Conquer. It was not simply the joy of battle—the *certaminis gaudia* which incited Attila to conquest—that maintained their hearts. Rather was it the conviction that they were fighting for the right.....that England looked to them for the vindication of her honour.....that inspired the soldiers who followed Havelock with an elan that was irresistible.....'[3] In the whole range of mutiny literature the image of England as a conquering power was not put to greater effect than this sketch.

Malleson was not the only historian who treated the Indian Mutiny as a vehicle for extolling the British empire and the quality of the English people. The Mutiny seems to have worked like a signal for the outburst of Anglo-Saxon temper. Charles Ball, one of the early British historians of the Mutiny, was no exception to this[4] but in him the imperial sentiment was more dominant than the racial one. He was yet another protagonist of British prejudices very much awed by the scale and grandeur of the 'Empire' and the achievements of the East India Company. At the end of his mighty two-volume history, he goes gay with all the sensibilities of a British writer throwing his weight here and there and moving in the most carefree way across and through the whole panorama of Indian history. He recalls the 'transcendent valour' and glorious activities of the British from the sailing of the first English merchant ship into the Gulf of Cambay in 1612 to the suppression of the Mutiny in 1859, from Clive to Clyde,

[1] Ibid. I, p. 525.
[2] *Supra*, p. 131.
[3] Malleson, I, pp. 544-45.
[4] See *Supra*, p. 79 for racial attitudes of Ball.

Marfat.com

and records his regret that the powerful rule of the 'Merchant princes of England' over the 'diademed potentates' and swarming millions of their Asiatic Empire had come to end. The East India Company was a name to conjure with, 'a living impersonation of that union of war and commerce', by which the 'Empire' came to be established. Its prestige and name acted like a 'talisman' to ensure the obedience of the chiefs and natives and the efficient working of the government. But suddenly a storm burst out into a 'desolating tempest' in the spring of 1857, and alarm and horror succeeded to complacent self-gratulation. The wonder was how the storm could have acquired strength without even a suspicion of the authorities. Ball states that the Indian Mutiny had produced one of the greatest disasters and its suppression had become one of the chief glories of 'our' modern history. 'From the spring of 1857, to the corresponding season of 1859, it seemed as if a century had passed, so great and so portentous for the events that had intervened'. The historian gives vent to his temper, the haughty arrogance of the time, and comments : 'The princes of the Moghul dynasty have been shot like dogs, and their carcasses exposed in the market-place. Everywhere retribution has overtaken the murderers, the rebellious rajas have been blown from guns, hanged, transported, the king of Delhi is awaiting a felon's doom. We have beaten the rebels on their battlegrounds ; we have driven them from the fortresses they had most strongly fortified. Our legions are invincible, the ramparts of our power impregnable, and our position unassailable...our gage is lying on the plains of Hindusthan ; but as yet we have found none to have the hardihood to pick it up'.[1] There are other writings also which were loaded with similar feelings and authors indulged in senseless attack on the Indians. Foul expressions like niggers, scoundrels, mutinous dogs[2] were not infrequently used and in general, writers on the Mutiny applauded the marauding activities of Cooper, Renaud, Neill, Hodson, general John Jones, and quite a few others.[3] The unprovoked attack

1 Ball, II, pp. 362-63, 654-55, 664.

2 cf. Cooper, p. 6, 124, 129 ; Ball, I, p. 256, II, p. 17.

3 Forrest writing on Renaud praised his jealous daring and courage (*History*, I, p. 381), For indiscriminate ruthlessness in the suppression of the Mutiny, see Majumdar, *Sepoy Mutiny*, pp. 93, 115 ; K. K. Dutt, *Reflections*, pp. 22 ff.

Marfat.com

made on the men of the 40th Regiment at Dinapore, about a hundred in number who had remained true to their allegiance on the night of 16 August 1857, by the men of Her Majesty's 10th European Regiment is another instance of complete abasement of British moral power. They were peaceably and inoffensively occupied and had refused to desert with their comrades on 25 July. The attack was made in revenge for the ill-fated expedition of captain Dunbar on the night of 29 July near Arrah in which 145 men and seven officers lost their lives. A court of inquiry assembled to investigate the affair but nothing was known of it.[1]

As the revolt was a confrontation between the two unlike civilizations the racial question crops up in any historical treatment of the subject. If actions were prompted by excessive racial hatred and animosity the historian cannot in compliance with an objective attitude ignore recording the reactions of such acts of racial bitterness. But this does not imply that the historian himself should show a preference for a partisan spirit. The inflexible and the sturdy character of the English is a racial feature, and actions originating from this attitude however fierce and cruel they might appear, will have a justification in their national traits. To Sir John William Kaye this aspect of the question was more important than any undisguised acts of racial monstrosity. He admitted that the Englishmen were arrogant, intolerant and fearless, they were stern, hard and immovable but it was this, their 'pride of race' which alone upheld them in the midst of this crisis—their obduracy and intolerance, which might have destroyed the English in this conjuncture were in effect the 'safeguard of the nation'. The compliment paid to the English that they never tasted a defeat was only an index of their unyielding self-reliance. The projection of such firmness and relentlessness will inevitably impinge on a subject people which may be counter-productive also and Kaye would not hesitate to 'condemn' such a hostile conduct towards a

[1] Ball, II, pp. 125-26. He quotes the Calcutta *Englishman* of 24 August 1857 to show that the present temper of the European soldiers was abnormal and it was natural that the 10th should take prompt vengeance of the slaughter of their comrades. Yet the general view in the British circles was that in the whole of Her Majesty's army there was not a corps in higher discipline than the 10th which was made a model regiment by colonel Franks.

Marfat.com

conquered people, but the fact remained, as he believed, 'that this assertion, the appearance of strength, was a strength in the midst of their weakness'.[1] If the British officers had given way to vehement exasperation and to an intense thirst for revenge on hearing the news of massacre, it was 'natural and commendable'. The soldiers 'did well to be angry'[2]. Kaye was possibly of this mood that anything less than that would not be in conformity with English character. If the hideous massacre of some two hundred Christian women and children in the course of a few hours would not rouse 'English manhood in India to a pitch of national hatred'[3] then the Anglo-Saxon would not have been able to regain the 'Empire' for his race. The historian goes further and pleads that the retributory carnage at Cawnpore in the first days of the re-occupation of the city deserves to be treated on a different footing altogether as the soldiers had turned fanatics under the shadow of that terrible calamity which had befallen them. The tragedy and intensity of the historical forces were such that Kaye would even recommend that 'it would be the duty of the historian to speak lightly of their offences'.[4] The same argument would apply in regard to the excesses committed by the British soldiers on the re-occupation of Delhi as there had been so much to exacerbate and infuriate the army and inflame the brain and fever the blood of the soldiers and it is doubtful if they could have been controlled also. The historian admits, 'the very sight of a dark man stimulated our national enthusiasm almost to the point of frenzy'.[5] He even makes an assessment that at Delhi the cruelty and inhumanity of which the English were victims were such that the reprisals of the avenging army would appear to be very light. But all attempts to evolve a style of thinking could not be free from contradiction[6]. It was difficult to draw a line of demarcation between racial pretensions and imperialist

[1] Kaye, II, pp. 605-6.
[2] Ibid. p. 602.
[3] Kaye, II, p. 373.
[4] Ibid. p. 387 ; also II, p. 400.
[5] Ibid. III, pp. 635-36.
[6] Kaye also gave a very vivid description of British atrocities at Benares, and Allahabad and admitted that there are circumstances which human weakness cannot explain (see *supra*, pp. 106-7).

Marfat.com

obsessions. Like other historians Kaye could not rationalise the instinct of the empire, 'the imperial conscience' of his age, and spoke with a strident voice. When all was ready for the final assault on Delhi, the historian could hardly suppress his emotion. 'Again the supremacy of the English race in India, obscured only for a little while, was to be re-asserted and re-established ; and there was not a white man in camp who did not long with a great hunger of the heart, for the day when it would be left for our English manhood to decide whether any multitude of natives of India...could deter our legions from a victorious entrance into the imperial city...'[1] Nobody could say that the whole mosaic was not admirably Victorian. Here we have English race, Whiteman's hunger, English manhood, Natives and the bait of an Empire ; the peculiar racial-imperialist-colonial combine. But the peculiarity of the mutiny-war was that the capture of Delhi was not exclusively a British affair, there was quite a good component of the Indian army in the siege-force. The total of the assaulting columns at Delhi on 15 September 1857 numbered about twelve hundred British and over five thousand natives[2].

On this point, however, the British historians were agreed that without the help and co-operation of the Indians that was available at every step the war could not have been conducted. Kaye, in particular, freely acknowledged that though they were fighting against the 'native' races they were in reality sustained and supported by the Indians. He speaks generously of the fidelity of the thousands of non-combatants who stuck to their work and remained true to the British throughout the siege though exposed to the merciless fire of the enemy and subjected to brutal treatment in some case by the blood-thirsty boys of the English force[3]. Forrest took a particular

[1] Kaye, II, p. 659. See also the article on Historiography in Chaudhuri, *Theories*, pp. 14--19.

[2] Lee Fitzgerald, p. 57 ; Kaye, III, pp. 582-584 ; Forrest, *History*, I, p. 150. Five thousand 'natives' were not necessarily all fighting men, some were camp followers. In every troop of artillery, there were four times as many natives as Europeans ; in the cavalry, two men for every horse. In Havelock's force including Renaud's party there were 1964 men all told of which 1403 were British and 561 natives (Forrest, *History*, I. p. 373).

[3] Kaye, II, pp. 602-605. See also report of T. Inglis on Lucknow quoted in Ball, II, pp. 56-7.



Marfat.com

interest in taking note of Indian soldiers who took a prominent part in the striking situation as in the case of the explosion of the Cashmere Gate[1]. Similarly Malleson found it difficult to praise too highly the gallantry of the remnants of the 13th, the 48th, and 71st N. I., and the daring bravery of their officers who remained in their post against all allurements and vied with the Europeans in all forms of work[2]. The story of the faithful Bengal sepoys who served in the defence of the Bailey-Guard at the Lucknow Residency passed into a legend in regimental annals. The sons of those who *'Baillie Guard gya'* as MacMunn says, helped maintain the Union Jack from the great wall to the Flanders Flat in the first World War[3]. There are again numerous instances of Indians offering help to European fugitives in their perilous escapades which formed a subject of succinct charm. 'Like Stars', Forrest says, 'these numerous acts of kindness shown by rustics shine through the dark clouds of murder and rapine[4]. Reciprocally Englishmen were not slow in recognising the kind help received[5]. Humanness of this story of the Indian Mutiny has not always received the light of history.

But unlike other such movements recorded in history there was no change in British attitudes towards the Mutiny.[6] There is very little reference in the whole range of mutiny writings to any tone of repentance for the atrocities of those whom 'Billingsgate' of the day delighted to call 'White Pandies'. Even after the publication of Kaye's work and a lapse of half a century, the *Times* of London wrote on the revolt (2 October 1907) in the following terms : 'There are some great struggles in history, some awful experiences, which seem to purify a man's whole being to clear away the meanness and leave only the things that really matter in his character. Such a struggle was the Indian Mutiny'.

The triumphant voice of the British Imperialists, was still resonant

1 Forrest, *History*, I, p. 137.
2 Malleson, I, pp. 466 ff.
3 MacMunn, p. 256. See also Oswell, pp. xvi-xvii for other instances of sepoy's faithful devotion to duty.
4 Forrest, *History*, I, Intro. p. xv ; III, p. 551 ; Wood, p. 146.
5 Oswell, p. xx.
6 *Calcutta Review*, 1858, vol. 31, p. 444.

Marfat.com

and was very loud even after a lapse of fifty years when the golden jubilee of the year of Mutiny was celebrated. G. D. Oswell, Principal, Rajkumar College, Raipur, wrote a book on the occasion which was dedicated to Lord Curzon, the late viceroy of India and was published by the Clarendon Press, Oxford in 1908. The author ran into an ecstasy over the theme of the Sepoy Mutiny, that it conformed to the character of a 'World epic'. Scene succeeds scene, figures tragic and pathetic which a Shakespeare alone could have presented pass along the stage, figures, half-divine and wholly demoniac which a Milton alone could have called up from the 'Vasty Deep' of his imagination move across the stage. Memory of the heroic companions and gallant war-worn veterans of the Mutiny was recalled at the historic banquet held to commemorate the memorable events of 1857. Gracious messages from the King-Emperor, the viceroy of India were received. Frequent references were made to the lessons which the great crisis known to an earlier generation of Englishmen as the Indian Mutiny teaches. Glorious activities of the British generals were recalled which accounted for the halo that surrounded the tale of the Mutiny. The indefatigable champions of the 'Empire' were asked to take up the 'White Man's burden' and to remember what Lord Curzon said in his 'The call of the Empire' speech delivered at Birmingham in 1907. There was 'no sentence on the wall of the British Empire, as it was upon those of Babylon and Nineveh and Rome' ; the former viceroy of India thundered. He develops this point : 'Have no such craven fears.....if the summon comes to you, go forth, into the larger fields of Empire where duty still calls, and an horizon opens. Preserve with faithful attachment the acquisitions of your forefathers..... count it no shame to acknowledge our Imperial Mission.....and even if God no longer thunders from Sinai and His oracles are sometimes reported dumb, cling fervently to the belief.....that we may still remain one of the instruments through whom He chooses to speak to mankind'.[1]

By 1947 Great Britain had ceased to be the 'instrument'. The 'sentence' which Curzon failed to see on the walls of the British Empire came on the surface of the wall in its inexorable way. But imperial

[1] Oswell, Intro. pp. xxviii.

Marfat.com

experience left its mark indelibly upon the mind of British writers on the Indian Mutiny. Writing a brief yet lively account of the Mutiny in the centenary year, 1957, it was expected that general Hilton would be free from the incubus of imperialism and escape from this marzipan hangover and write a dispassionate account of that 'Savage conflict'. In the introduction the author takes a tolerant view and avows that there are faults and atrocities on both sides and that his intention is only to write a plain and unvarnished tale. But prejudices die hard and even a modern English writer it seems could not look back on the episode of 1857 without anger. Hilton echoed the same tone as Minturn and others about social divisions and backwardness of India which has not 'altered very much even today', that there was no such thing as Indian people in the epoch of the Mutiny but only a minority of politically conscious people as it remains today, that the educated intelligentsia of the present day, a product of European rule, have shown a bitter hatred for the very people, by an irony of human ingratitude, who brought them into existence. The author expresses his sympathy for the lately 'colonial countries inhabited by the politically dumb people' and swaggers in the traditional style that time alone will show whether the replacement of British rule by the rule of 'Babu intellectuals' has been for the benefit of the masses.[1] British historians of the Indian Mutiny do not seem to have shed any of their ideas on India and still persisted on the racial issue and the facile theory of the battle between civilization and barbarism. An eminent Indian historian, in offering an apology for his book wrote, 'Englishmen do not any longer feel obliged to defend everything that colonial imperialism dictated'[2]. But Hilton writes quite freely : 'Our Victorian ancestors of pre-mutiny days did exactly what they considered to be in the best interest of the whole of India'.[3] It is impossible to ignore the remarkable sequence of attitude from Charles Ball to Trevelyan and from Trevelyan to Hilton—the usual rhapsody of the benefits of British rule, the same orchestra of European superiority as shown in the historical writings of the Westerners on the Indian Mutiny of 1857. It is surprising how one

1 Hilton, pp. 204-7.
2 Sen, Preface.
3 Hilton, p. 207,

Marfat.com

could attempt a plain and unvarnished tale with such obsessions, but Hilton emphatically stresses his conviction that longing for freedom from the British yoke was remarkable for its absence in the revolt of 1857.[1] The author considers himself to be an authority on the subject and in keeping with the average English writer, constructs his classic formulation : 'whatever else it may be called, the Mutiny of 1857 was emphatically not a popular or national insurrection for liberty or independence. It was not a progressive movement against a reactionary government...It was not even a patriotic movement'.[2]

The survey offered in the foregoing pages will make it clear that the question of the nature of the movement apart, the main trend of the attitude of the British writers was shaped by the success of the British in the mutiny-war which accounted for this proneness of racial overtones in their writings. But it is curious that neither Hilton nor Malleson or any other army officer had tried to rationalise this victory which appeared to be a little accidental ; they only extolled the qualities of British character to justify the success of the British arms. The central fact was the Enfield rifle and its greased cartridge but very few of the writings contained any reference to the effective use of this firearm or any detailed discussion about the technical matters relating to the rifle. While the rejection of the Enfield rifle by the sepoys eventually led to the defeat of the Indians, it does not appear to have impressed any of the writers that the victory of the British in 1857 was particularly attributable to the 'withering power' of the Enfield rifle. None but Charles Ball had the acuteness of intellect to observe ; 'Had the revolted army of Bengal, had the rifle in their hands, Delhi might still have belonged to the Moghuls...it is impossible to say where the revolt would have stopped had the sepoy been armed with this rifle.'[3]

[1] Ibid. pp. 214 ff.
[2] Ibid. p. 203.
[3] See 'Enfield Rifle in the Indian Mutiny' in *Bengal Past and Present* (vol. xcv Part I No. 180. January-June, 1976, pp. 172-83) by S. B. Chaudhuri.

Marfat.com

## CHAPTER TEN

# A SHORT CONSPECTUS

It would be difficult to offer any concluding remark other than what has already been stated in the foregoing pages regarding the distinctive features of individual works group by group. It was pointed out that there has not been much of a change in the interpretation of the nature of the Mutiny; opposite views are re-stated with much the same emphasis, as formerly, and indeed, there is a surprising coincidence of thinking regarding the military character of the revolt, despite the interval of a century, as there is regarding the other view. General Hilton's observation as stated in the preceding chapter, confirms the truth of this remark. Writing in 1957, he denounces the Uprising of 1857 as being not even a patriotic movement.[1] Another writer Alexander Llewellyn in his book the 'Siege of Delhi' (1977) also rejects the idea of a nationally-organised movement for independence from foreign rule, arguing that the 'notion of allegiance to a country had little meaning for the sepoys....'[2] This goes against the views of Dr. Tarachand who made a very perceptive analysis of the whole course of the Revolt. 'The pride of the Indian was wounded', and so in 1857 the country was ripe for rebellion. He reiterated the views already propounded in the *Civil Rebellion* etc.[3] and reinforced the idea that it was the comprehensiveness of the Revolt of 1857, comprehensive as regards the participants in the war ranging from the emperor to the wage earners as also the area covered by war and seditious conspiracies,[4] that gave the movement the character of a national revolt against foreign rule. Dr. Bisheshwar Prasad the latest to write on the subject holds the same view that the national composition of the Revolt, wrongly called a Mutiny, cannot be doubted. 'It was a combination of military grievances, national hatred, and religious fanaticism against the English

1 Hilton, p. 203.
2 Llewellyn. *The Siege of Delhi.*
3 Chaudhuri, *Civil Rebellion*, pp. 275 ff.
4 *Supra*, p. 14, 128-9.



Marfat.com

occupation of India'[1]. However, the whole question has been discussed several times over by many a writer[2]. In the Preface to this work it was also suggested that it was not the intention of the author to represent the subject in any particular light. Views of the historians on the military character of the revolt, as also those on its popular character are separately indicated in the Index under the title 'Indian Mutiny' for an objective assessment of the question.

All other matters regarding the methodology of the work and the trends of mutiny studies have been referred to in the preliminary chapters. As stated in the first chapter, recent works show a definite turn towards the agricultural background of the Mutiny, the position of the peasant proprietors, the interest of the landed elites and in a larger context, the Economic interpretation of the Indian Revolt. The very significant contributions of Eric Stokes in this direction will throw further light on the civil rebellion accompanying the mutinies. As well as this there has been a definite accession of interest in the local or regional risings on which many books have appeared and are still appearing.[3] In general, the authors are making a meaningful use of the materials now made available of many struggles and confrontations, though such studies as published in recent years do not make out a viable case of revolt of an organised people against a foreign power in all cases. Character of the risings in different regions and localities was much the same in all places ; the pattern did not change very much from place to place. But the nature of local participation in the struggle, its intensity and depth, depended on the circumstances obtaining there, particularly on the strength of local leadership. Civil rebellion in the Indian Mutinies, as studied in a book of this description, refers to all these and various other trends of local risings which projected any special feature and assumed the pattern of a relatively wider conflagration. In Eastern India, in particular, the revolt of the local leaders, as described in many works on the Mutiny, converted the Mutiny into a Rebellion of the

[1] Bisheshwar Prasad, *Bondage and Freedom*, p. 575.

[2] Also *Calcutta Review* for a detailed discussion by contemporary writers on the causes and character of the Mutiny (1857, vol. 29, pp. 98, 120, 390, 407 ; 1858, vol. 30 ; vol. 38, pp. 415, 863).

[3] *Supra*, p. 201.

Marfat.com

people. Further works on this aspect of the revolt could be undertaken if new materials are available. Even reinterpretation of old materials in respect of controversial topics may be highly rewarding if treated with insight and skill. It has been seen that J. A. B. Palmer's book on the Meerut episode has indicated a new line of study. Such a refined and distilled treatment on a particular phase of the movement may be attempted in respect of other such episodes also. There are other such works which show subtle changes in the evaluation of the nature of the Mutiny and are marked by a refinement in narration of important events and an awareness of restraint in the continuing bias in writings on the Mutiny.[1]

However, the survey of English historical writings on the Mutiny as attempted here shows that in the early days, the essential conditions of study did not exist. The critical study of documents had not begun, it was not realised that in regard to an Asiatic matter like the Indian Mutiny there was the need for a discerning use of available materials. Writings on the Mutiny became an exercise in partisanship, not an objective study of the event to many, and very few writers showed any acquaintance with historical evidence and knowledge of authorities, both Indian and British and public or private. Most of them wrote from the immediate impression of their experience without caring to verify their accounts from official sources or investigate the truth of occurrences by comparison with the testimony of other writers. British historiography on the Mutiny became a sermon, not a science, and offered the most tangible evidence of the colonial prejudices of the English people whose hatred of the Indians extended beyond religion to race. The moral of the British contributions on mutiny literature is the utter political incapacity of the Indians, who were represented as a nation of traitors. They made an attack not only on the Mutiny but on the mind of the Indians, and the history of this country. The cry of religion in danger appeared to them an appeal to greed and passion, not a demand for life and honour. According to them the British army had done nothing to commit excesses, but the Sepoys were mainly responsible for this carnage of the war. They ignored the attempts made by rebel leaders to consoli-

[1] *Supra*, pp. 195-97.

Marfat.com

date the results of the revolt at places. They also showed no appreciation and utterly failed to recognise the generous emotions of a large number of local queens and dignitaries and other people who took a plunge into the revolutionary stream heedless of consequences.

In general with the exception of a few, writings on the Mutiny constituted a purely external narrative not marked by penetration or accuracy. One may have a notion of things, but he will not see the men in fetters. He will know a lot of the doings of the English generals and soldiers, how they won the Victoria Cross, and ploughed the country up and down with bayonets and Enfield rifles, but the people of the country hardly appear within their purview. Instead, we witness a bloody Assize in operation. The writers failed to realise that the Mutiny was an expression of discontent of the Indians, against the British, a colonial and western power and that the initiation was Indian. In it the first phase of British tutelage was crumbling away and new factors and new forces were emerging. It was a time of inexperience no doubt, but it was a time of enthusiasm, sacrifice and nascent impulses for a free India, an epoch of immortal memory to the people who fought in those hectic days. But the British writers generally overlooked the situation and were chary of accepting the view that the Mutiny was not an accidental convulsion. None indeed had the objectivity to admit that if a legitimate revolution falls into excesses that is no ground for rejecting its principles. None attempted to show that the Mutiny was not only defensible as an expression of faith, but it was of real utility in the development of a national sense, and a few, if at all any, found in the events of 1857 the key to Indian politics, and an inspiration to the subject nations of Asia or at least a distant signal of the liquidation of a colonial hangover.[1] It does not appear to have impressed any writer that the Rising of 1857 was needed to assert the principle of freedom after a century-long reign of authority and that the rejection of greased cartridges had saved India from the hold of Christian missionaries and

[1] See Joshi, *Symposium*, pp. 337 ff. (China and India In the Mid-19th century by Yu sheng-Wu and China Chen-kun).

Marfat.com

the tentacles of the imperial evangelists.[1] On the other hand, the incorrigible colonial arrogance, never quite drowned by the Mutiny, became all the more malefic at the hands of a few writers. While one reminded the Indians that the invasion of Nadir Shah was even more frightful and calamitous, another suggested that the suppression of the Mntiny was a high act of mercy for which the Indians should be grateful to Great Britain. Still another condescended to write that the Indians did not pay too dearly for the triumph of the foreign rulers.[2]

The Mutiny thus provided an opportunity to write on the blessings of British rule over India which was a 'continuous contribution to her moral and material progress, but English historians in general scarcely referred to India's value as a colony for Great Britain. This aspect of British rule in India vis-a-vis the Indian Mutiny was admitted by foreigners who freely wrote that India added to the diplomatic prestige and military strength of England and provided a base for the investment of British capital. Valbezen even stated that thousands of British people were engaged in tea and indigo plantations in India and it will be nothing less than a disaster if Great Britain were to lose India and fall back to the rank of a small power like Holland and Denmark. Political and colonial motives thus operated to transform the Indian Mutiny into a crucial issue of British life. Utility of India as a colony due to the steady growth of industrial capitalism was increasingly felt. It was an age of extraordinary capitalist development in England and the victory of Free trade led to a tremendous growth of British productive forces. Parallel with this rapid development there was an enormous expansion of colonial activities. The 1850's were particularly marked by a phenomenal growth of British territory in India, the annexations and conquests. The sequence of these developments was that India was converted into a secure market for British capital export and a source for high surplus profits. So retention of India became absolutely essential 'to uphold

1 After the Mutiny no such policy of uniting the government of India with missionaries in proselytising activities was ever contemplated. For Mutiny's influence on educational and religious matters and government's policy towards missionary exertions, see Chatterji, pp. 76-7, 220 ff.

2 *Supra*, pp. 75, 234, 246.

Marfat.com

the existing social structure of England' and to ensure a position of continuous strength to the British capitalist society. The Revolt of 1857 was thus fraught with serious consequences for the people of England which may explain why the Indian Mutiny, the Delhi and Cawnpore massacres apart, created a hysteria of contempt for the Asiatics among them and generated a ruthless feeling which characterised the suppression of the Upsurge. Accordingly from the standpoint of Great Britain the most tangible result of the Indian Mutiny was that the 'Empire' was reinforced and its position as a strategic basis for pushing colonial and imperial interest was successfully utilized. There was greater investment of British capital after 1858 and so a more aggressive form of capitalist exploitation continued unabated. There was no question of 'Retrenchment of the Empire'. But the British historians of the Indian Mutiny have more often denied than confessed the colonial implications of the Revolt of India. The people's Uprising of 1857-59 shook the 'Empire' so gravely to its very foundation that the government was obliged to change its policy towards the princes and the feudal chiefs. The new policy of conceding power and position to the 'native states' was designed to meet the threat of internal disturbances in future, while measures taken to rehabilitate the landed classes were meant to offset the growth of Indian bourgeoisie. But these aspects of the question were conveniently ignored by the writers.

However, the revolutionary maelstorm went its way, as it happens, with many good men on the wrong side and many bad men on the right, yet the revolt hardly solved any issue. The Sepoy Mutiny was one of those tragic incidents of history which by themselves did not usher in any new age. It was a strange result ; there was no sudden and violent termination of any idea on either side. Progressive reforms in the social field introduced by the rulers continued and reforming movements of the pre-Mutiny period were not banned and indeed received acceleration of interest. There was no sharp breach in the continuity of administration. Even in the period of a grave crisis towards the end of 1857 when Campbell was fighting against the Gwaliors, Lord Canning and his Executive council was considering measures for the foundation of Universities at Calcutta, Bombay and Madras. In the social field there was also no return to orthodox

Marfat.com

Hinduism after the mighty overthrow of 1857 as it usually happens when the collapse of a revolt is followed by rise of obscurantist forces. In the economic field, the British had destroyed many of the baronial estates by its village system and the Mutiny had destroyed other vested interests like the auction purchasers, usurers and land-grabbers but neither the talukdars nor the peasants and tenants were sacrificed to the interest of the other. The armed conflict seem to have resulted in an equilibrium and indeed down to the end of the nineteenth century British rule was not felt to be totally untenable. Territorial dignitaries and ecclesiastical pretensions which in India are treated with respect as incorporating venerable traditions or responding to widely felt interests were tolerated by the government in their own interest as shown above. The educated bourgeoisie which was the true mean between the absurdities of the feudalists and the acquisitive proclivities of an alien rule was slowly emerging and the secular benefits of British rule, though slow in action, were taking shape. It appeared that the Indian Mutiny was no longer a challenge and this constituted the strength and weakness of the movement of 1857. 'It was fortunate', as one historian observed, 'that the British Empire subsided into history books not in 1857, but ninety-years later'[1]. But this period of ninety-years from 1857 to 1947 witnessed the germination of the revolutionary heritage of the Mutiny.

The Mutiny inducted a new perspective in Indo-British relations which were not the same as formerly. The idea that the British Empire in India will go the way of the older dynasties which declined and eventually fell after rising to a height did not just happen. On the contrary, the Mutiny left the 'Empire' more solid and stable as ever as neither the sepoys nor the Moghuls and Marathas could combine to provide an alternative government. The alien character of the British in India became more striking, who it was realised, could neither be assimilated nor expelled. Memory of the Mutiny to the Indians became even more bitter. Two years of racial warfare left increasing aloofness as its legacy and left its mark, as George Campbell observed, 'in a sudden alienation of feeling between Her Majesty's European subjects in India and the natives'[2]. Even before Campbell the point was

[1] N. K. Sinha in *Bengal Past and Present*, July-December, 1972, p. 128.

[2] Campbell, op. cit. I, p. 306,

Marfat.com

stressed more strongly by Russell, the Times' correspondent in India. He wrote, 'Many years must elapse ere the evil passions excited by these disturbances expire ; *perhaps confidence will never be restored* ; and if so our reign in India will be maintained at the cost of suffering which it is fearful to contemplate'[1]. These two views, coming from two contemporary authorities make it clear that the Mutiny had shaken Indian confidence in the British and in fact the government remained unsupported by any principle of loyalty. The racial cleavage became more marked, which 'was becoming a source of real danger' as Sir Bartle Frere, a member of the Viceroy's Council wrote in 1860.[2] The Ilbert Bill agitation brought it on the surface (1883) and the Indian National Congress founded two years later was the logical development of the political scene of the post-Mutiny epoch.

Nothing affects men's outlook more profoundly than an armed conflict, but in general English writers writing on the Mutiny had ignored this aspect of the aftermath of the War as not worth knowing. For years after the Mutiny, the more important episodes of the War and the fate of the leaders, Tatya Topi, Lakshmibai and others formed the most important part of discussion among the people everywhere in the countryside which 'helped to mould opinion throughout India'. The ferocity with which the rebels were hunted down was firmly imprinted on the Indian mind which was productive of revolutionary impulses, and the contemptuous brutality and arrogance of the average Englishman who looked upon the Indians as uncivilized creatures hastened the process of social and political estrangement between the two races. The last swell of this racial feeling of the swaggering Anglo-Saxon was demonstrated during the Punjab Disturbances of 1919. British officials had read the signs of the Mutiny of 1857 in the Rowlatt Bill agitation and the tradition of the Indian Mutiny led to excessive action. Hatred of the British generated by general Dyer's action at Jallianwalla Bagh in the style of Neill, recalled the worst days of the hectic struggle. The Pioneer of 24 April 1919 wrote, 'Every account we have received of the outrages

[1] Russell, II, p. 259.

[2] Quoted in *Rise and Fulfilment of British Rule in India* (Thompson and Garratt), p. 464.

Marfat.com

makes it clear that anti-British feeling inspired the mobs, who wanted to destroy the visible links of British connections with the country like the atrocities of 1857 and the *Times* (London) of 19 April 1919 recorded with alarm what occurred in 1857, the fraternisation of the hindus and muhammadans. The Indian Mütiny thus left the seeds of revolutionary activity and in other parts of India also, as in Western India and Bengal the revolutionaries drew their inspiration from the story of that great Revolt and were sustained by its powerful influence, 'an unavenged and unappeased ghost' which brought into existence extremist Hindu nationalism in the nature of a sequel. The dissemination of the growing national feeling was to take many years but '1857' was the prelude to all such exertions. Dr. R. C. Majumdar gives a graphic sketch, despite his own views about the character of the revolt, of the links that connected the Uprising of 1857 with the Freedom movement of a later age which eventually culminated in the withdrawal of the British from India. The great historian reflects[1] : 'It has been said that Julius Caesar, dead, was more powerful than when he was alive. The same thing may be said about the Mutiny of 1857. Whatever might have been its original character, it soon became a symbol of challenge to the mighty British power in India. It remained a shining example before nascent nationalism in India in its struggle for freedom from the British yoke, and was invested with the full glory of the first national war of independence against the British. Nana Sahib, the Rani of Jhansi, Bahadur Shah and Kunwar Singh became national heroes and champions of national freedom and stories of their heroic struggle animated the fighters for freedom more than half a century later'.[2]

[1] Quoted in Chaudhuri, *Theories*, pp. 117-78. cf. Edwardes, 'It was the fear of another greater Mutiny' which possibly in the ultimate analysis led to the independence of India (*supra*, pp. 225-26).

[2] Correct form of English proper names which are misprinted as in the case of C. H. Philips (p. 26, fn ), Wolseley (p. 33, line 31) and Polwhele (p. 118, lines 6) may be taken note of. Also see 'views' for view (p. 46, line 2) and the dropping of 's' after 'book' (p. 170, last line), and 'appear' (p. 176, line 6). In page 130 the word is 'paeanic' (above last line). Other such misprints will be readily intelligible.

Marfat.com

# APPENDIX

Marfat.com

Marfat.com

# APPENDIX

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## I. General Works[1]


1. ADAMS, W. H. D. — Episodes of Anglo-Indian History. London, 1879, 1891.
2. ADYE, Gen. Sir. J. — The Defence of Cawnpore by the Troops under the Orders of Maj-Gen. C. A. Windham. London, 1858.
3. „ „ — Recollections of a military Life. London, 1895.
4. AHMAD, Q. — Maulavi Abdul Karim, a scholar-soldier of Bihar (Indian Historical Records Commission, 1958).
5. „ „ — The Wahabi Movement in India. Calcutta, 1959.
6. AITCHISON, Sir, Charles — Lord Lawrence (Rulers of India series). Oxford, 1892.
7. ANDERSON, G. and SUBADAR — The Development of an Indian Policy ; the last days of the Company (1818-1858). London, 1918.
8. „ „ — The Expansion of British India (1818-1858). London, 1918.
9. ANDERSON, Captain R. P. — A personal account of the Siege of Lucknow, ed. by T. Carnegy Anderson. London, 1858.
10. „ „ — History of Bahadur Shah being an English translation of Tarikh-i-Bahadur Shahi. Calcutta, 1860.


[1] Titles going under the following numbers have been taken from Ladendorf's 'Annotated Bibliography' : 22, 29, 31, 39, 49, 50, 53, 58, 137, 166, 179, 181, 183, 227, 233, 238, 245, 305, 333, 348, 349, 355, 371, 386, 393, 425, 426, 441, 483, 530, 531, 535, 536, 558, 580, 583, 594, 605, 616, 618, 623, 634 (Forty-two in all).



Marfat.com

11. ANDERSON, T. Carnegy — The Order of the Victoria Cross; war services of all the officers of the Bengal Army. Calcutta, 1863.

12. ANNUAL REGISTER — Or a view of the history, politics and literature (volumes covering the Mutiny). London.

13. ANSON, Brevet Major O. — With the H. M. 9th Lancers During the Indian Mutiny. London, 1896.

14. A Pictorial — Presentation of 1857 (Album), Government of India.

15. ARGYLL, Duke of — Memoirs of my Indian Career, 2 vols. London, 1893.

16. ASHANULLAH KHAN, Hakim — The Memoirs of Karachi, 1958.

17. ARNOLD, Sir Edwin — India under Dalhousie and Canning.

18. ASIATIC SOCIETY — Exhibition of Books relating to the Revolt of 1857. Calcutta, 1957.[1]

19. ATKINS, J. B. — Life of Sir William Howard Russell, 2 vols. London, 1911.

20. ATKINSON, E. F. T. — Statistical, Descriptive and Historical Account of the North-Western Provinces, 14 vols. 1874-1886.

21. ATKINSON, Capt. G. F. — The Campaigns in India (1857-58) from Drawings made during the period of the recent mutiny to illustrate the military preparations etc. London, 1859.

22. AYLEN, W. H. — The Soldier and the Saint (Havelock). London, 1859.

23. BAHADUR SHAH II — Proceedings on the trial of Muhammad Bahadur Shah, Titular king of Delhi before a Military Commission upon a charge of rebellion...1858. Calcutta, 1895.


[1] The monograph offers a list of illustrations relating to the revolt which supply the social and emotional contents of the Upsurge.

Marfat.com

24. **BALL, Charles**[1] — The History of the Indian Mutiny, 2 vols. (27 cm.). London Printing and Publishing Co. (n.d.).

25. **BANERJEE, S. K.** — Bahadur Shah II of Delhi and the administration Court of the Mutineers (Indian Historical Records Commission), 1948.

26. **BANKS, J. S.** — Three Indian Heroes, the Missionary, the Statesman, the Soldier. London, 1874.

27. **BARAT, A.** — The Bengal Native Infantry, 1796-1852. Calcutta, 1962.

28. **BARKER, Gen. SIR G. D.** — Letters from Persia and India, 1857-59. London, 1915 (ed. by Lady Barker).

29. **BARNES, G. C.**[2] — Letters written from the camp before Delhi to G. C. Barnes. Calcutta, 1857.

30. **BARON DE RIMINI** — Memoirs of Baron de Rimini (Griscelli de vezzani) Secret Agent of Napoleon III. London, 1888.

31. **BARTLETT, D. W.** — The Heroes of the Indian Rebellion. Ohio, 1859.

32. **BARTRUM, Mrs. K. M.** — A Widow's Reminiscences of the Siege of Lucknow. London, 1858.

33. **BASU, Maj. B. D.** — Rise of Christian power in India (1750-1860). Calcutta, 1931.

34. **BATSFORD, B. T.** — Battles of the Indian Mutiny. London, 1963.

35. **BAYLEY, John** — The Assault of Delhi. London, 1876.

36. **" "** — Reminiscences of School and Army Life, etc. London (Privately printed), 1875.

[1] Indian Gup : Untold stories of the Indian Mutiny (London, 1897), by Rev. J. R. Baldwin usually inserted in Bibliographical lists of the Mutiny contains little material that are relevant to history (Ladendorf. p. 105).

[2] Ladendorf refers to the Ms. of Barnes entitled letters (1835-1861) including an account of the Mutiny (Ibid. p. 137).

Marfat.com

37. BEAMES, John — Memoirs of a Bengal Civilian. London, 1961.

38. BECHER, Mrs. Augusta — Personal Reminiscences of India and Europe 1830-1888 (ed. by H. G. Rawlinson). London, 1930.

39. BEISIMGER, V. — Die urspringe des Aufstandes von 1857 in Oudh. Frankfurt am Main, 1960.

40. BELL, Maj. Thomas Evans — The English in India, Letters from Nagpore written in 1857-1858. London, 1859.

41. ,, ,, — Retrospects and Prospects of India Policy. London, 1869.

42. ,, ,, — Memoir of General John Briggs. London, 1885.

43. ,, ,, — Holkar's Appeal : The Office or the Empire (Privately printed). London, 1881.

44. ,, ,, — A letter to H. M. Durand commenting on certain statements in his works. London, 1884.

45. BELL — Life of Canning.

46. BELLAMY, J. F. — The Cawnpore Outbreak and Massacre. Calcutta, 1859.

47. BENGAL MASSACRE — or Lord Canning and letters of Militaire. Calcutta, 1857.

48. BENSON, A. C. and viscount Esber — The Letters of Queen Victoria between the years 1837-61, 3 vols. London, 1907.[1]

49. BERNAYS, L. J. — Havelock, the good Soldier. London, 1858.

50. BERNCASTLE, Dr. Julius — The Revolt of the Bengal Sepoys. Sydney, 1857.

51. BEVERIDGE, H. H. — A Comprehensive History of India, volume III. Edinburgh, 1858-1862.


[1] Ladendorf refers to the Letters of Prince Consort (1813-1861), ed. by Dr. Kurt Jagow and trans. by E. T. S. Dugdale (Ladendorf, p. 47).

Marfat.com

52. BHALLA, P. (ed. by) — 1857 Centenary Souvenir. Delhi, 1957.

53. BILLOT, Frederic — L' Inde, L' Angleterre et La France. Paris, 1857.

54. BIRD, R. W. — The Indian Mutiny (Two Lectures). London, 1858.

55. BIRKS, Rev. H. — The life and correspondence of Thomas Valpy French, First Bishop of Lahore, 2 vols. 1895.

56. BONHAM, Col. J.[1] — Oude in 1857. London, 1928.

57. BORA, M. — 1857 in Assam. Gauhati, 1957.

58. BOST, Isabella — Incidents in the life of. Glassgow, 1913.

59. BOURCHIER, Col. G. — Eight months' campaign against the Bengal Sepoy Army during the Mutiny of 1857. London, 1858.

60. BOYLE, R. Vicars — Indian Mutiny : Brief narrative of the Arrah Garrison. London, 1858.

61. BRAUNHOLTZ, E. — German translation of the Siege of Lucknow by Lady Inglis and Reminiscences of the Great Mutiny by Forbes-Mitchell.

62. BRERETON — A Hero of Lucknow—a tale of the Indian Mutiny. London, 1906.

63. BROCK, Rev. William — A Biographical sketch of Sir Henry Havelock. London, 1858.

64. BROWNE, J. — The Lucknow Guide. Lucknow, 1874.

65. ,, ,, — Lucknow and its Memorials of the Mutiny. Agra, 1886.

66. ,, ,, — Cawnpore and the Nana of Bithoor. Cawnpore, 1890.

67. BUCKLAND, C. E. — Dictionary of Indian Biography, 1906.

68. BUCKLER, F. W. — The political theory of the Indian Mutiny (Transaction of Royal Historical Society. Ser. iv. No. v). London, 1922.


[1] There is a reference to a book by Bond, 'History of the Mutinies' in two volumes.

Marfat.com

69. BURGOYNE, R. H. — Historical Records of the 93rd Sutherland Highlanders. London, 1883.

70. BURNE, Maj. Gen. Sir O. T. — Clyde and Strathnairn. Oxford, 1891.

71. BURNE, Sir O. — Memories. London, 1907.

72. BURWAY, R. W. — Life of the Hon. Raja Sir Dinkar Rao...Prime Minister, Gwalior (1852-1859). 1907.

73. BUTLER, Lt.-Col. Lewis — Annals of the king's Royal Rifle Corps, 3 vols. London, 1932.

74. BUTLER, Rev. William — The Land of the Veda. Being personal reminiscences of India, its people etc., together with the incidents of the great Sepoy Rebellion. New York, 1871, 1906.

75. CAMPBELL, Sir Colin — A Narrative of the Indian Revolt from its outbreak to the capture of Lucknow (25 cm.). London, 1858 (see Vickers).

" " — James Outram's campaign in India, 1857-1858. London, 1860.

76. CAMPBELL, Sir George — Memoirs of my Indian Career (ed. by Sir Charles E. Bernard), 2 vols. London, 1893.

77. CAMBRIDGE HISTORY of INDIA, vol. vi.

78. CARDEW, Maj. F. G. — Hodson's Horse. Edinburgh, 1922 (see also Trotter).

79. " " — A sketch of the Service of the Bengal Native Army. Calcutta, 1903.

80. Carey, W. H. (ed. by) — The Good old Days of Honourable John Company, 2 Vols. Calcutta, 1907.

81. CASE, Mrs. A. — Day by Day at Lucknow. London, 1858.

82. CAVE-BROWNE, Rev. John[1] — The Punjab and Delhi in 1857...2 vols. Edinburgh, 1861.


[1] 'Incidents of Indian Life' by Rev. Cave-Browne is only a book of short stories (Ladendorf, p. 105).

Marfat.com

83. CAVENAGH, C, — Reminiscences of Indian Official. London, 1814.

84. CAVENDISH, A. J. — The 93rd Sutherland Highlanders. London, 1883.

85. CENTENARY SOUVENIR — Indian Freedom Struggle, 1857-1957.

86. CHALMERS, Col. John — Letters written from India during the Mutiny and Waziri Campaign. Edinburgh, 1904.

87. CHAMBERLAIN, Gen. Sir Crawford — Remarks on Captain Trotter's biography of Major W. S. R. Hodson. Edinburgh, 1901.

88. CHAMBERS. W. &. R. (Published by). — The History of the Indian Revolt and the expeditions to Persia, China and Japan, 1857-7-8 ( 25 cm. ). London, 1859 (see Dodd).

89. CHANDA, S. N. — 1857 : Some untold Stories, 1976.

90. CHANDER, Bholanath — The travels of a Hindu to various parts of Bengal and Upper India (with an introduction by J. T. Wheeler), 2 vols. London, 1869.

91. CHAPLAIN — From London to Lucknow, 2 vols. London, 1860 (see Rev. Mackay).

92. CHAPMAN, John — The Mutiny in the Bengal Army. London, 1857.

93. CHATTERJI, Prasanta K. — The Making of India Policy, 1853-1865. Calcutta, 1975.

93(A). CHATTOPADHYAYA, H. P. — The Sepoy Mutiny, A social study and analysis. Calcutta, 1957.

94. CHAUDHURI, S. B. — Civil Disturbances During the British Rule in India (1765-1857). Calcutta, 1955.

95. ,, ,, — Civil Rebellion in the Indian Mutinies (1857-1859). Calcutta, 1957.

96. ,, ,, — Theories of the Indian Mutiny. Calcutta, 1965.


Marfat.com

97. CHAUDHURI, S. B. — English Historical Writings on the Indian Mutiny of 1857-59. Calcutta, 1978.

" " — Enfield Rifle in the Indian Mutiny.[1]

97(A). CHICK, N. A. — Annals of the Indian Rebellion, 1857-58 (20 cm.). Sanders and Covers, Calcutta, 1859.

98. CHOLMELEY, R. E. — John Nicolson. London, 1909.

CHOPRA, P. N. — See Who's Who etc.

99. CHURCHER, E. J. — Some Reminiscences of three-quarters of a century in India. London, 1909.

100. CLIVE, Williams — Dando on Delhi Ridge. London, 1971.

100(A). COHEN, Stephen P. — The Indian Army, its contribution to the development of a Nation, 1971.

101. COLLIER, Richard — The Sound of Fury (or the Great Indian Mutiny, New York, 1963). London, 1963.

102. COLVIN, Sir AUCKLAND — John Russell Colvin. The last lieutenant-governor of the North-West under the Company. Oxford, 1895.

103. COOPER, F. — The Crisis in the Punjab from the 10th of May until the fall of Delhi. London, 1858.

104. COOPER, L. — Havelock. London, 1957.

105. COOPLAND, Mrs. Ruth M. — A Lady's Escape from Gwalior and life in the Fort of Agra during the mutinies of 1857. London, 1859.

106. COPE, W. H. — History of the Rifle Brigade. London, 1877.

107. CORK, B. J. — Rider on a Grey Horse, London, 1958.

108. COSENS, Lt. Col. F.R. and Wallace, C.L. — Fatehgarh and the Mutiny. Lucknow, 1933.

109, COTTON, Sir Evan — Calcutta Old and New. Calcutta, 1907.


[1] This is inserted here to meet enquiries about any work on the historical and technical aspect of the firearm (*supra* p. 277).

Marfat.com

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 110. | CRAWFORD, Lt.-Col. A. | Remarks on the Indian Army. London, 1957. |
| 111. | CRAWSHAY, George | The Mutiny of the Bengal Army. Gateshead, 1857. |
| 112. | CROMB, James | The Highland Brigade. London, 1893. |
| 113. | CRUMP, Lt. C. W. | A Pictorial Record of the Cawnpore Massacre. London, 1858. |
| 114. | CULROSE, J. | The Missionary martyr of Delhi. A memoir of the Rev. John Mackay etc. London, 1860. |
| 115. | CUNNINGHAM, Sir H. S. | Earl Canning (Rulers of India Series). Oxford, 1891. |
| 116. | CURETON, GEN. Sir C. | A short account of the services of General Sir Charles Cureton, K. C. B. during the Indian Mutiny. Colchester, 1893. |
| 117. | DALHOUSIE, Lord | Private Letters of the Marquess of Dalhousie (ed. by J. G. Baird). Edinburgh, 1911. |
| 118. | DALY, Maj. H. D. | Memoirs of General Sir Henry Dermot Daly. London, 1905. |
| 119. | DANGERFIELD, G. | Bengal Mutiny. London, 1933. |
| 120. | DANVERS, R. W. | Letters from India and China during the years 1854-58. London, 1898. |
| 121. | DATTA, Dr. K. K. | Biography of Kunwar Singh and Amar Singh. Patna, 1957. |
| 122. | ,, ,, | History of the Freedom Movement in Behar, Vol. I. Patna, 1957. |
| 123. | ,, ,, | Recollections of the Mutiny. Calcutta, 1967. |
| 124. | DAVIDSON, H. | History and Services of the 78th Highlanders, 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1901. |
| 125. | DAWSON, L. G. | Squires and Sepoys, 1857-1957. London, 1960. |
| 126. | DE KANTZOW, Col. C. A. | Record of services in India, 1853-86. Brighton, 1898. |


Marfat.com

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 127. | DEWAR, Douglas | Bygone days of the Company. Calcutta, 1920. |
| 128. | DHARAIYA, R. K. | Gujarat in 1857. Ahmedabad, 1973. |
| 129. | DHARAM PAL | The Poorbeah Soldier. Delhi. 1957. |
| 130. | " " | Tatya Tope. Delhi, 1957. |
| 131. | DICKINSON, J. | Last counsels of an unknown Counsellor. London, 1877. |
| | Dictionary of | National Biography. |
| 132. | DIGBY, W. | 1857, A Friend in need. 1887. Friendship forgotten. London, 1890. |
| 133. | DISTRICT | GAZETTEERS OF the Different States and Provinces of India compiled by various authors[1]. |
| 134. | DIVER, Maud | Honoria Lawrence : a fragment of Indian History (story of Honoria, wife of Sir Henry Lawrence who died when defending...). London, 1936. |
| | DODD, G[2]. | History of the Indian Revolt and of the expeditions to Persia, China and Japan, 1856-7-8. London, 1859-60 (same as Chambers' History). |
| 135. | DODGSON, LT.-Col. D. | General views and special points of interest of the city of Lucknow. London, 1960. |
| 136. | DORMER, J. | My Garden in the city of Gardens, a memory with illustrations. London, 1905. |
| 137. | D'OYLY, C. W. | Eight Months' experience of the revolt in 1857. Blanford, 1891. |
| 138. | DUBERLY, Mrs. H. F. | Campaigning experiences in Rajputana and Central India during the suppression of the Mutiny, 1857-58. London. 1859. |

[1] See S. B. Chaudhuri, 'History of the Gazetteers of India' (Published by the Ministry of S. R. & C. A. Government of India in 1965) for an account of the old and revised gazetteers.

[2] The Preface of the book is signed as 'G. D.' which is taken to be George Dodd.

Marfat.com

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 139. | DUFF, Dr. Alexander | The Indian Rebellion, its causes and results, in a series of letters. London, 1858. |
| 140. | DUNLOP, R. H. W. | Service and Adventure with the Khakee Ressalah : or, Meerut Volunteer during the Mutinies of 1857-58. London, 1858. |
| 141. | DURAND, H. M. | Central India in 1857. London, 1876. |
| 142. | ,, ,, | The Life of Major-General Sir Henry Marion Durand, 2 vols. London, 1883. |
| 143. | EDWARDES, Lady Emma | Memoirs and Letters of the life of Sir Herbert B. Edwardes by his wife, 2 vols. London, 1886 (also his speech at the 61st Anniversary of the Church Missionary Society. 1860). |
| 144. | EDWARDES, M. | The Necessary Hell. London, 1958. |
| 145. | ,, ,, | The Orchid House. London, 1960. |
| 146. | ,, (ed. by) | My Indian Mutiny Diary by W. H. Russell. London, 1957. |
| 147. | ,, ,, | Battles of the Indian Mutiny. New York, 1962. |
| 148. | EDWARDES, Sir H. B. & MERIVALE, H. | Life of Sir Henry Lawrence, 2 vols. London, 1878. |
| 149. | EDWARDS, W. | Personal Adventures during the Indian Rebellion in Rohilkhand, Futtehghur and Oudh. London, 1858. |
| 150. | ,, ,, | Facts and Reflections connected with the Indian Rebellion. Liverpool, 1859. |
| 151. | ,, ,, | Reminiscences of a Bengal Civilian (which includes a narrative of Raja Bayjeenath Mishra's sufferings). London, 1886. |
| 152. | ,, ,, | Narrative of the escape of W. E. (Privately printed). London 1857. |
| 153. | ELLIOTT, J. A. | A Padree Elliott of Fyzabad. London, 1906. |
| 154. | ,, G. A. | Laborious days. Calcutta, 1892. |


Marfat.com

155. ELSMIE, G. R. (ed. by) — Field Marshal Sir Donald Steward. An account of his life (Peshawar to Alighar, 1856-7). 1903.

156. EMBREE, A. T. (ed. by) — 1857 in India. Boston, 1963.

156 (A) ERIC STOKES — Peasants and the Raj. Delhi, 1978.

157. ERSKINE, W. C. — Chapter of the Bengal Mutiny as seen in Central India. By one who was there. Edinburgh, 1871.

158. Evans, T. — Three Lectures on the Revolt of the Bengal Army in 1857. Mussoorie, 1899.

159. EVANS, W. D. — Ode on the death of General Sir Henry Havelock. London, 1858.

160. EWART, LT.-GEN. J. A. — Story of a Soldier's Life, 2 vols. London, 1881.

161. FAYRER-BART, Sir Joseph — Recollections of my Life. London, 1900.

162. FITCHETT, W. H. — The tale of the great Mutiny. London, 1907.

163. FORBES, Archibald — Havelock (English Men of Action Series). London, 1891.

164. ,, ,, — Colin Campbell-Lord Clyde (English Men of Action Series). London, 1895.

165. ,, ,, — Glimpses through the cannon smoke (A series of sketches). London, 1883.

166. ,, ,, — The Black-watch : The Record of an Historic Regiment. London, 1910.

167. FORBES, Mrs. Hamilton — Some Recollections of the Siege of Lucknow, 1905.

168. FORBES-MITCHELL, W. — Reminiscences of the great Mutiny, ...1857-59. London, 1895.

169. ,, ,, — The Relief on Lucknow. Folio Society. London, 1962 (ed. by Michael Edwardes).

170. FORGUES, P. E. D. — La revolte des cipayes, episodes et recits de lavie Anglo-Indienne. Paris, 1861.


Marfat.com

171. FORJETT, C. — Our Real danger in India. London, 1877.

172. FORREST, Sir George William — Life of Field Marshal Sir Neville Chamberlain. Edinburgh, 1908.

173. „ „ — Sepoy Generals. Edinburgh, 1901.

174. „ „ — History of the Indian Mutiny (21 cm.). 3 vols. Edinburgh and London, 1904-1912.

175. „ „ (ed. by) — Selections from the Letters, Despatches and other State Papers preserved in the Military Department of the Government of India, 1857-58, 4 vols. Calcutta, 1893, 1912.

176. „ „ — Life of Lord Roberts. London, 1914.

177. FORSYTH, Sir T. Douglas — Autobiography and Reminiscences (ed. by his daughter Ethel Forsyth). London, 1887.

178. FORTESCUE, Hon. J. W. — History of the British Army, 13 vols. London, 1930.

179. FORT ST. GEORGE — GAZETTE. The Lucknow Despatches, 1857.

180. FRASER, Capt. Hastings — Our Faithful Ally. The Nizam. London, 1865.

181. From London to — Calcutta by the overland Route. Calcutta, 1873.

182. Frost, Thomas (ed. by) — A complete narrative of the Mutiny in India. London, 1858 (seventy-six pages).

Fulton, Capt. — Diary (see Napier).

183. FURNEAUX, R. — The first war correspondent William H. Russell. London, 1944.

184. GARDENER, F. M. — The story of the Indian Mutiny. New York (n. d.).

185. GARDYNE, C. G. — The Life of a Regiment : the history of the Gordon Highlanders 4 vols. Edinburgh, 1903.

186. GAMBIER-PARRY — Reynell Taylor. London, 1888.


Marfat.com

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 187. | Gazetteer of the | Province of Oudh, 3 vols. Lucknow. 1877. |
| 188. | GERMON, Maria Vincent | Journal of Siege of Lucknow (ed. by M Edwardes with an Introduction by Colin Wolech). London, 1958. |
| 189. | GERMON, Mrs. R. C. | A Diary kept by Mrs. R. C. Germon at Lucknow between May and December 1857. London. 1870. |
| 190 | GHALIB, MIRZA A. Khan | A Diary of the Revolt of 1857, trans. by K. R. Faruqui, 1970. |
| 191. | GIBBON, F. P.[1] | The Lawrences of the Punjab. London, 1908. |
| 192. | GILBERT, Henry | The Story of the Indian Mutiny. New York. London, 1916. |
| 193. | GILCHRIST, M. | The Mutinies (a poem).[2] |
| 194. | GILLIAT, Edward | Daring deeds of the Indian Mutiny. London, 1918. |
| 19 | ,, ,, | Heroes of the Indian Mutiny. London, 1914. |
| 196. | GIMLETE, Lt.-Col. George H. D. Golden | A Postscript to the Records of the Indian Mutiny. London, 1927. COMMEMORATION of the Indian Mutiny Veterans. London, 1908 (see Oswell). |
| 197. | GOLDSMID, Maj GEN. Sir. F. J. | Sir James Outram, a biography, 2 vols. London, 1880. |
| 198. | GORDON-ALEXANDER, Lt.-Col. W. | Recollections of a Highland Subaltern during the campaigns of the 93rd Highlanders in India, under Sir Colin Campbell, Lord Clyde in 1857, 1858 and 1859. London, 1898. |

[1] The famous book, 'My escape from the mutinies in Oudh' in two volumes (London, 1858), by R. D. Gibney is a novel but it is sometime listed as a source-book of the Mutiny (Ladendorf, p. 107).

[2] Gillean's 'the Ranee', a legend of the Indian Mutiny is considered a fiction (Ladendorf, p. 108). As for fictions on the Revolt, the list of the 'National Library' (No. 409) is more detailed (pp. 47-53) than the one furnished by Ladendorf (*Supra*, p. 28).

Marfat.com

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 199. | GORDON, Surg.-Gen. C. A. | Recollections of Thirty-nine years in the Army. London, 1898. |
| 200. | GORMAN, J. T. | The Siege of Lucknow. Oxford, 1942. |
| 201. | GOUGH, General Sir H. | Old Memories. Edinburgh, 1897. |
| 202. | GOWING, T. A. | A Soldier's experience or A voice from the Ranks. Nottingham, 1900. |
| 203. | GRAHAM, G. F. I. | Life and work of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan. Calcutta, 1909 (see Sayyid Ahmed Khan). |
| 204. | GRANT, Alexander | Physician and Friend. London, 1902. |
| 205. | GRANT, Sir H. | Life with Selections from his Correspondence, 2 vols. 1894. |
| 206. | GRANT, Gen. Sir H. and KNOLLYS, H. | Incidents in the Sepoy War, 1857-58. Compiled from the Private Journals of General Sir H. Grant, K. C. B. together with some explanatory chapties by H. Knollys, 2 Vols. Edinburgh, 1873. |
| 207. | GRANT, James P. | The Christian Soldier. London, 1858. |
| 208. | Gray, R. | Reminiscences of India and North Queensland. London, 1913. |
| 209. | Great Battles of the | British Army including Indian Mutiny. London, 1869. |
| 210. | GREATHED, Harvey Harris | Letters written during the Siege of Delhi (ed. by his widow). London, 1858. |
| 211. | GREENE, Captain D. S. | Views in India from Drawings, taken during the Sepoy Mutiny. London, 1859. |
| 212. | GREENER, W. W. | Gunnery in 1858. Being a treatise on Rifles describing the newest improvements. London, 1858. |
| 213. | GRETTON, Lt.-Col. G Le M. | Campaigns and History of the Royal Irish Regiment. Edinburgh, 1911. |
| 214. | GREVILLE, C. C. | The Greville Memoirs, 8 vols. London, 1888, 1938. |


Marfat.com

215. GREY, Col. L. J. — Tales of our Grandfather (ed. by F. & C. Grey). London, 1912.

216. GRIFFITHS, Charles J. — A Narrative of the Siege of Delhi with an account of the Mutiny at Ferozepore in 1857 (ed. by H. J. Yonge). London, 1910.

217. GROOM, W. T. — With Havelock from Allahabad to Lucknow (ed. by Mrs. H. M. Groom). London, 1894.

218. GUBBINS, Martin R. — An account of the Mutinies in Oudh, and of the Siege of the Lucknow Residency. London, 1858.

219. GUPTA, P. C. — Nana Sahib and the rising at Cawnpore. Oxford, 1967.

220. GURNEY, Rev. J. H. — The Moral of a sad story. Four sermons on the Indian Mutiny preached in Saint Mary's Church in 1857.

221. HAGELY, Avel Lind Von — Reisebilder und skizzen aus Indien und dem letzten indischen Kriege ; 1857-1859. Leipzig, 1861.

222. HALDANE, Julia — Story of our Escape from Delhi in 1857. Agra, 1888.

223. HALLEWAY — Essay on the Indian Mutiny (n d.).

224. HALLS, John J. — Two months in Arrah in 1857. London, 1860.

225. HANDCOCK, Col. A. G. — A short account of the Siege of Delhi in 1857. Simla, 1892, 1899.

226. HARE, A and CUTHBERT, J. — The Story of two noble Lives, 3 vols. London, 1895.

227. HARE, R. T. — Reminiscences of a Mutiny Veteran. Portsmouth, 1912.

228. HARINGTON, Captain H. — A Memoir. London, 1892.

229. HARRIS, J. T. — 'China Jim.' London, 1912.

230. HARRIS, Mrs. James — A Lady's Diary of the Siege of Lucknow. London, 1858.


Marfat.com

231. HARRISON, J. B. — The Indian Mutiny (Published for Historical Association). London, 1958.

232. HASSAN KHAN MAINODIN and JEEWANLAL MUNSHI — Two Native narratives of the Mutiny in Delhi. Translated by Charles Theophilus Metcalfe. London, 1898 (see Metcalfe).

233. HEADLEY, J. T. — Life of General H. Havelock. New York, 1859.

234. HEDAYET ALI, Shaikh — A few words relative to the late Mutiny of the Bengal Army and Rebellion in the Bengal Presidency. Calcutta, 1858.

235. HEARSEY, J. B. — Narrative of the Outbreak at Sitapur (Privately printed). 1858.

236. HERBERT, David — Great Historical Mutinies. London and Edinburgh, 1875.

237. HERFORD, Capt. Ivan — Stirring Times under canvas. London, 1862.

238. HIGGINSON, G. W. — Seventy-one years of a Guardsman's Life. London, 1916.

239. HILL, Sir R. and HILL, G. B. — Life of Sir Rowland Hill, 2 vols. 1880.

240. HILTON, Edward — Guide to Lucknow. Lucknow, 1916.

241. HILTON, R. — The Indian Mutiny : A Centenary History. London, 1957.

242. HINDU — The Mutinies and the People or Statements of Native Fidelity exhibited during the Outbreak of 1857. Calcutta, 1859 (see MUKHOPADHYAYA, Sambhu Chandra).

243. Historical Plans : — The city and environs of Lucknow.

244. HISTORICAL — RECORDS of the Queen's own Cameron Highlanders, 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1909.

245. HISTORY of the — GUIDE CORPS (1846-1922).

245(A). HISTORY of the — Sirmoor Battalion, 2 vols (Privately circulated).




Marfat.com

246. HODSON, Major W. S. R. — **Hodson of Hodson's Horse, or Twelve years of a soldier's life in India, being extracts from the letters of late Maj. W. S. R. Hodson including a personal narrative of and a vidication from the attack of Mr. Bosworth Smith. Ed. by Rev. G. H. Hodson. London, 1883 (4th edition).**

247. HOLOCOMB, J. F. — **Jhansi history and the rani of Jhansi. Madras, 1904.**

248. HOLLOWAY, J. — **Essays on the Indian Mutiny. London, 1864.**

249. HOLMES, F. M. — **Four Heroes of India. London, 1892.[1]**

250. HOLMES, T. R. Edward — **History of the Indian Mutiny and of the disturbances which accompanied it (19 cm). London, Revised edition 1913.**

251. ,, ,, — **Sir Charles Napier. Cambridge, 1925.**

252. ,, ,, — **Four Famous Soldiers. London, 1889.[2]**

253. HOOD, E. P. — **Havelock. London, 1858.**

254. HOPE, Ascott Robert[3] — **The story of the Indian Mutiny. Edinburgh, 1898.**

255. HOPE, A. — **Twelve years of a Soldier's Life.[4]**

256. HOSEASON, Commander John — **Remarks on the rapid transmission of troops to India. London, 1858.**

257. HUNTER, Charles — **Personal Reminiscences of an Indian Mutiny veteran. Brighton, 1911.**

258. HUSAIN, Agha M. — **Bahadur Shah II and the war of 1857 in Delhi. Delhi, 1958.**

[1] Four heroes are Clive, Hastings, Havelock and Lawrence.

[2] Four famous soldiers are Napier, Hodson, Edwardes and William Napier.

[3] The book is meant for young readers. The name of the author is Ascott Robert Hope as given in the Book, published in London (Frederick Warne & Co) and New York. Ladendorf puts the name of the author as Ascott Robert Hope Moncrieff (p. 26) which is unaccountable. There is reference to one Sir C. S. Scott Moncrieff in the list of officers who saw the Mutiny prepared by the Edinburgh Academy in India.

[4] This is on the authority of Malleson.

Marfat.com

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 259. | HUSAIN ASAD | British India's relations with the kingdom of Nepal from 1857 – 1947. Minnesota, 1965. |
| 260. | HUTCHINSON, Maj-Gen. George | Narrative of the Mutinies in Oudh. London, 1859. |
| 261. | HUXHAM, Mrs. A. | A Personal Narrative of the Siege of Lucknow (n. d.). |
| 262. | HYPHER, P. P. | Deeds of valour of the Indian soldier including the Indian Mutiny. Simla, 1925. |
| 263. | India : Army Intelligence Branch | The Revolt in Central India, 1857-59. Simla, Government of India Press, 1908. |
| 264. | India : Ministry of Information and Broadcasting | The Great Rising of 1857. Delhi, 1958. |
| 265. | India : Surveyor-General | Plan of Lucknow illustrating operations of Sir Colin Campbell. |
| 266. | INDIAN Freedom | Struggle Centenary Souvenir (1815-1917). Delhi, 1957. |
| 267. | Inge, Lt.-Col. D. M. | A Subaltern's Diary. London, 1894. |
| 268. | INGLIS, Hon. Lady Julia Selina | Letters containing extracts from a journal kept by Mrs. Julia Inglis during the siege of Lucknow. London (Privately Printed), 1858. |
| 269. | ,, ,, | The Siege of Lucknow, a Diary. London, 1892. |
| 270. | JOHN, E. W. | Report on the engineering operations during the defence of Lucknow in 1857. |
| 271. | INNES, Lt.-Gen. J. J. McLeod | Lucknow and Oudh in the Mutiny. London, 1896. |
| 272. | ,, ,, | The Sepoy Revolt, a critical Narrative. London. 1897. |
| 273. | ,, ,, | Rough Narrative of the Siege of Lucknow. Calcutta, 1857. |
| 274. | ,, ,, | Sir Henry Lawrence. Oxford, 1898. |


Marfat.com

275. INNES, P. R. — History of the Bengal European Regiment. London, 1885.

276. IRELAND, W. W. — A History of the Siege of Delhi by an officer who served there. Edinburgh, 1861.

277. ISDATELSTVO VOSTOCHNOY LITERATURY (Institute of Oriental Studies) MOSCOW, USSR (Published by). — Popular uprising in India 1857-59. A Symposium in connection with the centenary of the uprising. Moscow, 1957.

278. JACKSON, Madeline — A Personal Narrative of the Indian Mutiny and the flight for Seetapore.

279. JACOB, SIR George Le Grand — Western India before and during the Mutinies. London, 1871.

280. JAMES, David P. — Life of Lord Roberts. London, 1954.

281. JAMES, Rt. Hon. SIR W. M. — The British in India, ed. by his daughter M. J. S. Schwabe. London, 1882.

JEEVANLAL MUNSHI — See, Metcalfe.

282. JERROLD, W. C. — Field-Marshal Earl of Roberts. The Life of a Great Soldier, 1913.

283. JOCELYN, Col. J. R. J. — History of the Royal and Indian Artillery in the Mutiny of 1857. London, 1915.

284. JOHNSON, Major W. T. — Twelve years of a Soldier's life (Ed. by his widow). London, 1897.

285. JONES, Earnest C. — The Revolt of Hindustan, ed. with an introduction by S. K. Acharyya. Calcutta, 1957.

286. JONES, G. Sibbald — The Story of my escape from Fatehgarh. Cawnpore, 1913.

287. JONES, Captain Oliver — Recollections of a Winter campaign in India in 1857-58. London, 1859.

288. JOSHI, P. C. (ed. by) — Rebellion-1857. A symposium by K. M. Ashraf, James Bryne and others. New Delhi, 1957.


Marfat.com

289. JOURDAIN, H. F. N. — The Connaught Rangers, 3 Vols. London, 1928.

290. JOYCE, M. — Ordeal at Lucknow, the defence of the Residency. London, 1938.

291. JOWALA Sahai — The Loyal Rajputana. Allahabad, 1902.

292. KAVANAGH, T. H. — How I won the Victoria Cross. London, 1860.

293. KAYE, Sir John William — History of the Sepoy War in India. Vol. I (9th edition), 1880 ; Vols. II and III (4th edition), 1878. London.

294. KAYE, Sir John William — Lives of Indian officers, 2 vols. London, 1867.

295. KEENE, H. G. — Fifty-Seven. London, 1883.

296. " " — Hand-book for Visitors to Allahabad, Cawnpore and Lucknow. Calcutta, 1896.

297. " " — A Servant of 'John Company'. Being the Recollections of an Indian Official. London, 1897.

KEITH-YOUNG — Delhi-1857. See Young.

KELLY, CHARLES — Relief of Arrah (See G. F. T. Leather).

298. KENNEDY, Rev. James. — Life and work in Benares and Kumaon, 1839-1872. London, 1885.

299. " " — The Great Indian Mutiny of 1857. London, 1858.

300. KHITMANI, N. — British power in the Punjab, 1839-1859. Bombay, 1972.

300(A) KHOSLA, G. D. — Bahadur Shah II. 1969.

301. KILLOUGH, Le Comte H. Russel. — 16,000 lieues á travers L' Asie et l'Océanie ; voyage exécuté pendant les années 1858-61. Paris, 1886.

302. KINCAID, C. A. — Lakshmi Bai Rani of Jhansi. London, 1943.

303. KINGSLEY, Charles — His Letters and Memories of his life. Ed. by his wife, 2 vols. London, 1877.


Marfat.com

304. KNIGHT, A. E. — **The Romance of Colonisation in India from the Aryan invasion to the great Sepoy Mutiny. London, 1897.**

KNOLLYS, H. — **See Grant, Sir H.**

305. KYNE, J. — **A Chaplain at the Indian Mutiny. 1960.**

306. LADENDORF, J. M. — **The Revolt in India 1857-1858 : An annotated Bibliography. Inter documentation Company. Switzerland, 1966.**

307. LANDON, Perceval — **Under the Sun. London, 1906.**

308. ,, ,, — **'1857' in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the Indian Mutiny. London, 1907.**

309. LANG, J. — **Wanderings in India, and other sketches of the life in Hindostan. London, 1859.**

310. LAWRENCE, Lt.-Gen. Sir GEORGE — **Reminiscences of Forty-three years in India, including a narrative of mutinies in Rajputana. Ed. by W. Edwardes. London, 1875.**

311. LAWRENCE, Sir H. M. — **Essays, Military and Political. London, 1859.**

312. LAWRENCE, T. B. — **Six years in the North-West, from 1854-1860. Being extracts from a private diary, with a glimpse of the rebellion of 1857-58....Part I. Calcutta, 1861.**

313. LAWRENCE, Rt. Hon. Sir John — **Sir John Lawrence and the Talooqdars of Oudh. London, 1865.**

314. LAVERACK, Sergeant Alfred — **A Methodist Soldier in the Indian Army. London (n. d.).**

315. LEASOR, J. — **The Red Fort. An account of the Siege of Delhi in 1857. London, 1956,**

316. LEATHER, Major — **Arrah in 1857.**

317. LECKY, Edward — **Fictions connected, with the Indian Outbreak of 1857 Exposed. Bombay, 1859.**


Marfat.com

318. LEE, J. F. and RADCLIFFE, Capt. F. W. — The Indian Mutiny up to the Relief of Lucknow. Rawalpindi, November, 1857.

319. LEE, Warner Sir William — Memoirs of Field-Marshal Sir Henry W. Norman. London, 1908.

320. Letters from — Lucknow and Cawnpore (Privately printed). Greenwich, 1858.

321. LLEWELLYN, Alexander — The Siege of Delhi. London, 1977.

322. LOCKWOOD, E. — The Early days of Marlborough College (including a chapter on Patna during the Mutiny). London, 1893.

323. LOOKER, E. C. — Sir H. Havelock, Colin Campbell (Lord Clyde). London, 1885.

324. LOW, C. R. — A Memoir of Lt.-Gen. Sir Garnet J. Wolseley. London, 1878.

325. „ „ — History of the Indian Navy, 2 vols. London, 1877.

326. „ „ — Soldiers of the Victorian Age, 2 vols. London, 1880.

327. LOW, Miss Ursula — Fifty years with John Company, from the letters of General Sir John Low. London, 1936.

328. LOWE, Thomas — Central India during the Rebellion of 1857 and 1858. London, 1860.

329. LOWE, Major E. Delaney — Letters from Lucknow and Cawnpore.

330. LUDLOW, J. M. — British in India its races, and its history considered with reference to the Mutinies of 1857, 2 vols. Cambridge, 1858.

331. LUMSDEN, P. S. and ELSMIE, G. — Robert Lumsden of the Guides. London, 1899.

332. LUTFULLAH, Syed — The men behind the War of Independence, 1857. Karachi, 1957.

333. MACAREE, J. G. — The Passage of the Government of India Bill of 1858. Minneapolis, 1961.


Marfat.com

334. MACAULAY, T. B. — Miscellaneous writings and speeches of Lord Macaulay. London, 1871.

335. MACCREA, R. — Tablets in the Memorial Church, Cawnpore. Calcutta, 1894.

336. MACGREGOR, Lady (ed. by) — Life and opinions of Major-General Sir Charles Macgregor, 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1888.

MACKAY, Rev. James — From London to Lucknow : with memoranda of Mutinies, Marches, Flights.....By a Chaplain in H. M. India Service, 2 vols. London, 1860 (see also Chaplain).

337. MACKENZIE, Col. A. R. P. — Mutiny Memoirs. Allahabad, 1891. [1]

338. MACLAGAN, M. — Clemency Canning. London, 1962.

339. MACLEOD, A. — On India. London, 1872.[2]

340. MAC MUNN, Lt.-Gen. Sir G. F. — The Indian Mutiny in Perspective. London, 1931.

341. ,, ,, — Behind the scenes in many wars. London, 1930.

342. MACPHERSON, S. C. — Memorials of Service in India. London, 1865.

343. MADRAS, Asylum Press — Narrative of the Indian Mutinies of 1857. Madras, 1858.

344. MAJENDIE, Maj. V. D. — Up among the Pandies : Or, a Year's Service in India. London, 1859.

345. MAJUMDAR, R. C. — The Sepoy Mutiny and the Revolt of 1857. Calcutta, 1957.

346. MAJUMDAR, R. C. (ed. by) — History and Culture of the Indian People, vol. IX, Pt. I. Bombay, 1963.

347. MAJUMDAR, R. C. — History of the Freedom Movement in India, vol. I. Calcutta, 1962.


[1] A book entitled 'Life in the Mission or Six years in India-1857', ascribed to Mrs. Colin Mackenzie has no connection with the Revolt of 1857.

[2] John Maclean's book on British Rule in India is vitiated by a partisan spirit ( Ladendorf, p. 85. ).

Marfat.com

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 348. | MALCOLM, H. F.[1] | History of the war in India. Philadelphia, 1859. |
| 349. | MALCOLM, T.[2] | Barracks and Battle fields in India (ed. by C. Craine). London, 1891. |
| 350. | MALLSON, G. B. | The Mutiny of the Bengal Army, a historical narrative by one who served under Sir Charles Napier. London, 1857 (RED PAMPHLET). |
| 351. | " " | History of the Indian Mutiny, 3 vols. I and II (2nd edition), London 1878. Volume III (21. 5 cm.), London, 1880. |
| 352. | " " | Recreation of an Indian official. London, 1872. |
| 353. | " " | Indian Mutiny of 1857, with portraits and plans, 3rd edition. London, 1906. |
| 354. | MALLESON, Lt.-Col. W. | The Revolt in Central India. Simla, 1908. |
| 355. | MALLIKA, Isanchandra | The Mutiny and the Congress. Serampore, 1891. |
| 356. | MANGIN, A. (ed. by) | La Révolte Au Bengale en 1857 et 1858 etc. Tours, 1862. |
| 357. | MAP of India | Showing civil and military stations with tables of the population and distances by James Wyid, Geographer to the Queen. London, 1858 (Indian Mutiny Interest). |
| 358. | MARIWALIA, C. L.[3] | When the Storm came, 1857. Bombay, 1957. |


[1] A book entitled 'Stratford Canning' by S.E.P. Malcolm is also referred to by some writers .

[2] Another book, 'Lost Links in the Indian Mutiny', by H.P. Malet (London, 1857), is supposed to be a novel taken from true incidents (Ladendorf. p. 108).

[3] A book called 'Gup'—Sketches of Anglo-Indian Life and character (London, 1868), ascribed to Marryat Florence, variously named as Mrs. Francis Lean or Florence (Marryat) is a book of Indian gossip which exposes extreme contempt for the Indians and is not of any importance for a study of the Indian Mutiny (Ladendorf, p. 108). Another book, 'History of the Indian Mutiny' by Mariam written in 1896 is a fiction based on the incidents of the War (Ladendorf, p. 108. See also Chaudhuri, *Civil Rebellion*, p. 25).

Marfat.com

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 359. | MARSHMAN, J. C. | Memoirs of Sir Henry Havelock. London, 1860. |
| 360. | MARTIN, C. L. A. | La Puisance militaire des Anglais dans l', Inde et l', insurrection des cipayes. Paris, 1859. |
| 361. | MARTIN, R. Montgomery | La Revolte de l', Inde etc. Trans. from English by M. Kermoysan. Paris, 1860. |
| 362. | MARTIN, R. Montgomery | The Indian Empire with a full account of the Mutiny of the Bengal Army (26 cm), 3 vols. London, 1858-61. A detailed history of the Mutiny is given in volume two. |
| | ,, ,, | Rise and Progress of the Indian Mutiny : a full examination of the alleged causes of the insurrection. London, 1859. |
| 363. | MARTINEAU, J. | The Life and Correspondence of Sir Bartle Frere, 2 vols. 1895. |
| 364. | MARX, K. and ENGELS, F. | The First Indian War of Independence 1857-59. Published in Great Britain by Lawrence and Wishart Ltd. 81, Chancery Lane, London, W. C. 2. 1959. |
| 365. | MASON, P. W. | The Men who ruled India. 2 vols. New York, 1954. |
| 365(A). | MASON Philip | A Matter of Honour, 1974. |
| 366. | MAUDE, COL. E. | Oriental Campaigns and European Furloughs. The autobiography of a veteran of the Indian Mutiny. London, 1908. |
| 367. | MAUDE, Lt.-COL. F.C. and SHERER, J. W. | Memories of the Mutiny : with which is incorporated the personal narration of John Walter Sherer, 2 vols. London, 1894. |
| 368. | MAUNSELL, F. R. | Siege of Delhi. London, 1912. |
| 369. | MAURICE, F. B. and A. C. | The Life of Lord Wolsely London, 1924. |

Marfat.com

370. MAWE (Mrs.) — Narrative of the Mutiny of the 12th N. I. at Nowgong.

371. MAYNARD, F. — L' Indeen en feu. Paris, 1857.

372. MEAD, H. — The Sepoy Revolt ; its causes and consequences. London. 1857.

373. MECHAM, Lt. C. H. and COUPER, G. — Sketches and incidents of the Siege of Lucknow. London, 1858.

374. MEDLEY, Capt. J. G. — A Year's campaigning in India from March 1857 to March 1858. London, 1859.

375. MEDLEY, J. G. and GLOVER, T.G. — Lectures delivered at the Thomason Civil Engineering College. Roorkee, 1865.

376. MEEK, Rev. Robert — The Martyr of Allahabad. Memorials of the Ensign Arthur Marcus Hill Cheek. London, 1857.

377. MEHROTRA, S. R. — The Emergence of Indian National Congress. Delhi, 1971.

378. MEHTA, Asok — 1857, the Great Rebellion. Bombay, 1946.

MEMORIAL to MERIVALE, H. — Lord Clyde. 1864 (British Museum). See EDWARDES, H. B.

379. METCALFE, H. — Chronicle of Private Henry Metcalfe. Edited by Lt.-Gen. Sir Francis Tuker. London, 1953.

380. METCALFE, Sir Charles Theophilus — Two Native Narratives of the Mutiny of Delhi. Westminster, 1898. Translated from the originals by the late Sir Charles of the Bengal Civil Service. The first narrative is by Mainodin Hassan Khan and the other by Munshi Jiwan Lall.

380.(A) METCALFE, HENRY — La Revolte des cipayes. Paris, 1954.

381. METCALFE, Thomas R. — The Aftermath of Revolt in India, 1857. Princeton, 1965.


Marfat.com

382. MILES, A. H. and PATTLE A. J. — Fifty-two stories of the Indian Mutiny. London, 1895.

383. MINTURN, R. B. — From New York to Delhi, by way of Rio De Janeiro, Australia and China. New York, 1858.

384. MISHRA, A. S.[1] — Nana Saheb Peshwa and the Fight for Freedom. Lucknow, 1961.

385. MITRA, Kissory chand — The Mutinies, The Government and the People. By a Hindu. Calcutta, 1858 (see also Hindu).

MODE, Prof. Dr. Heinz — Great Rebellion in sketches.

386. MONTAGU, V. A. — A Midday's Recollections, 1853-1860. London, 1898.

387. MONTALEMBERT, C. F. De Troyen, Le Comte De — Un Débat sur L' Inde au Parlement Anglais, Bruxelles, 1858.

388. MOORSON, W. S. — Historical Records of the 52nd Regiment...London.

389. MORRIS, H. — Heroes of our Indian Empire, 2 vols.

390. MORRIS, J. — By Heaven's Command, 1973.

391. MORISON, J. L. — Lawrence of Lucknow. Being the life of Sir Henry Lawrence. London, 1934.

392. MOWAT — The British Soldiers in India. London, 1859.

393, MUERDTER, J. F. — Sir Henry Havelock, Stuttgart, 1859.

394. MUIR, Sir William — Reports of the Intelligence Department of the Government of the North-West Provinces of India during the Mutiny of 1857 (ed. by coldstream), 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1902.

395. MUIR, Sir William[2] — Agra in the Mutiny. 1896.


[2] 'Rebels of Destiny' (Bombay 1859), by Homi D. Mistri is a play where the leaders are presented to represent whether the Mutiny was a War of Independence or not (Ladendorf, p. 108).

[2] Mujeeb Muhammad's book entitled 'Ordeal 1857' (Bombay, 1958) is a historical play of life within Delhi during the Siege (Ladendorf, p. 109).

Marfat.com

396. MUKHERJEE, Hirendranath — Indian struggle for Freedom. Bombay, 1946.

MUKHOPADHYAYA, Sambhu C. — The Mutinies and People, or, Statements of Native Fidelity exhibited during the Outbreastk of 1857-58. By a Hindu. Calcutta, 1859. Reprinted 1905 (See Hindu).

397. MULLENS, J. — Brief Review of Ten years Missionary labour in India. London, 1863.

398. MUNRO, W. — Reminiscences of Military Service with the 93rd Sutherland Highlanders. London, 1883.

399. ,, ,, — Records of Service and campaigning in many lands, 2 vols. London, 1887.

400. MUNSHI Mohanlal of Delhi — See Madras Government Records for his account. Home Miscellany, No. 725.

401. Dr. MURRAY — Narrative.[1]

402. MUTER, Mrs. Dunbar D. Douglas — My Recollections of the Sepoy Revolt. London, 1911.

403. ,, ,, — Travels and Adventures of an Officer's wife in India, China and New Zealand, 2 vols. London, 1864.

404. NANAK CHAND's — Diary. See Forrest 'Selections' vol. III.

405. NAPIER, H. D[2]. — Field-Marshal Lord Napier of Magdala. London, 1927.

406. NAPIER — Biographical Memoir of the late Capt. G. W. W. Fulton.

407. NARRATIVE — of a JOURNEY through India By T. D. L. Westminster, Thomas Brettell, 1857.


[1] This is on the authority of Forrest. Many such Narratives were published as the one compiled for the Madras Military male orphan Asylum, Madras, 1858 (see Madras Asylum Press). For 'Narrative of Events' from Government sources see S. B. Chaudhuri, 'Theories of the Indian Mutiny', pp. 181, 199.

[2] Another book 'Letters of Field-Marshal Lord Napier of Magdala' is also referred to.

Marfat.com

408. NASH, J. T. — **Volunteering in India, or an authentic narrative of the military services of the Bengal Yeomanry Cavalry during the Indian Mutiny and Sepoy War. London, 1893.**

409. NATIONAL LIBRARY Calcutta — **Exhibition of Books relating to the Revolt of 1857 with an informative Preface. Calcutta, 1957.**

410. NEILL, J. G. S. — **Neill's 'Blue Caps' composed from the works of Brigadier Neill, Maj. Dale etc., by Col. H. C. Wylly, 3 vols. London (see Wylly).**

411. NEW AGE — **1857 Centenary Special**

412. NEVILL, Capt. H. L. — **Campaigns in the North-West Frontier, 1912.**

413. NIGAM, N. K. — **Delhi in 1857. Delhi, 1957.**

414. (The) Nineteenth — **Light Infantry in the Indian Mutiny. Lucknow, 1934.**

415. NOLAN, E. H. — **The Illustrated History of the British Empire in India and the East from the Earliest times to the Sepoy Mutiny, 1859, 3 vols. London, 1878-79.[1]**

NORGATE, Lt-Col. T. and Phillott, Lt.-Col. D. C. — **From Sepoy to Subadar. Calcutta, 1911 (See Sitaram Subadar).**

416. NORMAN, Sir Henry Wylie — **A Narrative of the campaign of the Delhi Army. London, 1858.**

417. „ „ — **Lecture of the Relief of Lucknow. Simla, 1867.**

418. NORMAN, Sir Henry Wylie and Mrs. YOUNG (ed. by) — **Delhi 1857—The Siege, assult and capture as given in the Diary and correspondence of the late Col. Keith-Young. London, 1902. (See Young).**


[1] This is from the British Musem Catalogue. Another book of the same author is entitled 'A History of the British Empire in India and the East', 2 Vols. London 1857-59.

Marfat.com

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 419. | NORTH, Maj. Charles Napier | Journal of an English officer in India. London, 1858. |
| 420. | NORTON, J. B. | The Rebellion in India. How to prevent another. London, 1857. |
| 421. | „ „ | Topics for Indian Statesman. 1858. |
| 422. | O'. CALLAGHAN, Daniel | Scattered Chapters : the fatal falter at Meerut (Privately printed). Calcutta, 1861. |
| 423. | OLIVER, J. R. | Campaigning in Oude. London, 1860. |
| 424. | ORR, Capt. Patrick | The English Captives in Oudh. Ed. by Macleod Wylie. Calcutta, 1858. |
| 425. | OSBORNE, George | A Collection of over 200 autograph Letters written to Osborne from May 1857 to September 1858. |
| 426. | OSIPOV, A. M. and REISNER, L. M. | Narodnoe vosstanie V Indii, 1859. Moskva, 1957. |
| 427. | OSWELL, G. D. | Sketches of Rulers of India, vol. I. The Mutiny Era and After. Oxford, 1908. |
| 428. | OUTRAM, Sir James[1] | The Campaign in India. |
| 429. | OUVRY, Henry A. | Cavalry Experiences and Leaves from my Journal. Lymington, 1892. |
| 430. | OUVRY, Mrs. Matilda H. | A Lady's Diary before and during the Indian Mutiny. Lymington, 1892. |
| 431. | OWEN, Arthur | Recollections of a veteran of the days of the Great Indian Mutiny. Lucknow, 1916. Autobiographical sketch of his life and work during sixty years. |
| 432. | Owen, Rev. John | Journal containing a narrative of the outbreak at Allahabad. |
| 433. | OWEN, REV. William M. | Memorials of Christian Martyrs etc. London, 1859. |
| 434. | OWEN, REV. William M. | The Martyrs of the Indian Rebeilion. London, 1891. |

[1] This is the same as the one going under No. 75 but it is also listed as a work of Outram.

Marfat.com

435. OWEN, REV. William M, — The good soldier—a memoir of Major-General Sir Henry Havelock. London, 1858.

436. PAGET, Mrs. Leopold — Camp and Cantonment, a journal of life in India in 1857-59. London, 1865.

437. PAKISTAN HISTORICAL SOCIETY (Board of Editors) — The History of the Freedom Movement, 3 vols. Karachi, 1957-61.

438. PALMER — Indian Life Sketches, 1816-66. Mussoorie, 1888.

439. PALMER, J. A. B. — The Mutiny Outbreak at Meerut in 1857. Cambridge, 1966.

440. PANIKKAR, K. M. — In 1857 (Laski Institute of Political Science). Allahabad, 1957.

441. PARKER, N. T. — A memoir of Meerut : Notes and Accounts from contemporary events in Meerut during the Indian Mutiny of 1857. Meerut, 1904.

442. PARRY, D. H. — Britain's Roll of glory or the Victoria Cross.[1]

443. PARRY, S. H. J. — An Old Soldier's Memories. London, 1897.

444. PARSONS, Lt. Richard — A story of Jugdespore, 1858. London, 1909.

445. PASSAGES from — the Life of a Hero (W. S. Hodson). London, 1863.

446. PEARSE, Hugh W. — The Hearseys, five generations of an Anglo-Indian family. Edinburgh, 1905.

447. PEARSON, H. — The Hero of Delhi, a life of John Nicholson etc. London, 1939.

448. PEILE, Mrs. Fanny — The Delhi massacre, a narrative by a lady. Calcutta, 1870.


[1] This is from the British Museum Catalogue.

Marfat.com

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 449. | PETRIE, Sir Charles<br>PHILLIPS, B. M.<br>(afterwards Looker Eliza C.)[1] | George Canning, 1930.<br>See Looker. |
| 450. | PHILLIPS, A. | Anecdotes and Reminiscences of Service in Bengal, 1878.[2] |
| 451. | PHILLIPS, A. and others | Communications and Testimonials re : Munshi Raja Ram. Agra, 1906. |
| 452. | PINCOTT, F. | Analytical Index (to the 'Sepoy War' of Kaye and the 'Indian Mutiny' of Malleson). London, 1880. |
| 453. | PITT, F. W. (ed. by) | Incidents in India and Memories of the Mutiny etc. London, 1896. |
| 454. | POLEHAMPTON, Rev. E. and POLEHAMPTON Rev. T. S. (ed. by) | A Memoir : Letters and Diary of the Rev. Henry S. Polehampton, M. A, Chaplain of Lucknow, 3rd edition. London, 1858. |
| 455. | POLLOCK, J. C. | Way to Glory. The life of Havelock of Lucknow. London, 1957. |
| 456. | POOL, REV. J. | Pictures of life in India. London, 1891. |
| 457. | PORTER, Barnard | The Lion's Share. London, 1975. |
| 458. | PRICE, G. W. | Extra Special Correspondent. London, 1957. |
| 459. | PRICHARD, I. T. | The Mutinies in Rajpootana. London, 1860. |
| 460. | PUDMA, Jang | Life of Maharaja Sir Jang Bahadur of Nepal. Ed. by Abhoy Charan Mukherjee. Allahabad, 1909. |
| | RADCLIFFE, F. W.[3] | See LEE J. F. |


[1] This is on the authority of the British Museum Catalogue.

[2] Reference may be made to the work of C. H. PHILIPS, 'Historians of India and Ceylon', London, 1961, in which Dr. S. N. Sen contributes an article on the Mutiny Historians.

[3] A book entitled 'Terrible Times' by G. Perry Raimes is a well-written historical novel which is 'close to historical facts' (Ladendorf, p. 100).



Marfat.com

461. RAHMAN, B. A. — The Indian Revolution, 1857. Bangalore, 1957.

462. RAIKES, C. — Notes on the Revolt in the North-Western Provinces of India. London, 1858.

463. RAJ, Jagadish — The Mutiny and British Land Policy in North India (1856-1868). Bombay, 1965.

464. RAMSAY, LT.-Col. B. — Rough Recollections of Military Service and Society, 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1882.

465. READE, E. A. — Description of the measures taken at Agra during the Mutiny. Agra, 1857.

RED PAMPHLET — See Malleson.

466. RED, WHITE AND BLUE — Sketches of Military Life, 3 vols. London, 1862.

467. REED, A. — A good soldier (on Havelock). London, 1958.

468. REES, L. E. R. — A Personal Narrative of the Siege of Lucknow, from its commencement to its relief by Sir Colin Campbell. London, 1858.

469. REID, C.[1] — Extracts from Letters and Notes written during the Siege of Delhi in 1857 (n. d.).

470. RICH, Capt. G.[2] — The Mutiny in Sialkot. 1924.

471. RICKETTS, G. H. — Extracts from the Diary of a Bengal Civilian, 1857-59 (privately printed). 1893.

472. RITCHIE, J. G.[3] — The Ritchies in India. London, 1920.

473. ROBERTS, FIELD-MARSHAL Earl — Forty-one years in India, 2 vols. London, 1897.

1 A book entitled 'Masque of the Mutiny' ascribed to C. Reid is a novel (Ladendorf, p 119).

2 A book entitled 'The Indian Mutiny of 1857 after Herodotus' ascribed to Richardson cannot be traced.

3 Rivett-Carnac's 'Many Memories of life in India' (Edinburgh, 1910) is hardly of any use to Mutiny historians.

Marfat.com

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 474. | ROBERTS, FIELD-MARSHAL Earl | Letters written during the Indian Mutiny. London, 1924. |
| 475. | ROBERTSON, Lt.-Gen. Sir Alexander C. | Memorials of General Sir E. Harris Greathed. London, 1858. |
| 476. | ROBERTSON, H. D. | District Duties during the Revolt in the North-West Provinces of India in 1857. London, 1859. |
| 477. | ROGERS, A. | The Rani of Jhansi. London, 1895. |
| 478. | ROGERSON, W. | Historical Records of the 53rd (Shropshire). London, 1891. |
| 479. | ROTTON, Rev. J. E. W. | The Chaplain's Narrative of the Siege of Delhi from the Outbreak at Meerut to the capture of Delhi. London, 1858. |
| 480. | ROWBOTHAM, W. B. (ed. by) | The Naval Brigade in the Indian Mutiny. 1857-58. London, 1947. |
| 481. | ROY CHOUDHURY, P. C. | 1857 in Behar. Patna, 1959. |
| 482. | RUGGLES, Maj.-Gen. J. | Recollections of a Lucknow veteran. 1845-1876. London, 1906. |
| 483. | RUIZ, D. J. (ed. by) | Los cipayos o la insurrection de la India, etc. Madrid, 1857. |
| 484. | RUSSELL, P. M. | Seize mille lieves a travers, etc. 2 vols. Paris. 1864. |
| | RUSSELL, Sir W. H. | My Diary in India in the year 1858, 2 vols. London, 1860. See also EDWARDES, M. |
| 485. | SAFA, M. N. | The War of Independence, 1857-59 Pakistan Historical Society. |
| 486. | SALMOND, A. | Salmond of Waterfoot. London, 1887. |
| 487. | SAVARKAR, Vinayak Damodar | The Indian War of Independence 1857. London, 1909 and Bombay, 1947. |
| 488. | SAVARKAR | A Guide to Indian Revolutionary Movement. Poona, 1963. |
| | SAYYID AHMED KHAN Sir | An Essay on the causes of the Indian Revolt. Translated by Capt. W. N. Lees, Calcutta, 1860, with a memorandum by R. Temple. A later translation |


Marfat.com

by Graham and Colvin. Benares, 1873. See Graham.

489. SCHOLBERG, H. — Union List of British Indian District Gazetteers. Leiden, Holland, 1967.[1]

490. SCOT, Capt. Patric — Personal Narratives of the Escape from Nowgon to Banda and Nagode (Printed at the Herald Office). 1857.

491. SEATON, Maj.-Gen. Sir Thomas — From Cadet to Colonel : the record of a life of active service, 2 vols. London, 1866.

492. SEDWICK, Lt.-Col. Francis R. — The Indian Mutiny of 1857. London, 1908.

493. SEN, Mohit — The Indian Revolution. Delhi, 1970.

494. SEN, Surendranath — Eighteen Fifty-Seven. With a Foreword by Maulana Abul Kalam Azad. Delhi, 1957.

495. SENGUPTA, K. K.[2] — Recent Writings on the Revolt of 1857. A Survey. Indian Council of Historical Research. New Delhi. 1975.

496. SEN GUPTA, S. — War of Independence, Centenary Souvenir. Calcutta 1957.

497. SETON-KARR, G. Berkeley — An Episode of the Indian Revolt. Bombay, 1862.

498. SETON-KARR — A short account of the events during the Sepoy Mutiny in the districts of Belgaon and Jessore (For private circulation only). 1894.

499. SETON-KARR, Scott — Selections from the Calcutta Gazettes. (1780-1885).

500. SEVESTRE, A. A. — A short and useful compilation from the Calcutta Government Gazette

1 Dr. S.B. Chaudhuri's book, 'History of the Gazetteers of India' was published in 1965 (Government of India Publication). See p. 380 of the book for a full list of the District Gazetteers of the Indian Union.

2 It is a monograph of seventy pages and deals with the publications of the post-independence period.

Marfat.com

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | about the fall of Delhi. Calcutta, 1858.[1] |
| 501. | SEYMOUR, C. C. | How I Won the Indian Mutiny Medal. Benares, 1888. |
| 502. | SHADWELL, Lt.-Gen. Lawrence | The Life of Colin Campbell, Lord Clyde, 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1881. |
| 503. | SHAND, A. Innes | General John Jacob. London, 1900. |
| 504. | SHARMA, B. | The Rebellion of 1857 (vis-a-vis Assam). Calcutta, 1950. |
| 505. | SHARMAN, S. H. | The Relief of Lucknow (Poems). London. |
| 506. | SHEPHERD, W. J. | A Personal Narrative of the Outbreak and Massacre at Cawnpore during the Sepoy Revolt of 1857. Lucknow, 1879, 1886. |
| | ,, ,, | Narrative of the Mutiny at Cawnpore. Agra, 1863. Lucknow, 1878. |
| 507. | SHERER, G. M. | Brief Narrative called for by Sir James Outram showing how 73rd Native Infantry was saved etc. Jersey, 1860. |
| 508. | SHERER, John Walter | Daily Life during the Indian Mutiny of 1857. London, 1898. Also see Maude. |
| 509. | ,, ,, | Havelock's march on Cawnpore, a civilian's notes. New York, 1898. |
| 510. | ,, ,, | At Home and in India. London, 1883. |
| 511. | SHERRING, Rev. Mathew A. | The Indian Church during the great Rebellion. London, 1859. |
| 512. | SHOWERS, Lt.-Col. C. L. | A Missing Chapter of the Indian Mutiny. London, 1888. |
| 513. | ,, ,, | The Indian Army and Col. Malleson. London, 1881. |
| 514. | SIDDONS, J. H. | India, its history, climate etc. With a full account of the development of the Bengal Mutiny. London, 1857. |


[1] Some writers refer to a book entitled 'The Journal of a soldier during the campaigns of 1857-1858' by J.C. Sewell.

Marfat.com

515. SIEVEKING, I. G. — Turning point in the Indian Mutiny. A secondary account of the Siege of Arrah. London, 1910.

516. SINGH, B. — Brief Survey of Raghogarh States Services during the Indian Mutiny. Ajmere, 1937.

517. SINHA, R. M. — Eighteen Fifty-Seven in Jabalpur. Jabalpur, 1957.

518. SITARAM SUBADAR — From Sepoy to Subadar (Hindi). English translation by Lt.-Col. Norgate. Lahore, 1873. See Norgate & Phillott.

519. SLEEMAN, Sir W. H. — A Journey through the kingdom of Oudh. 1858.

520. SMITH, G. — Twelve Indian Statesmen. London, 1897.

521. " " — Reminiscences. Edited by A. Haultain. New York, 1910.

522. SMITH, R. B. — Life of Lord Lawrence, 2 vols. London, 1883.

523. SMYTHE, J. — The Rebellious Rani. London, 1966.

524. SOMERVILLE, E. C. E. — Wheel-tracks. London, 1923.

525. SOPPITT, Mrs. — Diary of an officer's wife. Reprinted in Fitchett's work (1912 edition).

526. SPEAR, Percival — Twilight of the Mughuls. Cambridge, 1951.

527. SPENCER, M.[1] — Personal Reminiscences of the Indian Mutiny (n. d.)

528. SRIVASTAVA, V. L.[2] — The Revolt of 1857 in Central India and Malwa, 1966.

529. STARK, H. A. — The call of the Blood, or, Anglo-Indians and the Sepoy Mutiny. Rangoon, 1932.


[1] J.A. Spender's 'Public Life', London, 1925 does not contain any useful information on the Mutiny.

[2] V.S. Srivastava's 'The Patriots and Traitors, 1857-58' (Bombay) is only an account of a mock trial of the leaders.

Marfat.com

530. **ST. CLAIR W.** — J. L. M. Lawrence ; Viceroy of India. London, 1887.

531. **STATEMENTS of** — Regiments of Cavalry, Infantry and Artillery embarked for India from 1st July to 18th February, 1858.

532. **STEEL, Mrs. Flora** — On the Face of the Waters (A tale of the Indian Mutiny). London, 1897.

533. **STEWART, Col. Charles E.** — Through Persia in disguise, with Reminiscences of the Indian Mutiny (ed. by B. Stewart). London, 1911.

534. **STEWART, Lt.-Col. Rupert** — The Victoria Cross. London. 1916.

**STOCQUELER, J. H.** — Same as Siddons, J. H.[1]

535. **STUBBS, F. W.** — History of the organisation, equipment and war services of the Regiments of the Bengal Artillery, 3 vols. London, 1895.

536. **„ „** — Extracts from the Diary of Lt. F. W. Stubbs of Bengal Artillery in 1857-58. Woolwich, 1894.

537. **STURGES, O.** — In the Company's Service, a Reminiscence. In collaboration with Miss Mary Sturges. London, 1883.

538. **SWANSTON, W. C.** — My Journal ; Or What I did and saw between the 9th June and 25th November, etc. By a volunteer. Calcutta, 1858.

539. **SWINEY, G. C. (ed. by)** — Historical Records of the 32nd (Cornwall) Light Infantry, now the 1st Battalion Duke of Cornwall's L. I. etc. 1702-1892. London, 1893, 1971.

540. **SYLVESTER, John H.** — Recollections of the Campaigns in Malwa and Central India under Major-General Sir H. Rose. Bombay, 1860.[2]

[1] The work entitled 'Gunner Jingos Jubilee' by Thomas Bland Strange is a fiction (Ladendorf, p. 110). But the book, 'A story of the Indian Mutiny' by Herbert Strang (1878) is very close to the facts narrated in history.

[2] Ladendorf takes notice of a manuscript of J.H. Sylvester on the diary of the campaigns of the Indian Mutiny (Ladendorf, p. 144).

Marfat.com

541. TAHMANKAR, D. V. **The Ranee of Jhansi. London, 1958.**

542. TARACHAND **History of the Freedom Movement in India, 2 vols. Delhi, 1967.**

543. TAYLER, W.

(a) **The Patna Crisis or three months in Patna during the insurrection of 1857. London, 1858.**

(b) **Selection of Letters from distinguished Indian Statesmen...Calcutta, 1869.**

(c) **Selection on Tayler's removal from Patna. 1868.**

(d) **Veritas Victri. London, 1878.**

(e) **Thirty-eight years in India. From Jugannath to the Himalaya Mountains, 2 vols. London, 1881-82.**

(f) **Brief Narrative of Events connected with the removal of W. Tayler from Patna. Calcutta, 1857.**

(g) **A brief summary of the facts connected with my removal from the Commissionership of Patna. 1871.**

(h) **Correspondence connected with the removal of Mr. Tayler from the Commissionership of Patna. Remarks of Dr. Samuells on Tayler's 'Brief Narrative of Events'. Calcutta, 1858.**

(i) **A Narrative of Events connected with my removal from the Patna Commissionership in 1857. Calcutta, 1867-68.**

(j) **Defence of the Arrah House. Picture of the attack.**

(k) **Addenda to the correspondence relative to the removal of Mr. Tayler from the Commissionership of Patna. Calcutta, 1857.**

544. TAYLOR, MISS Alicia Cameron **General Sir A. Taylor. His Times etc., 2 vols. London, 1913.**

Marfat.com

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 545. | TAYLOR, Lucy[1] | The Story of Sir Henry Havelock, the hero of Lucknow. London, 1894. |
| 546. | „ „ | The Story of Henry Lawrence. London, 1894. |
| 547. | TAYLOR, Philip Meadows | The Story of my life. Edited by his daughter Alice Meadows Taylor. London, 1878. |
| 548. | „ „ | Letters written during the Indian Rebellion. London, 1857. |
| 549. | TEMPLE, Richard | Men and Events of my time in India. London, 1882. |
| 550. | „ „ | The Story of my life, 2 vols. London, 1896. |
| 551. | „ „ | Lord Lawrence (English Men of Action Series). 1889. |
| 552. | THACKERAY, Col. Sir Edward Talbot | Reminiscences of the Indian Mutiny (1857-58) and Afghanistan (1897). London, 1916. |
| 553. | „ „ | Two Indian Campaigns in 1857-58. Chathan, 1896. |
| 554. | The STORY | of the Indian Mutiny. Published by W. P. Nimmo. Edinburgh, 1880. |
| 555. | THOMASON, J. | Selections from the records of the Government of North-West Provinces. Calcutta, 1856-58. |
| 556. | THOMPSON, Edward | The Other side of the Medal. London, 1930. |
| 557. | THOMSON, Capt. Mowbray | The Story of Cawnpore. London, 1859. |
| 558. | THORBURN, S. S. | The Punjab in Peace and War. Edinburgh, 1904. |
| 559. | THORNHILL, Mark | The Personal Adventures and Experience of a Magistrate during the |

[1] B. Taylor's 'At Home and Abroad' etc. contains no reference to the Indian Mutiny. His other book 'A visit to India, China and Japan' etc. is not widely known.

Marfat.com

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | Rise etc. of the Indian Mutiny. London, 1884. |
| 560. | THORNTON, J. H. | General Sir Richard Meade, etc. London, 1898. |
| 561. | THORNTON, J. H. | Memories of Seven Campaigns. London, 1895. |
| 562. | THURBURN, E. A. | Reminiscences of the Indian Rebellion, by a Staff officer. London, 1889. |
| | TISDELL, E. E. P. | Mrs. Duberly's Campaigns : An English Woman's experiences in the Crimean war and the Indian Mutiny. Chicago, 1963. See Duberly. |
| 563. | TOWNSEND | The Annals of Indian Administration. |
| 564. | TRACY, L. | Red Year. London, 1908. |
| 555. | TREVELYAN | The Letters of Indophilus to the Times. London, 1858. |
| 566. | TREVELYAN, Sir George O. | The Competition Wallah. London, 1864. |
| 567. | ,, ,, | Cawnpore. London, 1865. |
| 568. | TREVOR, G. H. | A Chapter of the Indian Mutiny, Rajputana in 1857-58. 1905. |
| | TRIAL of Mohammed | Bahadur Shah, titular king of Delhi upon a charge of Rebellion (See Bahadur Shah). |
| 569. | TROTTER, Capt. Lionel J. | The Life of John Nicholson. London, 1898. |
| 570. | ,, ,, | Life of Hodson of Hodson's Horse. London, 1910. See also CARDEW. |
| 571. | ,, ,, | A life of General Sir James Outram. The Bayard of India. London, 1906. |
| 572. | ,, ,, | India under Queen Victoria, 2 vols. 1886. |
| 573. | ,, ,, | William Tayler of Patna. London. 1887. |
| 574. | ,, ,, | Life of Marquis of Dalhousie. London, 1895. |

Marfat.com

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 575. | TROTTER, Capt. Lionel J. | Lord Lawrence. London, 1880. |
| 576. | TUKER, Francis (ed. by) | The Chronicle of Private Henry Metcalfe. London, 1953. |
| 577. | TURNBULL, Lt. Col. John R. | Letters written during the Siege of Delhi. Torquay, 1883. |
| 578. | ,, ,, | Sketches of Delhi taken during the Siege. London, 1857. |
| 579. | TWEEDALE, Lord. (ed. by) | Letters from the field during the Indian Rebellion. London, 1907.[1] |
| 580. | TYRRELL, F. H. | In plain Memoriam : the Services of the Madras Native Troops (n. d.). |
| 581. | TYRRELL, Issac | From England to the Antipodes and India. Madras, 1904. |
| 582. | VALBEZEN, E. De | Les Anglais et L'Inde. Tome 2. L'insurrection des cipayes du Bengale, 1857. Paris, 1875. Or the English and India, New Sketches (22 cm). Translated from the French by a *Diplomate*. London, 1883. |
| 583. | VANDEVELDE Louis J. | Etude Sur les Indes Anglaises. Paris, 1858. |
| 584. | VAUGHAN Sir, J. L. | My Services in the Indian Army and After, London, 1904. |
| 585. | VERNEY, Lt. Edmund | The Shannon's Brigade in India. Being some account of Sir William Peel's Naval Brigade in the Indian Campaign of 1857-58. London, 1862.[2] |
| 586. | VERNEY, Maj. Gen. G. L. | The Devil's wind. The story of the Naval Brigade at Lucknow etc. London, 1956. |


[1] Reference is also made to major-general W. Tweedale's 'A Memory and a study of the Indian Mutiny'.

[2] Ladendorf's manuscript accounts refer to Edmund Hope Verney's Letters and other papers in private collections (p. 144).

Marfat.com

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 587. | VIBART, Col. Edward | The Sepoy Mutiny as seen by a Subaltern, from Delhi to Lucknow. London, 1898.[1] |
| 588. | VIBART, COL. Henry Meredith | Richard Baird Smith. The Leader of the Delhi heroes of 1857. Westminster, 1897. |
| 589. | ,, ,, | The Military history of the Madras Engineers, 2 vols. London. |
| 590. | ,, ,, | The life of General Sir H. N. D. Prendergast (Indian Mutiny Campaigns : Private Correspondence) 1914. |
| 591. | ,, ,, | ADDISCOMBE, its heroes and men of note. London, 1894. |
| | VICKERS (Published by) | Narrative of the Indian Revolt (see Campbell) |
| | VICTORIA (Queen) | See Benson and Albert |
| 592. | WAGENTREIBER, Mrs. | The Story of our Escape from Delhi. Delhi, 1894. |
| 593. | WAKEFIELD, H. F. | Some of the words, deeds, and success of Havelock in the cause of etc. 1861. |
| 594. | WALKER, John | Indian Atlas invaluable for place locations of the Mutiny period. |
| 595. | WALKER, Col. T. N. | Through the Mutiny : Reminiscences of thirty years active Service. London, 1907. |
| | WALLACE, C. L. | See Cosens, Fategarh Campaigns. Lucknow, 1934. |
| 596. | WALLACE, Rev. Jones | The Revolt in India, its causes (Lectures delivered in Belfast on February 22, 1859). |
| 597. | WALSH, Rev. J. J. | A Memorial of the Fattehgurh Mission etc. Philadelphia, 1859. |
| 598. | WARREN, LE COMTE E DE | L' Inde anglaise avant et apres l' insurrection de 1857, 2 vols. Paris, 1857. |

[1] Ladendorf takes notice of a ms. of Edward Vibart on his Letters on the Mutiny (p. 145).

Marfat.com

599. **WATERFIELD, Arthur** — Children of the Mutiny : a record of those now living who were in India during the Sepoy War, 1857-59. Worthing, 1935.

600. **WATSON, Edmund S.** — Journal with H. M. S. Shannon's Naval Brigade. Kettering, 1858.

601. **WHITE, S. Dewe** — Complete History of the Indian Mutiny. London, 1885.

602. **„ „** — Indian Reminiscences. London, 1880.[1]

603. **WHO'S WHO OF** — INDIAN MARTYRS, 1857. Ed. by P. N. Chopra, Ministry of Education and Social Welfare. Government of India. New Delhi, 1973.

604. **WILBERFORCE, R. G.** — An Unrecorded chapter of the Indian Mutiny, being the personal reminiscences. London, 1895.

605. **WILKINSON, O. AND WILKINSON, J.** — Memoirs. London, 1896.

606. **WILLIAMS, Rev. E. A.** — The Cruise of the Pearl around the world. With an account of the operations of the Naval Brigade in India. London, 1859.

607. **WILLIAMS, F. S.** — General Havelock and Christian Soldiership. London, 1858.

608. **WILLIAMS, Major George WALTER** — Depositions (on the Mutiny of 1857) taken at Cawnpore under the direction of Lt.-Col. George Walter Williams.

609. **„ „** — Depositions (on the Mutiny of 1857) taken at Meerut under the direction of George Walter Williams. Allahabad, 1858.

610. **„ „** — Memorandum on the Mutiny and Outbreak at Meerut. Allahabad, 1858.

611. **WILLIAMSON, Dr. G.** — Notes on the wounded from the Mutiny in India, etc. London, 1859.

[1] Michael White's Lachmi Bai Rani of Jhansi is a fiction (Ladendorf, p. 111).

Marfat.com

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 612. | WILLIAMSON, J. V. | Fallen Heroes of the Indian War : a poem in memory of Havelock. London, 1858. |
| 613. | WILSON, General Archdale | Letters written during the Mutiny : The Mutiny day by day. Being extract from letters of Colonel Sir H. Wilson to his wife. Ed. by Col. H. R. Nevill. United Services Institution of India Journal, 1923. |
| 614. | WILSON, F. H. | Rambles in Northern India with incidents of many scenes of the Mutiny. |
| 615. | WILSON, Minden | History of Bihar Indigo Factories. Reminiscences of Behar. Calcutta, 1908. |
| 616. | ,, ,, | History of the Behar Light Horse Volunteers. Calcutta, 1908. |
| 617. | WILSON, Major Thomas F. | Defence of Lucknow. A Diary recording the daily events during the Siege of the European Residency, from 31st May to 25th September, 1857. By a staff Officer. London, 1858. |
| 618. | WILSON, W. A. | Mutiny Musings and Volunteer Sketches. Singapore, 1916. |
| 619. | WIMBERLEY, Capt. Douglas | The 79th Highlanders in the Indian Mutiny. |
| 620. | WINDHAM, General Sir Charles | Observations supported by documents being a supplement to Col. Adye's Defence of Cawnpore. London, 1865. |
| 621. | ,, ,, | To the British Public, the Cawnpore Affair. London 1859. |
| 622. | ,, ,, | The Crimean Diary and Letters. London, 1897. |
| 623. | WINSLOW, O. | Honouring God and its reward. London, 1858. |
| 624. | WINTRINGHAM, T. H. | Mutiny : Being a survey of the mutinies from Spartacus to Invergosdon. London, 1936. |

Marfat.com

625. WISE, J. — Diary of a Medical officer. Cork, 1894.

626. WOLSELEY, FIELD-MARSHAL G. J. Viscount — The Story of a Soldier's Life, 2 vols. London, 1903.

627. WOOD, Sir Evelyn — Winnowed Memories. London, 1918.

628. „ „ — The Revolt in Hindustan, 1857-1859. London, 1908.

629. „ „ — From Midshipman to Field-Marshal, 2 vols. London, 1907.

630. WOODRUFF, P. — The Men who ruled India. London, 1954.

631. WRIGHT, C. H. H. — Memoir of John Covering Cooke and the Indian Mutiny. London, 1873.

WYID, J. — See Map of India.

632. WYLIE, M. (ed. by) — English Captives in Oudh.

WYLLY, H. C. — Neill's Blue Caps, 3 vols. Aldershot, 1925. See Neill.

633. „ „ — The York and Lancester Regiment, 3 vols. London, 1930.

634. WYNTER, P. — On the Queen's Errands. London, 1906.

635. YADAV, K. C. — Rao Tularam, A hero of 1857.

636. „ „ — The Revolt of 1857 in Haryana. Delhi, 1977.

637. YEOWARD, G. — An Episode of the Rebellion and Mutiny in Oudh. ete. Lucknow, 1876.

638. YOONG — Arsenals and Manufactories of the East India Company.

YOUNG, Col. Keith — Delhi—1857. Ed. by General Sir Henry Wylie Norman and Mrs. Keith-Young. London, 1902. See Norman.

639. YULE, H. (ed. by) — A memorial of the Life and Service of Major-General W. H. Greathed (Privately printed). London, 1879.

640. YOUNGHUSBAND — The Story of the Guides. London, 1879.[1]


[1] Several other works recently published, one each under Nos. 93, 97, 100(A), 245(A), 300(A), 321, 365(A), 380(A), 390, as shown, are to be added to the total of 640.

Marfat.com

## II. WORKS IN INDIAN LANGUAGES


1. ABDULLAH FARUQI — Bahadur Shah Zafar a Afsa-na-i-gham aur hangamah-i-Delhi. Daftar Risalah Khatoon-i-Mash-Riq, 1940.
2. AMIR AHMADULVI — Bahadur Shah Zafar. Lucknow, 1935.
3. BAGAL, Yogesh-chandra — Bharatvarser swadhinata O anyanya prasanga, Pt. I. Calcutta, 1948.
4. „ „ — Muktir sandhane Bharat va Bharater nava jagaraner itivritta. Calcutta, 1945.
5. BAGCHI, Mani — Sipahi yuddher itihasa. Calcutta, 1957.
6. BALASASTRI, Haradasa — Bharatiya svatantryasamara, Poona, 1957.
7. BANDYOPADHYAY, Durgadas — Bidrohe Bangali va amar jivan charit. Calcutta, 1924.
8. BANDYOPADHYAY, Manilal — Rani Lakshmibai. Calcutta, 1954.
9. BANDYOPADHYAY, Panchkari — Sipahi Bidroha (n. d.).
10. BASU, Rajnarayan — Atmacharit. Calcutta, 1952 (3rd edition).
11. BASU, S. Sekhar — Ya dekechi va sunechi. Calcutta, 1362 B. S.
12. BHATTACHARYA, Mahashweta — Jhansir Rani. Calcutta, 1956.
13. BEHERE, N. K. — Sana—1857. Bombay, 1938.
14. BHIDE, R. G. — Jhansici svatantrya Lakshmi. Phaltan, 1947.
15. BHUPAT LAL — Virangana Raso.
16. BISI, Pramathanath — Chapati O Padma. Calcutta, 1362 B. S.
17. CHATTO-PADHYAYA, Nripendra K. — Bharater prathama Svadhinata sangram. Calcutta, 1950.
18. DESHPANDE, H. V. — Sana-1857 cya svatantrya yuddhacesvarupe. Nagpur, 1946.
19. DEUSKAR, Sakharam Ganesh — Jhansir Rajkumar. Calcutta, 1908.


Marfat.com

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 20. | DWIVEDI, Shivnarayan | San 1857 ke gadar ka itihas. Calcutta. 1922. |
| 21. | GHALIB, Mirza Asadullah khan | Dastambu. Agra, 1858. |
| 22. | GHULAM NABI | Tarikh-i-Jhajjar. |
| 23. | GODSE, Visnubhata (ed. by C. V. Vaidya) | Majha Pravas athava sana 1857 salacya bandaci hakikata. Bombay, 1907. |
| 24. | GOKHALE, P. P. | Atharase sattavanaca Maharastra. Satara, 1957. |
| 25. | GUPTA, Rajanikanta | Sipahi Yuddher Itihas (20.5 cm), 5 vols. Calcutta, 1886-1900. |
| 26. | ,, ,, | Vir-mahima. Calcutta, 1885. |
| 27. | HASAN NIZAMI, Khwajah | Ghadr-i-Delhi ke afsane 2 vols. Delhi, 1919. |
| 28. | HASAN NIZAMI, Khwajah | Ghadr ke patra tatha etc. Translated by Catursen Shastri. Lucknow, 1939. |
| 29. | INTIZAMULLAH, Shahabi Mufti | Ghadr ke Chand Ulema. Delhi (n.d.). |
| 30. | JAFAR THANESRI, M. | Tarikh-i-Kalapani Musammi ba Tarikh-i-ajib. Ambala, 1885. A memoir of Maulana Muhammad Jafar Thanesri, one of the victims of the Revolt. |
| 31. | JOSHI, K. G. | 1857, arthat bandayada itihasa. Dharwar, 1948. |
| 32. | JOSHI, N. | 1857 kas vatantrya yuddha (Translation of Savarkar's The Indian War of Independence). |
| 33. | KALYAN SINGH | Lakshmi bai-ki-Raso. |
| 34. | KANHAYA LAL | Tarikh-i-Bhagawat-Hind. Lucknow, 1916. |
| 35. | KAVIRAJ, Narahari | Svadhinatar sangrame vangla. Calcutta, 1954. |
| 36. | KIVALAKAR, G. D. | 57 ce hutatme. Poona, 1950. |
| 37. | MEHTA, Asoka | 1857, doddadange ; tr. from the original English by N. S. Chandrashekara. Bangalore, 1952. |




Marfat.com

38. MEHTA, Asoka — 1857 Prathama Bharata jatiya viplavamu. Madras (n. d.).

39. MUKHOPADHYAY, Buhuvanchandra — Sipahi vidroha va Mutiny. Calcutta. 1907.

40. MUKHOPADHYAY, Durgamohan — Sipahi yuddha. Calcutta, 1931.

41. NIZAMI HASAN — Delhi-ki-Jankuni. Delhi, 1925.

42. " " — Delhi-ki-Saza. Delhi, 1946.

43. PARASANIS, Dattatreya, Balavant — Maharani Lakshmi Bai Saheb Hyanche Charitra. Satara, 1894.

" " — Jhansi ki rani Lakshmibai ; a translation from the original Marathi, is a biography of Lakshmibai. Allahabad (5th edition) 1939.

44. PATHAK, Chandrasekhar — San 57 ka gadar ya Sipahi vidroh ka itihas. Calcutta, (18 cm), 1922.

45. RAO, Mihira K. — Candana Hajuri. Cuttack, 1952.

46. RAMAMOHANA RAO, Mahidhara — Nurella kritam. Vijayavada, 1957.

47. RATHASARMA, Sadasiva — Čakhi Khuntia. Cuttack, 1955.

48. RAY, Narendranath — Jhansir Rani. Calcutta, 1925.

49. RAY, Suprakas — Bharater vaiplavik sangramer itihas. Calcutta, 1955.

50. REU, B. N. — Marwad ka Itihas, 2 vols. Jodhpur, 1940.

51. SAMVAD-PRABHAKAR — A Daily Newspaper (Bengali) ed. by Isvarchandra Gupta : the issues of 1857.

52. SANYAL, Ramgopal — Harischandra Mukhopadhyayer jivani. Calcutta, 1887.

53. SARVADHIKARI, Jadunath — Tirthabhraman. Calcutta, 1915.

54. SASTRI, Sivanath — Ramtanu Lahiri O tatkalin Bangasamaj. Calcutta, 1904.

55. SATYAPAL and PRABODH-CHANDRA — Sixty Years of Congress. Foreword by Dewan Chamanlal. Lahore, 1946.


Marfat.com

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 56. | SAVARKAR, N. D. | Senapati Tatya Tope.....charitra. Poona, 1932. |
| 57. | SAVARKAR, V. D. | Indian War of Independence.<br>Translated into Hindi by N. Joshi, Bombay, 1957 : 1857 ka svatantrya yuddha.<br>Translated into Marathi by V. V. Patavardhana, Bombay, 1949 : 1857 ce svatantryasamara.<br>Translated into Tamil by Jayamani Subramanyam, Madras, 1951 : Erimalai. |
| 58. | SAIYYAD, Ahmad Khan | Rissalah Asbab-i-Bhagawat-i-Hind. Agra. 1903. (See W. N. Lees). |
| 59. | SAIYYAD, Ahmad Khan | Sarkashi-i-zila Bijnaur. Agra. 1858. |
| 60. | SAIYYADAH, Anis Fatima, Barailvi | 1857 ke Hero. Aligarh, 1949. |
| 61. | SEN, Nabinchandra | Amar Jivani. |
| 62. | SEN, Chandicharan | Rani of Jhansi. Calcutta, 1894. (A historical romance). |
| 63. | SHAD AZIMBADI (pseud.) | Tarikhi-Suba-i-Bihar. Azimabad, 1893. |
| 64. | SHARMA, B. | Maniram Dewan. Gauhati, 1950. |
| 65. | „ „ | Satawan Sal. Gauhati, 1947. |
| 66. | SHARMA, Iswariprasad | Sipahi Vidroh ka San Sattavan ka gadar. Calcutta, 1924. |
| 67. | SHARMA, M. L. | Kota Rajyaka Itihas, 2 vols. Kota, 1939. |
| 68. | SHARMA, Shriram | Jhansi ki rani Maharani Lakshmibai. Agra, 1939. |
| 69. | SHUKLA, Devidatt | Awadh ke gadar ka itihas. Lucknow, 1940. |
| 70. | SINGH, D. S. Prasad | Kumar Singh : ek adhyayan. Patna, 1955. |
| 71. | THAKUR, Devendranath | Maharsi Devendranath Thakurer atmajivani. Calcutta, 1927. |


Marfat.com

72. THAKUR, Jyotirindranath — Jhansir Rani. Calcutta, 1903.

73. THAKUR, Rabindranath — Jhansir Rani. Calcutta, 1957.

74. TEJ SINGH and H. S. SHAN (ed. by) — Mahan Purakh. New Delhi, 1956.

URDU WORKS — For Urdu Books on the Revolt see K. M. Ashraf in 'Rebellion-1857', a symposium by P. C. Joshi.

75. VAJAPEYI, Beniprasad — San 57 ka viplav. Allahabad, 1950.

76. VARMA, Paripurnanand — San 57 ki kranti. Kalpi, Hindibhavan, 1951.

77. ZAHIR DELHVI — Dastan-i-Ghadr ; ya taraz-i-zahiri. Lahore (n.d.)

78. ZAKAULLAH — Tarikh-i-Hind.

## III. PAMPHLETS : Anonymous

A. D. : Lord Ellenborough's Blunder, respecting the Cause of the Mutiny of 1857 (Signed by A. D.), Calcutta, 1857.

A few remarks on the Bengal Army and Furlough Regulations, with a view to their improvement. By a Bombay Officer. Bombay, 1857.

A few remarks earnestly addressed to the men of England, etc. London, 1857.

A full and corrected Report of Proceedings of the Public meeting in honour of Lord Canning.

A Glance at the East by a retired Bengal Civilian. London, 1857.

A Lecture on the fallacy of British catering to Hindu notions of Caste.

A letter from a lay man in India on the policy of the East India Company in matters of religion. London, 1858.

An account of the administration of the Indian district during the revolt of the Bengal Army (n.d.).

Marfat.com

An account of the capture of Kotah by an officer of the attacking column.

An account of the outbreak at Bolarum. London, 1856.

Arrah : Siege Defence and Victory in July 1857. A brief narrative of the defence of the garrison by one of the besieged party.

A Review of Col. Adye's defence of General Windham. By a Civilian. London, 1858.

At the FRONT. Being a realistic record of a soldier's experience in the Crimean war and Indian Mutiny, by one who was there. Paisley, 1916.

A voice from India to the men of Manchester. 1858.

A week in the Mofussil in 1857.

Basis of the Reorganisation of our power in India, by an old resident, 1858.

Brief Narrative of events connected with the removal of W. Tayler from Patna, 1857.

By a Staff officer : Reminiscences of the Indian Rebellion, 1857-58.

By Y : Reminiscences of the Great and Good Sir Henry Lawrence and also of the Indian Mutiny of 1857. Dehra Dun, 1893.

Causes and Effect : The rebellion in India. By a resident in the North-Western Provinces of India. London, 1857.

Causes of the Indian Revolt. By a Hindu of Bengal. Edited by M. Lewin. London, 1857.

Crisis in India : Causes and proposed remedies by a Military Officer. 1857.

Crisis in India by a Retired Officer.

Des Sentiments de Justice et d'Humanite de L Angleterre dans Ia question Indienu etc. Paris, 1857.

English tenure in India by Scrutator. London, 1857.

Essays and Lectures on Indian Historical subjects (Havelock, Rose etc.). By an Officer. London, 1866.

Extract from the Journal of Rev. J. Owen.

From London to Calcutta by the Overland Route. Calcutta, 1873.

Government of India : The Great Rising of 1857.

HISTORY of Nana Sahib's claims against the East India Company. The will of the Ex-Peisheoa-Badjee Rao compiled from original documents...London (n.d.).

Marfat.com

**History of the Siege of Delhi by an officer who served there with a sketch of the leading events in the Punjab connected with the Great Rebellion of 1857. Edinburgh, Adam and Charles Black, 1861 (see Ireland, W. W.).**

**India and its Future 1858.**

**India ; its dangers considered in 1856. By a Retired Officer. Jersey, 1858.**

**India ; The Revolt and the Home Government. Calcutta, 1857.**

**Indian Mutiny (Cuttings from newspapers).**

**Indian Mutiny ; Sermons. By the author of 'National Humiliation' etc. London, 1857.**

**Journal of an Artillery Officer.**

**Justice for India : A letter to Palmerston, 1858.**

**Letters from Futtyghur by the Lady of an officer of Engineers,**

**Letters briefly describing the causes of the Indian Outbreak. By an Indian officer (L.M.D'SOUZA, BOMBAY).**

**Letters from Lucknow and Cawnpore (Privately printed). Greenwich, 1858.**

**Letters from a volunteer, Kulieanpur.**

**La Revolte au Bengale, au 1857 et 1858 ; Souvenir d'un Officer, Irlandais etc. Tours, 1862.**

**Mutinies in India : Extracts of letters from an Assistant Surgeon in the Infantry of the Hyderabad Contingent (Privately Printed) 1857.**

**My Journal with an account of Havelock's march from Allahabad to Lucknow by a volunteer 1858 (see Swanston).**

**My Escape from the Mutinies in Oudh. By a wounded officer. 2 Vols. London.**

**NOTES on the North-Western Provinces of India. By a District Officer. London, 1869.**

**Our Conduct after the disaffection and mutiny of native regiments (n. d.).**

**Proselytism in India.**

**Public feeling in regard to the removal of Mr. W. Tayler from Patna Commissionership as indicated by notices of the press. Thacker & Co. Calcutta.**

Marfat.com

QUI HI : What is to be done with the Bengal Army ? London, 1857.

Rapid Transportation of troops in India.

Reminiscences of School and Army Life, 1839 to 1859. London, 1875.

Revolt of the Sepoys. 1858.

THE ARMY Purchase question. London, 1858.

THANKSGIVING : thoughts on the Indian Mutiny : a Sermon. Incumbent. London, 1859.

THE Cawnpore Affair on the 26th, 27th and 28th November, 1857 under Major-General Windham C. B. Fully explained by one who was present. London.

THE Cawnpore Outbreak and massacre. Calcutta, J. F. Bellamy.

THE Crisis in the Punjab from the 10th of May until the fall of Delhi, by a Punjab Employee etc. Lahore, 1858.

THE Crisis in India : its causes and proposed remedies. By a military officer. London, 1857.

THE Empire of the Middle classes.

The first Bengal European Fusiliers in the Delhi Campaign. London, 1858.

THE first day Sermons : 'Indian Mutiny'. By several authors. London, 1858.

THE Great Indian crisis in five minutes. By a General officer. London, 1858.

THE Indian Mutiny, thoughts and facts. London, 1857.

The Indian Mutiny to the fall of Delhi, Complied, by a former Editor of the Delhi Gazette. London, 1857. Another edition, is entitled 'The Indian Mutiny to the evacuation of Lucknow.' To which is added a Narative of the Defence of Lucknow and a memoir of General Havelock. Complied by a former editor of the Delhi Gazette. London, 1858.

The Indian War of Independence by an Indian Nationalist.

The Mutiny in the Bengal Army. By a Retired Officer. London, 1857.

The present condition of the Bengal Native Army considered with a view to its improvement. London, 1857.

Marfat.com

The Present Crisis in India. Reflections by the author of 'Our North-West Frontier' (L.E. or E.L. as author's preface). London, 1857.

The Retrospect of 1857 : Lahore Punjabi Press.

The Thoughts of a Native of Northern India on the Rebellion, its causes and remedies etc. London, 1858.

The story of the Indian Mutiny. Published by W. P. Nimmo, Edinburgh, 1880.[1]

Timely Retreat, or, a year in Bengal before the Mutinies by two sisters. London, 1858.

TRUE TALE of the Indian Mutiny : By an Eye-witness.

WHAT IS history and what is fact ? Or three days at Cawnpore in November, 1857 under the command of Major-General C. A. Windham. By a Madras Staff Officer, Madras, 1868.

Why is the Native Army disaffected ? (A Letter to the Governor-General of India.) By an old Indian. Calcutta, 1857.

## IV. PAMPHLETS : with author's name

| | |
|---|---|
| ALEXANDER, Rev. T. | The causes of the Indian Mutiny : being an exposition of the second Psalm, etc. London, 1857. |
| ALLEN, C. | A few words anent the 'Red Pamphlet'. By one who has served under the Marquis of Dalhousie. London, 1858. |
| ALVES, N. | India its dangers.[2] |
| ANDERSON | The Blue Pamphlet. By an officer. London, 1858. |
| ARGYLL, G.D.C. Eightth Duke of | India under Dalhousie and Canning. From the Edinburgh Review of January and April 1863. London, 1865. |
| BOILEAU | Memorandum for reorganising the Indian Army. |

[1] Listed under General Works No. 554.

[2] This is the same as the pamphlet of this description in page 342.

Marfat.com

| | |
|---|---|
| CAMPBELL, R.J.R. | India : its government, mis-government and future considered. London, 1858. |
| ,, ,, | Indian Mutiny its causes. London, 1857. |
| CAREY, W. H. | The Mahomedan Rebellion. Roorkee, 1857. |
| COLLECTION | of Twelve Pamphlets found in One volume Published in 1857.[1] |
| CRAWSHAY, G. | The immediate cause of The Indian Mutiny, as set forth in the official Correspondence. London, 1858. |
| ,, ,, | The catastrophe of the East India Company. London (Privately printed), 1858. |
| ,, ,, | The Mutiny of the Bengal Army. A lecture from official documents. 1857. |
| DIXON, G. | The Sword of the Lord in the Indian Crisis. London, 1857. |
| EARL OF DERBY | Speech delivered in the House of Commons, December 5, 1857. |
| EVANS, REV. T. | Three Lectures on the Revolt of the Bengal Army in 1857. By one who passed through the days of the Mutiny. Mussoorie, 1899. |
| FORJETT, C. | Reply to Gen. Jacob's Pamphlet. London, 1879. |
| GARDINER, Gen, Sir R. | Cursory view of the present crisis in India : together with the military power of England...addressed to the Members of the House of Commons. London, 1857. |
| ,, ,, | Military Analysis of the remote and proximate causes of the Indian Rebellion, drawn from official papers of the Govt. of India. London, 1858. |


[1] See Ladendorf, p. 84. for details. But many of these are listed here.

Marfat.com

| | |
|---|---|
| GLEIG. | India and its Army (Reprint from the Edinburgh Review) London, 1857. |
| HEARSEY, Capt. J. B. | Narrative of the Outbreak at Seetapore (Privately Printed). 1858. |
| HEASON | Transportation of Troops. |
| HAYLIN, A. | The Sepoy Rebellion. 2nd ed. London, 1858 (Reprinted from the London Quarterly Review, No. 17, October, 1859). |
| HODGSON, Col. J. S. | Opinions of the Indian Army. London, 1857. |
| HOSKINS, Lt. Col. | British Route to India. |
| HUNTER | Suggestions relative to the Reorganisation of the Bengal Army. London, 1858. |
| HUTCHINSON | India ; The Revolt and the Home Government. Calcutta, 1857.[1] |
| JACOB, George Le Grand | The causes of the crisis of 1857-58. |
| ,, ,, | Letter to the Members of the East India United Service Club. London, 1878. |
| JACOB, Brig. Genl. John | Tracts on the Native Army of India. London, 1858. |
| ,, ,, | English Government of India. London, 1860. |
| ,, ,, | A few remarks on the Bengal Army. London, 1857. |
| ,, ,, | The views and opinions of Brig. Gen. John Jacob. London, 1857. |
| KINLOCH, C. W. | The Mutinies in the Bengal Army. London, 1858. |
| KNIGHT, R. | The Inam Commission-unmasked. London, 1859. |
| LEWIN, M. | The way to lose India. London, 1857. |


[1] Th is is the same as the pamphlet of this description in page 342.

Marfat.com

| | |
|---|---|
| **LEWIN, M.** | **The British in India considered with reference to the Mutiny.** |
| **„ „** | **Has Oudh been worse governed by its native princes ?** |
| **„ „** | **The Government of the East India Company and its Monopolies. London, 1857.** |
| **LEWIN, Lt.-Col. Thomas** | **A Fly on the wheel, or How I Helped to govern India. London, 1912.** |
| **LEWIS, Sir George** | **Speech of Sir George Lewis on the Introduction of the Bill in the House of Commons, 1858.** |
| **LONG** | **Questions of the conditions of the Natives.** |
| **LUDLOW, J. M.** | **The War in Oude. (Written before February 16, 1858). Cambridge, 1858.** |
| **„ „** | **Thoughts on the Policy of the Crown towards India, 1859.** |
| **MACLEAN, J.** | **British rule in India, vindicated. London, 1857.** |
| **MAC QUEEN** | **Who is to blame for the Indian Mutinies ? 1857.** |
| **MARGOLIOUTH :** | **The Quarrel of God's Covenant. London, 1857.** |
| **MARTIN, W.** | **Memorandum on the reconstruction of the Bengal Army. London, 1857.** |
| **„ „** | **Why is the English Rule odious to the natives of India ? London, 1858.** |
| **„ „** | **A few words on General Jacob's scheme for the reorganisation of the Indian Armies. London, 1858.** |
| **„ „** | **At the Front.[1]** |
| **MARTINEAU, H.** | **Suggestions towards the Future Government of India, 1858.** |
| **MAURICE, F. D.** | **The Indian Crisis.** |


[1] This is the same as the pamphlets of this description in page 341.

Marfat.com

| | |
|---|---|
| McKEE, Rev. J. | Obstacles to the progress of Christianity in India, 1858. |
| MELIS | Life in India, A Letter. |
| MEMORANDUM TO | Prince Matternich on India. By Lieutenant-General Jochmus with a preface by F. Mortimer Lewin. London, 1858. |
| MERCER, Maj. E. S. | A Letter to Rt. Hon. the Earl of Ellenborough on the causes of the Indian Mutiny of 1857. (And military, religious and European settlement question in the East Indies). London, 1861. |
| MILL, J. S. | Memorandum of the Improvement of Administration of India, 1858. |
| MILLS, A. | India in 1858. London, 1858. |
| MONEY, C. F. S. | The Indian Mutiny, 1857. |
| MONTALEMBERT, M. LE. COMPTE DE | Un debat sur L' Inde au parlement Anglais, Bruxelles, 1858 (A Translation of this article appeared on the 29th October 1858 in the 'Correspondent' a monthly organ of the Liberal Catholic Party).[1] |
| NAPIER, R. | Defects of India Government. |
| ,, ,, | Report on Engineering Operations at the Siege of Lucknow, 1859. |
| NORTON, J. B. | The Annexation of Oude and its relation to the Mutiny. Being a Review of the Rebellion in India—Published in the 'Economist'. November, 1857. |
| O'MALLEY, P. F. | Religious liberty and the Indian Proclamation. London, 1859. |
| ORLICH, Capt. L. Von. | The Military Mutiny in India, its origin and its results. London, 1858. |
| PITT | A Plan for the Military Seizure. |
| READ, Rev. H. | India and its people with a view of the Sepoy Mutiny. |

[1] This is the same as No. 387 of General Works.

Marfat.com

| | |
|---|---|
| **RENAUD, G.** | **Britain caught in the snare. 1857.** |
| **ROBERTSON, T. C.** | **The Political Prospect of British India. London, 1858.** |
| **SCOT, Capt. P. G.** | **Personal Narrative of the Escape from Nowgong to Banda and Nagode. Dumfries, 1857.** |
| **SQUIRE, E. B.** | **God's prolonged controversy with Britain. Swansea, 1857.** |
| **SYKES, Col. (Speech of)** | **On the proposed India Bill. London, 1858.** |
| **THOMAS, H. H.** | **The late Rebellion in India and our future policy.** |
| **TUCKER, Major-General, H. C.** | **A Glance at the past and the future in connection with the Indian Revolt. 3rd ed. 1857.** |
| **" "** | **A letter to an official concerned in the Education of India. London, 1858.** |
| **WALMSLEY, Joshua** | **Hints on the reorganisation of the Indian Army. London, 1858.** |
| **WHEELER, E. H.** | **What shall we do at Delhi ?** |
| **WILSON, John.** | **The Indian Military revolt viewed in its religious aspects. Bombay, 1857.** |
| **URQUHART, D.** | **The Rebellion of India. I-Mr. Disraeli, a speech reviewed. II- The illegality of the Acts abolishing Native customs and their consequences. London, 1857.** |
| **" "** | **The Rebellion in India. The wondrous tale of the greased cartridges. London, 1857.** |


Marfat.com

## V. PROCLAMATIONS, NOTIFICATIONS

### Addresses and other State Papers

Notification regarding the extinction of the titular sovereignty of the king of Delhi (Kaye, II, p. 32).

An incendiary Address, January, 1857 (Ball, I, pp. 39-40).

Sentence of disbandment of the Sepoys of the 19th Regiment (Ball, I, pp. 48-49).

Address of General Hearsey to the Sepoys of the 19th Regiment (Ball, I, p. 49).

Statement of the Fires at Umballah, May 4,1857 (Ball, I, p. 114).

Delhi Proclamation by Royal permission on Monday 11th May, 1857, when Bahadur Shah was proclaimed ruler at Delhi—'To all Hindus, Mahamadans, citizens and servants of Hindustan, the officers of the Army now at Delhi and Meerut send greetings etc: (Ball, I, p. 459). The version of the India Office Ms. is somewhat different as quoted by Dr. Majumdar (*British Paramountcy*, p. 513). The Proclamation quoted *in extenso* in Nolan (II, p. 740) is also the same as in Ball. Also see Mead, p. 107.

General order of the Governor-General of India in Council, Fort-William, 14th May, 1857 authorising every officer to appoint Courts Martial for the trial of offenders (Mackay, *From London to Lucknow*. By a Chaplain, Vol. I, p. 133). The same order in pursuance of Act No. 8 of 1857, Fort-William, 16th May, 1857 (Ibid. I, p. 135).

Caste Proclamation By order of the Governor-General of India in Council, 16th May, 1857 (Ball, I, p. 118). Also see Urquhart, *The Rebellion in India*, p. 5 for the government Proclamation of 27th March on the Cartridge question.

Proclamation of the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-Western Provinces anouncing Martial Law, 18th May, 1857 (Ball, I. p. 129).

Circular and General order of the Commander-in-Chief, Umballah, 19th May, 1857 (Ball. I, pp. 111, 188). Martin's version seem slightly different II, p. 179). Kaye also gives a different version (II, p. 143).

Proclamation of Colvin, Lieutenant-Governor of the North-Western Provinces, 25th May, 1857 (Ball, I, p. 137).

Marfat.com

Petition of the 70th Native Infantry, 25th May, 1857 (Ball, I, p. 160).

The order to arrest the issue of Colvin's Proclamation, 26th May, 1857 (Ball, I, p. 137).

Colvin's Proclamation superseded by Canning, 27th May, 1857 (Ball, I, p. 138).

Lord Canning's address to the Native officers and soldiers of the 70th N. I., 27th May, 1857 (Ball, I. p. 160 ).

Governor-Generals' Message to the Commander-in-Chief through Hon'ble Colvin, Calcutta 31 May, 1857 (Mackay, I, p. 150).

Petition of the 34th N. I. on 31st May, 1857 offering allegiance and loyalty (Ball, I, p. 184).

Petition of the 70th N. I. 5th June, 1857 offering allegiance and loyalty (Ball, I, p. 581).

Nana Sahib's Proclamation for the ordering of the Army while at Kalyanpur, 6th June, 1857 (Ball, I, p. 318).

Petition of the 32nd N. I. 8th June, 1857 offering loyalty and allegiance (Ball, I, p. 580).

Message from the Officer of the Army at Delhi to the officers of the Bareilly and Moradabad regiments (end of June, Martin II, p. 216).

Nana Sahib's Proclamation Ist and 5th July, 1857 (Ball, I, p. 341).

Nana Sahib's Proclamation, 6th July, 1857 (Majumdar, *Sepoy Revolt*, p. 133 ; Kaye II, pp. 670-76). Holmes says that the Proclamations are to be found in the *Enclosures to the Secret Letters from India* (*History* etc. p. 241).

Correspondence of the Rani of Jhansi in June and July 1857 including the Proclamation issued by the Commissioner of Saugor to the Rani on 2nd July, 1857 anouncing that she will, until further orders, rule the District in the name of the British government (Sen, *Eighteen Fifty-Seven*, pp. 297-305).

Despatch of the Governor-General in Council to the Directors of the East India Company urging the necessity of increasing the strength of the European troops, 8 July, 1857. The Honourable Court of Directors promised their best attention to the Governor-General's Report (Ball, I, p. 156).

Official Instructions to the Local Authorities of the North-Western

Marfat.com

Provinces of Bengal on 31 July, 1857 not to employ unreasonable rigour in the suppression of the revolt (Ball, I, pp. 589-591). For resolution of Government of India No. 1359 of 31 July 1857 see *Red Pamphlet*, p. 180.

Petition to the Queen for the immediate recall of Lord Canning accompanied by an appeal to the British Parliament. By the British inhabitants of Calcutta 3rd August, 1857 (Ball, I, pp. 592-99).

Petition of Jenabi Auliah Tajara Begam, the Queen Mother of Mirza Md. Hamid Allie eldest son and heir-apparent of His Majesty, the king of Oude. Received before 6th August, 1857 (Ball, I, p. 632).

Address of Sir Fitzroy Kelly to Lord Palmerston on the above subject, 14th August, 1857 (Ball, I, p. 635).

Notification of Sir Colin Campbell, 17th August, 1857 (Ball, I, p. 600).

Azamgarh Proclamation or the Manifesto issued by the king of Delhi at an early period of the rebellion possibly on 25th August, 1857. This wide-spectrum Proclamation was published in the Delhi Gazette on 25 September, 1857 (Ball, II, pp. 630-32).

Her Majesty Queen Victoria's Proclamation for a day of solemn fast and humiliation on 25 September, 1857 (Ball, II, pp. 419-20).

The Proclamation issued by Khan Bahadur Khan, Nawab of Bareilly to the Hindu chiefs, and published in Delhi, probably when the siege was on, on terms upon which Musalmans and Hindus were to merge their own differences and co-operate for the overthrow of the British race. The Proclamation in its full form signed by J, C. Wilson, Commissioner on special duty as produced in the Court during the trial of Bahadur Shah is reproduced in its entirety by Ball (II, pp, 176-77). A number of other documents were produced by the Prosecutor (Ibid.).

Governor-General's Communication to the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor to raise a fund for the relief of the sufferers by the Mutiny, 23rd October, 1857 (Ball, II, pp, 439-441).

Crime and Punishment. Legislative measures taken to confront the situation. Despatch (No. 144 Public) of the Governor-General and his colleagues forwarded to the Court of Directors dated

Marfat.com

Fort-William, 11th December, 1857, offering an explanation of the policy and conduct of his government so vehemently assailed. Another Despatch (No. 154) dated 24th December, 1857 on the same subject (Ball, II, pp. 395-99).

Queen's Address to the Parliament, 3rd December, 1857 (Ball, II, pp. 441).

Rani of Jhansi's *khareetah* to the Agent, of the Governor-General for Central India, 1st January, 1858 (Sen, p. 305).

Firuz Shah's Proclamation, 17th February, 1858 (Sen, p. 380 fn.).

Circular to the District Commissioners entitled Compensation to sufferers by the Insurrection, 5th March, 1858 (Ball, II, pp. 181-82).

Appeal of Khan Bahadur Khan of Bareilly to his Hindu and Muslim subjects, March, 1858 (Martin, II, p. 492 : Kaye, III, pp. 288-291 ; Forbes-Mitchell, p. 245).

Canning's communications with the Chief-Commissioner of Oude, 3rd March, 1858 (Ball, II, p. 277).

Chief-Commissioner's reply to Canning, 8th March, 1858 (Ball, II, p. 278).

Governor-General's reply to the Chief-Commissioner, 10th March ( Ibid. ).

Governer-General's Proclamation to the chiefs and people of Oude, 14th March, 1858 (Ball, II, p. 276).

A Letter from the Secret Committee of the Court of Directors of the East India Company to the Governor-General of India in Council relative to the Policy to be pursued towards the natives of Provinces lately in a state of hostility, 24th March, 1858 (Ball, II, pp. 480 81).

Governor-General's second reply to the Chief-Commissioner's letter of 8 March, and 31 March, 1858 (Ball, II, pp. 279-80).

A Letter from the Secret Committee of the Court of Directors of the East India Company (The condemnatory despatch of Lord Ellenborough) to the Governor-General of India in Council, 19th April, 1858 (Ball, II, pp. 479-80).

Instructions communicated to the Chief-Commissioner of N. W. P. by W. Muir, Secretary, regarding policy to be pursued for pacification of the country, 28th April, 1858 (Ball, II, pp. 320-21).



Marfat.com

Instructions from the Court of Directors to the Governor-General in Council, 5 May, 1858 (Ball, II, pp. 482-83).

Letter embodying the Resolution of the Court of Directors declaring confidence in the administration of Canning, 18th May, 1858 (Ball, II, p. 484).

Sir Hugh Rose's Address to the Troops after the fall of Kalpi, 1st June, 1858 (Ball, II, pp. 348-49).

Correspondence with the Nepalees Chief :—Many individual letters had certainly been addressed, as Ball confidently asserts, to Jung Bahadur of Nepal urging him to desert the infidels and to range himself on the side of those who had risen against the British. The following are some of letters which Ball could possibly collect :

A : Translation of a letter from Birjis Qadr to His Excellency Maharaja Jung Bahadur of 11 May, 1858 (Ball, II, p. 371).

B : Translation of a letter from Ramzan Ali Khan Mirza Birjis Kudr Bahadur to his Highness the Maharaja of Nepal of 19th May, 1858 (Ibid.).

C : Translation of a letter, from His Excellency Maharaja Jung Bahadur to Birjis Kudr Bahadur of Lucknow acknowledging his letter of 19th May to the address of his Highness the Maharaja of Nepal and that of 11th May, 1858 (Ibid.).

D : Translation of a letter from Ali Mahomed Khan, Viceroy of Lucknow to his Excellency Maharaja Jung Bahadur, 19th May, 1858, (Ball, II, p. 371).

E : Letters of Birjis Qadr to the Maharaja of Nepal dated 19th May and 25th May, 1858 (Nolan, II, pp. 714-15 ; Sen, p. 359 ; Ball, II, p. 371).

F : Reply of His Excellency the Maharaja Jung Bahadur to Birjis Qadr, end of May, 1858 (Ibid.).

G : Translation of a letter from the Maulvie Mahomed Surfraz Alee the ambassador of the king of Oude, to the Maharaja Jung Bahadur possibly received on 6th June, 1858 (Ball, II, p. 370).

Canning's reply to the condemnatory despatch of the Secret Committee (19 April) of the Court of Directors, 17th June, 1858. The whole policy of Canning is reflected in this letter, but this was written previous to the arrival in India of the vote of

Marfat.com

confidence adopted by the Court of Directors on 18th May, 1858 (Ball, II pp. 501-506).

Canning's reply to the Secret Committee's Letter of 18th May expressing confidence, 4th July, 1858 (Ball, II, pp. 506-7).

Memorandum of the Chief-Commissioner of Oude to all civil officers dated 8th October, 1858 accompanied by a Proclamation addressed to the People of Oude (Ball, II, pp. 512-14).

Lord Clyde's Proclamation to the inhabitants of Oude, 26th October, 1858 (Ball, II, p. 529).

Proclamation by the Queen in Council to the Princes, Chiefs and People of India, 1st November, 1858. Accompanied by a Notification of the Governor-General of India (Ball, II, pp. 518-19).

Counter-Proclamation of Begam Hazrat Mahal (Ball, pp. 543-44).

Major Barrow's Address to Rana Beni Madhu of Sankarpur on terms of surrender, 5th November, 1858 (Ball II, pp. 537).

Proclamation of Maharaja Rao Saheb Peshwah Bahadur, 7th November, 1858, (Ball, II, p. 546).

Lord Canning's vindication of his policy, 9th December, 1858 (Ball, II, p. 694).

Jung Bahadur's letter to the Begam of Oude, 15th January, 1859 (Sen, p. 367).

Letter of Birjis Qadr to Jung Bahadur, 1st February, 1859 (Ball, II, p. 581). This letter acknowledges that he (Birjis Quadr) had received from Jung Bahadur a letter dated 26th January, 1859 desiring him to go with his army to Chitwan (Ball, II, p. 581).

Nana Sahib's letter to Jung Bahadur, 2nd February, 1859 (Ball, II, p. 580).

Nana Sahib's *Ishtahar* to the Queen of England dated 20th April, 1859 and another letter from Deogarh dated 26th April, 1859, and Bala Rao's petition to the English dated 25th April, 1859 (Sen, p. 369).

*Ishtaharnama* from Nana Sahib to Her Majesty the Queen, the Parliament, the Court of Directors etc. dated 20th April, 1859 and the reply sent by Major J. F. Richardson on 23rd April, 1859. Nana's reply to the above from Deogarh on 25th April, 1859 and Richardson's reply on the same date (Sen, pp. 369, 392—97 ; Majumdar, *Sepoy Revolt*, pp. xiii-xiv).

Marfat.com

Marfat.com

# INDEX


Abercrombie, General 54
Abul Kalam Azad 2, 171-2
Acton, Lord 111
Achilles 102
Agamemnon 267
Agra 118
Ashanullah Khan, Hakim 180
Ajnala (Ujinala), execution of the sepoys 52, 54, 73, 82, 85, 249-50
Albigenses, crusade of 257
Alexander the great 161, 257
Allahabad 161, 220-21, 249
Allen, Charles 11, 45
Alva, operations of 75
Ambala, excitement of the sepoys 201-2
American missionaries 177, 229
American Revolution 203, 229
Adromache 266
Angad Tewari, 61, 251
Anglo-Indians, Press, Printers, Publishers and attitude of 7, 8, 11-12, 38, 84, 249, 251-2, 257
Anglo-Saxons 89, 90, 102, 126; attitude of 262, 269
Anson, Maj-Gen., opinion of Martin 86, 219; Kaye 100-01; Malleson 46, 132, 219; Mac Munn 219
Antwerp 256
Archbishop of Canterbury 79
Argus (thousand-eyed) 250
Argyll, 8th Duke of 97
Arrah 116, 156, 265
Ascher 143
Arthur, king 204
Asiatics, racial feelings and attitudes of Russell 12-3, 285; Bell 13; Cooper 52; Ball 79; Kaye 107; Malleson 131, 268; Minturn 229, 261; Missionaries 260-1; Butler 231; Valbezen 249; Trevelyan 265; Macaulay 265-6; Duberly 150; inferiority of Asiatic races 262-3
Atrocities committed by the sepoys 47, 48, 58, 69, 71, 106, 151, 233, 250, 265; George Campbell on 237, 239; Kaye on 106-7; spirit of retribution 73, 75-6, 85, 151, 256-8; Ball on 270; Valbezen on 249; no relaxation of 271-2, 274-5
Attila 269
Azamgarh Proclamation 193, 195
Azamgarh Field Force 39
Badli-ke-Serai, battle of 58, 103
Bahadur Shah II, king of Delhi, Kaye on Anglo-Mughal Relations 100; Butler on the imperial court and the royal family 230-1; letter to Colvin 135, 179; legitimacy of his position acknowledged—Ball 72, 81; Campbell 236; Butler 230; Valbezen 263; Sen 177; secret negotiations with the British 58, 248; Majumdar's theory about overtures for surrender 179-80; criticism of his views 180-1; Cave-Browne 54; Minturn on trial of the king 261; Hodson and Bahadur Shah 262-3
Bailey (Baillie)-Guard 163, 214, 221, 274
Baji Rao, the pension question of 45, 74
Baird Smith, Col. Richard 50-1, 168, 205
Ball, Charles 13, 25, 68ff, 93-4
Battles of the Indian Mutiny, Indians fought gallantly 175
Beadon, Cecil 10; his policy attacked 115; justified by the official views on relaxation 158-59, 217-18
Begamkuthi 122-23, 127, 242, 250
Bell, Evans 10, 14-5, 97
Belshazzar's feast 116
Bengali intelligentsia 195, 232; Bengali Babus deprecate the movement 232-3; Bhola Nath Chunder on the superiority of British rule 232-33
Betwa, battle of 267
Bibigarh massacre 225; monument over 250
Biographical works 34-36, 197n
Birch, Col, 10-11, 141
Bisheshwar Prasad 278
*Blackwood's Magazine* 30, 38, 53, 216; articles appearing in the January (1858) issue 39, 122; June (1858) 123; October (1858) 38, 121, 124, 126
Blue Books 31, 45, 57, 59, 69, 83, 122
Boer War 195, 203
Bosworth Smith 51, 168, 243
Boyle, Vicars at Arrah 37, 116, 156
Brasyer, Capt. 117, 161, 204
British Empire, leading the way to extension of European supremacy 18; the great Anglo-Indian Empire 2, 104, 258, 275; Sun never sets 131; the imperial image 269-70, 273; had shaped the Asian world 68; Empire




Marfat.com

as a colonial power 245 ; colonial interest threatened by the Mutiny 246, 261 ; equating the 'Empire' with a humanitarian mission as in Stocqueler 44, Ball 80, Kaye 95 ; Blessings of British rule and admiration for the Empire 258, 277 ; Opinion of Mead 8, Minturn 263, Valbezen 246, Babus of Bengal 232-33, S. N. Sen 176 ; British rule a mercy to India 246
British Museum Catalogue 41, 47, 81, 32n, 321
British people, racial characteristics and qualities of character 40, 88-9, 257 ; observations of Martin 84 ; Ball 76 ; Kaye 89-90, 95, 99, 102-3, 271-73 ; Wood 214 ; Campbell 241 ; Malleson 128-9, 131-2 ; Trevelyan 264-5 (utilitarian attitudes) ; Valbezen 246-7 (superiority of the White man) ; heroic exploits 204-5, 246 ; exemplary conduct of British women 140, 145, 148, 152 ; Indian and English character contrasted 261, 263 ; on treachery in the incidents of the war 78-9, 129-30, 166
British Rule, Henry Mead on Asiatic misery 8 ; pro-Hindu policy of the rulers 231 ; had no effect on Hindu society 247-8 ; Hindu institutions survived 252
Brind James 131
Buckle 258
Butler, Rev. W. 229ff.

Caesar 161
*Calcutta Review* 9, 12-3, 37-8 (on the campaigns of 1857-8), 41 (date of F. Lees' work), 44, 49, 51, 54 (Cave Browne) 56 (Bourchier), 64 (Dodd), 88-89, 110-11 (Kaye), 116 (V. Eyre), 151 (Duberly), 152, 224 (Swanston), 257
Campbell, Field-Marshal Sir Colin 47-8 (work published by Vickers) ; his campaigns 123-5, 212, 217, 222 ; his views on the weak position of the Residency 77, 164, 212 ; a hard master 77, 217, 227 ; his attitude towards Outram 77 ; criticism of his order on Outram 67, 77, 127, 206, 244; Malleson on Campbell's operations and strategy 124-6 ; George Campbell on Sir Colin 244 ; Valbezen and Llewellyn on Colin 251, 244-45n
Campbell, Sir George 234ff.
Canning, Earl 8-9, 11, 115, 176, 197-8 ; his complacency 8-9, 43, 115, 158-59, 217-18, 239, 245 ; views of Mead 43, Malleson 46, 98 ; Cooper 82 ; Kaye 98, 101 ; Campbell 245 ; Valbezen 252
Canning, Lady 153-4
Carlyle 88
Cave-Browne 18, 52
Cawnpore sources 175 ; writings on 62-3, 142f,.198-9 ; battle of 162 ; historians on Cawnpore 112, 104-5, 161, 233, 250, 187f., 174, 261
Central India Field Force 63, 126, 157, 165
Chanderi, city of 150
Charles the First 261-2
Chatterji, Dr P. K. 200, 281-2
Chattopadhyaya, Dr H P. 194-5
Chaudhuri, Dr S. B. 20, 169, 172, 189, 202, 277 ; 324n
China 40
Chinhat, battle of 82, 108, 119, 140-1, 160, 212
Christian De Wet 195
Civil Disturbances during the British rule in India 175, 254
Civilian Historians of the Mutiny 36-7 ; Cooper of Punjab 51, Greathed of Delhi 50, Gubbins of Lucknow 60, Raikes of Agra 60, Robertson of Saharanpur 37, Edwards of Budaun 37, Sherer of Cawnpore 143, 199, Thornhill of Mathura 40n, Tayler of Patna 116, Boyle of Arrah 116, 265
Civilian and professional historians of the Mutiny criticised from the standpoint of military historians 216-18, 220-21, 224
Civil Rebellion in the Indian Mutinies 20n, 22, 189, 320 ; views of Martin 14, Campbell 237-8
Clearchus 267
Clive, Robert 79, 204, 257
Cobden, R. 89
Collier, R. 172, 195-6
Colvin, John Russell 40, 43, 72, 117, 135, 179
Contemporary sources 3, 33-4, 91-3, 114-15
Contemporary works under reference—Lee and Radcliffe, Mead, Stocqueller (Siddons), Red Pamphlet, Colin Campbell, Frost, Madras Asylum Press Narrative, Duff, Sherring, Norman, Greathed, Hodson, Rotton, Cooper, Cave-Browne, Medley, Bourchier, Ireland, Wilson (T.F.), Innes, Rees, North, Hutchinson, Anderson, Raikes, Gubbins, Mackay, Jones, Mowbray Thomson, Shepherd, Prichard, Lowe, Sylvester, Dodd, Ball, Bell, Nolan, Martin ; other belated publications, Walker, Mackenzie, Hugh

Marfat.com

Gough, Vibart, Smith (R. B.), Turnbull, Keith-Young (41 ff)
Cooper, R. 51, 54, 82, 268 ; Cooper on Nana and Serajuddaulah 85
Coopland, Mrs. 146-7
Cornelia 268
Crimean War 147, 192, 203, 244
Cromwell, Oliver 88, 108, 161, 269
Curzon, Lord 275

*Daily News* 31, 136
Dalhousie, Marquis of 7-12, 22-5, 39, 57, 220, 242, ; Kaye on 96-7
Damodar Rao 183
Darius, 266n, 268
Datta, K. K. 175, 189, 192-3, 197
Davidson, C. 129
Delhi, the siege of—writings on 50f, 54f, 56f, 101-2, 138-39, 223 ; Arsenal at Delhi 220, 235-36 ; constitution of the rebel government 48, 75, 236 ; effective force at Delhi 160, 212, 273 ; siege-operations 102-3, Nicholson leading the first column 159-60 ; massacre of Europeans at Delhi 47n, 48, 208 ; sack of Delhi 48, 66, 75-76, 207, 249 ; nature of the siege 66, 113 ; fall of Delhi did not terminate the war 48, 123, 247n
De Kantzow 268
Derby, Earl of 10-11, 35, 117, 154
*Delhi Gazette* 63
De Quincey, Thomas 232
Dinkar Rao 150
Disraeli, Benjamin 85
Dobrolyubov, N. K. 192, 253-55
Dodd, G. 25, 64f
Dorin 10
Dost Mahammad 54, 181, 241
Drake, 269
Duberly, Mrs 149-151
Duff, A. 18, 49
Dumouriez, 116
Dunbar, Captain 116, 271
Dupleix 116
Durand, Sir Henry Marion 109, 128, 228

East India Company 7-9, 21, 81, 269-270
Edinburgh Academy 204n
Ellis, R. 14
Elphinstone, Lord 128
Embree, A. T. 17, 195
Emily Eden 148
Enfield rifle 44, 59, 103, 277, 296
*Englishman* 271n
English Women in Mutiny literature, as
Kate Moore, Mrs Flora Steel,
Mrs. Craigie, Mrs Peile,
„ Wagentreiber, Julia Haldane,
„ Greathed, Mrs Keith-Young
Mrs Harris, Mrs Case,
„ Inglis, „ Germon,
„ Bartrum, „ Huxham,
„ Forbes, „ Soppitt,
„ Hillersden, „ Ewart,
„ M. Ouvry,
„ Mawe, „ Coopland,
„ Paget, „ A. Becher,
„ Duberly, „ Polehampton
„ Groom, „ Mutlow,
Miss A. Jackson, Miss A. C. Taylor,
„ Mackenzie, „ M. Sturges,
„ U. Low, „ Jacob,
Anne Harden, Eliza Looker,
Ethel Forsyth, Schwabe James,
Alice M. Taylor, Isabel Chalmers,
Lady Edwardes, Lady Barker,
Lady Mac Gregor, Lady Canning,
Queen Victoria and many more (134-54)
Engravings—Mutiny scenes 47, 192, 290n, 303 (No. 211)
Evangelical Missions and missionary attitudes and writings 17- 8, 71, 79, 229-31, 233, 260, 281-82
Eyre, Vincent, Maj. 116-17, 204, 264

Fabius Maximus Q. 251
Fayrer Dr at Lucknow 160
Fictions in Mutiny literature 28, 290n, 302n
Fitchett 173
Flora Steel 135, 138-9, 223
Flying columns 40
Forbes-Mitchell, W. Sergt. 141, 211, 223-4
Forjett, Com. of Police, Bombay 129, 132
Forrest G. W. 133, 155-167, 216, 266, 273-4
Frederick, the great 120, 126, 161
French Revolution 229, 257
French writings on the Mutiny 245-53
Frere, Sir Bartle 285
*Friend of India* 7, 8, 72, 85
Fusiliers 120, 211, 221

Generalganj, battle of 55, 125-26, 212
Gillespie, Col. 220
Gilpin, member Parl. 82
Gimlete, G. H. D. 24, 214
Golden jubilee of the year of the Mutiny 275
Gough, Sir Hugh 216
Grand Inquisitor of the Indies 73
Grant, Sir Patrick 10, 115, 132, 216-18
Granville, Earl of 54, 180-1
Greathed, H. H. 50, 53, 138
Griffin, 251
Gubbins, F. 14, 117

Marfat.com

Gubbins, Martin 14-15, 37, 60-1, 107-8, 168
Gupta, Harish 255n
Gupta, P. C. 105, 197-9
Gustovas Adolphus 161
Gwalior contingent (Gwaliors) 123, 125-6, 128, 222, 240, 244, 251, 283

Haileybury College 72, 96, 264
Hannibal 121
Hastings 257
Havelock 120-1, 125, 132, 161-2, 204, 212, 221-2, 243, 251
Hazrat Mahal, Begam of Oudh 33, 78, 225
Hedayet Ali 158
Helot 265
Herculaneum 268
Hewitt, W. H. Maj-Gen. 135-6
Highlanders 59, 73, 124-5, 163, 211, 213 ; Campbells are coming 78 ; military tradition 126
*Hindu Patriot* 31, 234
Hilton, Richard 71, 195, 276-8
Historical writings on the Mutiny, influences at work 7, 8, 13, 17-19 ; confusion of ideas 20, 22 ; early works 87 ; British attitude 88-90, 170, 266f., 280f. ; areas of the war covered 155-57 ; modern works 172f. ; organisation of the presnt work 4 ; views of Kaye 91-2 ; special features of the main works—Dodd 67-8, Ball 80-1, Martin 86, Malleson 130-1, Kaye 111-12, women writers 154, Forrest 166-7, Holmes 168-9, Sen 172-3, 178, Majumdar 178, 189-90, Joshi 190, Mac Munn 215-16 ; prominent 'Histories' 214, 216, 223 ; size, volume, pages etc. of the works of Ball 69n, Martin 83, Kaye 69n, 88n, Malleson 69n, 113n, Forrest 69n
Hodson, Maj. Wilson 50, 54, 66-7, 164, 204, 222 ; king's arrest 262-63 ; killing of the princes 250, 262 ; writings on Hodson-Campbell 242, Valbezen and Minturn 250, 269, Malleson 122-3
Hope Grant, Col. James 24, 33-4, 209-10, 243
Hofer 130
Holmes, T. Rice 167-9, 172, 219
Hyder Ali 222n

Independence of India 170, 223, 225-6, 286
India Government see Beadon and Canning ; East India saved by 117
Indian Church 49
Indian Civil Service 131
Indian Military Service 204
Indian Mutiny of 1857-59, name of 2, 130, 203-4 ; works on 2-4, 7, 24, 214 ; a memorable episode 7, 22, 256 ; a noble epic 2, 158, 204 ; a world epic 275 ; a formidable military revolt 65, 245 ; dangerous to supremacy of Great Britain 203 ; a hard contest 224 ; greatest of the small wars 42, 203, 212 ; largest army in the field 222 ; a conflict between truth and error, of light with darkness 18, 231, 261 ; instrument of destiny 263 ; a theme of military exertions 34-5, 50 and essentially army-oriented as seen by Kaye 92, Malleson 128-30, Mac Munn 203-4
Indian Mutiny, plan of a general explosion 179, 196, 215, 233 ; no premeditated plot 179, 235, 248-9 ; CAUSES-confusion about 19, 80 ; Views of Lee and Radcliffe 41, Stocqueler 44, Campbell 48, Dodd 66, Ball 72, Martin 84, Kaye 94-6, Malleson 118, Gimlete 215, Sen 177, Joshi 193, Valbezen 248, Tocqueville 23, 97, 253 ; Agrarian aspect 20-22 ; actual wars of the Mutiny 113, 223 ; strategy of the war 222, 225 ; Long continuance of the war 66, 222 ; British success due to 54, 84, 214, 240 (defects of the Indian Army), 246 (imperial necessity), 277 (Enfield Rifle), 222 (no leader in the sepoy army), 264 (failure of Indian intellect) ; impact on foreign countries 191-93
Indian Mutiny, *military character* 7, 41, 241, ; communal aspects 18, 53, 58, 237 ; *not a popular or progressive movement* as seen by Minturn 15-6, 229, Valbezen 247, Holmes 169, Hilton 277-8, Azad 172, Sen 175-7, Majumdar 15-6, 178-9, 188-9 ; revolt of a *popular character* as seen by Bell 14-5, Martin 14, Mead 43, Malleson 46, Ball 72, 74, Kaye 112, Sedgwick 213, Valbezen 247 ; *a national movement* as appeared to Ball 81, Savarkar 171, Sen 177, Tarachand and Bisheswar Prasad 278 and surfaced by the reverses Havelock suffered—Malleson 120-1, Mac Munn 221, Edwardes 221n ; rise of the whole population *in Oudh* 39, 48, 208, 221, 238, 244
Indian National Congress 170, 285
India Reform League 9
Indo-British relations 1, 71, 106, 247-8
Indore, Holkar of 108-9
Indians and Indian Institutions criticised

Marfat.com

247, 264 ; contemptuous attitude 265, Buckle on 258 ; foul attack 259, 271
Inglis, J. E. W. 59-60, 70, 88, 108, 126, 140
Innes, Mc Leod 206-7
Ireland, Dr 56
Ionian Island 258
Israel 267

Iack Sepoy 39, 237
Jagdispur jungle 39, 133
Jagdis Raj 199-201
Jung Bahadur of Nepal, his biography 36, 199
Jayaji Rao Sindhia 117, 149-50
Jeremiah 151
Jesus Christ 144, 230
Jhansi, rani of—as treated by Kaye 109, 184 ; Malleson 117-8, 183-4 ; Forrest 165-66 ; Duberly 150 ; Sen 173 ; Majumdar 181-187 ; modern Semiramis 251
John Bull 258, 265
Joan of Arc 165
Joshi, P. C. 20-I, 177, 190-3

Kaiserbagh 67, 77, 127, 165
Kate Moore 135, 218
Kaye, Sir John 20, 34, 37, 43, 50, 71, 88f, 116, 162 ; sources of his book 90f. Anglo-Mughal relations 100 : on Cawnpore 267 ; critics of Kaye 109-111 ; Estimate 112
Khajwa, battle of 27, 227
Khaldun, T. 21
Kunwar Singh 39, 116, 133, 197

Ladendorf, J. M. 20, 25-32, 36n, 51, 59, 63, 75n, 141-42, 145,148n, 151-3, 289f.
Land Settlement 15 ; village settlement, 84 (see Talukdars)
Lawrence, Sir Henry 61, 97, 108, 118, 132, 160-1, 219-20, 242, 267
Lawrence, Sir John 14, 52-4, 58, 98, 181, 200, 241-2, 250
Leonidas 265
Lettowerbeck 195
Leuthen, battle of 120, 162
Libraries, sack of 39n, 233
Llewellyn, Alexander 75, 104, 111, 202-3, 243n, 244n, 278
Lloyd, Major-General 116, 132
Londonderry 265
*London Gazette* 83, 256
Loudon, Marshal 125
Louis Napoleon 52
Lucknow writers on 59 62, 107-8, 139, 206-7 ; first relief of Lucknow 42, 114, 119, 121, 163, 206, 208, 210 ; Assault on Secundrabagh-controversy 77, 124, 163, 165 ; effective strength of British forces 164, 222 ; defensive measures 78, 127 ; final relief 127-8, 164 ; sack of 165, 174

Macaulay 89, 111, 113, 257, 264, 265
Macedonian phalanx 268
MacKay, 62, 135
Mackenzie, A. R. D. 24, 33-34
Mac Lagan 20, 197-8
Mac Munn, Sir G. F. 77, 99, 166, 170, 198, 203, 207, 215-223, 274
Magdeburg, sack of 122, 150
Magnin, Dr 150
Majendie, V. D. Lt. 205, 260
Majumdar, Dr R. C. 16, 172, 178-90, 286
Malleson, Col. G. B, 10-11 ; his sources 38, 45-6, his work 117, 113-34, a military work 130-31 ; estimate of his work 131-34, 157
Mangal Pandey 192
Mangles, R. D. 15
Man Singh, chief of Powrie 78
Marathon, battle of 267
Marlborough 161
Marshman 18, 35
Martin, R. M. 14, 25, 38, 43, 49-52 ; date of his work 68, 83 ; his work 83-6 ; Butler on 233-34 ; other references 137-8, 143-44, 202, 219-20
Marx, views of 21, 190, 195-6
Maude, Col. 116
Mauritius 192n
Mead, Henry 8-10, 41-3
Mendelssohn 143
Meerut 135, 137, 179, Kaye on 98-100 ; Night of horror 218-20 ; Campbell on 235
Metcalfe, T. 20, 196
Military autobiographies 33-6
Military Despatches 70, 226-7
Military Historians 17-8, 203ff. ; a select list of—Majendie, Innes, Anson, Roberts, Hope Grant, Windham, Sedgwick, Wood, Gimlete, Mac Munn, Forbes-Mitchell, Edwardes, Durand
Miltiades 267
Milton 275
Minturn, R. B. 15-6, 229, 261-3
Mirzafar 78
Montgomery, Sir Robert 54, 82, 85-6, 122, 234
Movable column 55, 59, 103
Muir, William 39, 241
Muslim Rule, in the eye of foreigners 230, 232, 252
Mutiny veterans 204-5

Nadir Shah 16, 75, 177, 249
Najafgarh Jheel, battle of 103, 243

Marfat.com

Nanakchand's Journal 104, 173, 187, 188
Nana Saheb 74, 85, 143, 175, 187, 188, 221, 197-99, 233
Napier, Charles 9-11, 39, 42, 96, 115, 132, 242
Napier R. T. 79
Napoleon 126, 130, 161, 246
Narnul, Battle of 123
Neill, Col. 117, 120-1, 131, 132, 169, 204, 239-40
Nelson 54
Nepal 36, 192
Nicholson, Brig. Gen. John 36, 52, 54, 102, 103, 160, 204, 243
Ninevah 266, 268
Nolan, E. H. 81ff.
Norman, Sir H. W. 50, 148n, 159, 205
Norton, J. B. 14
Nurgoond, raja of 147-8

Old Testament 243
Omichand 78
Oudh 9, 15, 40, 118, 238, 252 ; Rise of, see Indian Mutiny
Osborne, Lt. Willoughby 14, 129
Outram, Sir James 39, 121, 127, 132, 162-3, 204, 242, 250-1

Paget, Mrs. L. 147f.
Pakistan 19
Palmer, J. A. B. 196-7, 220n, 279
Pamphlets 27
Parliamentary Papers 82-3, 93, 136, 181
Peel, William 205, 227
Persian host 39, 267
Peshawar, transfer of 54, 155, 181, 241, 244
Philip II, Armada of 246
Political situation in the different stages of the Mutiny 121, 123, 126, 128, 247n
Political theory of the rebellion, see Bahadur Shah—legitimacy of
Pompeii 75
Poorbeah 55, 108
Portia 268
Proclamations 32, 81, 193, 195, 350
Pudma Jung Bahadur 36, 192
*Punch* 256
Punjab saved India 237, 242

Queen's Proclamation 133, 154
Quintin, Battye 102
Quebeck 54

Raleigh 269
Ranjit Singh 222n
Red Pamphlet 10-11, 45-7, 223, 268
Regulus 268
Residency, Lucknow 119, 212, 227, 233 ; essentially a false position 61, 77, 164
Retreat of the Ten Thousand 39
Roberts, Frederick S. Field-Marshal 40, 209 ; contradictory views regarding Lucknow 164, justifies inaction at Meerut 218-9
Rose, Sir Hugh 36, 126, 128-9, 150, 165, 212 (Betwa battle of), 222-23 (story not lost in telling) ; 251-2, 267
Rome 5, 251
Rotton, J. E. W. 18, 51
Royal Palaces 165
Russell, Willlam Howard 12, 13, 165, 285
Russia, reaction of 191-3, 253-4
Russo-Turkish War 119

Satichaura ghat 106
Salarjung 129
Saragossa 210
Savarkar, V. D. 170-1
Sebastopol 67, 248
Sedgwick 203, 212-13
Sen, Dr S. N. 1-2, 25-7, 30, 45, 172-78, 187, 198
Sengupta, Dr K. K. 21, 28, 30, 191, 197n, 201
Sepoys, disaffection of, 10, 214-15, 261 ; qualities 175, 237 ; leaderless 222, 252
Shah Alam 100
Shah Najaf, battle of 77, 124-5, 213
Shakespeare 275
Shepherd, W. J. 45, 63, 66
Sherer, J. W. 143, 199
Sicilian Vespers 233, 257
Sikhs and Sikh states – help of 236-8
Sindhia of Gwalior 117, 123, 149-50
Sinha, N. K. 123
Sirajuddaullah 85
Sisyphus, story of 42
Sivaji 222
Smith, Goldwin 31
Smith, Vincent 168
Sources of Mutiny Studies 3, 12, 25-6, 33-4, 36-7 ; of Ball 69-70, Kaye 90-3, Joshi 190, Malleson 113-15, Holmes 167-8
South India in Revolt 14, 128-29, 147
Spaniard in America 249
Spartans 158, 265-6
Stanley, Lord 82-3
*Statesman* 234n
St. Bartholomew massacres 233, 257
Stokes, Eric 21, 279, 300
Sydney, Sir Philip 108

Talukdars 15, 20 ; village system 15, 84 ; land settlement 73, 199-200, 237-8 ; rise of the Talukdars in Oudh see Indian Mutiny
Tamerlane 249, 263
Tatya Tope 78, 105-6, 123, 125, 175, 195 ;

Marfat.com

observations of Ball 78-79, Malleson 129-30, Forrest 166
Tayler, William 115-6, 132
Terai campaigns 78, 83, 134
Terentius Varro 121
Thackeray's lash 84
Thermopylae 158, 266
Thomson, Mowbray 62, 173
Thucydides 89
Tilly, operations of 75n
*Times* 11-13, 31, 79, 83, 85, 89, 132, 136-7, 254, 275
Tocqueville 23, 97, 253
Trevelyan, Sir George O. 264-66
Tupper, Martin F. 85, 259

Ujinala same as Ajnala
*United Service Journal* 39-40

Valbezen 245f.
Verashchegin, Russian artist 192
Verma, N. P. 193
Venables 204
Victorian Age 36, 68, 202-4, 246, 273

Wagram 124
Walker, Col. T. N. 202
Wallenstein 122
Walpole, R. at Rooye 132
Wars of the Vendee 249
Waterloo, battle of 222
Well of Cawnpore, Ujinala and the Black Hole of Calcutta 85
Wellington, Duke of 161, 257
Wellesley 12, 111, 132
Wheeler, Sir Hugh 105, 212, 221
William the Silent 256
Williams, Major G. W. Depositions 99, 173
Willoughby, Lt. 102, 157, 236n, 266
Wilson, Lieut. Gen. Sir Archdale Wilson 12 ; Mac Munn on 218, Campbell on 243
Windham, Maj. Gen. C. A. 125, 132, 210, 212, 244
Wolfe 54
Wolseley, Field-Marshal 33, 213
Wood, Field-Marshal Sir Evelyn 213-4

Xenophon 268

Yadav, K. C. 201-2
Young, Col. Keith 50

Zinat Mahal, Begam 231

Marfat.com

Marfat.com

# A TABLE ON THE COURSE OF THE MUTINY-WAR OF 1857-59

**1857**

| | |
|---|---|
| 2 May | Mutiny of the 7th Irregulars at Lucknow. |
| 10 „ | Emeute at Ambala. |
| | Mutiny and massacre at Meerut. |
| 11 „ | Fall of Delhi to the Mutineers. |
| 27 „ | General Anson dies. |
| 30 „ | Rebel offensive checked at Hindan Bridge. |
| 13-31 May | Rising spreads. |
| 5 June | Mutiny at Cawnpore, then siege of the European survivors. |
| 6 „ | Star Fort at Jhansi seized by the rebels. |
| 8 „ | Massacre of the Europeans at Jokhan Bagh, Jhansi. |
| „ | British register a victory at Badli-ke-Serai followed by occupation of the ridge. |
| 27 „ | Massacre of the Europeans at Satichaura ghat, Cawnpore. |
| 30 „ | Disastrous defeat of British forces at Chinhat—Siege of Lucknow. Throughout June the revolt spread. |
| 5 July | Imposing victory of the Sepoy army at Shahganj near Agra. Death of General Barnard at Delhi. |
| 7 „ | Havelock marches for Cawnpore from Allahabad. |
| 15 „ | Bibigarh massacre at Cawnpore. |
| 16 „ | Battle of Cawnpore. |
| 17 „ | Havelock enters Cawnpore, |
| | Archdale Wilson commander of the Delhi Field Force. |
| 25-29 July | Havelock crosses the Ganges and, encounters a desperate resistance at Unao and Bashiratganj and falls back at Mangalwar near Cawnpore. |
| 29 July | Dunbars's ill-fated expedition to Arrah. |
| July-Aug. | Wake's wonderful defence at Arrah—relieved by V. Eyre. Throughout July mutinies and revolt stalked the land. |
| 5 August | Havelock's second advance on Bashiratganj. |
| 7 „ | Arrival of Nicholson on the ridge at Delhi. |
| 12 „ | Havelock encounters fierce opposition at Burhia-ke-Chauki, near Bashiratganj. He falls back on Mangalwar and re-crossed the Ganges on 13 August. |
| 13 „ | Defeat of Kunwar Singh at Jagdishpur. |
| 16 „ | Hard contest at Bithur. |
| 24 „ | Koel rebels fight at Alighar. |
| 25 „ | Battle of Najafgarh jheel. |
| | Throughout August mutiny and sedition spread through Narbada district and Western India. |



Marfat.com

| | |
|---|---|
| 14-20 Sept. | Assault and re-capture of Delhi. |
| 20 September | Rana Beni Madhu confronts the Gurkhas at Mandori. |
| 21 ,, | Havelock crossed the Ganges for the second time. |
| | The king of Delhi surrenders to Hodson. |
| 25 ,, | Lucknow relieved by Havelock and Outram. |
| 2 October | Ramgarh mutineers routed at Chatra. |
| 23 ,, | The force of the nawab of Farrukhabad defeated at Kanauj. |
| 31 ,, | Severe contest at Chanda, a town 36 miles from Jaunpur for the control of the Lucknow road. |
| | The Revolt spread to Assam, North Bengal, Kotah and Bombay. |
| 1 November | Victory of the British at heavy cost at Khajwa. |
| 16 ,, | Battle of Narnul in Haryana. |
| 17 ,, | Relief of Lucknow by Sir Colin Campbell (second relief), garrison evacuated. |
| 27-28 Nov. | Windham beaten to prostration at Cawnpore by Tatya Topi leading the Gwalior troops. |
| 6 December | Splendid victory of the British at Generalganj, Cawnpore. |
| 14 ,, | Farrukhabad rebels scattered at Kasganj, north of Etah. |
| 18 ,, | Chittagong mutineers defeated at Latu in Sylhet. |
| 27 ,, | Seaton's imposing victory at Patiali and the conquest of Mainpuri. |
| **1858** | |
| 2 January | Sir Colin clears the passage to Farrukhabad at Kali Nadi (Khodaganj). |
| 14 ,, | Lushington ambushed at Mogra (Chaibasa). |
| 27 ,, | Bahadur Shah brought to trial. |
| 3 February | Sir Hugh Rose's Central Indian Campaign—Saugor relieved. |
| 19 ,, | Second battle of Chanda (Jaunpur)—General Franks encounters a strong opposition. |
| 23 ,, | Battle of Sultanpur, road to Lucknow forced open. |
| 4 March | Sir Hugh Rose clears the Madanpur Pass held by the raja of Shahgarh. |
| 4-5 March | Rowcroft confronts the rebels at Amorah. |
| 20 ,, | Oudh Proclamation of Canning. |
| 21 ,, | Final relief of Lucknow. |
| 22 ,, | Rose invests the fort of Jhansi. |
| 24 ,, | Kunwar Singh occupies Azamgarh. |
| 1 April | Battle of Betwa. Tatya defeated. |
| 3 ,, | Jhansi fell before the onslaughts of Sir Hugh Rose. |
| 6 ,, | Lord Mark Kerr clears the road to Azamgarh. |
| 14-5 April | Narpat Singh beats back the best British column at Ruya. |
| 15 ,, | Sir Edward Lugard at Azamgarh to overtake Kunwar Singh who quitted the city before his arrival. |
| 17-20 April | Kunwar fights at Naghai, defeated at Bansdih and retreated to his stronghold of Jagdispur. |

Marfat.com

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 23 | April | Le Grand's expedition against Jagdispur met with a disastrous end. |
| 26 | ,, | Death of Kunwar Singh. |
| 3-11 | May | Fyzabad Maulavi beleaguers British troops at Shahjehanpur. |
| 5 | ,, | Battle of Bareilly. |
| 7 | ,, | Tatya Topi overpowered by Rose at Kunch. |
| 15 | ,, | Brilliant encounters of the Fyzabad Maulavi at Shahjehanpur. |
| 23 | ,, | Kalpi occupied by British forces under Rose. |
| 25 | ,, | Battle of Mohamdi. End of resistance at Rohilkhand. |
| 1 | June | Tatya Topi, and Rani of Jhansi seize Gwalior by surprise. |
| 6 | ,, | Sir Hugh Rose marched from Kalpi. |
| 14 | ,, | War of Talukdars at Nawabganj, eighteen miles from Lucknow on the Fyzabad Road. |
| 17 | ,, | Battle of Kotah-ki-Serai five miles to the south-east of Gwalior. Death of the Rani of Jhansi. |
| 20 | ,, | Capture of the fortress of Gwalior. Flight of Tatya Topi. |
| 2 | August | Transfer of the East India Company to the Crown. |
| 28 | ,, | Battle of Sultanpur. |
| 31 | ,, | Mutiny at Mooltan. |
| Aug.-Sept. | | Shahabad fights to the last. |
| 13 | October | Jagdispur encircled by British troops. |
| 14 | ,, | Attack on Chanderi relieved by General Michael. |
| 18 | ,, | Chiefs of Central India defeated at Khajuria. |
| 19-23 | ,, | Shahabad rebels ferreted out. |
| 25 | ,, | Operations against the fort of Dhar. |
| 1 | November | Queen's Proclamation. |
| 2 | ,, | Sir Colin advances against Oudh Talukdars. |
| 3 | ,, | Fort of Rampurkassia invested. |
| 8 | ,, | Attack on Mihidpur by Mandasor rebels repulsed after a desperate action. |
| 9 | ,, | Lord Clyde invests Amethi the largest of the Oudh forts. |
| 16 | ,, | Rana Beni Madhu evacuates the fort of Sankarpur. |
| 24 | ,, | Durand contacted the Nimach rebels at Garoria (Mandasor) in a sharp contest. |
| 27 | ,, | Hope Grant crossed the Gogra after storming the passage at Nawabganj at Bairam ghat. |
| 8 | December | Firoz Shah's smart action at Harachandrapur. |
| 15 | ,, | Clyde joins Hope Grant at Secrora, military station of Bahraich. |
| 20 | ,, | Clyde enters Bahraich further north. |
| 23 | ,, | Tulsipur, old fort, north of Bahraich on the border of Nepal captured by Hope Grant. Bala Rao retreated to Kundakot fort further up in the north. |
| 27 | ,, | Clyde arrived before the fort of Mujidiah one of the most formidable of the Oudh forts. A fierce contest, neutralised by the employment of Enfield Rifle by the British army. |

Marfat.com

| | |
|---|---|
| 30 December | Clyde marched for Banki on the banks of the Rapti to scatter the rebel forces which had concentrated there. |
| 31 ,, | Arrives at Banki at 7 a.m. The Indians defeated in a desperate engagement in foaming waters. |

**1859**

| | |
|---|---|
| 4 January | Kundakot fort attacked, Bala Rao and rebel leaders put to flight and escaped to Nepal. |
| 9 February | Action at Silka ghat. |
| 31 March | Action near Bhutwal, 25 miles east of Tulsipur. |
| 7 April | Tatya Topi betrayed by Mansingh and captured. |
| 15 ,, | Trial of Tatya Topi. |
| 18 ,, | Execution of Tatya Topi. |
| 21 May | British forces pierce Biskohur Pass near Sewara Pass in Nepal. |
| July | Lord Canning .the first Viceroy of the Queen, officially announced the end of the Mutiny. |
| 11 November | Battle of Dang valley. Last action of the Indians. Rana Beni Madhu of Sankarpur and remnant of the Sepoy army defeated by the Gurkhas and put to the sword. Nearly 1,200 of the rebel army were massacred. |
| 14 ,, | Jung Bahadur proceeded to Surhi the place of massacre to meet the Indian Leaders. He found nearly 1,000 sepoys under arms even then. Met Begam Hazrat Mahal at Noakote and made provisions for her settlement.[1] |



[1] For a compact account of the course of the mutiny-war and military movements, illustrating the incidents noted above, see *Civil Rebellion in the Indian Mutinies* (Historical Background, pp. 1-60, 365).

Marfat.com