

JOURNAL
of the
PANJAB UNIVERSITY
HISTORICAL SOCIETY

(Incorporating the Punjab Historical Society.)

VOL. I, PART II, pp. 87—173

DECEMBER, 1932.

	PAGE
ORIGINS OF THE FIRST AFGHAN WAR. <i>P. N. Khera</i>	87
QUINQUENNIAL CIRCUITS OR TRANSFERS OF ASOKA'S OFFICIALS. <i>A. C. Woolner</i>	108
THE TRIAL OF RAJA LAL SINGH, 1846. <i>R. R. Sethi</i>	113
CYRUS THE GREAT, AND THE INDIAN " SAKA " ERA. <i>Gulshan Rai</i>	123
THE MULTAN OUTBREAK AND THE TRIAL OF DIWAN MUL RAJ. <i>Sita Ram Kohli</i>	137
LUCKNOW IN 1841. <i>H. L. O. Garrett</i>	148
CAPTAIN MANUEL DEREMAO. <i>H. Bullock</i>	155
FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND AUDIT REPORT	172-73

Journal
OF THE
Panjab University Historical Society
(Incorporating the Panjab Historical Society.)

Vol. I.]

DECEMBER 1932.

[No. 2.

ORIGINS OF THE FIRST AFGHAN WAR.

BY

P. N. KHERA.

There have been some wars in history which were inevitable, which simply *had* to be fought. But there have also been wars which were not at all necessary, and the First Afghan War is one of them. The following essay is an attempt to prove that this ghastly affair in which thousands of human beings marched to the Valley of Death was not inevitable, was by no means in the logic of history.

The circumstances that led towards this war began to develop in 1834, the year of Shah Shuja's expedition for the recovery of his lost throne.

The first circumstance of note was the capture of Peshawar by the Sikhs while Amir Dost Mohammad of Kabul was away at Kandhar concerting measures for repelling the attack of Shah Shuja. This gave rise to a dispute between the Sikhs and the Afghans which is of great historical significance inasmuch as it was the failure of the British Government in India to find a solution of this question acceptable to the Amir that led him to form an alliance with Russia, a fact which was the immediate cause of the First Afghan War.

Having gained some confidence by an easy victory over the Durrani Prince, Dost Mohammad declared war against the Sikhs. He

counted upon the support of the British Government in India and sent frantic appeals for help. The Government, however, was not in a mood to interfere, although Captain Wade, the British Government's Agent at Ludhiana was in favour of mediation.

However, Dost Mohammad counting upon the support of his expelled Peshawar brothers advanced towards that city. It seems that Maharaja Ranjit Singh at this stage offered to negotiate with him on the basis of conferring the Kohat district on the expelled rulers of Peshawar, provided the Amir conferred Jalalabad upon them. But the Amir flushed with his last victory banged the door on negotiations and advanced. But having failed to get help either from his Peshawar brothers or from the British Government, he had to make an ignominious retreat.

The Amir was of course disappointed at the neutrality of the British Government. He retired through Jalalabad to Kabul, where he shut himself up in the Bala Hissar for three days and admitted no one to his presence out of shame.

Having felt the shame of his retreat so much, especially when he had assumed the title of Ghazi and Amir, he was very anxious to turn out the infidel Sikh from Peshawar. It was a question of national, religious and most of all personal honour with him now.

His appeals for help to the British Government had brought him nothing in reply but sermons on the benefits of trade and commerce and the wonderful era of prosperity that would follow the opening of the Indus to navigation. Naturally therefore he sought friends in other quarters, especially Persia.¹ But it is very clear that he always preferred a British alliance to any other.² He even proposed to send an agent to represent his case to the British Government.³ He seemed impatient of delay and wanted to know the intentions of the

¹ Wade to Government, giving information from a letter received from Mr. Masson, 23rd February 1836.

² See some of his letters of 'no date' given as enclosures to the letter of Captain Wade to Government of 7th June, 1836. Also Burnes to Government, 31st October, 1837. Also Book 108, Letter 42.

³ Wade to Government, 7th June, 1836.

British Government.¹ But the British Government had no intention of either helping him or interfering in the Sikh-Afghan quarrels at this stage.² Later on of course the policy changed. But before we come to that stage, it is necessary to look into the condition of affairs in Afghanistan itself in order properly to understand the developments that led to that change of policy on the part of the British Government.

The condition of Afghanistan.—Prince Kamran of Herat was in the habit of threatening and sometimes actually attacking Kandhar which was held by certain of Dost Mohammad's brothers. Their Chief was Sirdar Kohar Dil Khan.

But Kamran himself was in constant danger of an attack from Persia. He was accused by the Shah of Persia of persecuting his Shiah subjects.³ So the Kandharis, who considered Kamran an enemy, considered the Persian Shah a friend.

At Kabul Amir Dost Mohammad was hard pressed by the Sikhs. His one aim in life seems to have been (at this period at least) the expulsion of the Sikhs from Peshawar. For this end he begged help from the English, which was refused. So he too, like his Kandhar brothers, turned towards Persia for help. Moreover, his mother came of a Persian family,⁴ and so it seems that Persia was very favourably situated under these conditions.

In 1835, Shahzada Kamran planned an attack on Kandhar. The Kandhar Chiefs applied to Dost Mohammad, their Kabul brother, for help. But he himself was in need of help against the Sikhs, and so he refused to come to their aid. The Kandhar Amirs therefore decided to write to the English Governor of Bombay offering to surrender their country to the British Government on any terms.⁵

¹ See Wade to Government, 19th July, 1836. Dost Mohammad sent for Mr. Masson and said, "I hear the Government at Calcutta consider me unworthy of their notice, or otherwise I cannot account for their neglect of me. I have done all in my power to come to an understanding with them, but have received not the slightest encouragement from them. *I have only one wish, that the business be brought to a close.* (Italics mine).

² Government to Wade, 22nd August, 1836. Book 107, letter 10.

³ Burnes to Government, 10th November, 1837. 108/52.

⁴ Burnes to Government, 14th October, 1837. 108/42.

⁵ 142/14. Wade to Government, giving information received from Masson; 9th March, 1836.

But meanwhile Kamran postponed his attack and the Amirs never pressed their proposition. Dost Mohammad, however, continued to write to the British for help and at the same time kept making overtures to Persia.¹

Captain Wade, however, was a man of some imagination. He learnt of the Persian designs on Herat. If Herat fell, then might not Persia extend her influence to Kandhar and Kabul? *That* would be a real danger. But the danger could be warded off, and Captain Wade had an ingenious suggestion to make. It was that "the British Government has it in its power at any time by the restoration of Shah Shuja to the throne of Kabul in concert with Ranjit Singh, and the establishment which would ensue of a confederation of the States on the Indus, to counteract any designs inimical to its interests from the westward."²—This was in June, 1836.

Captain Wade thus anticipated the policy which was to be a fact two years later. No serious consideration was paid to this suggestion then, *i.e.*, in 1836, but it seems to me that this suggestion left a germ in the mind of the Governor-General which lay dormant for two years, when under favourable circumstances it became active again, and had important results. And while blaming Lord Auckland for his Afghan policy, which caused one of the most futile wars of history, *i.e.*, the First Afghan War, we must give a proper share of the blame to his subordinates, whose despatches and suggestions were constantly influencing his mind.

In September, 1836, Captain Burnes was ordered to proceed on a commercial mission to the countries bordering on the Indus, "with a view to complete the re-opening of the navigation of that river."³ From Hyderabad to Attock he was to "obtain without exciting jealousy or alarm the most minute information of the state of the country and the *character and strength* of the tribes along its banks."⁴ (Italics mine).

¹ 142/36. Wade to Government, 7th June, 1836.

² *Ibid.*

³ See a copy of letter of instructions to Burnes in the letter of Government to Captain Wade, 5th September, 1836.

⁴ *Ibid.*

By the year 1836, the fear in the minds of British diplomats, of Russian intrigues in the East, begins to manifest itself. The smallest and sometimes even unimportant news about Russia and Russians are reported to the British Government in India, and they are listened to with attention. Mr. Masson, the British news-writer at Kabul, reports whatever he hears of the Russians there. Captain Wade too is not slack in this matter. Mr. Masson wrote that a Russian envoy had arrived at Bokhara.¹ At the same time a mysterious man passed through the Punjab. His name was Disco, and he was supposed to be a Russian spy.² He came from Bombay with one S. Furni, but mysteriously disappeared at Multan, and then again met him at Lahore, where he stayed for some days and then left for Kabul. At Lahore he certainly entered into some correspondence of a suspicious nature with M. Ventura. Mr. Mackeson saw a letter from him written to Ventura inviting him to join the service of the Russian Government, which he could secure for him owing to his influence with the Russian Court, and that he (Ventura) would best serve his interests by entering the service of the Russians *who would soon be in India*. Ventura not believing in his *bona fides*, refused.³ When Captain Wade heard of the arrival of a Russian envoy at Bokhara, he thought that it was the same Disco.⁴ But Masson was not certain whether he was an envoy or a mere traveller. The Governor-General was naturally anxious to know more about him, and especially to learn whether he was an envoy or a traveller.⁵ But although these reports were sent and listened to carefully, no idea of interfering in Kabul affairs to guard against any danger from westward, was entertained at this period.

Ranjit Singh was to be clearly told that although his ambitions towards Sindh had been checked, the British Government had no wish to interfere in his quarrel with the Afghan nation. Peace in Afghanistan is of course desirable (and this non-interference might destroy peace) and the danger of Persian intervention is as threatening to the

¹ Wade to Government, 25th June, 1836. 142/39.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ 142/48. Wade to Government, 19th July, 1836.

⁵ 107/10. Government to Wade, 22nd August, 1836.

British Government as to the Maharaja, but it is not the policy of the British Government to interfere with quarrels so distant from its frontiers.¹

But at the same time full information about the developments taking place in the countries beyond the Indus was to be had. Meanwhile the Battle of Jamrud had been fought on 30th April, 1837, between Sikhs and Afghans, in which the Maharaja's famous general Hari Singh had been killed fighting bravely. The Maharaja therefore was concentrating his forces at Peshawar to retrieve his honour.

So far, as we have seen, the policy of the British Government had been that of complete neutrality and non-interference in Afghan affairs. But Persia was supposed to be meditating an attack on Herat, and it was feared that Ranjit Singh, provoked by the imprudent demonstrations of Dost Mohammad, might institute offensive operations, and although the Sikhs' position in Afghanistan was of no profit to them, yet Ranjit Singh "may not be without the hope of bringing the Kabul and ultimately perhaps the Kandhar Chiefship under supremacy."²

These circumstances and the thought that there would be disturbance of peace in Afghanistan, were making gradually for a change in the policy of the British Government. In his letter of 15th May, 1837,³ the Secretary to the Government of India writes to Captain Wade, that "in any case it must be the desire of His Lordship in Council to learn fully the state of affairs in these countries (to which indeed attention has been earnestly prescribed by the authorities in England,) and to omit no means of obtaining information upon the projects of aggression from the westward which *however distant and doubtful* they may be in execution are yet talked of with confidence at Tehran, and it must be in the policy and interest of the Lahore as well as of the British Government to resist them."

For this purpose, *i.e.*, resisting the aggressive projects of Persia, a friendship between the Sikhs and Afghans is the best means. But that friendship cannot be forced upon them "against the family and the

¹ 119/10. Government to Captain Wade, 2nd March, 1837.

² Government to Wade, 19th May, 1837. 119/18.

³ See Macnaghten to Wade, 15th May, 1837.

national and the religious animosities by which they are distracted.”¹ The best course therefore would be to limit the present endeavours to the collection of information and to “————the promotion of an unforced reconciliation with an avowal of a friendly disposition towards all parties————.”² This letter marks a definite change in the policy of the British Government. Before this time, they did not want to interfere at all. Now they were at least ready to promote an “unforced reconciliation.” From this day onwards also we see in all the letters of the British Government a strong desire towards a closer friendship with Ranjit Singh. The reason was that the Governor-General had a very exaggerated idea of the Persian danger to India. But the Home Authorities must have their share of blame in making him nervous. His mind was informed either by the information from Home or from his subordinates in India and Afghanistan, and therefore what is condemned as his policy was not only his. I do not say this as a justification of his later policy but only as an explanation of it. His letter to Burnes³ is written in the same tenor as that to Wade quoted above. Burnes was told not to discuss any political propositions made to him by any power but to refer them to Captain Wade. But he too, in addition to his commercial duties, was to learn “what has been the degree of recent connection (of Afghanistan) with Persia and by what agents it has been conducted and what would be the probable result of a Persian attack upon Herat.” “.....and you will gather all the information in your power on the commerce of Russia, and on the measures adopted by that power with the object of extending her influence in Central Asia.”

Captain Burnes' Mission.—Such was the condition of affairs when Captain Burnes sailed up the Indus and reached Peshawar on the 13th of August, 1837.⁴ It seems that Dost Mohammad was determined to make the most of the presence of an agent of the British Government. At Hasan Abdal Burnes was informed through a letter from Mirza Sammi Khan—the Secretary of the Amir—that an embassy from Persia was coming to Kabul and had arrived at Kandhar.

¹ See Macnaghten to Wade, 15th May, 1837.

² *Ibid.*

³ Of the same date. *Ibid.*

⁴ Book 108, letter 31, 22nd August, 1837.

Another embassy had arrived at Kabul from the King of Bokhara, and there was a Sirdar coming from Kandhar too. With so many agents present at Kabul, it would be difficult for him, thought Burnes, to satisfy Dost Mohammad.¹ But he proposed to dwell upon the advantages that would accrue to the Amir from being the first of his family who has had personal communication with an agent of the British Government.² At Peshawar he was called by Kharak Singh to a private conference, where the Kanwar and his Sardars said that they had received a letter from Ranjit Singh to ask him (Burnes) what his precise object in going to Kabul was. Captain Burnes told them that his object was purely commercial, and assured them of the friendship of the British Government towards the Sikhs, and that nothing in Kabul would diminish that friendship.³

Interesting developments had meanwhile taken place in Afghanistan. The Kandharis had opened diplomatic intercourse with Persia and the Russian agent at Tehran. Dost Mohammad had invited one of the Kandhar Chiefs to be present at any Conference that might be held with Captain Burnes at Kabul. They had resolved to send one, but when the *Elchi* from Persia (Kambar Ali Khan) arrived at Kandhar, they dropped the idea.⁴ They stipulated with Persia to attack Herat in concert with the Persian army if they are supplied with necessary money for expenses, and to send a son of Sirdar Kohan Dil Khan to Tehran and keep aloof from all friendship with the English.⁵

Kambar Ali Khan was still at Kandhar and seemed likely to continue there according to Burnes' report.

The strangest news conveyed by Burnes was that a representative of the Lahore Court was also present at Kandhar, the son of Sultan Mohammad Khan of Peshawar having been deputed with presents

¹ Book 108, letter 128, 1st August, 1837.

² *Ibid.*

³ Book 108, letter 32. 31st August, 1837, from Jamrud. At Peshawar Captain Burnes saw the Sikh Army and found it very efficient. He also writes that the Maharaja's people are actively engaged in erecting a fort at Jamrud, the place of the last conflict between the Sikhs and Afghans.

⁴ Burnes from Jalalabad, 9th September, 1837. Burnes in this letter gives a detailed account of the recent intercourse of Kandhar and Persia.

⁵ See letter of Kandhar Chiefs to the Shah of Persia as enclosure to the last letter.

in company with an agent from Ranjit Singh. The arrival of these gifts had given some offence to the Kandhar Chiefs. They had sent some gifts to Sultan Mohammad, with whom they were on friendly terms, and he had passed them on to Ranjit Singh as the tribute of Kandhar.¹ Ranjit Singh in his usual clever way, found an opportunity of trying to detach the Kandhar Chiefs from Dost Mohammad. He sent presents in return and a letter, portion of which contained a statement of his intention to restore Peshawar to Sultan Mohammad Khan, in co-operation with whom he was about to crush the Chief of Kabul, to aid in which he requested the assistance of Kandhar. Though sincerely attached to their brother of Peshawar, the Kandhar Chiefs were much concerned at this.²

Captain Burnes before reaching Kabul received the Governor-General's letter expressing a wish to bring the Afghan-Sikh disputes to a happy termination without involving the British Government. Captain Burnes' own suggestion was as follows:—³

1. That Peshawar be restored to Sultan Mohammad Khan. Burnes thought that Dost Mohammad would agree to it as it would be a "voluntary sacrifice of what is by conquest the right and possession of the Lahore Chief." Moreover, Dost Mohammad had by now found out that his late success at Jamrud had brought with it no substantial gain.

2. That the Maharaja should garrison the fort of Peshawar (Bala Hissar) and receive the tribute through his detachment.

This settlement, Captain Burnes thought, would satisfy all parties; Ranjit Singh, because, it would save his honour, Sultan Mohammad because he would get the whole district, the Kandhar Chiefs because they are attached to Sultan Mohammad and Dost Mohammad because he would be saved from the constant threats of the opponents to his religion and power.

On the 20th of September, 1837, Burnes reached Kabul and was conducted into the city with great demonstration by Mohammad

¹ Book 108, letter 34, from Burnes, 9th September, 1837.

² *Ibid.*

³ See Book 108, letter 36. From Burnes—Camp near Sufed Koh—10th September, 1837.

Akbar Khan.¹ After a few formal talks, he had at last a very long interview in private with the Amir.² In this interview Burnes fully explained the advantages to be derived by all those who associated in the navigation of the Indus and promoted commerce. The Amir appreciated the motives of the British Government and promised whole-hearted co-operation, but he complained that his wars with the Sikhs crippled his resources, and that he had to take money from his merchants and to increase the duties, which hurt the trade. The Amir was bitter against Shah Shuja, who had disgraced the name of Durrani and Peshawar by entering into an alliance with Ranjit Singh. His own existence was in danger, as the Sikhs planted a fort near the Khyber Pass, but he defeated them and Hari Singh, the 'inveterate hater of the name of Mohammadan' was slain. Burnes agreed that war crippled his resources, but at the same time urged him to reflect on the uselessness of seeking to contend with so powerful a Prince as Maharaja Ranjit Singh. Dost Mohammad admitted this, although he thought that Ranjit Singh's strength lay in the family differences of the Afghan Chiefs. It would, therefore, be a source of gratification to him if the British Government would counsel him how to act, as none of the other neighbours could avail him. He would in return pledge himself to forward the commercial and political views of the English. Captain Burnes declared that, although his mission was purely commercial, anything that tended to promote peace would be gratifying to him; but he wanted to know definitely what the Amir's sentiments were.

At this the Amir said that, it was known in the whole of Khorasan that the English had saved Shikarpur from the aggression of the Sikhs. Could not some similar motives induce them to interfere in the affairs of Peshawar? Burnes assured him that their motives were purely commercial and their friendship with Ranjit Singh firm. The difference in policy towards Shikarpur and Peshawar, he explained, was due to the fact that, Shikarpur was a *possession* of the Amirs while

¹ Book 108, letter 37. By an irony of fate this Mohammad Akbar Khan is the same man who played the principal part in the tragedy of the retreat to Jalalabad four years later.

² Captain Burnes gives an account of the interview in his letter to Government of 5th October, 1837. Book 108, letter 39.

Peshawar was an undoubted *conquest* of the Sikhs made by the sword and preserved by it. To interfere with that would be a violation of justice and the integrity of Ranjit Singh's dominions.

Dost Mohammad talked of the promise of assistance and pecuniary help from Persia. *Jabbar Khan* also said that they had written to Persia for help because the British Government had not shown any interest in their affairs. *Dost Mohammad* even showed willingness to send a son to the Maharaja to ask forgiveness and to agree to hold Peshawar as tributary to Lahore, and send horses, etc., as tribute for that part. But the Persian party (*Kazilbashes*) in Kabul tried whatever they could to promote *Dost Mohammad's* alliance with Persia. Therefore the arrival of the British agent was looked at with suspicion if not open dissatisfaction by them.¹ The Persian *Elchi* had arrived at Kandhar, but *Dost Mohammad* did not encourage him to come to Kabul.

The *Kazilbashes* must have realised that this was due to the arrival of *Alexander Burnes*. It rather damped their spirits. *Captain Burnes* even thought that it was doubtful if the Persian *Elchi* will advance to Kabul, and it is certain if he does so that "any offers which he may make will never be placed in the balance against those of the British Government."² Persia, thought *Burnes*, was urged by Russia to capture *Herat*,³ and *Dost Mohammad* agreed that it was so.⁴

The Persian *Elchi* at last started from Kandhar towards Kabul, but he was recalled by the Kandhar Chiefs at the instigation of one *Haji Khan Kakar* who had quarrelled with *Dost Mohammad* and who advised them to form an alliance with Persia independent of Kabul. The *Elchi* returned to Kandhar and from there to Persia with presents for the Shah and accompanied by a son of

¹ A very detailed account of the influence of the *Kazilbashes* (or the Persian party) in Afghanistan is given by *Burnes* in his letter of 14th October, 1837, to Government. See Book No. 108, letter 42.

² *Burnes* to Government, 14th October, 1837, Book 108, letter 42.

³ *Burnes* to Government, Book 108, letter 45, 20th October, 1837.

⁴ *Burnes* to Government, Book 108, letter 48, 31st October, 1837. The *Amir* said that "designs of Persia were sinister and that Russia through her was preparing to try her fortune in these countries as the British had tried it in India."

Kohan Dil Khan, the head of the Kandhar Sirdars.¹ Dost Mohammad made it clear to Captain Burnes that all this was done without his consent.² He himself had resisted all persuasions to send a letter of invitation to the Persian *Elchi* when he had reported his arrival at Kandhar, and this he said " was the best way in which he could mark his desire to ally himself to the British Government."³ Dost Mohammad, it appears certain, preferred an English alliance to any other, and tried his best to convince the British Government of his sincerity.

Meanwhile, the news of the arrival of the Persian *Elchi* at Kandhar had reached the Governor-General and he decided upon modifying the character of Captain Burnes' mission.⁴ He was permitted to enter into communication with Dost Mohammad on his present position and the circumstances by which he was surrounded. The Maharaja was told by the Governor-General that Burnes had been instructed to apprise the Amir that if he received foreign emissaries, the good will of the British Government towards him would be impaired, and its good offices upon every occasion withdrawn.⁵

The Governor-General thought that the division of power in Afghanistan was very useful to the British Government at this time.⁶ There was no single power strong enough to be dangerous if it went over to the enemy. The idea of the balance of power on a small scale was thus working in his mind.⁷

To maintain that balance it was necessary to follow the policy of supporting the *status quo*. The danger spots which could disturb the *status quo* were two, Herat and Kandhar. These two places must be saved from Persian and indirectly Russian designs. Therefore Mr. McNeil, the English representative at Tehran, was to be requested that in any mediation that he might undertake, the desirability of maintaining the integrity of Herat and Kandhar was not

¹ Wade to Government, 31st October, 1837, Book 108, letter 48.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Government to Wade enclosing copies of letters to Burnes and Ranjit Singh, 11th September, 1837, Book 119, letter 55.

⁵ Enclosure to the above. Governor-General to Ranjit Singh, Book 119, letter 55.

⁶ Government to Wade, 13th November 1837, Book 119, letter 69.

⁷ Government to Wade, 25th November, 1837, Book 119, letter 72.

to be overlooked.¹ His Lordship also realised the great importance of cultivating a closer connection between the British Government and the rulers of Kandhar.² Mr. McNeil was of the same opinion and Captain Wade agreed with him that, "it ought to be the primary object of the British Government to maintain at all hazards the integrity of Herat as the only safe and sure means of opposing the efforts of Persia to annihilate the independence of Afghanistan."³

When, therefore, Captain Burnes learnt that the Kandharis had entered, after useless appeals to the British for help, into a treaty with the Persian Shah, who had promised to win Herat for them, he at once thought of taking some definite step to detach the Khandar Chiefs from Persia.⁴ In fact he had been urged to use his own discretion in detaching them. He, therefore, at once wrote a letter to Kohan Dil Khan telling him that if Herat fell to Persia, and Kandhar was threatened by the Shah, and the Kandharis remained on friendly terms with the English, then Amir Dost Mohammad accompanied by Captain Burnes would come to their help and that in that event the expenses of keeping off the Persians would be furnished to them.⁵ A few days later he also sent Lieut. Leech to Kandhar. He was to be the agent of the British at Kandhar and this was openly to be declared, so that Persia should hesitate before attacking Kandhar.⁶ Burnes' action therefore was perfectly judicious and in accordance with his instructions.

The British Government *had* to make some definite and positive offer of help to some party. The mere expression of their wish that the Persians should be opposed was certainly not going to have any effect on the Kandhar Chiefs. The action Captain Burnes took was the only means of frustrating Persian designs on Herat and of proving the sincerity of the Government of India to the Afghans. Moreover, Captain Burnes believed that "this promise will be a dead letter,

¹ Government to Wade, 13th November, 1837, Book 119, letter 69.

² *Ibid.*

³ Wade to Government, 28th October, 1837, Blue Book No. 5, 26th March, 1839, p. 14.

⁴ See Book 108, letter 54, Burnes to Government, 19th November, 1837, and Book 108, letter 65, Burnes to Government, 22nd December, 1837.

⁵ Burnes to Government, 22nd December, 1837, Book 108, letter 65.

⁶ Burnes to Government, 26th December, 1837, Book 108, letter 67.

since Herat will detain the Persians, if not for good, certainly for a considerable time." But Lord Auckland, who had a genius for doing the wrong thing, could not see the wisdom of this step. Captain Burnes was therefore told that his action was disapproved and that he had never been authorised to make any such offer.¹ It is strange that, after indulging in such high-sounding phrases about the desirability of saving Herat, the Government should have shirked a small obligation by way of achieving its object.

Thus the Governor-General lost a very valuable opportunity of proving the sincerity of the British Government to the Afghans. But it must be remembered that Burnes made this offer of help to Kandhar immediately in consequence of the arrival of a Russian agent at Kabul on the 19th of December, 1837. How far the arrival of this man influenced Burnes it is difficult exactly to estimate. But it seems highly probable that he must have been influenced by the hints contained in the letter from Mulla Rashid, the counsellor of Kohan Dil, Khan of Kandhar, to Amir Dost Mohammad, received in Kabul on the same day as the Russian *Elchi*.²

The Mulla's letter says :

" ————Captain Burnes will undoubtedly comprehend the real motives of this *Elchi*," and, " you have now both the English and Russian ambassadors at your Court. Please to settle matters with any of them who you think may do some good office hereafter," and in a postscript that, the appearance of this *Elchi* will induce Captain Burnes " to be sharp and to put off delay in promoting objects."

So far the British Agent had not done anything to support Dost Mohammad. The Amir was bent upon rescuing Peshawar from the hands of the Sikhs. The Maharaja, as we have already seen, was willing to restore it to Sultan Mohammad Khan under certain conditions. Dost Mohammad too was willing to hold it as tributary to

¹ Book 121, letters Nos. 1 and 7, of 20th and 31st January, 1838 " Positive engagements to assist opposition to actual invasion from the westward by arms or subsidies have not been contemplated by His Lordship." Captain Burnes had only been authorised to proceed to Kandhar if he thought it essential for his efforts to check the influence of Persia on the Kandhar Chiefs, Book 119, letter 84.

² Book 108, letter 64, Burnes to Macnaghten, 20th December, with enclosures.

closer to Ranjit Singh, and the proposal emanating from the Maharaja for an interview with Lord Auckland was encouraged.¹ Captain Wade was instructed not to do or say anything that might offend the Sikh ruler.² Seeing the British Government in such placating mood Ranjit Singh, it seems, realised his importance and stiffened his attitude, and the Peshawar question naturally became more difficult of solution. Captain Wade indeed discerned this change in the tone and attitude of the Maharaja and reported it to his Government. But His Lordship had so far been "unable to discover any symptoms of such change."³

Dost Mohammad too must by this time have begun to feel disappointment at nothing being done by the British Government towards the realisation of his fond hopes. In October he had gone even so far as to say that "whether the British Government interested itself or not, he was resolved to do everything which he could to show his respect for its wishes and conciliate it, and if he could not succeed he was equally determined to have nothing farther to do with Persia."⁴

But the Governor-General's policy by the month of December was definitely that of maintaining the *status quo*. Burnes was informed that the British Government's good offices for the security of Dost Mohammad's *remaining territory* were available and "should thankfully be accepted by him." If the Amir should try to use this tender of good offices for his ambitious views, then those whom such ambitions concerned should be reassured. In such a case Burnes could send a member of the Mission "designed to mark our recognition of their independence to the Court of Kandhar and Herat."⁵

This was the situation when suddenly on the 19th December 1837, a Russian agent, called Vickovitch arrived at Kabul.⁶ Dost Mohammad took advantage of his presence to frighten the British Government, who were already in a mood to be frightened by the Russian bogey.

¹ Government to Wade, 25th November, 1837, Book 119, letter 76.

² Government to Wade, 13th November, 1837.

³ Government to Wade, 25th November, 1837, Book 119, letter 71.

⁴ Interview of Dost Mohammad with Burnes, on 24th October, 1837.

⁵ Government to Wade enclosing a copy of a letter for Burnes, Book 119, letter 91. This letter written on 27th December must have crossed the letter of Burnes of 26th December, informing that he had sent Lieut. Leech to Kandhar.

⁶ For the previous intercourse and letters of Russian ambassador at Tehran to Dost Mohammad, see Book 108, letter 53 and 66.

Vickovitch was considered a 'veritable agent of Russia.'¹ Burnes wrote that he was one of those who believe that "Russia entertains the designs of extending her influence to the Eastward and between her dominions and India."² Even if Russia had no designs against the British in India, she wanted relations with the countries on the British Government's borders and therefore 'evils must flow from such connections.' "It is indeed casting before us a challenge," and "it is a true maxim that prevention is better than cure, and we now both have in our hands."³ Such language was bound to have effect on the Government's mind, and Captain Burnes was asked to tell the Amir to dismiss the Russian with courtesy and a letter of thanks to the Emperor of Russia for his proffered kindness to Kabul traders. But if he (the Amir) enters into any political intercourse with him, then Captain Burnes was to give the Amir distinctly to understand that "the act will be considered a direct breach of friendship with the British Government."⁴

(Captain Vickovich's real name was believed to be Omar Beg, a Sunni Mohammadan subject of Russia.⁵)

Captain Wade's Suggestion.—Captain Wade again advocated the cause of Shah Shuja, and made the same suggestion which he had made sometime back. The reply to his suggestion for the restoration of Shah Shuja to the throne of Kabul, was that the scheme could not be discussed, as the Government's policy was to maintain the present position of the Chiefs in Afghanistan and that no scheme for supporting the pretensions of Shah Shuja was in His Lordship's contemplation.⁶ It is clear therefore that the Governor-General had no idea of restoring Shah Shuja to the Kabul throne in the January of 1838.

Ranjit Singh was to be again assured that nothing would be done in the matter of Afghan affairs without his concurrence.⁷ Captain

¹ Book 108, letter 66.

² Book 108, letter 68, abstract in Blue Book No. 6, 1839, p. 10.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Macnaghten to Burnes, 20th January, 1838.

⁵ Macnaghten to Burnes, enclosing a confidential letter from the English ambassador at Tehran. Book 121, letter 2, for a full description of the person of Omar Beg, see Book 121, p. 8.

⁶ Government to Wade, 20th January, 1838.

⁷ *Ibid.*

Wade was asked by his Government to furnish to the Maharaja; "without reserve and with perfect frankness all the information in his power relative to the proceedings of the Russian Envoy and the advance of the Persian Army."¹

It was also heard that the Russian Agent proposed to come to Ranjit Singh's Court. The Governor-General made it clear that he would strongly discourage his reception by the Maharaja. It was admitted by the Governor-General that his open reception by the ruler of the Punjab, though conveying with it no substantive impertinence would be open to the remark that the Maharaja is friendly to those who are the supposed enemies of British power.² The Maharaja on learning the wish of the British Government ordered Mon. Avitabile at Peshawar to prevent the Russian Envoy from entering the Maharaja's territory.³

Dost Mohammad it seems made a last effort at the solution of the Peshawar question, and was even ready to agree to a settlement giving Peshawar to Sultan Mohammad. But the Governor-General thought "that the relinquishment of Peshawar upon any terms must depend upon the pleasure of Maharaja Ranjit Singh whose right to that possession appears.....to be admitted even by the Amir and cannot be questioned."

And, thought the Governor-General, His Highness the Maharaja had never manifested any design of transferring the management of Peshawar to any of the Afghan brothers, and under these circumstances, His Lordship "will not of course bring forward for discussion any proposition for establishing the authority of Sultan Mohammad Khan throughout the territory."⁴ His Lordship wanted to know whether Dost Mohammad was prepared or not to rest satisfied *in his present possessions* with a guarantee for their integrity by the British Government, "the Sikhs remaining as at present in the immediate occupation and management of the Peshawar territory."⁵

¹ Government to Wade, 31st January 1838.

² Macnaghten to Wade, 3rd March 1838.

³ Book 121, letter 58.

⁴ Government to Wade, 7th March 1838.

This letter is very important as showing the attitude of the Governor-General at this time. Now he was not ready *even to discuss* the question of transferring the Peshawar territory to Sultan Mohammad.

⁵ *Ibid.*

It was regretted that positive instructions had not been sent to Captain Burnes to dispel from Dost Mohammad's mind any extravagant hopes of British interference.¹ Dost Mohammad was not to be helped although he was weak and pressed upon by powers stronger than himself. Frankness and openness of communication with Lahore was again urged upon Captain Wade.²

The Government's letter to Captain Burnes on the same day (*i.e.*, 28th March 1838) is very interesting as showing how the Governor-General shifted his previous position. Previously it had been said in so many words that the British Government were ready to enter into a stipulation with Dost Mohammad for the security of his *remaining territories*. Now it was said, "That we should engage to protect him against the powers to the Westward, would be as you are aware an infringement of our Treaty with Persia independently of other considerations."³

Captain Burnes was, in the same letter, required not to remain in Kabul "one day longer than may be consistent with the preservation of our national honour....." Also if Dost Mohammad prefers a Persian and a Russian alliance to that of the British Government, he will be committing a gross error in judgment, "the consequence of which he must be content to endure."⁴

A month later, *i.e.*, on 27th April 1838, the Governor-General made up his mind. On that day letters were written to Burnes, Dost Mohammad and the Honourable the Secret Committee.⁵ All these letters show Lord Auckland's exaggerated fear of Russia. He thought that although Russian help to Persia would have the immediate effect of furthering the Persian cause, yet ultimately Russia would extend her influence and intrigues to "the very frontiers of our Indian Empire."⁶ He thought that "Russia can have

¹ Government to Wade, 28th March 1838.

² *Ibid.*

³ Treaty with Persia of 1814.

⁴ Secretary to Wade with enclosures, containing copy of a letter to Burnes, 28th March 1838.

⁵ Government to Wade, 27th April 1838.

⁶ Letter to Secret Committee. *Ibid.*

no legitimate ground for extending her political connection to Afghanistan, while we are necessarily interested in the peace and independence of that country by proximity and position."

About the Persian Treaty of 1814 he wrote that Persia had departed from the Treaty by connecting herself with Russia in such matters as will be injurious to the British in India, which was opposed to the purpose of the treaty.

Dost Mohammad had suggested that the Kabul Government and the British Government should combine openly to resist the advance of the Persians. This hurt the pride of Lord Auckland. Burnes was informed that, though that topic (combined resistance to Persia) might be a subject of anxiety to the Amir, it was "in no degree alluded to or contemplated in the propositions tendered for his acceptance by your Government." This means if anything, that Dost Mohammad had no right to make any suggestion to the British Government to which the Government itself did not allude first. Moreover the Amir was to be told that the British Government "yet stands in need of no aid for its defence." The Government's good offices with respect to the Sikh-Afghan dispute were also to be withdrawn. Captain Burnes was sent a letter of 'recall' to be delivered to Dost Mohammad at the proper moment with an explanation of the reasons of that step. Dost Mohammad was also to be warned that if he, in alliance with Persia or Russia did anything hostile to the Maharaja or the British Government "he will incur a new danger, probably far more serious than is to be apprehended by him under any circumstances from Persian enmity or estrangement."

Thus Lord Auckland decided finally to break with Dost Mohammad. He also hinted pretty plainly at the serious danger that Dost Mohammad would incur from an alliance with Persia or Russia. But Dost Mohammad had realised by now that the friendship of the British Government would neither help him get Peshawar, nor save him from aggressions from the westward, nor would his propositions of a combined resistance to Persia be accepted, or even discussed. So why should he care for their friendship which would neither be useful itself, nor let others be useful to him. He therefore drifted into the arms of Russia.

It was decided by Lord Auckland to reinstate Shah Shuja on the throne of Kabul. The restrictions imposed upon the Shah's correspondence with his friends in Afghanistan were removed.¹ Mr. Macnaghten the Secretary to the Government of India was placed at the head of a mission to be sent to Lahore to explain the circumstances leading to Captain Burnes' recall and to negotiate a treaty for the reinstatement of Shah Shuja on the throne of Kabul.²

So this Russian fear from which the Governor-General suffered led to the decision to replace Shah Shuja on the throne from which he had been separated for about thirty years, and ultimately to the First Afghan War, one of the most futile wars of history. Lord Auckland's policy leading towards that war has been described in this article mostly in his own words. It speaks for itself, and there is no need to condemn the already much condemned policy. All one need say is that if statesmanship means the achieving of maximum results with minimum loss, Lord Auckland was no statesman. His main concern was the defence of Indian frontiers, and by some queer logic he arrived at the conclusion that the best way to defend was to attack. He did attack and the result was that after a loss of some 20,000 lives, the world witnessed one of the most remarkable and tragic 'as you weres' of history.³

¹ Book 121, letter 62.

² Book 121, letters 56 and 57.

³ The books and letter numbers given in footnotes are according to the arrangement in the Lahore Record Office.

QUINQUENNIAL CIRCUITS OR TRANSFERS OF ASOKA'S OFFICIALS.

By

A. C. WOOLNER.

In Asoka's Third Rock Edict the King commands that certain officials (*yutā rājūke ca pradesike ca* G. III. 2. = *yutā lajūke ca pādesike* (—). D. III. 10.) must every five years *anusamyānam niyātu* G. = *anusayāram nikhamāvū* D. J. "for this object the inculcation of the Laws of Dharma, to wit—" so and so.

In the Provincial's Edict (Dhauri I. 24. 25. = Jaugada I. 11. 12. Vincent Smith's No. II.) the King says that for this purpose (*i.e.*, the prevention of certain municipal abuses) by reason of Dharma (*dharmate*) *nikhāmayisāmi* every five years such as will be of mild and temperate disposition, and regardful of the sanctity of life, who knowing this my purpose will comply with my instructions. But from Ujjain (*Ujjenite*) the Prince, for this purpose, *nikhāmayisati* a similar body (*heḥiṣam eva vagam*) and will not overpass three years. In the same way from Taxila (*Takhasilāte*). When these High Officers *anusamyāram nikhamisanti*, then without neglecting their own (ordinary) business, they will attend to this matter also, and thus act in accordance with the King's instructions.

Many years ago M. Senart rendered *anusamyānam* as "assembly," and the late Mr. Vincent Smith in his Asoka (1901 edition p. 116) labelled the Third Edict "The Quinquennial Assembly," translating the phrase in question "must every five years repair to the General Assembly" and (p. 138) "I shall cause to be summoned to the Assembly—," and "The officials attending the Assembly—."

In a footnote however (p. 117) it is recorded that Professor Kern translated by "tour of inspection" instead of "assembly." Bühler translated "go forth on a tour." Hultzsch, "complete tour." Vincent Smith himself gave up "assembly" for "circuit."

Then in his last edition of Asoka (1920) he adopted a new interpretation. Edict III becomes "The System of Quinquennial Official Transfers." The officials "must every five years proceed in succession (*anu*) on transfer" (p. 163), and in the Provincial's Edict, "I shall send forth in rotation——" and "When the High Officers aforesaid—proceed on transfer in rotation."

This change is based on an article by Mr. Jayaswal in the Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society (IV. 37). Mr. Jayaswal rejects the old translation by "assembly" because "*Exit* cannot denote 'coming together' or 'assembling.' *Anu-sam-yāna* therefore has not been used in the sense of 'assembly.' Literally it means 'going together,' 'departure' *samyāna*, 'in sequence' or 'regularly' (*anu*)."

Then it is objected that the whole body of the High Ministers would not 'go out' or 'be turned out' together, for the purpose of going on an official tour. The abuses they were to check, refer to Tosali itself, so why should they leave Tosali?

Mr. Jayaswal then refers to the *Sūkranīti* as providing for the transfer of 'cabinet ministers' every three or five, seven or ten years, for 'authority in the hand of anyone should not be long,' and he quotes a passage from the Divyāvadāna referring to a revolt in Takshasila in Asoka's reign, in which the townspeople say "We are not opposed to the Prince nor to King Asoka, but *dustātmano*, 'mātyā āgatyāsmākam apamānam kurvanti."

In connection with this Mr. Jayaswal takes the words *nikhāmayisāmi*, *e akhakhase acamde sakhinālabhe hosati* as "I will make the Ministers go out" and "those will become Ministers who are not rough and violent." (Everyone else takes the relative clause to describe the object of *nikhāmayisati*). This is an ingenious combination, but it is not free from difficulties. It seems a curiously indirect way of providing for the performance of certain work, to say that the officials are to "go out," "be turned out" of their posts, in order that the work may be done (by someone else). Perhaps Mr. Jayaswal contemplates not a wholesale dismissal of high officials, but rather a general exchange of offices and portfolios. In Indian States certainly,

the Director of Education of one year may become the Chief Judge or Revenue Minister of the next year and so on. But then why should the similar body go out from Ujjain? Presumably they are to go to Taxila or somewhere else being replaced by other officials on transfer. Surely such a general post of all the high officials of the Empire is quite as unlikely as a simultaneous going out on tour from Taxila or elsewhere. That Taxila would be left as deserted as Delhi in the summer-time may seem improbable, but a simultaneous transfer seems much more improbable. Besides it was clearly a local operation. The Prince in Ujjain is to send his party out from Ujjain, and the Prince in Taxila is to send his party out from Taxila. Where were they to go? Any system of transfer from one provincial capital to another would necessarily be arranged by the central government not left to the Viceroys.

The generally accepted meaning of a "tour" or "circuit" is quite in accordance with custom. At no time would a governor or district officer have been considered efficient if he spent his whole time at headquarters. He has to go round his district or province, and see for himself what is going on.

What then, we may ask, is Mr. Jayaswal's evidence for the idea of transfer?

The fact that newly arrived ministers caused the trouble in Taxila has no necessary connection with the officials whom the Prince was to send out from Taxila. Akasmā need not be translated as "sudden" it can be "without due cause," a rendering which Vincent Smith retained. The passage in the Sukranīti does indeed show that certain officials were to be changed after 3, 5, 7 or 10 years, and that offices were exchanged.

Uktam tal-likhitaih sarvam vidyāt tad anudarsibhih
 pariartya nrpo hy etān yuñjyād anyonya-karmani. 107.
 ekasminn adhikāre tu purusānām trayam sadā
 niyuñjīta prājñātāmam mukhyam ekam tu tesu vai. 109.
 dvau darsakau tu tatkārye hāyanais tan-nivartanam
 tribhir vā pañcabhir vāpi saptabhir dasabhisca vā. 110.

nādhikāram ciraṃ dadyād yasmai kasmai sadā nṛpaḥ. 111.

adhikāramadam pītvā ko na muhyāt punas ciraṃ ? 112.

ataḥ kāryaksamam drstvā kārye' nye tam niyojayet. 113.

“The King should not let anyone hold office for a long time.”

“So seeing that (an officer) is fit for some work, he should appoint him to another post.” Śukranīti II. 107—113.

In all this we do not find *anusamyānam* or any close parallel to the supposed use of *nikhāmayisati*.

So that granting that transfers were common, the argument really rests on the assumption that *anusamyānam* means “going out together in succession :” on the basis of that, *nikhāmāvū* is rendered “must be turned out” which implies what it is desired to prove.

Now did *anusamyānam* mean going (out) together (*sam*), in sequence (*anu*)? Let us look at the meanings given for other compounds with a *ru-sam* as given in Monier William's Dictionary.

We find *anu-sam-carati* “visit, penetrate, traverse”

anu-sam-tanoti “overspread, extend everywhere”

anu-sam-dadhāti “explore, inspect”

anu-sam-vicarati “visit successively, make the round of”

anu-sam-yāti “go up and down, sentry-go.”

Again we may refer to the Pali Text Society's new Dictionary.

anusaññāti “to go to, inspect, control”

anusanyāyāti “traverse, go up to, surround, visit.”

anusancarati “to walk along, to go round about, to visit.”

All these meanings are appropriate to the work of a district officer and seem more to the point than being ‘turned out’ of office “in turn.”

The officers were not to neglect their work, says Mr. Jayaswal. True, but there is no reason to suppose the bulk of their work was in Taxila, or Ujjain, reading files or writing reports.

Mr. Jayaswal himself goes further than Vincent Smith would follow. The Rajukas and Pradesikas, according to him, were not district officers, but Imperial Ministers at Patna and Provincial Minis-

ters at provincial capitals. If so, why are both words in the singular in this passage of the third Rock Edict?

In Pillar Edict IV. *lajūkās* are said to be appointed over *bahusa pāna-sata-sahasasu janasi*. Mr. Jayaswal says that "lacs and lacs" can only indicate the central government. Probably the population of India was less in Asoka's days than it is now—but can we press the phrase to so definite a conclusion? In the first Rock Edict it is stated that formerly *bahūni pāna-sata-sahasāni* were slaughtered daily in the King's kitchen.

This suggestion thrown out by Mr. Jayaswal in 1918, and accepted by the late Mr. Vincent Smith, has been ignored in the Cambridge History of India.¹ Perhaps Mr. Jayaswal himself would not now maintain the "transfer" interpretation, but as the Rulers of India series is widely used, it may be worth while recording the objections to it.

¹ As also by Dr. Hultzsch in the new edition of the first volume of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum* and by Prof. Radhakumud Mookerji in his *Asoka*. 1928.

THE TRIAL OF RAJA LAL SINGH, 1846.

By

R. R. SETHI.

The Governor of Kashmir on the part of the Lahore State, Shaikh Imam-ud-Din, having resisted by force of arms the occupation of the Province of Kashmir by Maharaja Gulab Singh in October, 1846, the Lahore Government was called upon to coerce their subject, and to make over the Province to the representative of the British Government, in fulfilment of the conditions of the Treaty of March, 1846. A British force was employed to support and aid the combined forces of the Lahore State and of Maharaja Gulab Singh in these operations.

Shaikh Imam-ud-Din intimated to the British Government that he was acting under orders received from the Lahore Darbar in the course he was pursuing ; and stated that the insurrection had been instigated by written instructions received by him from the Wazir, Raja Lal Singh. He surrendered to the British Agent on a guarantee from that officer that if the Shaikh could, as he asserted, prove that his acts were in accordance with the instructions issued by the Lahore Minister, and that the opposition was instigated by him, the Darbar should not be permitted to inflict upon the Shaikh, either in his person or his property, any penalty on account of his conduct on this occasion. The British Agent pledged his Government to a full and impartial investigation of the matter.¹

Mr. Frederick Currie, Secretary to the Government of India in the Foreign Department, was deputed by the Governor-General "to

¹ Vide my article on "The Revolt in Kashmir, 1846" in Volume I, Part I of this Journal, pages 19—31.

investigate, in conjunction with Lieut.-Colonel H. M. Lawrence, the conduct of the Shaikh, in resisting, by force of arms, the execution of the Lahore Treaty, relating to the cession of the Province of Kashmir to the British nominee." ¹ Currie was instructed by the Governor-General that if it was proved, as maintained by the Shaikh, that Raja Lal Singh did encourage him to violate the Treaty, which the Lahore Darbar was bound faithfully to carry into effect, the immediate consequences of this betrayal of duty to Maharaja Dalip Singh, and of good faith to the British Government, were to be the deposition of the Wazir. If, however, the authenticity of the documents produced by the Shaikh, in palliation of his own criminal conduct, was disproved, that individual was to take the consequences of his own misdeeds; but it was apparent, from the nature of the papers which the Shaikh had produced, that the investigation was to be in reality the trial of the Wazir, Raja Lal Singh, and the Darbar.

The conviction of the Lahore Government in being implicated in a gross and violent infraction of the Treaty might have led, if pushed to the extreme limit, to very serious consequences; and it was not the intention of the Governor-General, therefore, to make the Lahore State responsible for the misconduct of one or more individuals. There was every reason to believe that the misconduct of Raja Lal Singh was to be attributed to his personal hatred of Maharaja Gulab Singh, and not to any political combination to violate the Treaty with the British Government. ²

Charged with these instructions and with the 'Kharita' from the Governor-General for Maharaja Dalip Singh, Currie proceeded forthwith to Lahore and arrived on December 1, 1846. He was met at Bhyrowal by Sardar Shamsher Singh Sindhanwala, Rai Kishen Chand, *Vakil*, and a few others, who had been deputed by the Darbar to accompany him to his camp through the Lahore District and provide supplies. ³

¹ The Governor-General to the Secret Committee dated Camp, Sham Chourasi, the 4th December, 1846. (Parliamentary Papers, 1844—47).

² The Governor-General to F. Currie, dated Camp, Hoshiarpur, the 23rd November, 1846. (Parliamentary Papers, 1844—47).

³ Panjab Government Records, Press List Volume IX, Serial No. 355, dated the 9th December, 1846. From F. Currie to H. M. Lawrence.

Currie entered Lahore with the usual ceremonies, having been met, some miles from the city, by Raja Lal Singh, Sardar Tej Singh, and the other Chiefs of the Darbar who escorted him to his tent.¹ It was no longer doubtful that an inquiry into the causes of Kashmir insurrection was to take place.² The Raja and the Rani were in great distress; the former holding private interviews from morning to night, the latter consulting the astrologers, and sacrificing to the gods in favour of the Raja.³

On December 2, a grand Darbar was held to receive the representative of the Governor-General who then delivered the Persian letter to the young Maharaja. On the same evening the Ministers and the Sardars paid him a visit of ceremony in his tent, and it was then that Faqir Nur-ud-Din read aloud for general information the contents of the letter received from the Governor-General. It congratulated His Highness on the happy and peaceful termination of the Kashmir rebellion, which at one time threatened to disturb the friendly relations then existing between the Lahore and the British Governments, by violating the terms of the Treaty so lately made at Lahore. It proceeded to inform the Maharaja that Shaikh Imam-ud-Din had, at last, only given himself up to the British authorities on their promise that the causes of the rebellion should be investigated, for he solemnly declared that he had acted under orders from Lahore in resisting the transfer of Kashmir to Maharaja Gulab Singh. Finally, it pointed out the necessity of such an investigation to prove the truth or falsehood of the Shaikh's allegations.⁴

¹ Panjab Government Records, Press List Volume IX, Serial No. 355, dated the 23d December, 1846. From F. Currie to H. M. Lawrence.

² Henry Lawrence writing to F. Currie in this connection "On my return to Lahore from Kashmir on the 30th November, I found rumours very generally afloat that when Shaikh Imam-ud-Din made his submission to me at Thana on the 1st of the month, he had given up to me certain papers criminating me. Those members of the Ministry, who were most in the Raja's confidence, seem up to the last moment, to have been ignorant or at least affected to be unaware of the existence of any such papers, and scarcely a day passed in which they did not question him on the subject and advise him, if he were guilty, to acknowledge it and throw himself on the generosity of the British Government. To all such advice he obstinately replied that he knew nothing of the papers, and had never held any secret correspondence on the subject." Panjab Government Records, Press List Volume IX, Serial No. 365, dated the 17th December, 1846. From H. M. Lawrence to F. Currie.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ The Governor-General to the Secret Committee (No. 57), dated the 4th December, 1846. Enclosure 2 in No. 8 (Parliamentary Papers, 1844—47).

The Ministers and the Sardars were accordingly informed that on the following day, December 3, at 8 a.m. a Court of Inquiry would assemble at the Darbar tent. The Court was to be perfectly open to all, and the Sardars of all ranks were invited to attend.

At the appointed hour next day the Court assembled, constituted as follows :—¹

President :

Mr. Frederick Currie, Secretary to the Government of India.

Members :

Lieut.-Colonel H. M. Lawrence, C.B., Agent to the Governor-General.

Major-General Sir John Littler, K. C. B., Commanding the Garrison.

Mr. John Lawrence, C.S., Commissioner, Jullundur.

Lieut.-Colonel A. Goldie, Commanding the 12th Native Infantry.

¹ The Governor-General's directions to Mr. Currie, "so to arrange the inquiry into the Shaikh's conduct, in concert with the Lahore authorities, that there should be no ground for suspicion in any quarter as to the fairness of the proceedings." (The Governor-General to F. Currie, dated Camp Hoshiarpur, the 23rd November, 1846—Parliamentary Papers, 1844—47), shows that His Lordship contemplated the possible necessity of associating some members of the Darbar too as judges. But Currie did not think this to be fair, and wrote to the Governor-General on December 2, expressing his opinion: "I have consulted with Lieut.-Colonel Lawrence and Mr. John Lawrence upon the subject, and we have determined that it is impossible to associate any members of the Darbar with us as judges of the conduct of Shaikh Imam-ud-Din. His plea and grounds of defence are known to all, and they directly implicate the Darbar; the matter at issue being, whether he was, or was not, acting in accordance to their instruction, in forcibly opposing the occupation of Kashmir by Maharaja Gulab Singh, and in raising the rebellion in that Province. Neither could we associate with us other Chiefs not members of the Darbar. In the first place this would be calling on the subjects of the Lahore State to sit in judgment on the acts of their Government, and in the next, it would be impossible to find any Chief who is not a friend or enemy of the Wazir, and interested either in his conviction or acquittal.

"The only mode of fairly redeeming the promise under which the Shaikh surrendered and of doing impartial justice to all, appears to us to be, that the Shaikh's conduct and defence should be investigated by a tribunal of British officers in the presence of the parties interested in the result of the trial. I have, therefore, requested General Littler to join us in this inquiry, and to nominate another intelligent officer of high rank also to act as a member, and we propose that the Court shall consist of myself as President, Major-General Littler, Lieut.-Colonel Lawrence, Mr. John Lawrence and Lieut.-Colonel Goldie (the Officer General Littler seems to desire to name) as members." Panjab Government Records, Press List Volume IX, Serial No. 355, dated the 9th December, 1846. From F. Currie to H. M. Lawrence.

To this the Governor-General agreed and wrote thus to the Secret Committee on December 4, 1846: "The course which has been determined upon by Mr. Currie, on consultation with Lieut.-Colonel Lawrence and Mr. John Lawrence has my full approbation, as being the best adopted to remove many of the objections which would have attended a mixed Commission of Sikh Sardars, associated with British Officers, for the investigation; or, on the other hand, the selection of a tribunal entirely composed of Sikh functionaries." (Parliamentary Papers, 1844—47).

Raja Lal Singh, Diwan Dina Nath, Sardar Tej Singh, Khalifa Nur-ud-Din, Sardar Attar Singh Kalehwala, Sardar Sher Singh Attariwala and a large assemblage of other Sardars attended, as did also Shaikh Imam-ud-Din and his officers.

The Shaikh, being called on to make his statement, declared that he received secret instructions from Raja Lal Singh, through his confidential agent, Puran Chand, to resist the occupation of Kashmir by Maharaja Gulab Singh, and to create disturbance in the Province; that he replied in a matter of this kind the mere letters of Puran Chand would not be sufficient for him to act upon, he must have a writing from the Raja to himself, and a paper to assure and guide the troops; and that he subsequently received the three papers which he had delivered to Colonel Lawrence at Thana, and that he considered these papers his warrant for raising the rebellion which he had headed.

The proofs adduced by the Shaikh in substantiation of his statement were these: (a) a letter written to him by Raja Lal Singh, desiring him to create disturbances in Kashmir, and oppose the occupation thereof by Maharaja Gulab Singh; (b) an *ikrarnama* which accompanied the above letter, engaging to maintain him in his *jagirs*, and to intercede with the British officers for his Jullundur property, and promising further reward to him, and to his followers, if he did as directed in the letter; (c) a *parwana* from the Darbar to the officers and soldiers in Kashmir, exhorting them to exert themselves and do good service at the bidding of the Shaikh, without fear of consequences, and promising in that case, that they should be continued in service when they came to Lahore; (d) the evidence of Puran Chand corroborating the statement of the Shaikh, as to the nature of the communications which passed between Raja Lal Singh and the Shaikh, through him, his confidential agent at Lahore, and as to the authenticity of the documents produced; and (e) the evidence of Diwan Hakim Rai, a confidential servant of the Darbar, who was deputed from Lahore in August, 1846, to bring away the Shaikh from Kashmir.¹

¹ The evidence of Diwan Hakim Rai was important. He was sent to Kashmir in consequence of the British authorities urging the Lahore Darbar to send a special emissary to bring away the Shaikh. He declared in his evidence that he received secret instructions from Raja Lal Singh, directing him to aid and assist the Shaikh, who had been written to by the Raja to raise disturbances in the Province.—Panjab Government Records, Press List Volume IX, Serial No. 255, dated the 9th December, 1846. From F. Currie to H. M. Lawrence.

The circumstances stated in the defence bore very little on the matter at issue. The only facts stated were (a) the orders given by the Darbar to the Shaikh to evacuate the Province ; (b) the *parwana* sent to Diwan Hakim Rai to proceed on his mission ; and (c) the practice of not employing an agent to write the letters addressed to his master. The first two of these were admitted but they did not affect the case ; and the third was satisfactorily disproved by a document admitted to be true.

Upon full deliberation and consideration of the evidence and the statements, the Court of Inquiry recorded their unanimous opinion that it was established and proved beyond doubt, that the Wazir, Raja Lal Singh, did encourage Shaikh Imam-ud-Din to excite disturbance in Kashmir, and to oppose the occupation of the Province by Maharaja Gulab Singh ; and that he did encourage the troops in the Province to aid the Shaikh in the late rebellion.

Mr. Frederick Currie explained to the members of the assembly, after the verdict was given, that it was not the intention of the Governor-General to consider the misconduct of the Wazir as a violation of the Treaty of Peace, and as involving the termination of the relations of amity which had been established between the two Governments, and that His Lordship would consent to accept the deposition of Raja Lal Singh as an atonement for his attempt to infringe the Treaty by secret intrigues and machinations.

It was manifestly impossible that the Government of the Maharaja could be carried on with any prospect of success by one who had proved so faithless to His Highness' interests, or that the British Government could continue to act in concert with one who had so grievously offended them.¹

The Ministers and the principal Sardars acknowledged, more candidly than might have been expected, the impossibility of the Raja any longer being the Wazir ; and his deposition once determined on, he seemed to pass altogether from their minds, or only to be remembered as a large *jagirdar*, whose income must be recovered to the

¹ Panjab Government Records, Press List Volume IX, Serial No. 355, dated the 9th December, 1846. From F. Currie to H. M. Lawrence.

State without delay. Diwan Dina Nath, the most practical man in the Ministry, who had singlehandedly defended the Raja in the face of facts to the last moment, as soon as the verdict was pronounced, passed on without a remark to the necessary arrangements for securing his relatives, Misr Amir Chand and Misr Bhagwan Das who held extensive districts in the Province and were defaulters to a large amount.¹

This indifference to the Raja's fate is to be accounted for by his policy in the Wazarat. Instead of trying, as any sensible man in his position would have done, to make himself popular with the Sardars and 'win golden opinions from all sorts of men,' by attending to the interests of the Khalsa and administering the revenues with liberality; he early took the first step to his downfall, by acting as if he considered it certain and laying up ill-gotten gains against the evil day. He discharged as many of the old Sikh soldiers as he could; and entertained in their places foreigners from his own country and Hindustan, and while, reducing the *jagirs* of the Sardars on the plea of public poverty, he appropriated enormous grants to himself or lavished them on his relatives and servants. His brothers, relations and servants were all largely provided for at the expense of the State; though when he found, by orders from Henry Lawrence from Simla in July and August 1846, that Government would not permit him openly to appropriate ten lacs of rupees of *jagirs* for the payment of his own 'Body-guard,' he denied all intention of so doing. He refrained from having the Sanads, which had been prepared issued—but by private orders he regularly received the proceeds of these *jagirs* and paid

¹ Panjab Government Records, Press List Volume IX, Serial No. 365, dated the 17th December, 1846. From H. M. Lawrence to F. Currie.

The Governor-General entirely concurred in the decision of the Court and confirmed the same. The Governor-General writing to F. Currie in a letter dated, Bhyrowal Ghat, the 7th December 1846: "You selected the best form and mode of proceeding, and the invitation given to the leading Chiefs to attend the examination of the witnesses in open Darbar, was well calculated to satisfy all parties that the inquiry would be conducted in a fair and impartial manner; and I am gratified to find by your report of the 5th instant received this morning that the Chiefs had unanimously assented to the mode of investigation as being satisfactory to them. You further state that all the Chiefs were unanimous in assenting to the immediate deposition of the Raja from the Wazarat. I have attentively perused the whole of these documents. I concur in the decision, which is clearly justified by the evidence and I confirm it." Panjab Government Records, Press List Volume IX, Serial No. 355, dated the 9th December 1846. From F. Currie to H. M. Lawrence.

Cortlandt's and other Battalions, as also some others as his own personal retainers.¹ As a minister, therefore, the Raja failed to conciliate either the Chiefs or the army; and as a private character, he was personally odious to the Sikhs for his intrigues with Ranjit Singh's widow.

One of his favourite projects was the establishment of the 'Body-guard' (above referred to), which was to prove faithful, when all others might desert him. It was composed of about 2,000 Afghan *sawars* under Sardar Sultan Mohammad Khan of Barukzai, brother of Dost Mohammad Khan of Kabul, and four Infantry Regiments of Hindustanians with two troops of Horse Artillery, under the command of General Cortlandt. His two brothers appear to have had similar bodies of men at their disposal. The anxiety of the Raja during a few days preceding the trial had made him draw most of these guards around him within the Palace walls; and the absurdity of relying on such anti-national supports was strongly exemplified on the occasion of his deposition—when if ever—their devotion should have been shown. To General Cortlandt orders were given to withdraw his infantry and guns; to the Barukzai Chief to retire with his *sawars*, and both orders were tamely and unhesitatingly obeyed.²

On December 4, on the termination of the investigation and after the sentence of "guilty" had been pronounced, Henry Lawrence, attended by the rest of the Darbar, went to the Palace, and the result of the investigation and the removal of Raja Lal Singh from the Wazarat was communicated to the Maharani by Faqir Nur-ud-Din and Diwan Dina Nath.³ The charge of the Palace was, at this time, made over to Sardar Sher Singh Attariwala, brother-in-law of the Maharaja, who had gained considerable credit lately by his spirited administration at Peshawar, and active co-operation with Maharaja Gulab Singh in suppressing the Kashmir rebellion. Meanwhile, the Raja himself was conducted by Lieut. Edwardes from the tent wherein

¹ Panjab Government Records, Press List Volume IX, Serial No. 365, dated the 17th December, 1846. From H. M. Lawrence to F. Currie.

² *Ibid.*

³ "On the news being communicated, as could be expected, the Maharani became greatly outrageous," Panjab Government Records, Press List Volume IX, Serial No. 357, dated the 10th December 1846. From H. M. Lawrence to F. Currie,

the Court was held, to his own house within the city, escorted by a detachment of his own 'Body-guard'.

To prevent even the slightest hindrance of public business, the powers of Government were, as a temporary arrangement, vested in a Council of four, *viz.*, Sardar Tej Singh, Sardar Sher Singh, Diwan Dina Nath and Faqir Nur-ud-Din; and circular orders were immediately issued by the Darbar to all the Kardars in the kingdom, informing them of the Wazir's deposition for treason to his sovereign, and that no *parwanas* were to be obeyed which did not bear the four seals of the Council.¹

After the deposition of the Raja from the Wazarat, it was resolved to remove him also from the Lahore State. This was rendered necessary by his intimacy with the Queen-Mother, who laying aside even the last appearances of matronly modesty, had abandoned herself to alternate ravings and intrigues—now imprecating, now imploring the Sardars, the British Resident, in fact anybody, to restore her lover. But it was considered quite inconsistent with the peace of the Province that the Rani and the Raja should both remain in it. Accordingly, on December 13, 1846, the Raja was removed under charge of Lieut. Wroughton of the 12th Native Infantry, escorted by the 27th Native Infantry Regiment, 200 Sikh *sawars* and a company of Sikh Infantry,² to Ferozepore, *en route* to Agra in British territory, where he lived upon a pension of Rs. 2,000³ a month from the Lahore State⁴ till October 1852, when he was allowed by the Governor-General in Council to reside at Dehra Dun in winter and at Mussoorie in summer,⁵ of course under strict surveillance as

¹ Panjab Government Records, Press List Volume IX, Serial No. 365, dated the 17th December, 1846. From H. M. Lawrence to F. Currie.

² Panjab Government Records, Press List Volume IX, Serial No. 1059, dated the 11th December, 1846. From H. M. Lawrence to Lieut. Wroughton, 12th N. I.

³ In April 1849, this amount was reduced by half.—Panjab Government Records, Press List Volume XI, Serial No. 31, dated the 23rd April, 1849. From the Secretary to the Board of Administration, Panjab, to H. M. Elliot, Secretary to the Government of India, with the Governor-General.

⁴ Panjab Government Records, Press List Volume IX, Serial No. 139, dated the 25th August, 1847. From W. Edwardes, Under-Secretary to the Government of India with the Governor-General, Foreign Department, to H. M. Lawrence, Resident at Lahore and Agent, Governor-General, N.-W.F.

⁵ Panjab Government Records, Press List Volume XI, Serial No. 2035, dated the 29th October, 1852. From the Offg. Secretary to the Government of India to the Board of Administration for the Affairs of the Panjab.

before.¹ In June 1862, the Raja petitioned praying to be permitted to return to the Panjab, but his request was not complied with.² It was in September 1867, after his death, that his son Ranbir Singh was allowed to come to this Province.³

¹ Panjab Government Records, Press List Volume XI, Serial No. 2070, dated the 7th December, 1852. From the Secretary to the Government, N. W. Provinces, to the Secretary to the Board of Administration, Panjab.

² Panjab Government Records, Press List Volume XX, Serial No. 1789, dated the 7th July, 1862. From the Secretary to Government, Panjab, to the Commissioner of the Meerut Division.

³ Panjab Government Records, Press List Volume XXI, Serial No. 1763, dated the 21st September, 1867. From the Secretary to Government, Panjab, to the Secretary to Government, N.-W. Provinces.

THE PERSIAN EMPEROR CYRUS THE GREAT, AND THE
INDIAN "SAKA" ERA.

BY

GULSHAN RAI,

Sanatana Dharma College, Lahore.

[Paper read 24th February 1923.]

(Continued from page 73.)

There is one other point in this connection which may be mentioned. I have already quoted Varahamihira's Brihatsanhita, Chapter VIII, verses 20-21. They are :—

गतानि वर्षाणि शकेन्द्रकालाद्गतानि रुद्रैर्गुणयेच्चतुर्भिः ।
नवाष्टपञ्चाष्टयुतानि कृत्वा विभाजयेच्छून्यशरागरामैः ॥२०॥
लब्धेन युक्तं शकभूपकालं संशोध्य षष्ट्या विषयैर्विभज्य ।
युगानि नारायणपूर्वकाणि लब्धानि शेषाः क्रमशः समाःस्युः ॥२१॥

It means :—Multiply by 11 and then by 4 the years that have passed in the Era of the Saka King. Add to the product 8589, and divide the resultant by 3750. Then add to the quotient the years of the Saka King, and divide the resultant by 60. Then divide the remainder by 5. The quotient is the number of Yugas elapsed from the commencement of Narayani, and the remainder are the years in the current Yuga.

These verses evidently give a method for finding out the Samvatsara year in the 60 year Cycle of Jupiter. Let us apply this formula in the first place taking the commencement of the Saka Era in 550 B. C., and let us see what Samvatsara year it gives for the present day. I will then apply the same formula, assuming that Saka Era began in 78 A. D., and see what results this gives. Assuming that the Saka Era is 550 B. C., the present year in this Era is the close of 2481. Multiplying it by 44 we get 109,164. Add to it 8589, and we get 117,753. Divide it by 3750, and the quotient is 31. Add this figure of 31 to 2481, the present day Saka

King's year. That gives 2512. Divide it by 60. The remainder is 52. This gives 10 Yugas elapsed and 2 Samvatsaras passed in the 11th Yuga. Let us now apply the same formula with the assumption that Saka year began in 78 A. D. Then the present Saka year is the end of 1853. Multiplying it by 44 we get 81,532. Add to it 8589, and we get 90,121. Divide it by 3750, and the quotient is 24. Now add this 24 to 1853, the present day Saka Salivahana year. This gives 1877. Divide it by 60. The remainder is 17. This gives 3 Yugas elapsed, and 2 Samvatsaras passed in the 4th Yuga.

By adopting 550 B. C. as the commencement of the Era, we get 52 elapsed and 53rd current Samvatsara in the 60 year Jupiter Cycle. By adopting 78 A. D. as the initial date of this Era we get 17 elapsed and 18th current Samvatsara in this Jupiter Cycle. Now which is the correct Samvatsara. Let us look at the existing Almanacs. In the Deccan Almanacs the current Samvatsara is Prajapati, the 5th in the list. In North India Almanacs the current Samvatsara is Tarana, the 18th in the list. A cursory view would show that the north Indian almanacs consider the Salivahana Era to be identical with the Saka Era, and the Deccan Almanac Samvatsara is wrong according to the formula of Varahamihira. But a closer study of the problem would show that neither of these two present day almanacs is correct. There are according to Surya Siddhanta, 364,220 revolutions of Jupiter in a Mahayuga of 4,320,000 years. That gives for each revolution of Jupiter a period of 11.860963154137 years. Multiplying it by 5 we get 60 year Samvatsara Cycle of Jupiter. That gives for each Jupiter Cycle a period of 59.304816 years. From the beginning of Kaliyuga, there have so far elapsed 84 such cycles. This last cycle ended in Kaliyuga year 4981. The current Kaliyuga year is 5033. That gives us Samvatsara 52. This is exactly the result we arrived at by applying Varahamihira formula on the assumption that the Saka King Era began in 550 B. C.

Now let us examine the question from another point of view. All modern astronomers are agreed that the precession of equinoxes is $50.26''$ per annum. Indian Astronomers have calculated that this precession of equinoxes, called in Sanskrit, Ayana Gati, is $50''$ per

annum. The calculation is so approximately true, that for all practical purposes, results arrived at by them may be taken to be correct. From Varahamihira we know, at what point in the ecliptic were Winter and Summer Solstices, both at the time when Vedanga Jyotish was written, and when Varahamihira himself flourished. From this we can find out the exact number of degrees by which the Solstices in the ecliptic have receded. By dividing this difference by the rate of the precession of equinoxes, we can calculate the exact number of years which intervened between the time of Vedanga Jyotish and Varahamihira. Then again we know the present position of the Solstices, and from this we can calculate the period by which we are separated from Varahamihira. That would definitely fix the date of Varahamihira, and then we will be in a position to say which Saka Era he is using in his books. In his book Brihat Samhita, Chapter III, verses 1 and 2, he says :—

आश्लेषार्द्धाद्दक्षिणमुत्तरमयनं रवेर्धनिष्ठाद्यम् ।
 नूनं कदाचिदासीद् येनोक्तं पूर्वशास्त्रेषु ॥१॥
 साम्प्रतमयनं सवितुः कर्कटकाद्यं मृगादितश्चान्यत् ।
 उक्ताभावो विकृतिः प्रत्यक्षपरीक्षणैर्व्यक्तिः ॥२॥

They mean :—“At one time the Sun’s southward course commenced on his reaching the middle of Ashlesha, and its northward course on his reaching the beginning of Dhanishtha. This must have been the case as we find it so recorded in ancient Sastras. But at present the one course of the Sun commences at the beginning of Karka (Cancer), and the other at the beginning of Makara (Capricornus.) That it is so, and different from what it was at one time, can easily be ascertained from actual observation as follows.”

At the present time the Zodiacal sign of Karka (Cancer) begins at 90° of the ecliptic and ends at 120°. The sign Makara (Capricornus) begins at 270° and ends at 300°. The Nakshatra Ashlesha on the other hand begins at 106°—40’ and ends at 120°. The Summer Solstice at the time of the Vedanga Jyotish was in the middle of Ashlesha, that is to say at 113°—20’, and Winter Solstice in the beginning of Dhanishtha, or at

293°—20'. In 1931 the Summer Solstice had receded to a point in the Nakshatra, Ardra, *i.e.*, at 67°—16'-20" in the ecliptic, and the Winter Solstice to a point in the Nakshatra, Mula, *i.e.*, at 247°—16'-20", in the ecliptic. So in 1931 there was a precession of the equinoxes to the extent of (113°—20')—(67°—16'-20")=46°—3'-40" which is the interval between ourselves and the times of the Vedanga Jyotish. Dividing this by 50.26" the rate of precession, we get 3299 years, or 1368 B. C. Mr. Davies and Col. Wilford fix 1391 B. C. as the date of Vedanga Jyotish. Sir William Jones, Colebrook, Weber, B. G. Tilak, and R. C. Dutt also accept this date. Now let us see what is the difference in time between Varahamihira and Vedanga Jyotish on the one hand and Varahamihira and our own times on the other hand. We have seen above that in his work Brihat Samhita, Chapter III, verses 1 and 2, Varahamihira says that in his time the Sun commenced his southward course in Karka (Cancer). In another work of his, Pancha Siddhantika, Chapter III, verse 21, he says :—

अश्लेषाद्वासीच्चदा निवृत्तिः किलोष्णकिरणस्य ।

युक्तमयनं तदासीत् साम्प्रतमयनं पुनर्वसुतः ॥२१॥

Which means :—“ When the return of the Sun towards the south took place from the middle of Ashlesha, then the Ayana was right. At the present time the Ayana begins from Punarvasu.”

From this we find that in Brihat Samhita Varahamihira distinctly says that the Sun commenced his southern course in Karka (Cancer). This Zodiacal sign begins in 90° of the ecliptic. If we accept 78 A. D. as the commencement of the Saka Era used by him, then 427 Saka is 505 A. D., *i.e.*, 1426 years from the present time. If we take into calculation the precession of the Equinoxes then the Sun in that year should have commenced his southward journey at 87°—11' in the ecliptic. But this point is not in Karka (Cancer), but in Mithuna (Gemini). The last point in Karka, *viz.*, 90° had been crossed in the year 303 A. D. If this statement of Varahamihira is to be believed, then his date must be much earlier than the year 303 A. D. Then again in Panch Siddhantika Varahamihira says that the Sun commenced his southward course at

the end of the Nakshatra, Punarvasu, which means a point $93^{\circ}-20'$ in the ecliptic, or in other words we must take the time of Varahamihira 239 years earlier still, *i.e.*, to 64 A. D.

The only portion of Punarvasu which is common, with the Zodiacal sign of Karka (Cancer) is between 90 degrees and $93^{\circ}-20'$. So it appears at the time when Pancha Siddhantika was written, Summer Solstice may have taken place at $93^{\circ}-20'$, and Winter Solstice at $273^{\circ}-20'$. This means that the difference between Varahamihira and Vedanga Jyotish is 20 degrees of the ecliptic, and between Varahamihira and our times, $26^{\circ}-3'-40''$. Reducing them into years, we get 1432 years interval between Varahamihira and Vedanga Jyotish, and 1866 years interval between Varahamihira and our own times. So the date of Varahamihira is 1432-1368 or 1931-1866 ; *i.e.*, 64 A. D. in one case and 65 A. D. in the other case. The difference of one year is due to fractions involved in calculations. From the positions of solstices in the ecliptic thus given by Varahamihira, and recorded by him in his own books, Brihat Samhita and Pancha Siddhantika, we find that he must have flourished in the first century A. D. He may be a century earlier still, for a difference of even a degree and a half in the ecliptic means an interval of more than a century. We have already seen that according to Amaraja, Varahamihira died in 509 in the Saka King Era. If we take 550 B. C. as the commencement of this Era, then his death must have taken place in 41 B. C., which is quite reconcilable with the results arrived at by calculating equinoctial positions. The equinoctial position in 41 B. C. was $94^{\circ}-24'$, *i.e.*, the first half of the first quarter of Pushya Nakshatra, or very near the end of Punarvasu Nakshatra. In 123 B. C. which is arrived at by deducting 427 the basic figure of Varahamihira from 550 B. C. the Era of Cyrus the Great, the equinoctial position was $95^{\circ}-56'-54''$, again the first quarter of Pushya Nakshatra not very far from the end of Punarvasu.

In this connection it may also be pointed out, that we can find an explanation for the figure 427 used by Varahamihira in his calculations. 550 minus 427 is 123 B. C. We have just seen that his date of death is 41 B. C. So it is clear 427 cannot be the date of the book Pancha

Siddhantika, for he cannot be expected to have lived 82 years after writing his book, which cannot be the earliest one of his works. There is no evidence to show that 427 is the date of his birth. Then again it cannot be shown that 427 was the year when according to his calculations the precession was put at Zero, nor we are told there was any great conjunction of planets in this year, as was the case with the commencement of Kaliyuga. Why should have Varahamihira then selected the figure 427. I have shown above that it cannot represent the year 505 A. D. Let us see if by adopting 550 B. C. as the commencement of his Saka Era, 123 B. C. represents some historical event. If we look at the ancient History of Persia, we find that the Parthians became independent of the Greek Empire, in about 250 B. C. This Parthian dynasty lasted till 225 A. D. We also know that one of the kings in this dynasty, Mithradates I conquered Taxila in northern Punjab in about 138 B. C. But he was killed by the Yuichis in 136 B. C. He was succeeded on the Parthian throne by Phraates II, who ruled till 127 B. C. He was followed by Artabanu II, who ruled only 4 years, and died in 123 B. C. In 123 B. C. Mithradates II ascended the Parthian throne, and ruled for sufficiently long time till 88 B. C. It appears that from 136 B. C. to 123 B. C. during a period of 13 years the Parthian Empire was under a shadow, for within a period of 15 years it had 4 kings, on its throne. But it seems before 136 B. C. under Muthradates I and after 123 B. C. under Mithradates II, the Empire had stable government. The first monarch ruled for 38 years and the second for 35 years. Both were great conquerors, and both extended the limits of their empire. The first was little known in India, for within 2 years after his conquest of Taxila, he died. But the second Mithradates had made extensive conquests from the very beginning of his reign, and he also ruled for a sufficiently long time to have become widely known. We know from Indian History that during this period the Parthians had extensive territories in India. They were in occupation of western India as well. To the people in Malwa and its capital Ujjain they were well-known. In fact the Indian tradition has it, that it was a king of Ujjain, Vikramaditya, who defeated the Sakas in 57 B. C. About this time we

again find that there is a quick succession of short lived kings in Parthia. After the death of Mithradates II in 88 B. C. and before the death of Mithradates III in 56 B. C., there were in 32 years as many as 4 kings in Parthia. It is quite possible that during this period they were defeated in India. Because Mithradates II was a powerful king well-known in India, it is more than probable that Varahamihira took this king's date of coronation as the date for calculations in his astronomical works. We must also remember that the rise of the Parthian Empire in circa 250 B. C. was a result of a patriotic movement against the domination of the Greeks, who had overthrown the ancient Persian Empire of the Achæmedians in 331 B. C. It should not therefore be surprising, if the Parthians revived the Era of their ancient national hero, Cyrus the Great. This Era I have tried to show began is 550 B. C. There was an interval of 427 years between the epoch of Cyrus, and the coronation of Mithradates II. The Achæmedians had established an empire in India, and so did the Parthians. The Era of the Saka king Cyrus was known to the Indians, as is testified by the astronomer Garga the elder, and the new Saka king Mithradates II was as I have shown a contemporary of Varahamihira. There is under the circumstances nothing surprising, when we find him adopting the figure 427 for the purposes of his calculations.

So from the writings of Garga the elder, Varahamihira, Kalidasa, the Astronomer, Bhattotpala, and Bhaskaracharya, we are driven to the conclusion, that the Saka Era mentioned by these authorities is not the one counted from 78 A. D., but from 550 B. C. This does not necessarily mean, that no Era commenced in 78 A. D. What I am trying to establish is, that there were more than one Saka Eras. One 550 B. C. which was called the Era of Saka kings. The other was of 78 A. D. which was the Era of Salivahana, the Deccan King well-known to Indian tradition. It is notorious that the Huna invasions of India in the 5th and 6th centuries A. D. disorganised Indian society completely. We know that before the rise of the Chalukyias in the Deccan, there is a blank in the history of that part of the country, for several centuries. In northern India also, there was before the rise of Harshavardhana of Kanauj, a blank in the history for more than a

century. In the modern period too, between the fall of the Mughals, and the rise of British power in India, society had been disorganised to such an extent, that the people of India had lapsed into illiteracy, and the early British rulers had to take special steps to promote Oriental Learning. Our knowledge of our own ancient literature, had contracted so much that we had forgotten even our greatest of Emperors like Asoka, Chandragupta and Samudragupta. It is no wonder then, that after the cataclysm of Huna invasions, Indians lost to a very great extent a knowledge of their past. It seems after society was again reorganised in the 7th and 8th centuries A. D., Indians mixed up the 2 Sakas, the Saka Salivahana, and the Era of Saka King. Salivahana was remembered in the Deccan as an Emperor of the South. So here the Saka Era began to be associated with him. In northern India, Vikramaditya was remembered as the Emperor of the North. So here the Saka King's Era was forgotten, and Vikrama Era associated with his name spread in these parts. But Vikramaditya is still remembered as Saka-Ari or enemy of the Sakas.

The next question to settle is, when was this Era of the Saka Kings introduced into India, and who introduced it. On this point I can offer no definite explanation. But some few points might be mentioned in this connection. We know that Darius Hystaspes, the 2nd Persian Emperor after Cyrus the Great, who ruled from 521 B. C. to 485 B. C. conquered the north western portions of India in about 510 B. C. Herodotus, the Greek historian, tells us that India formed the 20th Satrapy of the Empire of Darius. We are also told that in the time of Darius, a Greek Admiral Skylax by name, traced the course of the river Indus, right upto the place where it falls into the sea, and that he navigated the coasts of the Arabian Sea, Persian Gulf, and the Red Sea. From this we can infer, that the entire Indus Valley, consisting of modern Sindh, western Punjab, Frontier Province, Baluchistan and Afghanistan formed part of the Persian Empire. There is some evidence to show that Persian influence had during the Achæmedian occupation of this country penetrated so far south as Gujrat (Kathiawar). From the well-known Rock Inscription at Girnar, in Kathiawar, we learn that the famous Sudarshana lake

was first constructed by Chandragupta, and that supplemental water channels were constructed by Asoka, under the superintendence of his representative, Raja Tushaspa, who was then Viceroy of this part of the country. The name Tushaspa is certainly a Persian name. It means that even in the time of Asoka, who enjoyed an almost universal sovereignty in India, Persian influence in the country had survived to such an extent, as to enable a Persian to attain the position of a Viceroy of such an important Division as western India. It may be pointed out that in the time of Asoka, Ujjain was the capital of western India, and Gujrat (Kathiawar) was within the territory of this viceroyalty. It may also be mentioned in this connection, that the edicts of Asoka discovered in Shahabazgarhi (Peshawar), and Mansehra (Hazara), are written in Kharoshti script. This means that in the time of Asoka, Persian influence had survived in northern India also. The Kharoshti script contains many letters of the Aramaean script. We know that the Syrians and the Chaldeans used this script in their trade and official business. The entire official class in the old Assyrian, Babylonian and Median kingdoms, carried on their official work in this script and when these kingdoms were superseded by and merged in the all embracing empire of the Persians, the officials of this empire also carried on their work in the same old Aramaean script. When a portion of India was annexed to the Persian Empire, the Persian officials, and later on the Persian educated Indian officials too, used the same Aramaean script, and it was thus introduced into northern India. It is certain, Kharoshti script was introduced into India several centuries before the Parthians and Scythians invaded it. The Indian territory within the Persian Empire must have been an extensive one, for we are told by Herodotus, that the Indian Satrapy paid 360 talents of gold per annum, the largest amount of tribute, paid to the Emperor. In the presence of all this evidence, it cannot therefore be denied that Persian influence in northern and western India during this period was really great. It is just possible nay probable, that the Era of the Saka King Cyrus the Great, was introduced into India during this period, and it remained current in north-western and western portions of the country. India came into contact with the Western Greek world in

the time of Chandragupta. This contact continued in later times, as is shown by the Rock Inscriptions of Asoka. The Persians were also in contact with the Greeks. We may, therefore, take it that Indian astronomers became acquainted with the Babylonians during the Achæmedian period and with Greek and Roman astronomy of the Alexandrian School for the first time in the time of Asoka. This contact must have continued in later ages, for on the rise of the Parthian Power, the Indian trade must have diverted from the middle Eastern Countries to the Arabian and Red Seas. It is therefore not surprising that Varahamihira should in his *Pancha Siddhantika* talk of Romaka Siddanta.

Furthermore, it may be mentioned that within a century of the death of Asoka, the Parthian Kings established their rule not only in Northern India, but also in Sindh and Western India as well. Mithradates I, the Parthian King, took Taxila in 138 B. C. Mithradates II who ascended the Parthian throne in 123 B. C. was a very powerful king, and he certainly held very large portions of India within his empire. Varahamihira thus must have been contemporaneous with Mithradates II and his successors, and he could not have been unacquainted with the Persians and their Era. This is of course on the assumption that the year 427 used by Varahamihira was of the Saka King Era commencing in 550 B. C., and was actually the year of coronation of the Parthian King Mithradates II. If, on the other hand, Saka Era mentioned by him was 78 A. D., then certainly the rule of Persian Kings and Persian influence in India, would be far distant from him, about 4 or 5 centuries earlier. Moreover, at this time Huna invasions were taking place, and no one could think of using the Era of the Saka Kings, whether it was 550 B. C. or 78 A. D. In 500 A. D. even Salivahana had receded into the dim past, and there would have been no motive for Varahamihira, a native of Northern India, to use Saka Salivahana, the Era of a South Indian King. For this reason too I must hold, that Varahamihira used the Saka Era of 550 B. C.

One word more in this connection. I have mentioned above, that the Saka King Era of 550 B. C. was introduced into India, possibly

during the period of Persian Rule in this country. But I may point out my conclusion does not rest on this argument alone. It is not necessary that a foreign era should be introduced into a particular country only during a period of foreign rule. No European power has so far established its rule in Japan, and yet in 1873, that country adopted the European calendar. During the Achæmedian period, the Persian Empire was the greatest power in the world. It had within its confines the ancient lands of Babylonia and Egypt, and it was at this time a centre of the then civilised world. India was the next door neighbour of this magnificent Empire. Even if Persia had not conquered any portion of India, it would not have been matter for surprise, if traders, astronomers, poets and other educated people of India, who admittedly had intimate relations with Babylonia and Egypt, mentioned the Era of Cyrus in their books or remembered the year when Cyrus established his Empire. There is now evidence of the existence of more than one Saka Era in India. Mr. Ston Konow who has edited Kharoshti inscriptions found in India, says that the Saka Era mentioned in these inscriptions begins in about 88 B. C. So it is clear the Era of 78 A. D. is not the only Saka Era.

But it may be pointed out, nothing so far is known in the western world about the establishment of an Era by Cyrus the Great. That is unfortunately true. If Herodotus and Xenophon had not told us something about the great Persian Empire, established by Cyrus the Great, we should have known nothing about it either. There are hardly any Persian records to give us the history of this magnificent Empire. It is only in recent times that some corroborative evidence in support of the statements of Herodotus have become available by the decipherment of Cuniform inscriptions of Darius Hystaspes, the Babylonian chronicles of the reign of Nabonidus, and the Babylonian proclamation of Cyrus the Great. The entire history of the mighty empires of ancient Assyrians, Babylonians, Egyptians, the Hittites, and the Mittanians, have only in recent times begun to be known. Present day investigations by Indian Parsis have shown that Darius Hystaspes did use some Era, and a distinctive kind of calendar coming from times even older than his,

It may be said that at such an early time as 550 B.C. the system of counting by Eras had not perhaps been discovered. But that is not correct. The Greeks had begun to count by the Olympiads, and this Era began in 776 B. C. The Romans counted by an Era beginning in 753 B. C. which is supposed to be the year when Rome was founded. The Babylonians used an Era which began in 747 B. C. This Era was started by King Nabonassar. Here was an example where a king established an Era. The Persians were the next door neighbours of the Greeks and the Babylonians. The latter were a great commercial and literary people, and their commercial activities extended all over the then civilised world. The Babylonians are also known as great astronomers. It cannot I think be seriously contended, that the ancient Persians were unacquainted with a system of chronology, fixed by Eras. The empire established by Seleucus on the ruins of this Persian Empire, brought into being a new Era, which is counted from 312 B. C. I am sure this Era of Seleucus must have displaced the previous Era established by Cyrus. When the only sources for the histories of the Achæmadian, Parthian, and Sassanian dynasties in Persia, are Greek and Latin writers, it is not surprising that we at the present day know nothing about the Era associated with the Empire founded by Cyrus the Great.

In India, I claim, we do have a record, however mutilated it may be, of the Era of Cyrus, and of Persian Rule in this country. History of India tells us that the Persians occupied India at least twice, and Indian tradition claims that they were on both of these occasions expelled from India. There is one Vikramaditya known as Saka-Ari, (enemy of the Sakas), whose Era is 57 B. C. There is another Vikramaditya, known to Indian tradition as Harsha Vikramaditya. Albiruni says, his Era was 400 years before the Vikramaditya of 57 B. C. Both these Vikramadityas are known to the author of Nepal Vanshavalī. If that is the case, and there is no sufficient reason to doubt it, then in connection with Persia, we should have in Indian History, and in Indian tradition, the following important dates:—

550 B. C. The Era of Saka Kings, associated with Cyrus the Great,

510 B.C. Conquest of Northern and Western India by Darius Hystaspes.

457 B.C. Defeat of the Persians by Harsha Vikramaditya.

138 B.C. Conquest of Northern Punjab by the Parthian King Mithradates I.

123 B.C. Accession to the Parthian throne of Mithradates II.

57 B.C. Second defeat of the Persians, this time by Vikramaditya.

78 A.D. Overthrow of Vikramaditya by Salivahana.

Under this scheme of chronology, the Era of 78 A.D. is reduced to the position of a South Indian Era, introduced in commemoration of the victories of Salivahana. I believe 78 A.D. is not the only Saka Era. There is another Saka Era beginning in 550 B.C., and still another one, according to Mr. Ston Konow, which began in 88 B.C. I think we have so far been mixing up together, these so many Saka Eras. In my humble judgment, the entire material on this subject requires careful re-examination. There are now 600 to 700 dates in Saka Era collected from various inscriptions. I have classified these dates into three categories. In the first category, I have put those dates, which mention only the word "Saka." In the second category, I have put those dates, which mention along with "Saka" the word "Salivahana." In the third category, I have put only those dates, which mention the expression "Sakendra-kala," or "Saka-bhupa-kala," or "Saka-nripa samaya," which certain such words as mean "Saka King." It would be better if all these dates be subjected to a thorough examination, of course taking into full consideration the Indian tradition, on the subject. Inscriptions bearing dates subsequent to 1100 or 1200 Saka need not be examined, for such later dates must be a long time after the Huna invasions. If the whole thing is re-examined in this manner, I am sure, Indian tradition and the results of modern scientific investigation will be found to be reconcilable. By accepting the Era of Saka King to have begun in 550 B.C. we bring down the dates of Vikramaditya, Kalidasa and Varahamihira, from the 6th century A.D. to 1st century B.C., and Bhaskaracharya from 12th century A.D. to 6th

century A.D. Bhattotpal is brought down from 10th century A.D. to 4th century A.D. This no doubt upsets the present day scheme of chronology, but if scientific investigation requires us to modify our previous views, more so when the results of such investigations enable us to reconcile them with Indian tradition, I think we should be quite ready to change our views.

THE MULTAN OUTBREAK AND THE TRIAL OF DIWAN MUL RAJ.

BY

SITA RAM KOHLI.

(Continued from page 48).

Mul Raj's trial—31st May 1849.—In the meanwhile, Diwan Mul Raj had been brought to Lahore (20th February). It was decided that he should be tried for the murder of Mr. Agnew and Lieutenant Anderson. The hands of the Government were, however, otherwise too full with more pressing work and it was not before the month of May that a Commission, consisting of Mr. C. G. Mansel (President), Mr. R. Montgomery and Lieutenant-Colonel Penny* (members), was appointed to try Mul Raj for the “murder of Mr. Agnew and Lieutenant Anderson.” Mr. Loring Bowring was appointed to conduct the prosecution and Captain Hamilton,† assisted by Mr. Girdhari Lal, represented the defence. Captain J. H. Wakefield and Maulvi Rajab Ali were appointed recorders of the proceedings in English and “native languages,” respectively.

The Commission began its sittings in the Diwan-i-Am, in the citadel of Lahore, at 7 o'clock on the morning of the 31st May.‡ As

* Colonel Penny was substituted for Brigadier Godby who was unable to attend on account of severe indisposition. This was also one reason why the trial was delayed. Regarding the appointment of the Commission and its personnel, etc., see Government of India letter No. 174, dated 25th April 1849, Punjab Board of Administration letter, dated 16th May, Government of India letter No. 216, dated 24th May, and Punjab Board's reply dated 28th May 1849.

† Captain Hamilton of the 34th Native Infantry was acting as Deputy Commissioner in the Punjab. His services were secured after Mr. John Lawrence and Herbert Edwardes had declined to accept Mul Raj's request to defend him. It appears from the vernacular correspondence that Raja Dina Nath and Diwan Rattan Chand were also requested to act as Mul Raj's counsel, but they declined on the ground of pressure of work. In fact, the Governor-General desired “to employ only the native agency” to conduct defence and disapproved of the appointment of a British officer (Captain Hamilton) as counsel for Mul Raj,—*vide* Government of India letter No. 216, 24th May 1849.

‡ The Diwan-i-Am is a spacious building of the old Mughal days in the citadel of Lahore. It was specially fitted up for the occasion by Mr. John Login.—see page 164 “Login and Duleep Singh” and also Sohan Lal's *Diary*, *daftar* V, page 164. The *Indian News*, London, dated 31st July 1849, gives the following note:—

“The trial was conducted in the Diwan-i-Am or Hall of the Darbar, which presented a very imposing appearance. Two sides of the raised platform, on which were seated the members of the Commission, the counsel for the prosecution and defence, prisoner, English recorder, etc., etc., were lined with troops, European and Native. One side was set apart and provided with seats for spectators, who were not, however, so numerous as might have been expected from the interest attaching to the trial. A few ladies and several Sikh Sardars of note were present and the centre of the large hall was nearly filled with natives.”

ordered by the Governor-General, the proceedings were carried on in the open court.* Mul Raj was present in court throughout the trial. The order of the Governor-General having been read out, the President and members of the Commission along with the recorders were duly sworn in.

Charges against Mul Raj.—The prisoner was then publicly arraigned by the President on the following three charges :—

- (a) That he did positively enact and instigate the murder of Mr. Patrick Vans Agnew and Lieutenant William Anderson, which murder was committed at Multan on or about the 20th day of April 1848, by his troops and followers ;
- (b) that he was an accessory before the fact to the murder by his troops and followers of the said P. V. Agnew and William Anderson ;
- (c) that he was an accessory after the fact to the murder by his troops and followers of the said P. V. Agnew and William Anderson and that he approved of the act and rewarded the murderers.

Mul Raj pleads not guilty.—On being asked by the Court to plead to the charges Mul Raj pleaded “ not guilty.”

The Prosecution opens the case.—Mr. L. Bowring opened the case, and, on behalf of the Prosecution, he urged, among other matters, that Mul Raj, though too late for his wish to bear fruit, repented of his decision to resign, and, therefore, prepared to resist the transfer of the charge of his Nizamat when the new Governor and his companions arrived in Multan, and that, on their arrival, the Diwan neglected the customary forms of civility to the Governor-designate and to the British officers. That the Diwan’s conduct after Mr. Agnew was assaulted and wounded by Amir Chand was totally opposed ‘ to what humanity or common attention would dictate.’ Instead of attending to Mr. Agnew or making any attempt to capture his assailants, the Diwan rode off at full speed to his own residence, in spite of the fact that he had from 200 to 300 troopers at his back at the

* Rules were drawn up by the order of the Government to regulate attendance of the visitors in the Court room.

time. Mul Raj's subsequent conduct, said Mr. Bowring, was hostile, for he not only employed his own forces, but, by offer of tempting bribes and promises, he even seduced the Lahore troops from their allegiance. It was further urged by the prosecution counsel that even supposing Mul Raj gave no positive instructions to the effect that he intended to resist the transfer of authority, there could be little doubt that he must have used such expressions as would lead his troops to suppose that such was his wish and design, for, otherwise, it seemed highly improbable that all these men should have been seized by sudden impulse without any orders from their master.

The Defence.—At the close of the Prosecution evidence, the accused was called upon to enter on his defence and Captain Hamilton produced ten witnesses on behalf of the defence. It took the court four days to record the defence evidence. On the 5th day Captain Hamilton addressed the court. Considering the fact that Captain Hamilton was not a lawyer by profession, the manner in which he presented the case for the defence does no small credit to him personally, as also to those who were responsible for the selection. Throughout the anxious days of his trial, Mul Raj must have felt that, whatever the verdict of the court might be, he could not have done better if he had placed his brief in the hands of the ablest man of his own choice.* Captain Hamilton began with discussing and criticising the prosecution evidence. After carefully examining the statement of each witness, he pointed out material discrepancies in their statements. He further remarked that the major portion of this evidence was hearsay and as such, inadmissible and not worthy of a moment's credit. He denounced the evidence produced by the prosecution before the court as in the main no better than "foul heaps of falsehood and perjury." He pointed out that, with the single exception of Mr. John Lawrence, all the witnesses were men of no worth or status in life. They were rather men without a job or men who gave evidence in the hope that they would thereby be able to secure better jobs at some future time.

* In a letter to his wife (June 10th, 1849), Sir John Login also expresses his appreciation of the marked ability shown by Captain Hamilton in the conduct of the case.—See page 165, "Login and Duleep Singh."

Theory of accident.—Captain Hamilton next dwelt on the all-important question of the murder of Messrs. Agnew and Anderson and tried to show that, in its origin, the attack was a mere matter of accident. The passage over the bridge which the party was crossing at the time of the attack, he urged, was narrow and crowded and consequently it was far more likely that the spear was thrust into Agnew's body by a sudden turn of Amir Chand or that Agnew was struck by the spear because of his horse taking a slight swerve.* Mr. Agnew gave a blow with his riding whip to the assailant or some other person by whom he supposed he had been struck. This was resented and was returned with a sword cut. The soldiery was excited and inflamed into a popular insurrection and military revolt. He put special emphasis on the theory of accident as the root cause of the assault and observed that the alleged attack was neither preconcerted nor premeditated. It was further urged that there was no complicity or motive on the part of Mul Raj in so far as he sent Raizada Tulsi Ram explaining his inability to visit the wounded English gentlemen and entreating them to be on their guard against the mutineers. "The best exculpation of the Diwan," argued Captain Hamilton, "was to be found in the declaration of Mr. Agnew that he did not consider Mul Raj in any manner implicated in the attack, and that he believed the disturbance to be a popular tumult and mutiny."† With regard to the absence of motive on the part of Mul Raj, the counsel remarked that no evil motive could be ascribed to the Diwan, who had repeatedly shown his anxiety to be relieved of the charge. Long before the arrival of the Governor-designate, Mul Raj had dismissed his superfluous troops and disposed of the stores required for the support of the garrison, had paid off the arrears of revenue due from him and had already remitted a portion of his own savings to Amritsar. Moreover, the Diwan stood high in the opinion of those in authority (as is borne

*The proclamation issued by the troops, which accompanied Mr. Agnew from Lahore and subsequently joined Mul Raj; also represents the assailant of Mr. Agnew as having acted without any sort of provocation. Rumour, however, invented all sorts of stories alleging provocation. Some of these are given in contemporary ballads. One such ballad will be found transcribed in the Gazetteer of the Multan District 1901-02, by Sir Edward Maclagan, and another is in the private collection of the present-writer.

† See also Agnew's letter to Lieut. Edwardes, page 40 of Part I, Vol. I of this Journal.

out by the evidence of Mr. John Lawrence) and had high hopes and expectations of a bountiful provision from the British Government—hopes and expectations which could not have been realised if he had shown the slightest opposition.

Motive of the garrison and citizens to prevent a change of government.—In regard to the outbreak at Multan, Captain Hamilton put forward the following motives on the part of the garrison and the citizens to prevent a change of the government. In the first place, a force of 1,500 men (possibly more) which accompanied Mr. Agnew from Lahore was much larger than was required for mere escort and it was rightly judged by Mul Raj's army that so many men had been brought to Multan with a view to displace a portion of the garrison. This would have meant utter ruin to a large portion of Mul Raj's forces. Secondly, the people of the town had been for more than thirty years under the government of Mul Raj and his father. They had prospered under their rule and were doubtless attached to the Diwan's family. Of the British they knew nothing, and from the Lahore Court they must have anticipated oppression and misrule. It was argued that no deep-laid scheme was required to rouse the people and the military to action.

Law points urged by Defence Counsel.—Captain Hamilton also urged various points of law: firstly, that Mul Raj after having made over the charge had no legal authority in the province; secondly, that when the alleged crime charged against him was committed, Mul Raj was not a British subject. The Punjab had not yet become a British province and Mul Raj was, therefore, in no way amenable to the jurisdiction of the British courts. Thirdly, the charges against him had been drawn up with considerable regard to the technicalities of the British law and that, according to the British code, the punishment for being an accessory after the fact was most severe, while under the Native Government such an offence would be considered a mere misdemeanour, and that under the circumstances the prisoner was not liable to the 'ample grasp of British Law.'

* A similar impression, very favourable to Mul Raj, is conveyed by Lord Dalhousie in a letter addressed to his friend Sir George Couper, dated May 10th, 1848. See *Private Letters of Dalhousie* by Baird, page 24.

The Prosecution Counsel's reply.—Mr. Loring Bowring, counsel for the Prosecution, then made his reply. He urged that the Defence counsel's arguments with regard to Mul Raj's intentions and motives were neither clear nor convincing. It had been argued that Mul Raj had discharged his superfluous troops, disposed of his stores, paid up his revenue arrears, remitted his savings to Amritsar and had, in fact, prepared himself in every way to make over charge of his office. If he had done this with a view to handing over the province, observed Mr. Bowring, it was strange that the inhabitants of Multan should have been kept ignorant of his purpose. As the evidence of some of the witnesses for the defence showed, no such intimation was given to the people of the place. Moreover, the defence had not put forward anything convincing in regard to Mul Raj's conduct at the time Mr. Agnew was set upon by his men. It was clear from the evidence of the defence itself that the Diwan was present at the time when Amir Chand wounded Mr. Agnew. What possible difficulty, it was argued, could there have been in directing the immediate arrest of the assailant of Mr. Agnew?

Mr. Bowring in the course of his speech next referred to the main argument of the defence regarding the subsequent conduct of Mul Raj. The essence of the defence story, he said, for the subsequent conduct of Mul Raj was that he was powerless, being a virtual prisoner in the hands of his mutinous troops. He was thus in no way responsible for the acts of the troops. This too, the prosecution argued, was not borne out by facts. Mul Raj had on a previous occasion promptly and successfully put down the mutiny when in 1844 his troops had risen in revolt for increase of pay. Further, the entire course of the siege revealed the fact that Mul Raj exercised complete control and authority over his troops, and, indeed, but for his master mind—always alert and constantly directing his men throughout the siege till the capture of the fort—it would have been quite impossible for any one to keep the garrison in order. This view, contended Mr. Bowring, was further supported by the fact that even when, towards the close of the siege, the tired and starving troops expressed desire to surrender, it was Mul Raj who, raising his voice, had called

upon them to hold out, a command which they had at once obeyed. Mr. Bowring then made a few comments on the credibility of the defence evidence and characterised it as 'meagre and unsatisfactory.' The more weighty points, such as the conduct of Mul Raj on and after the occasion of all the officers taking the traitorous oath, urged the counsel, were left by the prisoner quite unaccounted for. Raizada Tulsi Ram, one of the chief witnesses, had merely deposed to Ram Rang's exertions to induce the Diwan to visit Mr. Agnew after the first attack, and had said that Mul Raj had lost his presence of mind and made no arrangements for stopping the mutiny. The evidence of Ram Rang himself must naturally be looked upon with suspicion, he having been one of Mul Raj's principal officers and his nearest relation.*

Sentence pronounced.—22nd June 1849.—The case was then closed. The court was cleared of visitors and witnesses, while the judges sat within closed doors to consider the *pros* and *cons* of the case and frame their judgment. After a few hours' deliberation, the doors re-opened and the sentence, finding and recommendations of the judges were immediately read out to the prisoner and subsequently to the public. They ran as follows:—

"After mature deliberation and consideration and having duly weighed the evidence for both the prosecution and the defence, and what the advocate and *vakil* of the prisoner have urged in his cause, the Commission are of opinion that the prisoner Mul Raj, late Governor of Multan, is of the—

First charge	Guilty,
Second charge	Guilty,
Third charge	Guilty,

and do therefore sentence him to suffer death. But the Commission direct that the execution of the sentence, in compliance with the instructions of the Right Honourable the Governor-General of India, be suspended pending orders of the Governor-General of India.

* Ram Rang was married to Mul Raj's first cousin.

Further, the Commission earnestly recommend the prisoner to mercy as being the victim of circumstances.”*

Some observations on the trial.—The trial of Mul Raj attracted a good deal of public attention at the time. As we have had occasion to remark before, the proceedings of the trial were reported in the English Press both in India and in England. As was natural to expect, in an atmosphere of intense feelings, which the Sikh War had created, some severe comments were made even when the case was *sub judice*. A correspondent writing under the pseudonym of “Ultor” in the *Friend of India* accused Mul Raj of ‘grossest cruelty and treachery,’ while another writer described him as a ‘daring malefactor’ who deserved no sympathy. But if Mul Raj had many accusers, he had also some sympathisers who regarded him as neither a murderer nor a villain, but a weak, timid man forcibly placed at the head of the revolt by his mutinous troops and as such, deserving of pity—‘a victim of circumstances.’

We have the opinions of some contemporary writers—persons capable of making shrewd observation of men and events, persons who had had opportunities of studying Mul Raj’s character at close quarters. The most important of these men is undoubtedly Mr. (Sir) John Login. He was appointed Governor of the Lahore Citadel in March 1849, and in that capacity he had the charge of all State prisoners, Mul Raj, Chattar Singh, Sher Singh and others. In a letter dated, Citadel, June 10th, 1849, Mr. Login writes to his wife “..... I told him (Mul Raj) that Vans Agnew was my dear friend, and that his death was a grief to me. He expressed himself as more grieved than ever at the event since he heard this, and he solemnly avers he never

* At the conclusion of the trial the President of the Commission, submitted two bills for contingent expenses to the value of Rs. 469-12-0, incurred in the conducting of the case:—

	Rs.	a.	p.
(A) (i) Amount due to Girdhari Lal (<i>Vakil</i>), at Rs. 5 per day for 23 days, 8th May—30th May 1849	115	0	0
(ii) Amount due to Girdhari Lal at Rs. 10 per day for 23 days, 31st May—22nd June 1849	230	0	0
(B) Wages of Clerks employed in transcribing the prosecution and defence evidence	112	0	0
(C) Stationery	12	12	0
Total	469	12	0

authorised it. Nor had he ever encouraged his people to attack Agnew. He expressed great regret for what had occurred, but said he was helpless, and so far I believe the evidence does not implicate him."

In another letter, dated June 17th, 1849, Mr. Login again writes: "The trial of Mul Raj still going on. I do not think the old fellow is anything of the hero they would make him out to be, but rather a weak, chicken-hearted fellow, afraid to do what was right and entirely in the hands of some resolute villains around him. I do not think he really intended any harm to dear Pat Vans Agnew, but he had not moral courage enough to put the fellows down....."*

Mr. (Sir) John Lawrence heard of the outbreak on the 30th April while he was at Dharamsala. On the same day he wrote to Sir F. Currie: "Bad as Mul Raj's conduct may have been, I should doubt very much if he has had anything to do with the original outbreak. Depend on it he has been forced into it by circumstances. He was notoriously a timid man, and one of the chief points on which he originally so much insisted with me was that he might be allowed to get away before it could be publicly known that he had given up the country....."†

Sir Lepel Griffin wrote and published his history of the Chiefs and Families of Note in the Punjab in 1865, and, as he tells us in the preface, he personally questioned the actors in, and eye-witnesses of, the events described in the book. He further adds that he has had also special opportunities of personally examining a large number of the Chiefs and Sardars with their bards and family priests from whom he had gained much new and interesting information. Speaking of Mul Raj's trial, Sir Lepel Griffin remarks: "It is not for history to praise an unsuccessful rebel, but a careful review of the Diwan's history will show him to have been more unfortunate than criminal. It is certain that when Mr. Vans Agnew first arrived at Multan, the Diwan had no intention of rebelling. Had such been his design, he would not have resigned his charge or have given over the fort. It is equally certain that the first attack on the British officers

* "Sir John Login and Duleep Singh," (pages 164—167).

† "Life of Lord Lawrence," by R. Bosworth Smith, Volume I, page 218.

was without the Diwan's privity or consent. That attack was either an outburst of fanatical hatred on the part of the Muhammadan soldiery, who saw the fort, in which they took so much pride, passing into the hands of strangers, or it was instigated by some of the Diwan's officers, who wished to compromise him and compel him to rebel. It is probable that he was under restraint and unable to command the obedience of his soldiers when the Idgah was assaulted and the English officers slain. At no time from that fatal day till the arrival of the British army before Multan, could the Diwan, with any safety to himself, have proposed terms of submission or have sued for pardon. He was surrounded by relatives, friends and troops who depended upon him for place and wealth and power, and who saw in a new Governor nothing but ruin to themselves. They determined to force Mul Raj to rebel, for his victory would enrich them, and his defeat could not be more injurious to them than his resignation. Diwan Mul Raj was not an amiable character. He was mean, grasping, suspicious and vacillating. But the crimes of cold-blooded murder and of premeditated rebellion cannot, with any justice, be laid to his charge."*

Commutation of sentence—31st July 1849.—The judges while pronouncing the sentence of death on Mul Raj had recommended him to the Governor-General of India for mercy as being the 'victim of circumstances.' "Lord Dalhousie," writes Sir William Lee-Warner, "gave anxious consideration to the case, feeling that if the crime had been committed while Mul Raj was engaged in hostilities as a rebel, he could not be fairly treated as a murderer, since Sher Singh and other Sardars had been allowed to go free. Moreover, for the murder of Agnew, the culprit, Godhar Singh, had already been sentenced to death. The evidence convinced the Governor-General that the Diwan had not premeditated the slaughter of the two British officers, nor had he instigated the attack upon them as they left the fort. No doubt, he was in command of the garrison when the assault was delivered on the Idgah where the wounded officers lay, and had made no effort to save them; he had even rejected their overtures for help, and seduced their escort from fidelity. But as it seemed clear

* The Punjab Chiefs by Lepel Griffin, Lahore, page 284, Chronicle Press, 1865.

that Mul Raj could not in any case have stayed the fury of his fanatical followers, Lord Dalhousie gave him the benefit of the doubt, and remitting the death penalty, sentenced him to imprisonment for life, with banishment from India.”*

Death of Mulraj—September 1851.—The decision of the Governor-General was conveyed to Mul Raj on or about the 31st July 1849. But no arrangements were made for his removal from Lahore till January 1850. Mul Raj was then taken to Calcutta, probably en route to ‘Black Water.’ On the mere thought of his dreaded doom, Mul Raj’s fortitude for once gave way. He became indisposed and never recovered from his illness. For about a year, he was kept in Fort St. William in Calcutta. Early in August 1851 he was taken seriously ill and it was decided to remove him to Benares. But before he reached his destination, Mul Raj breathed his last near Buxar, on 11th August at the age of 36.†

* *Life of Marquis of Dalhousie*, Volume I, pages 264-65, London, 1904. It may be pointed out in this connection that when Sir William recorded his opinion in 1904, the Private Papers of Lord Dalhousie had not seen the light of the day. These papers were edited and published by J. A. H. Baird in 1911. One of Lord Dalhousie’s letters, bearing date February 5, 1849, contains the following reference to Mul Raj: “I cannot hang him, but I will do what he will think a thousand times worse; I will send him across the sea, what they call the “Black Water” and dread far more than death.” (page 51). This is supported to the very letter by a reference made by Sohan Lal, the Diarist of the Lahore Darbar. Under date 9th Phagan, 1905 (19th February 1849), with reference to the Resident’s conversation and remarks in the Darbar, he writes.

”باز فرمودند، فردا مولراج خواهد آمد۔ و بعد از ان در کله پادی خواهد رفت“
viz., afterwards (he) was pleased to remark that Mul Raj will reach (Lahore) to-morrow and will be subsequently deported to Black Water,—page 155, *Daftar V*.

† Mul Raj’s body was cremated on the banks of the Ganges, off Partabpur near Buxar—vide letter No. 90, dated 18th August 1851, from R. Lowther, Esq., Commissioner, Allahabad Division, to the Board of Administration Punjab.

LUCKNOW IN 1841.

By

PRINCE ALEXIS SOLTYKOFF.

(Translated and Edited by H. L. O. Garrett.)

(Prince Alexis Soltykoff was a member of a distinguished Russian family. He made several journeys to India and his descriptions of the Panjab, Delhi and the Simla hills have already appeared in the *Civil and Military Gazette*.)

LUCKNOW, DEC. 24TH.

I arrived here yesterday at midnight. On leaving British territory 45 miles from here, I crossed the Ganges on a bridge of boats and entered a wild sandy desert, completely without roads. However I got on fast, the porters of my palanquin did their work well and after twelve miles, I was met by two troopers of the Royal police from Lucknow who had been sent to look after me, as the country is not very safe owing to the *thugs* or stranglers an Indian sect who abound in this kingdom.¹ These picturesque horsemen were relieved every ten miles. As I went on the country became less arid; but it had been quite dark for a long time when I arrived at the capital. Not knowing where to go I had myself taken to the place where porters are supplied, the post office in fact, and there, as there was no shelter for me, I had the palanquin put on the ground in the courtyard and having eaten some bread and sardines and drunk a glass of wine, I went to sleep in the palanquin with the idea of calling on the English Resident early in the morning. But at four o'clock in the morning before dawn a gentleman called Login,² the medical officer attached

¹ I have often heard it said by reliable persons that there has never been a case of a European being attacked by *thugs*. On the other hand they kill quantities of Indians.

² Afterwards Sir John Login, better known as the guardian of the young ex-Maharaja Dulip Singh—Editor.

to the Residency, came to wake me. He was full of apologies saying that nothing had been known of my arrival and begged me on behalf of the Resident to come at once to occupy the room they had just got ready for me, either to sleep or to have a cup of tea and dress. So I left my travelling den and accompanied by the doctor, a nice young fellow who had just arrived from Herat, I passed through several dark and deserted streets to get to the English Residency, a large mansion where I have a big comfortable room. When the sun rose I went on to the terrace from which I saw a magnificent panorama of the city of Lucknow, with its mosques, its splendid palaces, its mysterious wooded surroundings. But there were no more palm trees here, except here and there as in Italy. It was very cold, yet during the day there is a fierce sun which warm one's chilled body. One does not know what to do, one shivers yet one must stay in the shade for fear of sunstroke. The Resident, Colonel Low,¹ soon came to my room in a dressing gown with a shawl cap. He speaks French fluently, at which I was much surprised as this is most unusual in India. He was not like a Englishman at all, but more like a genial Frenchman. This hospitable officer without any ceremony invited me at once to go through the city on an elephant, adding that there was one ready for him every morning at daybreak and that he scarcely used it. He called out of the window and at once I saw the giant quadruped come out of the garden with splendid silver gilt *howdah*, decorated with plates of imitation precious stones, diamonds, rubies and emeralds which instead of being inset were simply hung on the *howdah* and gave a charming effect in the rosy morning sun. This *howdah* of a very original design was composed of two chased silver swans with, as I have said, these plates of imitation precious stones. The harness was a blaze of gold and red. The Mahout was in white with a Kashmir shawl thrown over him. I mounted by means of a ladder and a servant, also wrapped in a Kashmir shawl, seated himself behind me. Then we set off, preceded by a regular trooper, a kind of Cossack in curious uniform. There are always a dozen mounted at the gate of the Residency garden, ready to accompany its inmates.

¹ Afterwards General Sir J. Low, K.C.B., G.C.S.I., Military Member of the Executive Council of the Governor-General during the Mutiny.—Editor.

I entered a large and crowded street. On all sides were beautiful Moorish buildings, with cupolas in the Russian style and countless minarets. Horsemen dressed in cloth of gold and Kashmir shawl, on fine horses preceded by armed pikemen or swordsmen, other nobles carried in open gilded palanquins, smoking silver *hookahs*, and surrounded by servants and preceded by guards on camels caparisoned in red and green; elephants, often several together in whose *howdahs* the rank and fashion of Lucknow, richly dressed in the brightest colours, chatted to one another; parties of wild Afghans on their huge camels, a great contrast to the fastidious Lucknow people; all this passed by me. At last I reached the end of the street and perceived a magnificent Moorish gateway above which rose slender minarets and gilded cupolas like those of the Kremlin the whole making a superb effect against the crowded street before me. On arriving at this gate I learnt that it led to into the walled enclosure which the old king has chosen for his burial. I entered and I was astonished to see that this huge place contained everything of the most interesting and diverting that could be gathered together; charming Moorish buildings, fountains and aviaries containing the most strange and beautiful birds. They were still working at one or two of these buildings which are intended to accommodate the citizens of Lucknow on public festivals. I entered the largest where the mother of the king lies in the middle of the principal hall. By the side of the tomb is a charming little mosque or rather model of a mosque in silver gilt. It is there that the king also wishes to be buried by the side of his mother. The interior of this handsome building is composed of four or five apartments with roofs separated from one another by columns and arcades. All this space, except that occupied by the Queen's tomb, has been filled with all the most splendid and striking objects of which the king could think. The vaults are adorned with hundreds of cut glass lustres in all colours: silver gilt candelabra stand on the marble floor as do strangely carved pulpits also in silver gilt for the use of the Mohammadan priests, for the kings of Lucknow belong to that religion and are of the sect of Ali (Shias). Two tigers life size in coloured glass of an emerald colour, with gold ornaments, coming, I was told, from Siam where they were cast; a beautiful silver horse as high as a

table held by a beautiful girl in silver, thousands of other things ; some rather ordinary arms arranged in trophies, a life size horse in painted wood, a representation of the king's favourite charger, made by an Englishman in Calcutta and richly caparisoned held by the statue of the royal groom also in painted wood ; all this mass of richest tinsel shines magnificently in the days of Moharram ; the fountains play, the birds sing and the whole place is full of happy crowds.

In the courtyard or principal garden a sort of screen is placed before the entrance on which are painted life size the favourite servants of the king. One of them exactly resembled my guide, a venerable old man with a long silver wand in his hand. He smiled when he showed us his picture, which was very like him.

This miniature paradise is surrounded by a bazaar always filled with a noisy crowd, and by stables where are elephants, and rhinoceros captured in the royal forests as well as enormous tigers and bears shut up in large iron cages, placed under the domes or strangely painted arcades.

There is also a large sheet of water surrounded by stone steps and grotesquely carved statues. In this pond a boat on wheels, in the form of a large fish, was moving about. It all seemed like a dream. I have also seen the royal palace while the king was away. One of his thrones, for he has many, is a gold platform, encrusted with diamonds and worth £220,000. He is rich, his revenue is £1,500,000 and I have heard that if the English took over the state it would be £4,000,000. There are 300,000 inhabitants in Lucknow. The bazaar is one long crowded street but I have not seen anything special. I feel I ought do some sketches ; but where to begin with so many charming things of which I have not yet seen a quarter ?

DECEMBER 26TH.

Early this morning I went to see a royal garden, full of roses and jasmine, orange trees and cypresses, for the vegetation here is not tropical but more like that of Sicily. The garden is full of charming white marble pavilions and baths of all sorts. The king sometimes comes there with his harem of Kashmiris and give parties there also. The keeper of this garden, who is a person of importance, complained

to me that when the ladies of the harem are let loose in the garden they spoil everything, break and pull up the flowers, damage the paths and make the pavilions dirty. After each of these invasions everything has to be renewed. From this delightful garden we went to see the stable of the king's rhinoceros, which is in a park which also contains the grave of his favourite horse surmounted by a mausoleum. A dozen huge and ugly beasts were chained under a long roof supported by beams. Further off is an elephant park which I have not yet seen but they tell me that the royal elephants, which besides those in this park, are some here some there in the neighbourhood of the city, number 450. The English Resident has a dozen and all the Lucknow nobility have dozens in their stables.

As I write the wild parrots are perched peacefully by my window for in Indian cities no one kills them. Francois has a parrot in a cage which he bought at Kandy in Ceylon. He is very fond of it and carries it about in his palanquin. This parrot is hung up on my verandah: the wild ones come and sit near him and he seems to talk to them.

Having seen the rhinoceros we then entered the tomb of one of the kings of Lucknow, a fine marble hall where three Mullahs were reading the Koran for the repose of the soul of the deceased. On our entering—I was with Colonel Low, the English Resident,—the old Mullahs stopped reading and turned to us, taking off their spectacles. The Resident saluted them and begged them to go on without interruption. Then they replaced their spectacles and began to murmur prayers once more. After we had walked round the hall we saluted the worthy priests once more and withdrew. This tomb is placed in the middle of a vast courtyard round which are Persian schools for the young people of Lucknow. One must suppose that the dead monarch was very fond of learning, as he wished to be surrounded by it even after his death.

Then we visited the observatory of an English astronomer whom the king keeps at his court and of whom he has a great opinion.

DECEMBER 29TH, 1841.

The King of Lucknow is 65 and is said to be in very bad health so I have not attempted to trouble him.¹

¹ Mohammad Ali—succeeded 1837.

Yesterday morning in the street while I had got off my elephant to make a hasty sketch of a dromedary ridden by a man who had stopped to look at me, I heard a shouting and I saw coming from the corner of the street a band of men with swords in their hands and running among the people. I stood by my elephant and they passed me with a salute. Some had silver wands, others red flags on silver staves, pikes, swords, guns, bows, arrows and shields. They were followed by four trotting dromedaries ridden by what appeared to be dragoons. Then a fine troop of cavalry with flying Kashmir shawls cantered past us, followed by the king's son,¹ the heir-apparent to the throne, carried in an open palanquin. He was a large, fat, man with a coarse ugly face, about 45 or 50, in a costume of cloth of gold and fur with a round cap trimmed with fur such as one sees in the pictures of our old Czars. As he passed he detached two of his staff to find out who I was. I gave no answer for the very good reason that I do not speak Hindustani but my Mahout hastily made some sort of answer on my behalf and they went off satisfied, to report to the prince. The people of India from hereto Cape Comorin cannot understand that there are any other European people except the English. When one says Russian they take that for some particular English caste. Europe and England in their idea are the same thing. It was only on going further north that I met people who had a vague idea of Russia and the Russians.

After the prince came three elephants at an absurd amble, one had a *howdah* on his back: the other three servants; the third merely carried the ladders for mounting the first. That was not all. After these galloped a detachment of comic opera hussars with little pennons and helmets like ancient European ones. The whole thing seemed pompous and silly. The primitive Orient and ancient Asia side by side with a parody of modern Europe.

The King of Lucknow has other soldiers, a regiment, on dromedaries in red uniforms with long skirts rather like circus riders, with the helmets and the straight swords of cuirassiers.

Lucknow is a fine city but most of the buildings are in brick and stucco, the majority white but some painted red and green: the

(1) Amjad Ali.

interiors are often of marble. As far as I can gather Delhi and Agra contain buildings of the same type but much finer and of more costly material. But Delhi and Agra, which belong to the English, are dead capitals while Lucknow has its splendid court. I saw the royal menagerie to-day ; twenty tigers and some leopards so tame that the keepers play with them like dogs : however they are kept chained up.

A royal tomb which I visited to-day contained some ancient banners very curious and surmounted by enormous badges of a quaint design in gold or wrought iron or by huge hands. The late king's turban was there : two silver tigers, life size and very well done are stationed on either side of the sarcophagus, which is covered with cloth of gold and shawls. This tomb was that of a king whose name I have forgotten.

His sword and shield, the latter, quite black are placed above. While everything else here seems costly, bows and arrows are not, so far I have seen, of value. There were four silver horses there also of the height of a table held by winged *houris* and by Indian Mythological heroes. There were also glass cupboards partially covered with golden gauze which contained curiosities, but as I had my boots on and as all the people there treated me with every mark of respect and politeness, I wished in my turn to show my respect for the place of which they were the guardians and I did not pass the threshold of the arcade from which I could see most things except a few details. I thought it better not to see everything rather than run the risk of offending these very attractive people, who would have let me do any thing in that sacred spot provided they purified it afterwards ; for the respect shown to Europeans here is really extraordinary. I am almost tempted to believe that it is a kindly pity like that of the Turks for the insane, or like the consideration one gives to children who know nothing and whom one readily forgives.

I wish to pass on from here ; it is quite time, though my kindly hosts wish me to stay on. They told me that on New Year's day the heir to the throne will come to breakfast in state at the Residency and that then he will probably invite back the Resident with his staff, among whom I should be included.

CAPTAIN MANUEL DEREMAO.

BY

H. BULLOCK.

Manuel Deremao, or D'Eremao, was born at Delhi about 1744. His ancestry is dealt with in Sir Edward Maclagan's *The Jesuits and the Great Mogul*. We know little of his early life: tradition has it that he was brought up by his maternal grandfather Monsieur Manuel Gascoine. A few traces may be found in the Registers maintained by Father Gregory, the discalced Carmelite who came to Northern India in 1781 and remained there till his death in 1807. At a baptism at Kanaund on 23rd May 1783, "Emmanuel Wel" and "Mariana Wel" appear as sponsors. At the same place, two days later, "Mariana Wel" acts in the same capacity. At Delhi on 22nd June 1783, Mariana "Moniwel" was godmother by proxy at the baptism of an illegitimate daughter of the Chevalier Charles Dudrenee, the celebrated soldier of fortune. Again, at Delhi on 13th April 1784, we find in the Register the name of "Emmanuel Wel Darinod," which allowing for copyist's errors as well as the probably erratic orthography of the original is very probably intended for Emmanuel Val Deremao. I think it likely that all these entries relate to Captain Manuel Deremao at the time he was serving in a military capacity at the Mughal Court, or to near relatives of his.

Manuel appears to have succeeded to a *jagir* of twelve villages near Delhi, part of the estates which had been granted by the Emperors to Donna Juliana Dias da Costa in recognition of her professional services (see Maclagan, *op. cit.*, ch. XII). In his will he mentions "lands conferred as a royal gift by the Maharajah Buhadar Shah in the name of and on Bebee Juliana, my paternal Grand Mother, in Mouzees Bhopanee, Khanpoor, and Rutter Dihi Mundy," extending to 3,333 *bighas*. What position he held at the Mughal Court we do not know, nor have we any precise details of his relations with the *de facto* ruler, Scindia. It is said that he commanded a regiment of cavalry in the Emperor's service; and that about 1801-2 a force under

his command had regained from the Irish adventurer George Thomas the country from Rohtak to Bhatinda. It is also related that at the outbreak of hostilities between the British and the Marathas in the autumn of 1803, Deremao was in occupation of five thousand square miles in what is now the Ambala Division of the Punjab, with an annual revenue of twenty-five lakhs of rupees, on which he supported a force which like himself owed nominal allegiance to the Emperor, Scindia and Perron, but which was virtually independent. If these were the facts it is curious that the memoirs of George Thomas and of Colonel Louis Bourquien make no mention of Deremao, with whom they must have had many dealings.

There can however be no doubt that when Lake and Ochterlony had time, after their triumphs elsewhere, to devote attention to the country west of Delhi in mid-December 1803, Deremao was in effective control of the important fortress of Hansi. The following extracts from Lake's dispatches to the Governor-General show what weight was attached to the possession of that fortress; and the second extract is curious as being, it is believed, the only mention of Deremao in published correspondence, though even in this he is not named:—

Lake to Marquis Wellesley, 12th September 1803.

I apprehend the Seiks if assured of our not interfering with their government will enter into a treaty of amity with us, and would ensure the capture of the fort called Hansi, late George Thomas's, provided we would promise to destroy it, which in my opinion would be a good thing: I believe at present there are a great many of Perron's guns in it, which might be got by this means, and which I shall endeavour without trouble and difficulty. . . .

The same to the same, 17th September 1803.

. . . I forgot to say that I looked upon the strong fort at Hansi to be ours, as there are very few persons in it, and the person who commands it has sent to say that he will give it up to me if I can send troops, which will be difficult, he therefore will keep it, as the people he has in it are entirely his.¹

¹ *Selection of the Despatches and Treaties of the Marquess Wellesley*, ed. S. J. Owen, Oxford, 1887, pp. 397, 401.

We have Deremao's own authority for stating that he had addressed a letter to Lake as soon as the latter arrived in Delhi in September 1803, offering to deliver up to the British the fort of Hansi "with seventy pieces of Ordnance, ammunition, and other stores."¹

This is corroborated by Lake's dispatch of 17th September, quoted above. Deremao further states that, as soon as his approaching the British with this offer was known, the princes of Patiala and Bikaner "severally wrote to him, each offering him Rs. 50,000 and villages in *Altamgha*² in their respective districts" in lieu of those villages which Deremao held from the Mughal. It was for this reason that the sole condition which he imposed for the surrender of Hansi to Lake was that he should be confirmed by the British in the possession of the lands which he had inherited. This condition was accepted: Lake wrote to Deremao "you will not only retain your lands of Altumgha and Pay, but future favours will be conferred on you. The allowances of your brother, &c., and those sepoy's under you shall likewise be continued to them for life."³

It was not till 16th December that Lake was able to spare troops to proceed to Hansi. On the morning of that day, in accordance with the Commander-in-Chief's instructions, a detachment of *Telingas* and *Najibs* (irregular levies, recruited from men who had quitted Scindia's service at Agra, shortly before), under the command of Major John Brownrigg, an Irish adventurer who had left the Maratha army with them, arrived at Hansi and was "immediately put in possession of the Fort by Captain Manuel the Commandant, to whom every credit is due for his judicious and firm conduct during a long period. The Garrison consisted of 500 fighting men: of them Captain Manuel happily succeeded in attaching 300 to the interest of the Hon'ble Company. The remaining 200 were refractory and have been dismissed." Thus ran Brownrigg's report⁴ and he continued: "Those who behaved well are retained in service and continued in the Fort, and in pursuance of your orders, I sent in a party of Tellingers and Najeebs for its better security until the arrival of Col. Ball, who will

¹ Deremao to Government, 2nd January, 1821. (Appendix, No. IX.)

² Tenure by grant under the royal sign-manual.

³ Captain John Gerard to Deremao, undated. (Appendix, No. IV.)

⁴ Major John Brownrigg to Ochterlony, 16th December, 1803. (Appendix, No. II.)

take such measures as he judges best." Brownrigg adds that he was making a Union Flag, which he hoped to hoist on the ramparts with a salute on the following day; that there were about seventy guns mounted in the fort; and that Hansi was "a strong Fort and does great credit to the active and enterprising genius of George Thomas."

Another eye-witness of the capitulation of Hansi was Captain William Long, an English soldier of fortune formerly in Scindia's service, who had come over to the British on the outbreak of war. "We arrived in due course of march at Hansy," he writes, "and Monsieur Perron's commandant, a Captain Manuels, received us with open arms and gave a grand fête, at which all the officers were present. Captain Samuels (*sic*) evacuated the fort of Hansy, with a remaining garrison of about five thousand fighting men, chiefly Mawatties, who had a bonus given them of six months' pay; and the Captain himself is said to have marched out with about two lakhs of rupees. A good job for him he had made a favourable treaty with the Resident at Delhy, the well-known Colonel Sir David Ochterlony. The fort, guns and ammunition became the Hon'ble Company's property, as well as the adjoining districts."

When regular troops under a regular officer, Colonel George Ball, arrived, Deremao appears to have handed the fort over in a more formal manner. This took place on 28th December 1803, when he obtained a written receipt for the fort and its contents¹ from Lieutenant Robert Young of the Bengal Army, "commanding a detachment of the 1st Bn. 8th Regt. N. I." His conduct throughout the transaction was acknowledged by Ochterlony² and we may conclude that he then retired to Delhi and took up his residence there. The "well-affected men of the Garrison" received an additional reward of half a month's pay, apparently for the purpose of clothing themselves in British uniform, and were no doubt absorbed in one of the many irregular corps then existing.

We hear no more of Deremao till September 1806, when he received a notification from the Governor-General in Council that his

¹ Receipt by Lieutenant Robert Young, 28th December, 1803. (Appendix, No. III.)

² Ochterlony to Deremao, undated. (Appendix, No. V.)

allowance from the British was to be reduced, whilst those of his son Lieutenant Domingo Deremao (who seems to have been a Maratha officer and at Hansi with his father) and his nephew Antony Deremao (also said to have been a Maratha officer) were to be withdrawn. The Captain was drawing a pension of Rs. 400 monthly from the British.¹ Deremao was not slow to protest respectfully against this reduction² and his representations, which appear to have been supported by the Resident at Delhi, soon met with success. The Governor-General gave orders that the payment of the allowances to be resumed and for the *Altamgha* lands to be put in Deremao's possession; and it is satisfactory to know that the old officer retained both till the day of his death.³

Captain Manuel Deremao spent the rest of his life at Delhi, his birthplace. There, known to all as "Manuel Sahib," he was held in high esteem and renowned for his widespread generosity. Amongst his personal friends were, it is said, the Maharajas of Patiala and Bikaner, despite his refusal of Hansi to them; and even the Emperor Shah Alam, who visited him frequently and of whom family tradition relates that when the Captain was ill, the Emperor prepared a dish with his own hands and waited on him whilst he partook of it. The last time he took up his sword was for the siege and capture of Bharatpur in the winter of 1824-5, when his son Domingo is stated to have acted as an honorary aide-de-camp to Sir David Ochterlony, their old friend. In 1821 he was much concerned at a suggestion which reached him from official quarters that his *Altamgha* lands would not descend to his posterity on his death, but would be assumed by Government. He submitted a lengthy petition, in which his past services were summarised and which was sponsored with warmth by Ochterlony,⁴ and the Governor-General in Council conceded the point.⁵

He died at Delhi on 5th June 1829, aged eighty-five years, and was buried in the ancient cemetery at Kishanganj, where his tomb may

¹ Resident at Delhi to Government, 6th June, 1829. (Appendix, No. XIII.)

² Deremao to Government, 16th September, 1806. (Appendix, No. IV.)

³ Government to Deremao, 2nd December, 1806. (Appendix, No. VII.)

⁴ Deremao to Government 2nd January, 1821 and Resident at Delhi to Government 22nd January, 1821. (Appendix, Nos. IX and X.)

⁵ Government to Resident at Delhi, 10th February, 1821. (Appendix, No. XI.)

still be seen. Beside him sleep his wife, daughter, son and daughter-in-law, as well as many Armenians and other Christians who died before the British came to the capital and whose history is extremely obscure. His death was duly reported to the Political Department of the Government of India, and the wish in his will that the Resident at Delhi should be trustee of his estate appears to have been acceded to.¹ His wife Justiana or Justiniana survived him and died at Delhi on 1st November 1843. Their son, Lieut. Domingo Manuel Deremao, seems to have removed to Calcutta for the benefit of his health a few months before his father's death; his first wife died at Delhi on 3rd July, 1836, aged 43 years. (She is described in her epitaph as "Bibi Anna Sahiba, daughter of the late Masih Ata Khan Sahib, grandson of the Nawab Iswi Khan Sahib, *rais* of Delhi." Inquiry from Muslim historians has failed to throw any light on these persons, and it is thought that the names are Persian pseudonyms of Christians rather than Muslim names).² His second wife, whom he is believed to have married at Sardhana about the year 1837, is stated to have been of high Afghan birth. Converted to Christianity, she received the name Elizabeth. Domingo died at Delhi on 19th January, 1852, being survived by three sons and four daughters. Previous to his death the *jagir* had been handed over by the family to the management of the local British revenue officials.³ Though his father had twelve villages, only three are named in Domingo's petition: the remaining nine must have fallen to the share of other members of the family.

In the Roman Catholic Church at Delhi there is a tablet inscribed: "Mrs. Dominga (*sic*) Deremao, a benefactress of this Church, died on the 4th February, 1871 in the 81st year of her age." This lady, however, cannot be identified with Lieut. Deremao's second wife, who is known to have lived for some years after 1871.

¹ Government to Resident at Delhi, 26th June, 1829. (Appendix, No. XVI.)

² *List of Inscriptions on Tombs and Monuments in Punjab, &c.*, by Miles Irving, Lahore, Government Press, 1910.

³ Commissioner of Delhi to Board of Revenue 9th January 1829. (Appendix, No. XVII.)

APPENDIX I.

Secret and Political Department, Fort William, 2nd March 1804. Secret Consultation of 2nd March 1804, No. 2117.

(LAKE TO WELLESLEY].

MY LORD,

For your Lordship's information I have the honour to enclose extract copy of a letter this day received addressed to Lt.-Col. Ochterlony, Acting Resident at Delhi, containing information of our troops having taken possession of the important fortress of Hansi on the 16th instant.

2. It is necessary to inform your Lordship that in consequence of a correspondence which passed between Lieut.-Colonel Ochterlony and Captain Manuel (late in the service of Dowlat Rao Scindia) commanding the fort of Hansi, I directed that officer to detach the force under Major Brownrigg consisting of the battalion of Telingars and Nujeebs which came over from the enemy at Agra to take possession of the Fort which owing to the meritorious exertions of Captain Manuel, who I beg leave particularly to recommend to Your Lordship's favour and protection, was delivered up immediately on the arrival of our troops.

3. Major Brownrigg and the Officers and men under his Command have conducted themselves to my entire satisfaction on this service and will I have no doubt acquit themselves with credit whenever their services may be further required.

4. I have the honour to enclose a copy of Lt.-Col. Ochterlony's order, of whose present to the Garrison as a reward for their good conduct I have entirely approved.

I shall have the honour to transmit correct returns of the Ordnance and Stores taken in the Fort as soon as I receive them from Major Brownrigg.

I have the honour, &c.

(Signed) G. LAKE,

Headquarters, Camp Nehmeda, December 22nd, 1803.

APPENDIX II.

Extract of a letter from Major Brownrigg to Colonel Ochterlony, Acting Resident at Delhi.

CAMP AT HANSI.

16th December 1803.

SIR,

I have the honour to inform you for the information of His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, that I arrived before Hansi this morning with the detachment under my Command and was immediately put in possession of the Fort by Captain Manuel, the Commandant, to whom every credit is due for his judicious and firm conduct during a long period. The Garrison consisted of 500 fighting men: of them Captain Manuel happily succeeded in attaching 300 to the interest of the Hon'ble Company. The remaining 200 were refractory and have been dismissed. Those who behaved well are retained in service and continued in the Fort, and in pursuance of your orders, I sent in a party of Telingars and Najebs for its better security until the arrival of Col. Ball, who will take such measures as he judges best. I am making colours for the Fort, and if ready shall hoist the British-Union on the Rampart tomorrow morning under a salute of 21 guns from the Fort and an equal number from the Camp.

There are about seventy-five pieces of Cannon mounted on the Fort, and in a day or two I shall have the honour of transmitting you a return of the Ordnance and

stores. The Fort is square, built on a high mound of earth and encompassed by a ditch from 30 to 40 feet deep which can be supplied with water from a very large tank close under the walls.

The Glasses (*sic*) is very good but not perfectly finished. I have not time at present to give you a particular description of Hansi, but must express my satisfaction that it has fallen thus into the hands of the Hon'ble Company, for even in its present unfinished state it is not only capable of defence but may be deemed a strong Fort and does great credit to the active and enterprising genius of George Thomas.

A true extract.

(Signed) G. A. F. LAKE,
Military Secretary.

APPENDIX III.

Political Department, Consultation of 18th December 1806.

This is to certify that Captain Manuel Deremao, late of the Maratha Service, having this day delivered over to me that charge of the Fort of Hansi with 70 guns, ammunition, grain, and other stores in the Fort without any resistance and agreeable to His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief's orders.

HANSI:
28th December 1803.

(Signed) ROBERT YOUNG, LIEUT.,
Commanding a Detachment of the
1st Bn. 8th Regt. N. I.

APPENDIX IV.

Translation of a Persian letter.

From—Captain J. Gerard [A. A. G. to Lake.]
To—Captain Manuel.

I have received your letter and agreeable to your request it was submitted to the Commander-in-Chief. He has directed me to acquaint you that all who entertain a sincere desire and incline themselves to serve under the British Government will no doubt merit its approbation.

If your attachment is really as you express in your address, you will deliver over the Forts, etc., under your charge to the English Power. As to your request you will not only retain your lands of Altumgha and Pay, but future favours will be conferred on you. The allowances of your brother, &c., and those sepoy's under you shall likewise be continued to them for life.

[This letter evidently passed during the negotiations for the surrender of Hansi and other forts. It is undated.]

APPENDIX V.

[Not checked with original or copy, which is not traceable in Imperial Record Department.]

Lt.-Col. Ochterlony desires Captain Manuel Deremao will accept his best acknowledgement for his firm judicious conduct during the short but trying period he has held the Command of Hansi under the protection of the British Government,

The Lieut.-Colonel will not fail to represent his sentiments to His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief and requests Captain Manuel D'Eremao will assure the well-affected men of the Garrison of his approbation of their good conduct and fidelity and inform them that half a month's pay has been remitted for the purpose of purchasing a uniform and Gorkha (?) as a reward for their good Conduct and Obedience to Captain Manuel D'Eremao's orders.

(Signed) G. A. F. LAKE,
Military Secretary.

APPENDIX VI.

(Imperial Record Office, Calcutta, Political Department Consultations, 18th December 1806).

No. 20.

N. B. EDMONSTONE, ESQUIRE,

Secretary to the Government &c., &c., &c.

SIR,

Agreeable to the orders of the Hon'ble the Governor-General in Council conveyed to me through the circular letter of Mr. Seton, Resident at Delhi, stating "that the allowance which had hitherto been paid to me in consideration of my having quitted the Marhatta Service under the proclamation issued by this Government on the 29th August 1803 was to cease on the 1st instant, from which time a Reduced rate of allowance would be assigned to me proportionate to my Rank and claims," I have to acquaint you that I have fixed on Delhi (my birth-place) for my future abode, and I trust that the Hon'ble Governor-General will take my peculiar situation, as differing from those of the other officers of the late Marhatta Service, into his favourable consideration.

I have taken the liberty of enclosing for the information of the Hon'ble the Governor-General in Council a copy of a letter received by me when in Command of Hansi and also a copy of a Receipt for Guns and Stores delivered over to Lieutenant Young.

By the former I had understood that my present allowances as well as my Altumgha would have been continued not only to me but to my son Domingo Deremao and my nephew Anthony Deremao, the former in the receipt of 60 Rupees and the latter 40 Rupees per month for life on account of the services I had performed at a critical juncture and at a period of the utmost danger to my person from the mutinous state of the Garrison of Hansi, and I have only to refer the Hon'ble the Governor-General to Lieutenant-Colonel Ochterlony then Acting Resident at Delhi as to the extent of my services at that period, and to whom it is well known that I was offered both by the Rajas of Patiala and Bikanir not only fifty thousand rupees, but a permanent provision for life for the fort of Hansi which I refused.

I have &c.,

DELHI:

(Signed) MANUEL DEREMAO,

16th September 1806.

CAPTAIN.

APPENDIX VII.

To Captain Manuel D'Eremao.

SIR,

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 16th September together with its enclosures and to signify to you the determination of the Governor-General in Council on your case.

The Governor-General in Council has been apprized by the reports of His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief of your Meritorious Conduct on the occasion of the

delivery of the Fort of Hansi to the British Arms and of His Excellency's sense of your general merits and character. I am directed to inform you that the Governor-General in Council acknowledges the value of your services and entirely approves and Confirms the Assurances conveyed to you by the Commander-in-Chief of the continuance to you during your life of the full amount of the pay which you received in the Marattha Service and of your confirmation in the possession of the lands which you held in Altumgha. The Resident at Delhi will accordingly receive instructions to resume the payment of the allowance of Rs. 400 per mensem which you have received from that Officer which the Governor-General in Council is pleased to grant to you as a pension for life. The Resident will further be directed to proceed to put you in possession of the Altumgha Lands referred to in your letter, and in that of the Right Honourable the Commander-in-Chief to your address.

I am further directed to inform you that the allowances heretofore received by your son and nephew from the treasury of Delhi will continue to be paid to them during the remainder of their lives.

2nd December, 1806.

I am, Sir, Your Obedient Servant,

(Signed) N. B. EDMONSTONE,

Secretary to Government.

APPENDIX VIII.

To—A. Seton, Esquire, Resident at Delhi.

SIR,

You will have been apprized by the records of the Residency at Delhi, of the Services rendered to the British Government by Captain Manuel Deremao on the occasion of the surrender of the Fort of Hansi to the British Arms and of the Assurances Conveyed to him by the Right Honourable Lord Lake of the Continuance during life of the pay which he received in the Marattha Service and his Confirmation in the possession of the lands which he held in Altumgha under the Marattha Government. The Governor-General in Council having entirely approved and confirmed the assurances made to Captain Manuel by the Commander-in-Chief.

I am directed to desire that you will resume the payment of the allowance of Rs. 400 per mensem which he formerly received from the treasury at Delhi and that you will continue to pay to him that amount which the Governor-General in Council has been pleased to grant to him as a pension for life. You are authorized to recommence the payment from the 1st September last when it ceased under the order for discontinuing the allowances heretofore received by the Officers who quitted the Marattha Service.

I am further directed to desire that you will ascertain the extent and value of the Altumgha lands referred to in the preceding part of this letter and take the necessary measures for putting Captain Manuel in possession of them, agreeably to the promise of the Right Honourable the Commander-in-Chief.

The Governor-General in Council has further determined to continue to the son and nephew of Captain Manuel for themselves the amount of their respective pensions of Rs. 60 and Rs. 40 per mensem; [and you are accordingly authorized to resume] the payment of those pensions from the 1st September last.

I have, etc.

FORT WILLIAM :

2nd December 1806.

(Signed) N. B. EDMONSTONE,

Secretary to Government.

APPENDIX IX.

To His Excellency the Most Noble The Marquess of Hastings, Governor-General in Council.

The humble petition of Captain Manuel Deremao late of the Marattha Service and Commandant of Hansi.

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH,

That in the year of our Lord 1803, when the victorious Arms of the British had extended their conquest to Delhi, Your petitioner was sole Commandant of the Fort Hansi, which he held on the part of the Marattha Government and on their defeat and dispersion by the English, continued to defend against the bodies of the Bhutes, Ranghurs and others, till the conquest of Delhi by the British and the arrival of Lord Lake at the Capital.

2. Your petitioner then, in admiration of the British prowess, magnanimity, and equity, determined to surrender himself and deliver the Fort of which he was Commandant to them; and with that view addressed the late Lord Lake.

3. When it was known that Your petitioner sought the protection of the British, and had offered to deliver up the Fort to them, the Rajas of Patiala and Bikanir severally wrote to him (copies of whose letters Nos. 1 and 2 Your petitioner has taken the liberty to enclose) each offering him Rs. 50,000 and villages in Altumgha in their respective districts (in lieu of those held by Your petitioner in Altumgha from the Emperor Bahadoor Shah in the province of Delhi) for the Fort of Hansi.

4. That Your petitioner considering the palpable want of fidelity in the Native Chiefs to their promises and likewise the unsullied character of the British for their veracity; and viewing them besides, from their being the Sovereigns of the Country and conquerors of the Maratthas, as his lawful masters, Your petitioner determined to cast himself on their clemency and munificence and therefore refused every offer, however advantageous, made by the above-mentioned Native Chiefs.

5. To this end Your petitioner in the very month (September 1803) that Lord Lake arrived at the Capital, addressed to His Excellency the letter above alluded to, in which Your petitioner without making any stipulations for himself or asking any terms excepting being confirmed in the possession of the Altumgha lands held by Your petitioner from the Emperor Bahadoor Shah (Copies of whose Firmans to Your petitioner's ancestors are enclosed, Nos. 3 and 4) and subsequently confirmed to Your petitioner by the Marattha Government (Copies of whose Parwana is enclosed, No. 5) offered to deliver up the Forts to the British with seventy pieces of Ordnance, ammunition, and other stores.

The result of this address to Lord Lake was a letter from His Excellency to Your petitioner (a copy of which is enclosed, No. 6) expressing His Excellency's gratification at my offering to surrender, and his acceptance thereof, and besides promising to Your petitioner the continuance of his allowance with that of the Officers and men under his Command as enjoyed under the Marattha Government; and appointing him on the part of the British Government still to hold the Command of the Fort of Hansi. His Excellency was pleased expressly to declare with the solemnity of an oath calling God to witness, that agreeable to Your petitioner's desire (it being the only condition of the delivery of the Fort) the villages and lands held by Your petitioner, should according to the purport of the Emperor's Firmans and the Parwana of the Marattha Government be confirmed and continued to him and his posterity by the British as heretofore.

Your petitioner in perfect reliance on Lord Lake's assurances, delivered himself and Forts up to the British, and in return experienced the utmost happiness in so doing, from the fulfilment of all the engagements and kind assurances continued in Lord Lake's letters in both continuing to him and the Officers and men, late under his Command, the pay of their rank and in confirming and protecting him in the possession of the Altumgha lands above alluded to (*Vide* enclosure No. 7).

While thus enjoying both the allowance and the Altumgha lands, secured to Your petitioner by British munificence, Your petitioner received in the year 1806 an intimation from Mr. Seton, the then Resident at Delhi, that Your petitioner's allowance would be reduced, from a misconception that Your petitioner had quitted the Marattha Service under the proclamation of 1803.

But Your petitioner's representation of the true state of the case, addressed to Mr. Secretary Edmondstone, removed the misconception and obtained for Your petitioner the very favourable decision of Government, contained in enclosure No. 8, in which the "Governor-General in Council entirely approves and confirms the assurances conveyed to Your petitioner by the Commander-in-Chief, of the continuance to

him during life of the full amount of the pay which he received in the Marattha Service and of Your petitioner's confirmation in the possession of the lands which he held in Altumgha."

In conformity with the above decision, Your petitioner continued to enjoy both his allowance and lands.

In the year 1817, the wording of that part of Mr. Secretary Edmonstone's letter, which confirms the Altumgha lands to Your petitioner and his posterity, having created in the mind of a friend a doubt as to its real import, Your petitioner addressed a private letter to General Sir David Ochterlony, begging to be favoured with his opinion on the subject; that gentleman having a perfect knowledge of all the circumstances of Your petitioner's case, and of the nature of the provision made for him by the Government.

The reply with which General Sir David Ochterlony was pleased to favour me being of the utmost importance to a just view of the point in question, Your petitioner takes the liberty to quote it for the information of Your Lordship:—"I believe that the word Altumgha mentioned in the Secretary's letter secures to your offspring whatever lands you hold on such grants. It would however be satisfactory to me to examine copies of the Grants you possess from the Emperor and from the Marattha Government as it might put the question beyond doubt."

In compliance with the request of General Sir David Ochterlony Your petitioner lost no time in forwarding copies of the necessary Grants and in reply received the following encouraging definition of the purport of Mr. Secretary Edmonstone's letter, *viz.*—"I have received your papers and will not permit myself to doubt that the Altumgha Grants you possess and the assurances received from the British Government will secure to your posterity the lands held by your ancestors."

After such an unequivocal declaration of security afforded both by the letter of General Sir David Ochterlony and by that of the Government communicated by Mr. Secretary Edmonstone and by the letter of His Excellency Lord Lake, Your petitioner could not but rest assured that the possession of the Altumgha lands was secured both to Your petitioner and his posterity for ever, according to the tenure of the original Grants and their subsequent confirmation.

Your petitioner therefore would never have taken the liberty of troubling Government any further respecting either his allowance or his Altumgha lands, but for an intimation from Mr. Fraser the Deputy Superintendent of Delhi, received about two months since, acquainting Your petitioner that after his demise his Altamgha lands would not descend to his posterity but be assumed by the Government.

The occasion of this intimation having originated in a misunderstanding of the terms on which Your petitioner holds his Altumgha lands, Your petitioner begs leave to state for the information of Your Lordship:

About four years ago Mr. Fraser, the then Collector of Delhi, requested to see and examine the Grants pertaining to the villages held by Your petitioner in Altumgha and Your petitioner, in consequence of his official request, forwarded the Firmans of the Emperor and the Parwanas of the Marattha Government.

Your petitioner had heard nothing for about four years of the result of this examination but about eight months ago Mr. Fortescue the late Civil Commissioner of Delhi communicated a similar request, and Your petitioner forwarded the same papers which had been sent to Mr. Fraser, the letters of Lord Lake not having been demanded (as the British Government's Confirmation of the lands to Your petitioner and his posterity it was not sent).

Mr. Fortescue upon examination of the Firmans and Parwana only, made his report to Government and having neither demanded or seen the British Confirmation of the lands, assumed that they were held by the authority of the Maratthas only. It was on this principle (Your petitioner humbly conceives) that Mr. Fortescue made his report to Government; and occasioned the intimation last received from Mr. Fraser.

Having thus stated for the information of Your Lordship the nature of Your petitioner's and his posterity's claims to the Altumgha lands, confirmed to him by Government, and also the occasion of the intimation which has induced this petition it only remains for Your petitioner to say that he ever relied on and still relies for

his and his posterity's protection in the Altamgha lands on the equity and veracity and munificence of the British Government, so manifestly pledged and manifested towards Your petitioner in the letters of Lord Lake and Mr. Secretary Edmondstone; and therefore humbly hopes that the justice of his and his posterity's claims to those lands will appear to Government to be of a nature perfectly clear and decided; and Your petitioner further humbly implores Your Lordship to grant to him some additional mark of the favour and protection of Government which shall effectually secure Your petitioner and his posterity against any further molestation in their possession of the Altamgha lands for ever.

And Your petitioner as in duty bound shall ever pray.

DELHI,

The 2nd of January, 1821.

(Signed) M. DEREMAO, CAPTAIN.

APPENDIX X.

TO GEORGE SWINTON, ESQUIRE,

Acting Secretary to Government,

Political Department, Fort William.

SIR,

I have the honour herewith to transmit a memorial from Captain Manuel DeEremao to the Most Noble the Governor-General in Council.

2. I would fain indulge the hope that this memorial, which I know in every part which relates to recent events to be a faithful recital of facts, will, of itself, induce His Lordship's most favourable consideration.

3. At the moment that Captain Manuel Deremao delivered up to us the Fort of Hansi, the importance of the cession was immense; and I have no hesitation in saying would have been gladly purchased on much higher terms than what was demanded or expected by Captain Manuel Deremao; not so much for the value of the country, or for any intention to retain it, as that it gave us a strong Fortress, and a powerful train of Artillery which in other hands might have been highly injurious to our interests, and in ours, was of the utmost importance; as from thence, on the first suspicion of Holkar's attempt on Delhi, I drew several guns, which were of the greatest use in the defence. It was all that remained to Perron in this quarter; and the acquisition gave a formidable blow to the adherents of Dowlut Row, who were traversing the purgunahs, and levying contributions in the name of the Marattha Government, as collections, and granting receipts for much larger sums than they received.

4. Independently however of the individual claims of Captain Deremao, and the strong assurances he received from myself, and the then Commander-in-Chief, I beg leave earnestly to implore the attention of His Lordship in Council, to the Sunnads under which he holds, and which I am instructed to believe are not merely Grants in perpetuity to heirs male, but to heirs general; and if I am rightly informed, the undoubted validity of the grants, the length of time which his ancestors held uninterrupted possession, and even the period in which it has been in his own occupancy, would secure him unmolested possession, by the existing regulations of Government, were it situate in our own Provinces and made a subject of discussion in our own Courts of Law.

5. To a man bordering on, if not past, the age of seventy years, little satisfaction can be derived from the assurances that he will hold his lands for life. He is fully aware that at his death, his personal allowance will cease to benefit his family; and to the grant, to the assurance he received, and the word Altamgha, and his heirs general, he looked with full conviction, that his Children and Grand-Children, under the benignant protection of the British Government, would enjoy comparative ease and comfort, and at all events be secured from penury. I never, in any instance,

regretted more sincerely my inability to do justice to a cause, which I most solemnly believe to have strong claims on the most favourable consideration of His Lordship in Council; for the merits, and essential services, of the individual; and one where I was more strongly impressed with the belief, that the memorialist could establish a positive right, which would be held sacred, were it subjected to investigation in our own Courts, and decided by our own regulations.

DELHI RESIDENCY,
22nd January 1821.

I have, &c.,
(Signed) DA. OCHTERLONY,
Resident.

APPENDIX XI.

TO MAJOR-GENERAL SIR DAVID OCHTERLONY, BART., G.C.B.

SIR,

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your despatch of 22nd ultimo, containing a memorial from Captain Deremao.

2. The documents now submitted by the memorialist, consisting of letters from Lord Lake, and Mr. Edmonstone; which did not appear to have been produced before Mr. Fortescue; and the facts and circumstances stated in your despatch, having satisfied His Excellency in Council of the just claim of Captain Manuel Deremao to hold his lands in Fareedabad, Altamgha, according to former usage, His Lordship in Council has been pleased to revise the orders passed on his case; and to resolve that the lands in question shall be continued to his heirs after his demise. Indeed this resolution may be considered as an anticipation only of the decision which would have been passed, when his heirs should have brought forward their claims, grounding it on the documents now produced by Captain Deremao; who appears to have misunderstood the orders of the Government with regard to the resumption of his Altamgha. It was not declared by the orders as stated in his memorial, that the lands should not descend to his heirs, but that their claims would be considered after his death.

3. You will be pleased to make the necessary communication on the subject to Captain Deremao, and to the Deputy Superintendent.

FORT WILLIAM,
The 10th February 1821.

I have, &c.,
(Signed) G. SWINTON,
Secretary to Government.

APPENDIX XII.

(Imperial Record Office, Calcutta: Political Consultations, dated 26th December 1828).

No. 15.

TO GEORGE SWINTON, ESQUIRE,

Chief Secretary to the Government,
Political Department at Fort William.

SIR,

I have the honour to transmit for the orders of the Right Honorable the Governor-General in Council copy of a letter from Lieutenant D. Deremao of the late Maharratta Service, requesting to be allowed to draw his Pension for the future at the Presidency.

DEHLEE RESIDENCY,
CAMP PANEEPUT,
7th December 1828.

I have, &c.,
(Signed) ED. COLEBROOKE,
Resident.

To SIR E. COLEBROOKE, BART,
Resident,
Dehlee.

SIR,

My continued indisposition inducing me to remove to Calcutta for my health, I beg you will obtain the Permission of Government for my drawing my Pension at the Presidency, where I propose to reside.

DEHLEE :
 5th December 1828.

I have, &c.,
 (Signed) D. DEREMAO,
 LIEUTENANT.

A true copy.

(Signed) C. E. TREVELYAN,
 ASSISTANT RESIDENT.

Ordered that the following reply be returned to Sir Ed. Colebrooke.

No. 16. To

SIR J. E. COLEBROOKE, BART,
Resident at Dehlee.

SIR,

I am directed to acquaint you in reply to your letter of the 7th instant that Lieutenant D. Deremao, late of the Mahratta Service, will be permitted to draw his Pension at the Presidency on his producing a certificate from you of the amount and of the period up to which it has been paid at Dehlee.

You will be pleased to report whether Monsr. Deremao's Pension has hitherto been paid in Furruckabad or Sicca Rupees, in order that its corresponding amount may be paid to him at the Presidency.

FORT WILLIAM :
 26th December 1828.

I have, &c.,
 (Signed) GEO. SWINTON,
 CHIEF SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT.

APPENDIX XIII.

(Imperial Record Office, Calcutta ; Political Consultations, 26th June 1829).

No. 1. To

G. SWINTON, ESQUIRE,
Chief Secretary to Government,
Political Department,
Fort William.

SIR,

I have the honour to inform you that Captain Manuel Deremao—a Pensioned Officer formerly of the Marhatta Service receiving a monthly allowance from Government of Rupees 400—died yesterday at this place and that the payment of his allowance will accordingly be discontinued.

DELHI RESY. :
 6th June 1829.

I have, &c.,
 (Signed) E. COLEBROOKE,
 RESIDENT.

Ordered that a copy of the foregoing letter from the Resident at Delhi be sent to the Civil Auditor for his information.

APPENDIX XIV.

TO SIR J. E. COLEBROOKE, BART.,

Resident at Delhi.

SIR,

Having been present at the reading of the Will of the late Captain Manuel Deremao, I deem it my duty to inform you that the testator has therein expressed himself to the following purport. "Further in consideration of the Services rendered by me to the British Government I entreat the Resident at Delhi for the time being or other Civil or Military Chief to be guardian to my Estate, and to see all and every part of my Will rightly administered."

2. Copy of the said Will shall be forwarded as soon as it can be prepared.

DELHI:

I have, &c.,

JUDGE AND MAGISTRATE'S OFFICE.

(Signed) T. T. METCALFE,

8th June 1829.

Judge and Magistrate.

APPENDIX XV.

TO GEORGE SWINTON, ESQUIRE,

Chief Secretary to Government,

Political Department, Fort William.

Dated Delhi Residency, 9th June 1829.

SIR,

I do myself the honour to submit the annexed copy of a letter from the Magistrate of Delhi and to solicit the orders of the Right Honourable the Governor-General in Council, whether I am at liberty to take upon myself the official administration of the late Captain Deremao's Will as requested by him. The Estate which he wishes to place under the guardianship of the Residency is an hereditary Jageer of 12 villages which has already been the subject of correspondence with the Government in regard to the powers which he claims to exercise in it.

I have, &c.,

(Signed) J. E. COLEBROOKE,

Resident.

APPENDIX XVI.

TO J. E. COLEBROOKE, ESQUIRE,

Resident at Delhi.

Dated Fort William, 26th June 1829.

SIR,

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter dated 9th instant, reporting the death of Captain Deremao and to state that the Governor-General in Council has no objection to your undertaking the official administration of such provisions of the Will of the deceased as are consistent with the law and usage. It will doubtless have occurred to you that the Jageer being Hereditary, Captain Deremao's interest in it ceased with his life and he could have no right to regulate by Will its disposal after his death, or otherwise to interfere with the legal and established course of succession thereto.

I have, &c.,

(Signed) A. STIRLING,

Deputy Secretary to Government.

APPENDIX XVII.

From Commissioner of Delhie Division.

SIR,

I have the honour to submit the accompanying application made through the Officiating Collector of Delhie from Lieutenant Deremao, the holder in Altumgha of three villages :

Bhopany

Khanpur

Bichputti

to transfer his Jageer to the management of the Local Officers to be assessed by us and the Revenues after deducting all expenses of collection to be paid to him and his heirs.

This arrangement I beg to recommend for the sanction of superior authority.

I have, &c.,

DELHIE :

(Signed) J. METCALFE,

COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE.

Commissioner.

9th January 1843.

Submits application from Lieutenant Deremao received through the Officiating Collector of Delhie to transfer his Jageer to the management of the Local Officers, the Revenue to be paid to him and his heirs after deducting expenses on account of collections, &c.

NOTE.

I desire to express my gratitude to Mrs. Pratt, great-grand-daughter of Captain Manuel Deremao, for assistance given me in the compilation of this paper.

PANJAB UNIVERSITY HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

(*Incorporating the Punjab Historical Society*).

FINANCIAL STATEMENT.

The old Punjab Historical Society was in January 1932 merged in the newly organised Panjab University Historical Society. The funds of the old society which amounted on 31st December 1931 to Rs. 1,380-6-10 were handed over to the new Society. The life members of the old society are members of the new Society, and other members of the old society are invited to join the new Society. There are at present two life members, and 21 annual members. Out of these 21 annual members 14 are ordinary members and 7 student members. The income of the society during the current year is given below :—

	Rs.	a.	p.
14 Ordinary members subscription ..	130	0	0
7 Student members subscription ..	17	8	0
Grant from Panjab University ..	250	0	0
Total ..	397	8	0

The expenditure during the same period, including the expenditure on account of the old society merged in the new one is shown thus :—

	Rs.	a.	p.
Clerk and peon ..	86	8	0
Printing ..	48	10	0
Postage and contingencies ..	45	11	3
Exchange on realisation of cheque ..	0	4	0
Total ..	181	1	3

The balance at present in hand is Rs. 1,572-13-7. This includes Rs. 1,380-6-10 the amount we received from the old Society. The stock consisting of the previous copies of the Journal is not valued yet.

LAHORE :	J. F. BRUCE,	GULSHAN RAI,
<i>Dated 13th April 1932.</i>	PRESIDENT.	HONY. TREASURER.

AUDIT REPORT.

I have checked the accounts of the Punjab Historical Society from 1928 to 1931 inclusive and the accounts of the Panjab University Historical Society for 1932, to to-day, April 13th, 1932. I suggest

- (1) The accounts each year should be submitted to a general meeting or executive committee and approved and then signed by the President.
- (2) All vouchers with receipts should be numbered.
- (3) Receipts for all payments should be obtained.
- (4) I note that with one exception there is no income from the sale of the Journal of the Punjab Historical Society from 1928—1932.

J. F. BRUCE,
PRESIDENT.

LAHORE :
Dated 13th April 1932.

J. E. PARKINSON,
PRINCIPAL,
Central Training College, Lahore,
Honorary Auditor.