Astrid Erll

RE-WRITING AS RE-VISIONING
Modes of representing the 'Indian
Mutiny' in British novels, 1857 to 2000

In the course of a 'memorial history' (that is, the history of how events or persons are recalled by social communities) it is to a great degree the mode of remembering which effects changes in the shape and meaning of the past. Modes of remembering are modes of re-presenting the past. The aim of this essay is to explore the way in which literary forms generate specific modes of remembering. I will look at features such as narrative voice, focalisation, metaphors, intertextuality, and plot structures of the literary (re-)writing of the 'Indian Mutiny' (1857) which has been taking place over a time span of almost 150 years, in order to provide some insights into one of literature's potential functions, its power to re-vision the past, in imperial and post-colonial cultures of memory. A broader aim of the essay is to show in exemplary fashion how the field of post-colonial studies can usefully apply concepts of cultural memory.

Keywords cultural memory; 'Indian Mutiny' 1857; British imperial history; imperial discourse; Anglo-Indian literature; post-colonial literature; narratology; G. A. Henty; R. Kipling; E. M. Forster; J. G. Farrell; Z. Smith

The 'Indian Mutiny' and Great Britain's imperial culture of memory

> Of all great events of this century, as they are reflected in fiction, the Indian Mutiny has taken the firmest hold on the popular imagination . . . [T]he events of the time seemed to provide every element of romance that could be desired in a story. Valour and heroism, cruelty and treachery, sharp agony and long endurance, satiated vengeance and bloodthirsty hatred were all present . . .
>
> (Gregg, 1897: 218)

Starting a scholarly piece on the literature of the 'Indian Mutiny' by quoting Hilda Gregg's famous lines on the impact of the experience of 1857 on British literature has become by now a topos in itself.[1] Despite the host of imperialistic stereotypes displayed in her review, Gregg is fascinated by what contemporary literary and cultural history is intrigued by as well: it is certainly not the literary quality of an enormous body of (at best) middle-brow novels;[2] nor is it the novelty of narratives

which keep reiterating the same story. Rather more worthy of consideration is the fact that the 'Indian Mutiny' has been turned into a key event of British history by acts of imperial and post-colonial remembering and that the novel has emerged – over a period of almost 150 years – as *the* major medium of the production and transformation of 'Mutiny' memory.

The term 'Indian Mutiny' has been (and still is) used in Great Britain to describe the rebellion which broke out in northern and central India in 1857. It indeed started as a mutiny of discontented sepoy regiments, that is, Indian soldiers in the service of the East India Company, which had, by that time, annexed the greater part of the subcontinent. But the soldiers' uprising speedily turned into a 'popular revolt',[3] also involving the tax-drained Indian peasants and disinherited Indian princes, like the Rani of Jhansi and Nana Sahib. One year later, in 1858, the British had re-established power, with an hitherto unknown cruelty – burning, for example, whole villages, and executing every single man in them, in order to avenge British victims and to deter any other rebels. In the history of British imperialism, the 'Mutiny' turned out to be a watershed: it led to the transformation of an informal Empire, controlled for more than a hundred years by the East India Company, to the formal empire under the British crown, the Raj.

Militarily merely one of the colonial 'small wars' and a not very well- conducted one at that, the 'Mutiny' was quickly turned into a foundational myth of the British that contributed to grand scale imperial self-fashioning and helped legitimate British rule in India. The British created a colonial narration – uncontested in British society in a formerly unknown way – which had little to do with the actual events. It prominently figures the themes of Indian treachery, of terrible Indian atrocities and – as far as the British side is concerned – of extreme heroism ('every woman was a man, every man a hero', as one source phrases it[4]). From the colonisers' perspective, Indians had betrayed British benevolence by turning against their just, liberal and progressive rulers. Back at home, in England, the rumours of massacres and of the rape of British women struck at the heart of Victorian sensibilities. According to Gregg, 'it was the suffering of women and children which roused England to madness' (1897: 218).

None of the figures of memory just mentioned can stand up to historical enquiry, even if one relies solely on British sources. The elements of the British myth are at best debatable, more often utterly wrong. For example, most of the rape stories belonged to the 'fictions connected with the Indian Mutiny' as Edward Leckey pointed out as early as 1859. And what was often forgotten, moreover, was that some British atrocities preceded as well as surpassed those of the Indians.[5] The British memory of the 'Indian Mutiny' – up to 1947, and in a residual way also after Indian independence – is a case in point for the selectivity, unreliability and political functions of cultural memory.

An important contribution to the issue of *The Indian Mutiny and the British Imagination* was recently made by Gautam Chakravarty (2005), who reads novels and works of historiography alongside each other in order to trace the processes of what I would call 'the production of an imperial cultural memory'. Since Chakravarty is specifically interested in 'imperial memory' he concentrates on the novels produced before Indian independence in 1947, and discards the rest as 'unimportant'. He states that:

> Occasional novels on the subject have appeared in each decade after the political independence of India, but with the end of Empire and its inner circuitry of myths, memories and meanings, its statuary of heroes and villains, such novels amount to little more than ironic coda or naïve nostalgia.
>
> (Chakravarty, 2005: 4 – 5)

I would like to contest this all too apodictical view taken in an otherwise highly valuable book. Rather than being 'occasional', the literary memory of the 'Indian Mutiny' lives on powerfully after 1947, in historiography, in fiction and film: new narrative histories reiterating the British version of the 'Mutiny' (such as Saul David's *The Indian Mutiny*, 2002) are published and reach high sales numbers; Indian revisionist historiography (such as Rudrangshu Mukherjee's *Spectre of Violence*, 1998) keeps challenging those histories; intercultural bestsellers like Zadie Smith's *White Teeth* (2000, discussed below) deal with the 'Mutiny', albeit ironically; and the Bollywood production, *The Rising* (Ketan Mehta, 2005), has led to heated controversies in Great Britain and India. What changes, however, with the undeniably different cultural and political contexts after 1947 is the *mode* of remembering – modes Chakravarty already points to when he writes somewhat offhandedly about 'ironic coda' or 'naïve nostalgia'.

Literary representations of the 'Mutiny' differ not only as far as the 'what' and the 'what for' of memory is concerned, that is, the particular story which is told and the ideological functions this story seems to fulfil. They can also be distinguished according to the 'how' of literary memory, that is, the specific formal characteristics which constitute different modes of cultural remembering in the medium of literature. It is these formal features which are visible to the literary historian, and can therefore be analysed. They provide us with a 'window' on the possible pre-forming constellations and refiguring effects of literature in cultures of memory.[6] In what follows I will draw attention to some modes of representing the 'Indian Mutiny' which have developed over a time span of almost 150 years. The diachronic overview will show how re-writing results in a re-visioning of the past. My examples range from early eyewitness accounts to the high imperial 'Mutiny' novel, and from Anglo-Indian fiction before 1947 to the British intercultural novel of today.

Narrativising and conveying experience: the experiential mode of remembering in early eyewitness accounts

Making sense of the past involves putting events in a temporal and causal order, perceiving them from a certain angle, and condensing complex processes into apt metaphors and symbols. Poetic and narrative strategies tend to play an important role in the symbolic transformation of experience into memory.[7] Cultural memory, too, is very much based on practices of creating and sharing stories.[8] Making narrations of individual-autobiographical memory available to social groups entails moreover their medial externalisation: oral discourse, letters, and published diaries are some of the primary media of transformation between the levels of the individual and the collective.

In the aftermath of the revolt, a host of diaries and 'Mutiny' memoirs were published. These typical 'witnessing' genres fulfil one main function for their audience: they promise to convey 'lived experience'. Correspondingly, on the textual level they display a mode of remembering which draws attention to their sources in personal memory and their embedding within the framework of what Jan and Aleida Assmann would call 'communicative memory'.[9] Typical forms of the 'experiential mode' of literary remembering are therefore the 'personal voice'[10] generated by first-person narration; forms of addressing the reader in the intimate way typical of face-to-face communication; the use of present tense or of lengthy passages focalised by the 'experiencing I' in order to convey embodied, seemingly immediate experience; and the description of many details of everyday life (the *effet de réel* turns into an *effet de mémoire*). Perhaps not very surprisingly, such circumstantial realism tends towards the military and ethnological in men's narratives (for example, those by George Bourchier, W. J. Sheperd, and Mowbray Thomson) and towards the description of social interaction and physical and mental experience in women's narratives (as in the writings of Julia Inglis, Katherine Harris and Adelaine Case).

To get an idea of how the 'experiential mode' is typically created, one can choose at random a preface to one of the numerous eyewitness accounts of the siege of Lucknow, for example Katherine Bartrum's *A Widow's Reminiscences of the Siege of Lucknow* (1858), which concludes by claiming that

> It is not the wish of the writer of this little volume, any more than it is in her power, to draw, in *glowing colours*, a picture of sights and scenes through which it has been her lot to pass, but merely, at the *desire of her friends*, to give in *simple truthfulness* a *detail* of those domestic occurrences which fell immediately under her *own observation* during the siege of Lucknow, to show how wonderfully she was protected in perils and dangers of no ordinary kind, and how, when called to drink deeply of the cup of human sorrow, the arm of *the Lord* was her stay, a 'rock of defence in the day of trouble. Bath, November, 1858.
>
> (Bartrum, 1858; emphasis added)

The original addressees of this narrative – as the preface clearly states – were friends. This originally small circle of communication was actually transcended by the publication of the book. Nevertheless, in their prefatorial apologies many writers of 'Mutiny' memoirs thematise and indeed insist on the medium's place within the narrow social frameworks of communicative memory.[11] By means of a characteristic choice of keywords – 'simple truthfulness', 'detail', 'own observation' – Bartrum promises to hand down lived experience. Closely connected with this assurance is the rejection of literariness. The reluctance to write in a 'glowing' way is a recurring metaphor in the prefaces to 'Mutiny' diaries.[12] It belongs to a tradition in which authenticity is associated with an empirical, factual style. However, the preface also shows nicely where and how this realm of 'simple truthfulness' is transcended. Eyewitness accounts are usually neither 'simple' nor 'unliterary'. On the contrary, the importance of literary and 'cultural paradigms' (in Paul Fussell's sense, 1980), which structure the narrative and generate meaning out of a seemingly meaningless chaos, cannot be overrated. Given the missionary attitude and Anglican background of

the British in India, intertextual references to the Bible as a major cultural paradigm in Bartrum's *Reminiscences* do not come as a surprise. The 'Mutiny' memoirs foreshadow and indeed partly form the dominant Christian interpretation of the 'Indian Mutiny', which turns British soldiers into 'muscular Christians' and the women of the Anglo-Indian community into 'Angels of Albion'.[13]

Although 'Mutiny' narratives like Bartrum's do not belong to the domain of fictional writing, their narrative strategies provide important templates for subsequent 'Mutiny' novels proper. The experiential mode of literary remembering, with its focus on the details of everyday life and the specific experientiality of past events, remains an integral part of fictional 'Mutiny' writing. By drawing on this mode, 'Mutiny' narratives generate and circulate representations of the past as lived-through experience and as an object of communicative memory.

Turning history into myth: the monumental mode of remembering in the high imperial juvenile 'Mutiny' novel (G. A. Henty's *In Times of Peril*, 1881)

The most important and also, as far as cultural memory is concerned, most tenacious period of British 'Mutiny' writing is the latter part of the nineteenth century, an age of self-confident and aggressive imperialistic self-fashioning. In the 1880s, and even more so in the 1890s, the number of published 'Mutiny' novels reaches a peak. The literary market is flooded by popular romances and juvenile novels addressing the events of 1857; examples include G. A. Henty's *Rujub the Juggler* (1893), H. C. Irwin's *A Man of Honour* (1896), J. E. Muddock's *The Great White Hand* (1896) or Flora Annie Steel's *On the Face of the Waters* (1897). The turn from memoir to fiction and the greater freedom of representation associated with the latter result in an amplification of 'Mutiny' memory. The 'vicious' Nana Sahib's troops become more and more numerous, British soldiers become more and more heroic, women are raped in hundreds by lecherous sepoys. This 'larger than life' version of the 'Indian Mutiny' (prepared and supported by other contemporary media of cultural remembering, such as sensationalist newspaper articles, sermons, odes, monuments and popular historiography) will enter popular memory and prove very persistent. Even a hundred years later, in contemporary British narrative history (as in Christopher Hibbert's *The Great Indian Mutiny*, 1978), traces of the high Victorian myth-making can still be discerned.

If the testimonial first-person accounts considered above employ narrative strategies which evoke the specific experientiality of a recent past, then the 'Mutiny' novels of high imperialism are characterised by a mode of literary remembering which, while also taking up some of the typical forms and contents of communicative memory, gives the past a mythical appearance. Jan Assmann explains that Cultural memory is about transforming the past into myth, that is, into stories which make sense, convey a 'truth' of a higher order and which therefore exert normative and formative power.[14] 'Mutiny' novels of the late nineteenth century operate through myth-making. They rely heavily on monumentalising modes of literary remembering, which turn history into myth. This process can be particularly well observed in the juvenile literature of the epoch, because as an important means of handing down

cultural memory to future generations, it usually displays in a paradigmatic way whatever strategies of remembering are current.

In 1881, G. A. Henty, one of the empire's most productive bards and successful 'recruiting officer for a generation of schoolboys' (Turnbaugh, 1975: 734) published *In Times of Peril*, a juvenile adventure novel with a highly propagandistic, didactic, and not least, memorial dimension. The fictive teenage protagonists, the brothers Dick and Ned, take part in every major campaign of the 'Indian Mutiny'. They experience the siege and the storming of Delhi; they spend time in the Lucknow residency among the besieged and later take part in General Campbell's so-called 'second relief'; they even witness the Satichaura Ghat massacre of Cawnpore (in actual fact only four witnesses survived). By means of this literary tour de force the novel condenses various widely known topoi of the British 'Mutiny' myth into one coherent narrative sequence, thus facilitating its recall and at the same time securing the canon of remembered events.

As the didactic and propagandistic dimension of Henty's novel has been extensively discussed by Vera Nünning,[15] I will confine my comments to those textual strategies which turn the historical events into myth and thereby contribute to the collective production of cultural memory. The title 'In Times of Peril' – clearly Biblical in tone[16] – takes up the religious patterning of the 'Mutiny' customary since the early memoirs. Yet the change of genre – from personal narrative to juvenile novel – is significant with regard to the authority and range of this patterning. While in the personal narrative, for example, of Katherine Bartrum, references to the Bible seem to provide a form of (dogmatically Anglican) consolation, in Henty's novel they unequivocally promote the idea of a God-chosen British empire. As far as the level of characters and action is concerned, the narrative mode of *In Times of Peril* is certainly characterised by a high degree of experientiality (this is doubtless the major incentive for the juvenile target readership), but the fictional 'here and now' is often transcended into the monumental realm of imperial myth. For example, Ned (the older, sensible brother and reliable voice of cultural memory) considers in Darwinian terms the question of what the 'Indian Mutiny' actually meant with respect to the larger, mythical horizons of cultural memory: 'This is no ordinary war, Dick; it is a struggle for existence' (Henty, 2001: 56). More such enlightening comments are provided by the authorial narrator. He uses his omniscient point of view and licence to interrupt the story with extra-representational comments in order to locate the events of 1857 in the realm of national myth. By acts of prospective remembering[17] the narrator stretches temporal boundaries to their limits:

> Of all the names connected with the Indian mutiny, Cawnpore stands conspicuous for its dark record of treachery, massacre and bloodshed; and its name will, so long as the English language continues, be regarded as the darkest in the annals of our nation.
>
> (Henty, 2002: 143)

This hyperbolic rhetoric is the rhetoric of the monumental mode. The superlative British heroism promoted by the narrator finds its equivalent on the level of action in the paradigmatic heroic deeds of the two juvenile protagonists: Dick and Ned's fearlessness, audacity and gallantry serve the normative ('what shall we do?') and

the formative ('who are we?') purposes characteristic of 'Cultural memory' as defined by Jan and Aleida Assmann. Whereas in the early 'Mutiny' memoirs, agents retain their mediocrity and individuality, in high imperial (juvenile) literature, they turn into allegorical figures of memory.

Historical events such as the Indian rebellion of 1857 can be remembered as a content of everyday-life 'communicative memory' or as a myth of 'Cultural memory'. What matters is the way they are represented. In the medium of literature, experiential and monumental modes contribute to a representation of past events according to the communicative and the Cultural frame respectively.[18] All subsequent literary re-writings of 'Mutiny' memory (and their indirect, implicit, reflexive, or demythologising modes) will – in one way or another – refer back to the basic experience-conveying and myth-making literary representations of the 'Mutiny' in the nineteenth century.

Hegemonising the myth: an indirect mode of remembering the 'Indian Mutiny' in Kipling's *Kim* (1901)

The most important author of the British empire, Rudyard Kipling, never wrote a 'Mutiny' novel proper. Brantlinger (1988: 199) muses: 'Perhaps Kipling avoided a subject that so tempted other writers to bar the door against imaginative sympathy: great literature does not mix well with calls for repression and revenge.' Yet in some ways, Kipling's fiction does take part in the literary production of 'Mutiny' memory. In Kipling's canonical Indian novel *Kim* (1901), for example, an *indirect* mode of remembering the 'Mutiny' is discernible. The rebellion is not part of the level of action; yet it is shown indirectly, as living on in the consciousness of its characters, as a part of cultural memory.

In the third chapter of *Kim* little Kimball O'Hara and the lama make the acquaintance of an old Indian soldier. He is a former sepoy, who served in the times of the 'Mutiny' and readily tells Kim stories of war:

> Kim had enjoyed a most interesting evening with the old man, who brought out his cavalry sabre and, balancing it on his dry knees, told tales of the Mutiny and young captains thirty years in their graves, till Kim dropped off to sleep.
>
> (Kipling, 1995: 54)

The sepoy episode of Kipling's *Kim* stages the typical process of generating communicative memory: the oral transmission of knowledge and experience from one generation to the next. By listening to the soldier's discourse, Kim is given the opportunity to become part of a community of remembering. The story, however, which is told by the old soldier, turns out to be resonant with the topoi and stereotypes of the British myth as it was stabilised at the turn of the century:

> A *madness* ate into all the Army, and they turned against their officers. That was the first evil, but not past remedy if they had then held their hands. But they

chose to *kill the Sahibs' wives and children*. Then came the Sahibs from over the sea and *called them to most strict account*

(57; emphasis added).

At least three phrases in the passage quoted above refer directly to British figures of memory: 'madness', the 'killing of women and children' and British revenge. (1) According to the British, the Indian rebels had neither a logical strategy nor a reasonable cause for the mutiny. The word 'madness' is indeed a keyword in British 'Mutiny' writing. It may remind the contemporary reader of the first mutineer, Mangal Pande, who is represented in British historiography as a raving lunatic, intoxicated by drugs. It will also call to mind what was dubbed 'religious prejudice' in British sources, that is, the fact that the outbreak of mutinies in 1857 had a religious cause: Hindu and Muslim sepoys refused to use the new Enfield rifle, which had to be operated with greased cartridges. For this, it soon turned out, the British had used cow's and pig's fat, which would have defiled Hindus and Muslims alike. (2) The alleged 'killing of women and children' (here we have a reason for the *British* to go mad) refers not so much to the actual events, but must be understood as an intertextual link to the high imperial 'Mutiny' novel of the nineteenth century, in which these themes figured prominently. (3) For the third topos of British memory – 'counter-insurgency' (cf. also Guha, 1988) – I will quote Edward Said, who has drawn attention to the representation of the 'Mutiny' in *Kim* in his *Culture and Imperialism*:

> In such a situation of nationalist and self-justifying inflammation, to be an Indian would have meant to feel natural solidarity with the victims of British reprisal . . . . For an Indian, *not* to have had those feelings would have been to belong to a very small minority . . . . And when Kipling has the old soldier describe the British counter-revolt . . . as 'calling' the Indian mutineers 'to strict account', we have left the world of history and entered the world of imperialist polemic, in which the native is naturally a delinquent, the white man a stern but moral parent and judge.
>
> (Said, 1993: 178)

Actually, there *were* Indian soldiers – mainly Sikhs from the Punjab – who had remained loyal to the British during the 'Mutiny'. Therefore, the existence of such an old soldier in the 1890s is not a pure British fantasy. Yet it is a significant choice to make. The thrust of this choice becomes even more obvious when the old sepoy starts singing the song of 'Nikal Seyn [Nicholson] – the song that men sing in the Punjab to this day' (Kipling, 1995: 61). In that way, Kipling's narrative suggests that the British myth is an integral part of Indian folk memory.[19] Said (1993: 178f.) sums up: 'Thus Kipling gives us the extreme British view on the Mutiny, and puts it in the mouth of an Indian, whose more likely nationalist and aggrieved counter-part is never seen in the novel.' How the 'aggrieved Indian' actually remembered and interpreted the 'Mutiny' in the nineteenth century is not easy to reconstruct, because the British were anxious to establish their monolithic version of the past. Writing down a differing, Indian interpretation of the events would have been a very dangerous thing to do. And indeed, according to

R. Veena (1999: 1), 'the National Archives, Delhi, have a handful of novels written by Indians in vernacular languages, before Independence, all of which are listed under Proscribed Publications'. The nationalist classic by Vinayak Damodar Savarkar, *The Indian War of Independence*, was not published until 1909 and then immediately banned by the British.[20] However, Savarkar's pamphlet points to the enormous potential of 1857 as a foundational event of an Indian nationalist culture of memory, a potential Karl Marx had already drawn attention to in 1858 when he called the rebellion the 'first Indian war of independence' and emphasized the fact that for the first time in history Hindus and Muslims fought side by side against foreign rule.

What implications does the sepoy episode of *Kim* have for British cultural memory? Kipling's novel appeared in 1901 and its action takes place during the 1890s. As the 'Mutiny' took place some forty years prior to both fictional action and date of publication, the novel intervenes at an important transitional moment in cultures of memory, when the lived collective memory dies out with those who carry it (like the old soldier in *Kim*). Only those memories which are fixed in media – books, monuments, but also songs and rituals – will survive. Thus, for cultural memory, the late nineteenth century is a strategic point in time for the British. If the colonisers manage to fix their version then, there will be a good chance that this version will come to dominate the twentieth century (as indeed it did), because there are no Indian eyewitnesses any more who might challenge the highly distorted British picture of 1857. As the old soldier is the only representative of the memory of the 'Mutiny' (the lama only vaguely recalls that there was a 'Black Year') and a witness at that, his voice assumes authority, and his memories seem veracious. The fact that in *Kim* the only Indian eyewitness remembering the 'Mutiny' re-narrates the British myth, is a literary strategy to 'hegemonise' this myth. A cultural hegemony is established (and legitimised) at the very moment when other, rival groups accept the memories it is based on. What Kipling's novel does is transfer the British myth to Indian memory cultures in order to create a monolithic, hegemonic version of '1857 – 58'. *Kim* displays a British fantasy of complete imperial hegemony as far as 'Mutiny' memory is concerned.

The mode of literary remembering in *Kim* is not only indirect; it is also antagonistic, because it silences counter-memory. Indian 'Mutiny' memory is not only 'forgotten' by non-representation, it is also de-legitimised. After the representation of a good Indian old soldier's 'authentic memory', assuming any other – say, nationalist – version of the 'Mutiny' would simply seem querulous. Kipling's *Kim* is a fiction of memorial hegemony. It stages oral memory as an indicator of the power, and also of the 'truth', of the imperial culture of memory, thus further stabilising the British 'Mutiny' myth.

Structural analogies: implicit modes of continuing topoi and narrative patterns

By the turn of the century the memory of the 'Indian Mutiny' had become internalised. Certain ways of emplotting history, certain topoi of speech and stereotypes had become habitual. They belong to an area which one might

call – drawing again on the categories of cognitive psychology and metaphorically applying them to the level of the cultural-collective – the 'implicit system' of cultural memory.[21] Implicit modes of literary remembering can be found in novels which neither directly nor indirectly deal with the 'Indian Mutiny' (that is, the mutiny is not a part of the level of action, nor is it recalled by any of the characters or the narrator), but in which 'Mutiny' memory appears to be present nonetheless, because the myth is evoked *structurally*, by echoing its narrative patterns. Examples of this are again found in the writings of Kipling. As Don Randall (1998) has shown, 'post-mutiny allegories of empire' pervade the *Jungle Books* (1894–95). Mowgli's fight against and eventual killing of the old tiger Shere Khan, who still claims power in the jungle and who is for a time even helped by the young wolves of Mowgli's pack, seems to echo the constellation of the events of 1857 (as remembered by the British): formerly obedient sepoys (young wolves) turn against the British and call upon the 84-year-old Mughal leader Bahadur Shah (Shere Khan). Randall states that 'The story of Mowgli's ultimately victorious struggle against Shere Khan thus mirrors key features of Mutiny history and of the British reconstitution of that history, recapitulation a British ''triumph'' in the midst of treachery and adversity' (1998: 111). To quote another example: in the story 'Letting in the Jungle', where Mowgli takes revenge against the villagers who hurt his parents, Randall uncovers the 'thematics of femininity' typical of the British 'Mutiny' narrative:

> Mowgli's revenge upon his enemies is inspired not so much by violence against himself as by violence against his mother . . . Messua's role in Kipling's story parallels that of ''the English lady'' in inflammatory Mutiny narratives: the violence done to her justifies the most extreme reprisals.
>
> (1998: 112)

Whether consciously or unintentionally on the part of the author and/or readers, the dominant British narrative of the 'Mutiny' is structurally continued in English literature and thereby implicitly legitimised and further consolidated. The dominant themes of treachery, violence against women and children, and eventually British retribution, find expression in the conventionalised 'narrative formula' of 'mutiny gothic' (Druce, 1993: 19). This formula was installed into the canon of 'Mutiny' writing by the novels of the late nineteenth century, though it seems to have its sources in the spectacular newspaper accounts of the years 1857–58. The high imperial novel set a pattern which would never entirely disappear from literary 'Mutiny' writing, dragging on even to post-imperial literature. It seems to lie at the heart, for example, of the nightmarish visions of the outbreak of mutinies in John Masters's *Nightrunners of Bengal* (1951). Druce maintains that such 'formulae of both plot and character . . . are to be found – attenuated and to some extent mysticised by Forster, reduplicated and intensified by Scott – in *A Passage to India* and *Raj Quartet*' (1993: 21). However, in discussing the case of E. M. Forster in the following section, I will stress the difference between the simple continuation of existing narrative patterns on the one hand ('implicit mode of remembering') and a form of literary continuation which is accompanied by a critical observation of this very process. I will call the latter a 'reflexive mode of remembering'.

Observing memory: the reflexive mode
of E. M. Forster's *A Passage to India* (1924)

E. M. Forster's *A Passage to India* was published in 1924, during, as Allen Greenberger (1969) calls it, the 'Era of Doubt': the British looked back at a disastrous First World War, a growing Indian nationalism, Gandhi's movement, and the Amritsar massacre. Quite aptly, therefore, Philipp Darby (1998: 105) calls the Empire novels of the inter-war period (such as Orwell's *Burmese Days*, 1934, or Edmund Candler's *Abdication*, 1922) a 'post-imperial lament about mistaken turnings and lost opportunities'. This lament was often accompanied by a critical look at the processes and problems of imperial cultural memory.

In his essay *The Other Side of the Medal* (1925) Edward Thompson claims that what he calls 'racial memories' strain the Indo-British relationship. It is the 'Indian Mutiny' which he takes as the worst example of an extremely biased British memory. '[T]here is nothing in our history books more emphatically calling for revision than their accounts of the Mutiny' (Thompson, 1925: 97). Thompson points to the great impact that literature had on the creation and maintenance of collective images of the past. The result of the 'dramatic and heightened fashion in which the Mutiny has been pictured' (1925: 87) in literature and historiography is a 'Mutiny-trained or Mutiny-obsessed mind' (1925: 94). According to Thompson, the massacre of Amritsar (1919) is the result of such a 'Mutiny'-obsessed mind. What Thompson describes is a cultural phenomenon quite similar to the workings of 'procedural memory' as described by cognitive psychologists.[22] Like the individual who is, thanks to procedural memory, able to ride a bicycle or to tie his shoes every morning, after the experience of 1857 the British as a collective had learned how to act whenever they felt threatened by Indians.

Forster and Thompson did not meet until 1925. Forster helped Thompson to find a publisher for *The Other Side of the Medal* (which turned out to be Leonard and Virginia Woolf's Hogarth Press). Strangely enough, *A Passage to India*, which had been published one year *earlier*, reads like the transformation of Thompson's arguments about the power of 'racial' (or 'cultural procedural') memory into fictional form. Patrick Brantlinger has already pointed out that

> [a]wareness of the ultimate result of the Mutiny . . . lies at the center of E.M. Forster's *Passage to India*. Following Miss Quested's charge of sexual harassment against Dr. Aziz, the Mutiny becomes the touchstone by which several of Forster's English characters try to comprehend what they see as a new revelation of Indian criminality. When Mr McBryde, the superintendent of police, tells Fielding that the psychology of Indian crime is different from that of English crime, he adds, 'read any of the Mutiny records; which, rather than the Bhagavad Gita, should be your Bible in this country.'
>
> (Brantlinger, 1988: 223)

The comparison with the Bible indicates that the 'Mutiny' records had the status of 'holy texts' in Anglo-Indian culture. As Jan Assmann (1992) maintains, holy texts – like the Old Testament in Jewish and Christian culture – cannot be altered; they can

only be commented upon. The memory they convey is monolithic. There is no room for divergent versions or even counter-memory.

Apart from the passage quoted by Brantlinger, however, the 'Mutiny' is never explicitly recalled by Forster's characters. Much more importantly, its memory lingers on implicitly. After Aziz has been accused of attempted rape and put into prison, emotions are running high. The effects of a 'cultural procedural Mutiny memory' can be discerned in episodes like the following:

> The club was fuller than usual, and several parents had brought their children into the rooms reserved for adults, which gave it the air of the Residency of Lucknow.
>
> (Forster, 1942: 162)

> They had started speaking of 'women and children' – that phrase that exempts the male from sanity when it has been repeated a few times. Each felt that all he loved best in the world was at stake, demanded revenge, and was filled with a not unpleasing glow, in which the chilly and half-known feature of Miss Quested vanished, and were replaced by all that is sweetest and warmest in the private life . . . [The British are] intoxicating themselves . . .
>
> (Forster, 1942: 165)

The English characters' ways of interpreting and coping with the situation mirror the strategies of 1857. They all huddle together in the club, which thus assumes (as the narrator observes) the 'air of the Residency of Lucknow': in British memory the siege of Lucknow is one of the most important topoi of the myth of British heroism, because British soldiers, women and children held out there for more than four months before being relieved by Campbell's troops. The Collector echoes the British attempts to counter rumours of a mutiny with aloofness: 'Keep cool, keep cool. Don't go out more than you can help, don't go into the city, don't talk before your servants. That's all' (Forster, 1942: 163). Major Callendar, however, represents the other British strategy of 1857: that of 'proactive revenge'. He cries: 'Call in the troops and clear the bazaars' (163). The Anglo-Indian community, moreover, re-enacts the – purely literary – fantasies of effective British espionage found in so many 'Mutiny' novels of the nineteenth century: 'Mr McBryde's down there disguised as a Holy Man' (163). Heaslop, the fiancé of Miss Quested, finally, becomes a post-figuration of the 'Christian soldier (and martyr)'. He is perceived by the community as 'bearing the sahib's cross' (167).[23] Last but not least, as Jenny Sharpe has shown, what unfolds in the fictional world created by Forster is the logic of the 'violation of the female body in India'.

> The (mis)representation of the object of the 1857 uprising is so closely imbricated with the racial stereotype of brown-skinned men desiring white women that the Mutiny serves as a convenient name for expressing colonial fears and fantasies over the intermingling of two races.
>
> (Sharpe, 1993: 123)

The somewhat strange fears and actions of the Anglo-Indian community result from an act of (unintentional) misremembering. The Anglo-Indians invert the logical

and chronological order of 1857: in 1857 there was first a mutiny and then (allegedly) British women were assaulted. In Forster's fictional case, there is first an (alleged) assault against an English woman – after which everybody waits for the mutiny. Thus the fear of racial intermingling and the fear of a mutiny interfere with each other. They seem to come up at the same time, because they were 'collectively encoded' together.

To sum up: Forster's novel stages (and satirises) the transformation on the collective level from what psychologists describe with regard to the individual level as 'knowing *that*' (that is, explicit semantic memory) to a 'knowing *how*' (that is, implicit, habitual or procedural memory). The Anglo-Indian community knows exactly *how* to behave towards Indians in general and in times of danger, even if its members do not explicitly recall *that* the given situation might resemble the events of 1857. This is Thompson's 'Mutiny-trained mind'. The 'Mutiny' memory has soaked into the texture of social life.

In the first versions of his manuscript Forster had Miss Quested actually raped (cf. Sharpe, 1993: 126). By redrawing his novel, he moves from a simple continuation of the 'Mutiny' narrative to the meta-level of observing the logic of this narrative. Now it is not the novel, but its characters' minds which draw a connection between experience and the stock figures and topoi of an internalised 'Mutiny' memory. Forster's *A Passage to India* is therefore a fictional observation of cultural procedural memory. Its reflexive mode relies heavily on internal focalisation and a detailed study of the reactions and the habits of the Anglo-Indian community. In that way the novel exposes the vicious circle of cultural procedural remembering. It is a medium of memorial self-reflection and critique, pointing towards the problems that British imperial myths generate in the contemporary inter-war period.

Deconstructing the myth: the demythologising mode of J. G. Farrell's *The Siege of Krishnapur* (1973)

After Indian independence in 1947, remembering the 'Indian Mutiny' became dissociated from the restrictions of an official imperial culture of memory with its 'inner circuitry of myths, memories and meanings' (Chakravarty, 2005: 5) – which does not mean, however, that its significations did not powerfully live on. There are different possibilities for representing the 'Mutiny' after 1947. One is the nostalgic 'escape to the past' (Rubin, 1986: 26), a tendency which novels such as M. M. Kaye's *Shadows of the Moon* (1957) or Valerie Fitzgerald's *Zemindar* (1981), with their stress on the exotic, exemplify well. Another important form of literary remembering which opens up as the Raj recedes to an unreachable past is a reassessment from hindsight of the history of the British Empire, a long and complex history, represented synecdochically by the events of 1857. John Masters's *Nightrunners of Bengal* (1951) tries to give such a critical reassessment, but appears to be too close to the imperial culture of memory: its retrospective critique of an undifferentiated hatred of Indians turns quickly into a romantic apology for a Christian and benevolent variety of British rule in India. It will take a further quarter of a century until a 'Mutiny' novel appears which is different from each of its predecessors in that it represents the events of 1857 in a thoroughly ironic and demythologising mode. This novel is J. G. Farrell's

The Siege of Krishnapur (1973), a complex text about the mentalities of British imperialism, which explores Victorian forms of knowledge, structures of society, and concepts of religion, gender relations, liberalism and progress.

The story told in *The Siege of Krishnapur* is a complete inversion of the myth of the 'Indian Mutiny'. Its demythologising mode of remembering is established by taking up many of the literary topoi developed over more than a century of 'Mutiny' writing and then deconstructing them one by one. To begin with, Farrell's novel re-narrates the typical 'Mutiny' plot. The fictive residency of Krishnapur is – very much like Lucknow – besieged by rebels. Assisted by some loyal Indians, the Anglo-Indian community holds out for a long time. Hunger, cholera, and constant shelling take their toll. According to the conventions of the 'Mutiny' novel, several romance plots unfold in the midst of 'peril'. Eventually, the station is relieved by British troops. However, the besieged British are no heroes, but – as shown by means of variable internal focalisation – have many things on their minds which do not exactly contribute to the Victorian image of 'muscular Christians', sex, greed and envy ranging prominently among them. Quarrels over food, over money, over Protestant and Catholic corpses (between the two clerics of the Anglo-Indian community), and finally over moral standards and social positions (there is a 'fallen woman' in the residency) seem to take up most of the energy of those who will be remembered as the 'heroes of Krishnapur'. On the other hand, far from being cruel and mad fanatics, many Indians – princes as well as peasants – gather at a hill nearby and impassively watch the spectacle of the siege as tourists or picnickers would. And as regards the rape fantasies of British memory: the only attempt to defile an Englishwoman is made towards the end of the novel by an Englishman – the misanthropic magistrate.

D. C. R. A. Goonetilleke records that '[t]here has been disagreement among critics as to who the hero of the novel is, and, consequently, as to the distribution of authorial emphasis' (2003: 409). This is one further clue to the novel's wholesale demythologisation of 'Mutiny' memory. There is no hero in a strict sense in *The Siege of Krishnapur*, no character the reader would be led to empathise with continuously. There is not even an anti-hero or a complete villain. This strategy is part of the deconstruction of the British 'stock-figured' memory of 1857 with its larger-than-life heroes and villains. One example must suffice of this literary practice of demythologising which bars a resort to empathy and inverts fixed narrative sequences of 'Mutiny' memory. It is the depiction of the final relief of the residency. Young Lieutenant Stapleton dashes forward, expecting (according to the traditional closure in the Victorian 'Mutiny' novel) to save heroically the woman he loves:

> Lieutenant Stapleton had managed to recognise Louise without too much trouble, though her appearance had given him a bit of a surprise. It was when he went to embrace her, murmuring: 'Don't worry, my dear, you're safe now,' that he got a really severe shock . . . for she stank.
>
> (Farrell, 2003: 309)

The novel's final plateau of the siege reveals an artistic self-reflexivity in that it exposes the active and productive role of media in the processes of mythogenesis and

heroising, the consequences of which *The Siege of Krishnapur* seeks to deconstruct. The General who led the relief muses:

> Even when allowances were made, the 'heroes of Krishnapur', as he did not doubt they would soon be called, were a pretty rum lot. And he would have to pose for hours, holding a sword and perched on a trestle or wooden horse while some artist-wallah depicted 'The Relief of Krishnapur'! He must remember to insist on being in the foreground, however; then it would not be so bad. With luck this wretched selection of 'heroes' would be given the soft pedal ... an indistinct crowd of corpses and a few grateful faces, cannons and prancing horses would be best.
>
> (Farrell, 2003: 310)

Remembering to forget: Zadie Smith's *White Teeth* (2000)

With Zadie Smith's recent best seller *White Teeth* (published in 2000) we have left the period of post-independence nostalgia and demythologising far behind and entered a (literary) Great Britain that is characterised by a multicultural society. The story of *White Teeth* is set in present-day London. Its protagonists are the members of two families of Anglo-Jamaican and South Asian background. Interestingly, the most important example of post-colonial memory in *White Teeth* is the 'Indian Mutiny': Samad Iqbal, immigrant from Bangladesh, maintains that his great-grandfather was Mangal Pande, the famous first mutineer of 1857. But whereas in British historiography Pande figures as a religious fanatic, intoxicated by drugs and even in mutineering a complete failure as he neither managed to kill his officer nor himself, Samad – claiming that this is 'not the *full story*' (Smith, 2001: 253; emphasis in original) – tries to recover a memory of his ancestor as the first to rise up against the British, as a hero and precursor to Gandhi. With the description of Samad's acts of cultural remembering *White Teeth* is the first British novel to represent the Indian experience and later memory of 1857.

    White Teeth does not aim at simple revisionism by depicting South Asian diasporic Mutiny-memory, but instead displays a highly reflexive mode of literary remembering. Playfully, the novel stages all major topics related to the problem of remembering the 'Indian Mutiny': the constructedness of memory (for example, the Muslim Iqbal believes he is a descendant of the Hindu Pande); the bias and contested nature of memory even in seemingly 'objective' works of historiography (as a representation of the biased British view a paragraph from the imperialist *Tale of the Great Mutiny* by William Fitchett (1901) is inserted into the novel – see Smith, 2001: 254); the complicated dynamics of the memories of coloniser and colonised, and of their respective descendants in multicultural societies (see, for example, Millat's stoned flash of insight in front of Havelock's statue in Trafalgar Square: 'Pande was no one and Havelock was someone ... *That's the long long history of us and them*'; 2001: 506; emphasis in original).

    Despite its highly ironic and often mocking tone, *White Teeth* also takes a very serious look at the impact of cultural memory on present-day societies. In Samad's case, remembering Mangal Pande means clinging to a past hero who himself clung to the past: he imagines 'that great-grandfather of his, Mangal Pande, flailing with

a musket; fighting against the new, holding on to tradition' (180). Therefore, Samad's decision to send one of his twin sons, Magid, back to Bangladesh, in order to grant at least one of his sons a traditionalist upbringing, is an act of cultural remembering. The potentially counter-productive results of such acting in accordance with anachronistic traditions become evident, when – again, highly ironical – Magid returns to England as the embodiment of western culture and values, whereas his brother Millat, who stays in London, turns into a violent Muslim fundamentalist.

What seems increasingly important in the novel, therefore, is the art of 'remembering to forget': of being aware of one's past ('root canals', in Smith's dental imagery) at the same time that one is prepared to discard dysfunctional elements of memory when necessary. Jan Rupp has convincingly argued that acts of forgetting are of paramount importance in Smith's novel – a rather unconventional literary strategy, especially in the context of post-colonial literature:

> The novel challenges established routines of looking at the past . . . It does not straightforwardly seek to dismiss postcolonial mores of remembering, but it ventures near this taboo zone to reassess them from the perspective of second-generation 'hy-Brits', for whom this code of remembrance seems to have become obsolete . . . In postcolonial contexts, or other memorial cultures focused on the commemoration of suffering and loss . . ., forgetting figures almost only as an ideologically charged operation (which it often is, of course, but very often may not be at all), not also as a structurally given (or even necessary) one.
>
> (Rupp, 2006, forthcoming)

A veritable 'rhetoric of forgetting' is associated with the characters of the 'second generation', the children of the immigrants. Such rhetoric is discernible, for example, in Irie Jones's central and final speech. The daughter of Archie (British and working class) and the Anglo-Jamaican Clara, and friend of Millat and Magid, echoes and at the same time discards a central topos of feminist and post-colonial theories of memory – the 'madwoman in the attic' – when she cries: 'No shit. No shit in attics. No skeletons in cupboards. No great grandfathers' (Smith, 2001: 515).

The choice of the 'Indian Mutiny' in *White Teeth* as a paradigmatic site of contested memory and as an object of a 'rhetoric of forgetting' perhaps indicates the thrust of the novel's memory critique. *White Teeth* certainly does not suggest a wholesale rejection of remembering. It rather seems to suggest a critique of a certain mode of remembering: the establishment of normative, formative, and binding myths of the past, which have been so closely connected to the memorial history of the 'Indian Mutiny' in camps, British and Indian. Such nationalist and highly exclusive memory is no longer – *White Teeth* seems to suggest – beneficial in today's multicultural societies. One alternative form of memory is presented in Archie and Samad's variant of communicative memory: the two old men bore those around them by retelling the same old stories, such as their adventures in the Second World War, time and again, and pay almost ritualistic visits to the same shabby old café. Although tedious, these shared narratives and habits serve to stabilise friendship and identity across ethnic boundaries. And when, at the final showdown in the last chapter, it becomes clear that the very basis of their more than fifty-year-old friendship – the shared memory of how Archie executed the German Nazi Dr Sick in 1945 – is based

on a lie, because Archie could not fulfil Samad's wish and instead let his victim go, Samad is reported to have a veritable '*anagnorisis*', a sudden recognition. He knows that '*This incident alone will keep us two old boys going for the next forty years*' (Smith, 2001: 533; emphasis in original). For Archie and Samad – and, one can conclude, for the various groups within multicultural societies – the question of *what* is remembered is not as important as the fact *that* they manage to remember a *shared* past. Or, in Dominic Head's words: the 'participative generation of history is the narrative livelihood of all post-colonial futures' (2003: 115).

'Mutiny' and modes of memory: a history yet to be written

What the past appears to be in a given culture of memory – lived experience, myth, contested terrain, source of certain habits and stereotypes, or even a collective fiction – arises not so much from the remembered events themselves, but from the specific *mode* of re-presenting these events. Two basic modes of cultural remembering have already been distinguished by Jan and Aleida Assmann: 'Cultural' and 'communicative memory' are concepts based on cultural anthropology and media theory. Moreover, a careful transposition of concepts from cognitive psychology to the level of the cultural-collective can be of use. A number of literary and cultural phenomena seem to operate in a way similar to individual memory systems – from explicit and autobiographical memory to implicit and procedural memory.

This study has looked at various literary modes of remembering which are generated by specific formal and semantic patterns and which shape new contexts of cultural remembering as well as responding to old ones. The experiential and monumental modes of writing are two basic options of literary remembering, that inform such genres as (fictional) autobiographies, memoirs and historical novels. That cultural memory is also present – if inconspicuously – in other genres, from parable and allegory to romance and adventure novel, becomes clear when attention is shifted to the indirect and implicit modes of literary remembering, of which Kipling's fiction has provided good examples. Reflexive and demythologising modes of remembering, such as can be found in the novels written by Forster and Farrell, are closely connected to a change in the observer position: their work implies that both authors and readers are aware of the mechanisms of cultural remembering. And if there is really such a thing as a literary 'mode of forgetting' or whether this is, as Umberto Eco (1988) has noticed with regard to an *ars oblivionalis*, adynaton and oxymoron at once – impossible and nonsensical – is a question which will have to be explored in greater detail.

The topic of 'Mutiny'-memory and its various modes, which have evolved over a time span of one and a half centuries, has by no means been treated exhaustively in this essay. Further stages could be discerned, such as the re-appropriation of the 'Mutiny' narrative as a transcultural site of memory – for example, in V. S. Naipaul's *A Million Mutinies Now* (1990). Of much greater importance, what is missing in this study, as in the European academic discussion at large, is a further investigation of Indian memories of 1857. Short stories such as Shoshee Chunder Dutt's

Shunkur (1885) and Indian English novels ranging from Manohar Malgonkar's *The Devil's Wind* (1972) to Vikram Chandra's *Red Earth and Pouring Rain* (1995) would have to be considered, not to mention the large corpus of Indian 'Mutiny' writing in languages other than English (cf. Scholberg, 1993). Finally, not only various literary genres but also different media were involved in the representation and imaginative appropriation of the 'Indian Mutiny', ranging from the early photographs made by Felice Beato to the forms of actualisation and re-mythologisation of the 'Mutiny' narrative in recent Bollywood blockbusters such as *Lagaan* (2001; cf. Erll, 2006, forthcoming) and *The Rising* (2005).

Acknowledgement

Notes

1 See also Thorpe (1986: 181); Brantlinger (1988: 199) and Chakravarty (2005: 1).
2 Singh (1973) counts fifty Mutiny novels and Chakravarty (2005: 3) 'seventy-odd' novels. My list comprises right now more than 120 Mutiny novels.
3 This is the term preferred by the Indian historian Rudrangshu Mukherjee (1984).
4 Quoted after Chakravarty (2005).
5 Cf. the host of sources presented by Edward Thompson (1925) in support of this argument; see also Brantlinger (1988: 201).
6 In Paul Ricœur's sense. Ricœur conceives of Aristotelian mimesis as a circle in which narrative text and cultural context intersect. He distinguishes three stages of a dynamic mimetic process: mimesis$_1$ (prefiguration), mimesis$_2$ (configuration) and mimesis$_3$ (refiguration). A narrative text is (1) prefigured by its cultural context with its specific symbolic order. It (2) configures (or: emplots) extra-literary elements into an exemplary temporal and causal order. In the act of reading, finally, the narrative composition is actualised. It becomes part of the symbolic order of a cultural formation, which is thereby (3) refigured and – here the circle closes – functions in turn as the source of narrative preunderstanding on the level of mimesis$_1$. Ricœur's first and third levels are intersections between narrative text and cultural context; mimesis$_2$, the configuration of textual elements, is the traditional focus of interest in literary studies. For an application of this concept to the study of literature and cultural memory see Erll (2005: 149 – 55).
7 See Bruner (1991) and Schacter (1996).
8 On literal and metaphorical notions of collective memory see Erll (2005: 95 – 100) and, on the various intersections between media, narrative, literature and cultural memory see Erll/Nünning (2004, 2005a, b).
9 See J. Assmann (1992; 1995). Jan and Aleida Assmann have introduced the distinction between 'Cultural memory' and 'communicative memory', which they hold to be subcategories of 'collective memory', as Maurice Halbwachs (1950) has studied and theorised it. Therefore, 'Cultural memory' – with a capital letter – refers in the following to Assmann's specific concept of cultural memory, which must be understood in relation to communicative memory. Elsewhere 'cultural memory'

(in small letters) is used an umbrella term for all imaginable kinds of remembering in socio-cultural contexts. The term 'communicative memory' describes all our collective memories which are the result of direct communication – the memories of past experience, which are passed on orally among living generations. Communicative memory is a phenomenon of everyday life. Its contents are variable. Each member of the community is free to impart his or her memories and interpretations of past events to other members. The temporal range of the communicative frame of remembering extends to the memories of the oldest member of a community, that is, approximately 80 – 100 years. With the concept of 'Cultural memory', in contrast, Aleida and Jan Assmann describe a fixed stock of media that a society preserves and the messages they convey. Remembering in the frame of Cultural memory means recalling a shared past, which is understood to be of vital importance to the present community. Examples are the Trojan Wars, the Exodus, the French Revolution or the World Wars. Cultural memory provides versions of the process and meaning of history and shapes collective self-images as well as values and norms. Cultural and communicative memory are different *modes* of collective remembering, different 'uses of the past'. Both serve to constitute 'social autobiographies'. But the first locates historical events in the wide temporal horizon of nations, religious or ethnic communities, and tends to create myths, while the second is concerned with making sense in the more limited horizon of social communities (like family, friends or colleagues). Thus, an historical event like the First World War or German reunification can be remembered according to both frames: it can be understood as a significant part of national history, but it can also be remembered as an event which was experienced in and had effects on small social groups, and was woven into the autobiographies of their members.

10   In the sense of Lanser's (1992) feminist narratology.

11   See also the preface of Adelaine Case's (1858) diary: 'In submitting the following pages for public inspection, I have listened to the suggestions of my friends rather than to the dictates of my own judgement. They were written for the perusal of my relatives in England, and with no view whatever to publication . . .'

12   See Case (1858, n.p.): 'I have not attempted, by subsequent additions, to produce effect, or aim at *glowing descriptions*, but have given it as it was written, in the simple narrative form, which the dangers and privations of the siege alone permitted' (emphasis added).

13   See Hall (1994) and Robinson (1996). On the image of women in the 'Indian Mutiny' see also Sharpe (1993).

14   See Assmann (1992: 76; my translation).

15   Nünning (1995); for the processes of imperial myth-making as far as the events in Lucknow are concerned see also Nünning (1996).

16   See, for example, 2 Corinthians 1: 10: 'He has delivered us from such a deadly peril, and he will deliver us. On him we have set our hope that he will continue to deliver us.'

17   Aleida Assmann (1999: 33 – 48) differentiates between prospective and retrospective cultural remembering. Mourning the dead is a typical act of retrospective remembering. Prospective remembering is often used in order to construct *fama*: great deeds are recorded for future generations to remember heroes.

18   The functions of literary texts as 'a social framework for memory' and as 'portable monuments' have also been identified in an important article by Ann Rigney (2004),

which looks at the memorial history of the Jeanie Deans figure from Walter Scott's *The Heart of Midlothian* (1818).

19   See A. J. P Taylor (1996: 249) and Thompson (1925: 99) for rumours about a Punjabi sect which venerated Nicholson, and Scholberg (1993: 95 – 7) for a Punjabi 'Ballad of Sir John'. As the collections of folk songs in Scholberg (1993) and Joshi (1994) show, however, there are far more Indian ballads about Indian heroes (such as the Rani of Jhansi or Kunwar Singh) than about English ones.

20   Even Savarkar has to draw upon colonial records, in themselves rather biased sources. The relative absence of records left by the rebels and later generations of Indians is explained by Joshi (1994: ix): 'There is a lamentable lack of sound historical material from the Indian side. The reasons are two. First, it was not the Indian tradition to leave historical documents behind. Secondly, the conditions of terror that followed the failure of the 1857 struggle were such that any Indian trying to write his version of the story risked his skin.' Veena (1999: 1) concludes that 'the British had complete control not only over Indian territory but also over the literary 'space' within which to write about it'.

21   For individual implicit memory see Schacter (1996: 161 – 91).

22   Cf. Schacter (1996: 17): Procedural memory 'allows us to learn skills and acquire habits'. This memory system 'is selectively involved in '''knowing how'' to do things: ride a bicycle, type words on a keyboard, solve a jigsaw puzzle, or read words in mirror image form' (Schacter, 1996: 170).

23   See also Sharpe (1993: 122): 'The term *sahib's cross* is a parody of the idea of the white man's burden that represents colonialism and an act of martyrdom. It is also an indictment of the masculinist perception that the sexual humiliation of English women is an indirect attack on men' (emphasis in original).

References

Primary sources

Bartrum, Katherine Mary. *A Widow's Reminiscences of the Siege of Lucknow*. London: James Nisbet, 1858.

Case, Adelaide. *Day-by-day at Lucknow: A Journal of the Siege of Lucknow*. London: Richard Bentley, 1858.

Farrell, J. G. *The Siege of Krishnapur*. 1973. London: Phoenix, 2003.

Forster, E. M. *A Passage to India*. 1924. New York and Toronto: Knopf, 1942.

Henty, George Alfred. *In Times of Peril: A Story of India*. 1881. Oregon: Althouse, 2002.

Kipling, Rudyard. *Kim*. 1901. London: Campbell, 1995.

Smith, Zadie. *White Teeth*. 2000. London: Penguin, 2001.

Secondary sources

Assmann, Aleida. *Erinnerungsräume: Formen und Wandlungen des kulturellen Gedächtnisses*. München: Beck, 1999.

Assmann, Jan. *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen*. München: Beck, 1992.

Assmann, Jan. 'Collective Memory and Cultural Identity.' *New German Critique* 65 (1995): 125 – 33.

Brantlinger, Patrick. *Rule of Darkness: British Literature and Imperialism, 1870 – 1914*. Ithaca, NY and London: Cornell University Press, 1988.

Bruner, Jerome. 'The Narrative Construction of Reality.' *Critical Inquiry* 18/1 (1991): 1 – 21.

Chakravarty, Gautam. *The Indian Mutiny and the British Imagination*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Darby, Phillip. *The Fiction of Imperialism: Reading Between International Relations and Postcolonialism*. London and Washington, DC: Cassell, 1998.

Druce, Robert. ''And to Think that Henrietta Guise Was in the Hands of Such Human Demons!'': Ideologies of the Anglo-Indian Novel from 1859 – 1957.' *Shades of Empire in Colonial and Post-Colonial Literatures*. Eds C. C. Barfoot and Theo D'haen. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1993. 17 – 34.

Eco, Umberto. 'An *Ars Oblivionalis*? Forget it!' *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 103/1 (1988): 254 – 61.

Erll, Astrid. *Kollektives Gedächtnis und Erinnerungskulturen: Eine Einführung*. Stuttgart: Metzler, 2005.

Erll, Astrid. '*Lagaan* – Mythosaktualisierung in Bollywood.' *Mythosaktualisierungen. Tradierungs- und Generierungspotentiale einer alten Erinnerungsform*. Eds Dietmar Rieger and Stephanie Wodianka. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter 2006 (forthcoming).

Erll, Astrid and Nünning, Ansgar, eds, in collaboration with Hanne Birk, Birgit Neumann and Patrick Schmidt. *Medien des kollektiven Gedächtnisses. Historizität – Konstruktivität – Kulturspeziftät*. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter 2004.

Erll, Astrid and Nünning, Ansgar, eds, in collaboration with Hanne Birk and Birgit Neumann. *Gedächtniskonzepte der Literaturwissenschaft*. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter 2005a.

Erll, Astrid and Nünning, Ansgar. 'Where Literature and Memory Meet: Towards a Systematic Approach to the Concepts of Memory in Literary Studies.' *Literature, Literary History, and Cultural Memory. REAL – Yearbook of Research in English and American Literature* 21. Ed. Herbert Grabes. Tübingen: Narr, 2005b. 265 – 98.

Fussell, Paul. 'Der Einfluß kultureller Paradigmen auf die literarische Wiedergabe traumatischer Erfahrung.' *Kriegserlebnis: Der Erste Weltkrieg in der literarischen Gestaltung und symbolischen Deutung der Nationen*. Ed. Klaus Vondung. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980. 175 – 87.

Goonetilleke, D. C. R. A. 'J.G. Farrell's Indian Works: His Majesty's Subjects.' *Modern Asian Studies* 37/2 (2003): 407 – 27.

Greenberger, Allen J. *The British Image of India: A Study of the Literature of Imperialism*. London: Oxford University Press, 1969.

Gregg, Hilda. 'The Indian Mutiny in Fiction.' *Blackwood's Magazine* 161 (Feb. 1897): 218 – 31.

Guha, Ranajit. 'The Prose of Counter-Insurgency.' *Selected Subaltern Studies*. Eds Ranajit Guha and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Vol. 2. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988. 1 – 42.

Halbwachs, Maurice. *La mémoire collective*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1950.

Hall, Donald E., ed. *Muscular Christianity: Embodying the Victorian Age*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Head, Dominic. 'Zadie Smith's *White Teeth*: Multiculturalism for the Millenium.' *Contemporary British Fiction*. Eds Richard J. Lane, Rod Mengham, and Philip Tew. Oxford: Polity Press 2003. 106–19.

Joshi, Puran Chand, ed. *1857 in Folk Songs*. New Delhi: People's Publishing House, 1994.

Lanser, Susan Sniader. *Fictions of Authority: Women Writers and Narrative Voice*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1992.

Leckey, Edward. *Fictions Connected with the Indian Outbreak of 1857 Exposed*. Bombay: Chesson & Woodhall, 1859.

Mukherjee, Rudrangshu. *Awadh in Revolt, 1857–58: A Study of Popular Resistance*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1984.

Mukherjee, Rudrangshu. *Spectre of Violence: The Kanpur Massacres in 1857*. New Delhi: Viking, 1998.

Nünning, Vera. 'Viktorianische Populärliteratur als imperialistische Propaganda: G.A. Hentys historischer Roman *In Times of Peril*.' *Literatur in Wissenschaft und Unterricht* XXVIII/3 (1995): 189–201.

Nünning, Vera. 'Vom historischen Ereignis zum imperialen Mythos: The Siege of Lucknow als Paradigma für den imperialistischen Diskurs.' *Anglistik und Englischunterricht: Intercultural Studies. Fictions of Empire* 58 (1996): 51–71.

Randall, Don. 'Post-Mutiny Allegories of Empire in Rudyard Kipling's *Jungle-Books*.' *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 41/1 (1998): 97–120.

Rigney, Ann. 'Portable Monuments: Literature, Cultural Memory, and the Case of Jeanie Deans.' *Poetics Today* 25/2 (2004): 361–96.

Robinson, Jane. *Angels of Albion: Women of the Indian Mutiny*. London: Viking, 1996.

Rubin, David. *After the Raj: British Novels of India Since 1947*. Hanover, PA and London: University Press of New England, 1986.

Rupp, Jan. 'Memorial Culture in Transformation: The Postcolonial Tradition and Second-Generation ''Hy-Brits'' in Zadie Smith's *White Teeth*.' *Literature and Memory: Theoretical Paradigms – Genres – Functions*. Eds Ansgar Nünning, Marion Gymnich and Roy Sommer. Tübingen: Narr, 2006 (forthcoming).

Said, Edward. *Culture and Imperialism*. London: Vintage, 1993.

Schacter, Daniel L. *Searching for Memory: The Brain, the Mind, and the Past*. New York: Basic Books, 1996.

Scholberg, Henry. *The Indian Literature of the Great Rebellion*. New Delhi: Promilla, 1993.

Sharpe, Jenny. *Allegories of Empire: The Figure of Woman in the Colonial Text*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1993.

Singh, Shailendra Dhari. *Novels on the Indian Mutiny*. New Delhi: Arnold-Heinemann, 1973.

Taylor, A. J. P., ed. *The Oxford India Companion to the 'Indian Mutiny' of 1857*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Thompson, Edward. *The Other Side of the Medal*. London: Hogarth Press, 1925.

Thorpe, Michael. 'Making History: Fiction, History and the Indian ''Mutiny.''' *World Literature Written in English* 26/1 (1986): 179–87.

Turnbaugh, Roy. 'Images of Empire: G. A. Henty and John Buchan.' *Journal of Popular Culture* 9 (1975): 734–40.

Veena, R. 'The Literature of the Events of 1857: A Postcolonial Reading.' *Writing in a Postcolonial Space*. Ed. Surya Nath Pandey. New Delhi: Atlanti Publishers 1999. 1–9.

Astrid Erll is research assistant at the Collaborative Research Centre 'Memory Cultures' (Justus-Liebig-University, Giessen). Recent publications include *Gedächtnisromane* (WVT, 2003) and *Kollektives Gedächtnis und Erinnerungskulturen* (Metzler, 2005). Together with Ansgar Nünning, she is general editor of the series *Media and Cultural Memory/Medien und kulturelle Erinnerung* (de Gruyter, since 2004), and co-editor of *Medien des kollektiven Gedächtnisses* (2004) and *Gedächtniskonzepte der Literaturwissenschaft* (2005). A monograph on the medial representations of the 'Indian Mutiny' (*Prämediation – Remediation*, 2006) is forthcoming. *Address*: Justus-Liebig-University, Department of English, Otto-Behagel-Str. 10B, 35394 Giessen, Germany. [email: Astrid.Erll@anglistik.uni-giessen.de]