of Elliot's "Supplemental Glossary"? In my MS. the word is plainly written 'Burhānpur'! The conjecture in the note on p. 140 is borne out by my MS., which has the word *ser*; but *ser-hāṣil* simply means 'very productive.'

I have said enough to show that Mr. Sarkar's work is of a very meritorious nature, but if it is to be perfected he should keep it constantly by him, amending and altering it as his researches extend and his materials accumulate. We shall look for and welcome the other works announced as in preparation. But we beseech him on the next occasion not to forget an index, without which any work of this kind is nearly useless.

WM. IRVINE.

MEMOIRS OF MAHARAJA NUBKISSEN BAHADUR. By N. N. GHOSE. (Calcutta, 1901.)

The Sobha Bazar family has been exceptionally fortunate in finding such a competent writer as Mr. N. N. Ghose to undertake the biography of its founder, Maharajah Nubkissen. The Rajah was born about 1732, being the third son of one Rām Charan, akāyasth, who had moved from his home near Murshidābād to Mūrgācha, a parganah close to Calcutta, upon appointment as a *qānūngo*. Nubkissen was probably born in Govindpur, one of the three villages now merged in Calcutta. Apparently he was left to fight his own battle in life; he began to earn his living early, at the age of 18, as Persian munshi to Warren Hastings. In 1757 he was employed by Clive, and afterwards rose rapidly in the English Company's service. Finally, in 1767, he was made Political Banyan, or the chief native servant of the Government. He retired from public life in 1782, and died at his house in Calcutta on the 22nd November, 1797, full of years and honours.

Mr. Ghose's subject inevitably introduces us to many often-debated points in Anglo-Indian history—Nubkissen's loan to Hastings, the prosecution and execution of Nandkumār, the Bardwān *sazāwahī*, and so forth. On most of these

he takes a fairly impartial attitude. Nandkumār, as he evidently thinks, got no more than his deserts. As to the matter of the loan of three lakhs to Hastings, it would have been better if a bond had been executed in the usual way when the money was accepted. At the same time, apart from the turgid rhetoric of Burke, there is nothing to prove corrupt intention. No one, so far as I know, denies that Nandkumār was a man with a very bad record ; still, that fact, as one easily perceives, is no proof that he committed forgery in the particular instance. But he was elaborately tried before a jury, which probably came to a correct finding. With the actual course of this trial Hastings could not interfere, and to that extent cannot be made responsible ; it might have been better, looking to the novelty of the death penalty for that crime, if Nandkumār had not been hung ; but here, too, Hastings is apparently not to blame, for he would have sent the prisoner's petition to the judges if Francis and the others had not outvoted him (p. 134). Hastings disliked Nandkumār, of that there is little doubt ; probably he was not sorry that the man was prosecuted ; but in spite of all the research devoted to the subject, nothing in the shape of act or word involving him has been discovered. Nubkissen seems to have given his evidence with some reluctance. I do not believe that this was mere finessing, meant to produce all the more deadly effect. In such matters the simplest explanation is generally, in my experience, the safest and soundest. Nubkissen was, I think, really reluctant to give evidence incriminating a Brahman, but what he did say was the truth, as he believed it.

Modern Indians are somewhat unfortunate in the types that they have chosen as national heroes : the Mahrattahs with their Shivaji, a robber chief of genius ; the Bengalis, with Nandkumār (p. 104), a man who ended on the scaffold a life of intrigue and deceit, his last crime being the mean one of forgery.

As for Mr. Ghose's view that the services of Nubkissen have been overlooked by the English, in fact that Indian

work is always ignored by us, we would remind him that this injustice (so far as it may be truly alleged) is not confined to India or the English. Nowhere do the working subordinates obtain the recognition that is so often their due. In Nubkissen's case, moreover, he got all that he sought for, power, wealth, and titles; and I should be very much astonished to find that he ever looked on himself as a slighted or neglected man. By the custom of his caste, observed through thousands of years, he was born to earn his living by his pen in the service of others; and it seems a mere modern misinterpretation of the then conditions to picture him as a conscious patriot working for the redemption of his native land. One master was to him as good as another; it was a question of personal advantage. Like most other Indians, he faithfully served the side that employed and paid him.

The position of the Indian in the employ of the Anglo-Indian Government has gone through several phases; before Cornwallis, after Cornwallis, under Lord William Bentinck, and since the Mutiny, each of these periods marks a different stage in the position of officials of Indian race. At present a higher official morality is preached in native society and to a great extent practised. Irregular gains have nearly ceased; existence has to be maintained on pay which, although liberal enough, does not permit the honest acquirement of wealth. The money rewards having diminished by the loss of unavowed receipts, something must be substituted, and Indians now claim, fairly enough, increased public recognition and more equality with Europeans in power and position. They are no longer content, as of old, to be the power behind the throne, having great influence and little responsibility.

Mr. Ghose, on p. 123, contests the justice of Macaulay's assertion that the Indian is peculiarly ready to turn upon a man directly he has fallen from power or favour. The metallic brilliance of Macaulay's style produces too often the effect of exaggeration or even untruth. In this instance, however, was he so very far wrong? My own experience,

reinforced by that of my contemporaries, could furnish me with innumerable instances of the same habit of mind, of course on a smaller scale and in regard to more trifling matters. But Mr. Ghose may console himself under the imputation against Indians by the reflection that the same readiness to pander to kings and crowds, in their fickleness, is far from unknown in other parts of the world.

As for the late Professor Seeley's paradoxes, Mr. Ghose would do well not to be fascinated too much by their inviting speciousness. Of Seeley's two assertions, (1) that the English conquered India without intending it and (2) that the Indians conquered it themselves for the English, neither is worth anything. Sir Alfred Lyall has already sufficiently disposed of the first half of the theory. As to the second, I would ask Mr. Ghose, who is, so far as I can judge, an exceedingly fair and open-minded man, how it happens that for over a hundred years (1757 to 1857) the side the English were on invariably won? The inference is sufficiently obvious—nay, inevitable. It reminds me of the old dispute between the organ-blower and the organist; the first supplies the material force, but the second plays the tune. Both are necessary, but what result would there be without the organist? In a sense the Indians *did* conquer India for us; we led and they fought. But for any effectual purpose, either of history or present-day politics, what useful deduction can be drawn from that admission? None, so far as I can see.

One statement of fact struck me as erroneous. On p. 44 Mr. Ghose says, "After consulting him (Nubkissen), Clive reinstated Jaffer Aly Khan as subadar and Muzuffer Jung as naib subadar." If we consult the volume of "Treaties and Engagements" (4to, 1812) we find that the Treaty of Reinstatement, dated the 10th July, 1763, bears the signatures of Henry Vansittart and his councillors. Mir Ja'far died on the 5th February, 1765, while Clive did not land in Calcutta until May, 1765 (Marshman, "History," i, 307). Thus Clive could not possibly have reinstated Mir Ja'far.

Mr. Ghose, on p. 51, suggests that the Emperor Shāh

‘Ālam made a very bad bargain by the grant of the Dewānī to the Company. Had he not, on the contrary, considerable reason to be “pleased” with the transaction? For forty years the Dihli Court had seen very little money from Bengal, and for at least twenty years none at all, beyond an occasional bribe. In short, Shāh ‘Ālam conferred an office over which he had not the least power or control, in exchange for the very substantial tribute of twenty-six lakhs of rupees annually. Evidently he had a predilection for such one-sided bargains. In 1774 he offered the Province of Sind, first to the French and then to the English, in return for military protection at Dihli. This can be seen in Mr. Emil Barbe’s “Le Nabab René Madec” and in the pamphlet of J. Morrison, “generalissimo of the Armies of the Great Mogul” (London, 1774). After Sind was ceded to Nādir Shah in 1739 the Moguls had exercised no authority there.

In the English documents quoted there are several words which would have been useful additions to Mr. Crooke’s new edition of Yule and Burnell’s Glossary—*Pooneah* (p. 79), the formal commencement of rent or revenue collections; *Connah Barry* (id.), a house enclosure; *Kauridge* (p. 81), land excluded at settlement; *Jeriff* (p. 87), *Zeriff* (p. 89), a word not traced, apparently some kind of account on estimate; *Cullundaun* (p. 101), pen-case or *qalam-dān*.

Nubkissen was a devout and orthodox Hindu, but at the same time a most generous benefactor to both the Christians and the Mahomedans of Calcutta. On the whole, he was a man of most estimable character, endowed with considerable ability and *savoir-faire*, who played his part in important events with great credit to himself and his country. Mr. Ghose’s task in bringing together the documents and setting them forth has been well done, and he deserves much commendation for the satisfactory book he has produced.

WM. IRVINE.