4

SCOTTISH PRESBYTERIAN MISSIONARIES AND PUBLIC OPINION IN SCOTLAND[1]

Esther Breitenbach

CHARACTERISATIONS of the events of 1857 in India have long been a subject of debate and contestation. While the description of the events as the 'mutiny' by the British imperial regime has dominated both popular and historical discourses, the events have been severally characterised as a revolt, rebellion, war of independence, people's uprising, an attempt to restore the sovereignty of the Mughal emperor and as a religious war.[2] If there is no clear agreement among historians on a definitive characterisation of the events, historical investigation has at least established the complex and multifaceted nature of the causes of the uprising, and that considerable local variation existed. One factor that was clearly integral to events was religion, yet the precise nature and extent of its significance remains disputed. Views on why the breaking of religious taboos by the use of greased cartridges triggered the initial revolt at Meerut have ranged from the dismissal of this as political manipulation to the sympathetic treatment of it as an insensitive blunder by the British. Similarly, assessments of the provocative nature of missionary activity range from denials that they had much impact on the Indian population to the depiction of a 'clash of rival fundamentalisms' between British evangelical missionaries and Muslims.[3] There is evidence that the activities of evangelical Protestant missionaries, who were increasingly making their presence felt in the period before 1857, were causing disquiet among Muslims.[4] Hindu responses to the activities of missionaries were mixed, as Hindus were said to be often willing to make use of the educational opportunities provided by missionary schools, but were in general resistant to attempts at conversion, with individual conversions often provoking protests and the temporary withdrawal of pupils from schools.[5] It has been argued that, in the period preceding the 1857 uprising, what was most alarming to Indians was the perception of government support for missionary activities. As Disraeli put it to the House of Commons in July 1857, what the 'Hindoo does dread' is 'the union

of missionary enterprise with the political power of the Government'.[6] While the official East India Company position was one of religious neutrality, in practice among both civil servants and military personnel there were active supporters of missions and of Christian proselytising, a factor which may have led, as Copland has argued, to a growing belief that 'the British were secretly encouraging the missionaries to spread Christianity'.[7] Given that religion is widely understood to have played a role in the events of 1857, it seems pertinent to ask how missionaries themselves interpreted events and how they represented their role in events. This chapter takes as a case study Scottish Presbyterian missionaries in India, how they depicted the uprising and its causes to the public in Scotland, and how missionary perspectives were reflected in the contemporary press in Edinburgh.

Scottish Presbyterian Missionary Activities in India Prior to 1857

India was among the early fields of missionary activity by Scots Presbyterians, and became a major location for Scottish foreign missions in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Organised support for foreign missions was first established in Scotland with the formation of the Scottish Missionary and Glasgow Missionary Societies in 1796. Having endorsed foreign missions in 1824, the established Church of Scotland sent their first missionary, Alexander Duff, to India in 1829. By then the Scottish Missionary Society had already commenced missionary activity in Bombay. Following the split in the Church of Scotland—the Disruption of 1843[8]—missionary work in India was undertaken by both the Church of Scotland and the Free Church of Scotland, and from 1860 onwards also by the third main Presbyterian denomination, the United Presbyterian Church. By 1857, then, there were a small number of Scottish Presbyterian missionaries active in India, in around half a dozen locations scattered across the subcontinent: Bombay, Calcutta, Poona, Madras, Nagpur and Sialkot.[9] The overall number of Scottish missionaries, including wives of missionaries, at work in India between the 1820s and 1850s was small, probably around 60 altogether, with around 40 being in India in 1857.[10] Missions also employed Indians as ordained missionaries, teachers, catechists, and assistants, probably numbering as many as the Scottish missionaries if not more.[11]

The Sialkot mission was established in early 1857, and the Rev. Thomas Hunter, his wife, Jane Scott, and their infant son were to fall victim to the uprising in July 1857. They were the only Scottish missionaries killed during the uprising. Other Scottish missionaries were less directly affected by the events, and many of the reports sent back to Scotland suggested that as far as possible mission work continued as normal. Though the number of missionaries active in India was small, several missionaries in service in 1857 had already lived and

worked in India for substantial periods of time, most notably Alexander Duff, John Wilson and John Murray Mitchell. Duff, in particular, was one of the most influential missionaries of his time, both in terms of his promotion of education in the English language and his influence in building up missionary support at home in Scotland.[12] A prolific writer and passionate publicist for missionary activity, Duff was, not surprisingly, the most vocal contributor of views about the uprising among Scots missionaries.

In the period up to 1857, missionaries carried out evangelical and educational work, including educational work with girls, supported by Ladies' Associations at home from the late 1830s onwards. That education of girls was understood to contravene the views of Indians was often commented on, and arguments for its importance in the process of Christianisation were stressed. Regular denunciations of the treatment of girls and women in India were made, especially of sati,[13] the treatment of widows, child marriage and temple prostitution. In the 1850s a new approach of 'zenana' visiting was adopted, i.e., visiting at home those Indian women who lived in seclusion. Accounts of Scottish missionary work in India have claimed this as a Scottish innovation, apparently first mooted by Dr Thomas Smith, a Church of Scotland missionary in Calcutta, in 1840, and first put into practice in 1855 by a Miss Toogood.[14]

That a number of aspects of missionary work provoked a reaction or produced tensions is apparent in reading missionary reports. Scottish missionaries' activities, like those of other Protestant missionaries, could disrupt family relationships, breach rules of caste or the religious beliefs of Hindus and Muslims, and contravene Indian views of girls' and women's roles. Missionaries attempted to carry Christianisation into women's homes, actively promoted education in the language of the conquering power and clamoured for the abolition of practices and customs associated with indigenous religions. Furthermore, they took their preaching of Christianity into the streets and villages of India as far as they were able, preaching in public places, itinerating in provincial cities and towns, and establishing rural missions. They also actively organised occasions where disputations on different religious systems might take place, in their own accounts always declaring their victory in such intellectual battles. Between the 1830s and the 1850s missionaries were thus increasingly making their presence felt, through a range of activities that had the potential to cause disquiet.

Missionary work had a dual character, focused not only on the Christianisation of others in foreign countries, but also on the communication of 'missionary intelligence' to people at home. This was integral to their work, and was part of the contract of missionary 'agents', regulated by committees and boards at home. Periodicals containing news of foreign missions, alongside news of home missions, first appeared in Scotland in the 1820s. Following the 1843 Disruption, periodicals were produced on denominational lines, with both the Church of Scotland and the Free Church of Scotland additionally launching periodicals on women's mission work around the late 1850s and early 1860s. An

abundant pamphlet literature was also produced, including sermons, addresses to General Assemblies, speeches to AGMs of the Ladies' Associations, and so on.

This literature 'relied on the endless recirculation of tropes in a discourse condemning Indian customs and practices'.[15] Its key themes were: the superiority of Christianity; the civilising mission, with its emphasis on education and European science; and the 'degradation' of women in India. The idea of the superiority of Christianity was often articulated through a denunciation of Indians' 'horrid delusions' and 'multifarious idolatries',[16] while missionary education afforded moral protection and brought the 'fierce light of European thought' to challenge the 'terrible power' of Indian religions.[17] India was denounced as witnessing 'the greater degradation of women and her subjection to the man' than any other country.[18] Such discourses of religion, race and gender were structured around the counterpoint of Scots Christians and their values, justifying missionary intervention and projecting an austere Presbyterian ethic, emphasising hard work, education and self-help.

By 1857, there was in Scotland what might be described as an 'educated' public with an interest in India, an audience of regular consumers of first-hand accounts from Scots and other Protestant missionaries, albeit accounts framed by a religious understanding with a particular bias. That Scottish missionaries had the capacity to comment on events in India, drawing on direct experience of living and working there, would have naturally aroused interest among supporters, and it is in this context of the growth of an actively engaged public that contemporary debate on the events in India should be understood.

Reporting of the Uprising in Missionary Periodicals

Given the proximity of Scots missionaries in India to the events of the uprising, it might be anticipated that missionary periodicals would have commented on events, their causes and their impact on missionary work. In fact the coverage given to the uprising in periodicals appears to have been very limited.[19] This may have been on the one hand because, with the exception of Thomas Hunter and his family, none of the Scottish missionaries was caught up directly in the conflict, and on the other because of a conscious desire to emphasise the efforts of missionaries to continue steadfastly in their labours despite the difficult circumstances.

The overall number of missionaries and members of their families who lost their lives during the uprising was relatively small. Duff, writing in October 1857, estimated the number of 'British Christians' who had died to be at least 1,300. This number 'includes *four* chaplains, and *ten* male missionaries with their wives. Of the latter ten, two, belonging to the Propagation Society, fell at Cawnpore, and three at Delhi; four, of the American Presbyterian Mission, at

Futteghur; and one, of the Established Church of Scotland, at Sealkote, in the Punjab.'[20] Thus most Scottish missionaries appeared not to have been directly in danger during the uprising. Duff and his colleagues in Calcutta were probably the most affected, given the episodes of panic that afflicted Europeans in Calcutta in the period after the initial 'mutiny' at Meerut. Other Scots had some involvement in events, such as John Wilson, whose linguistic skills were of use to British intelligence in deciphering intercepted letters (an involvement only acknowledged much later).[21]

With mail taking months to travel between India and Scotland, it was not until September 1857 that the first reference to the uprising occurred in the pages of the Church of Scotland's *Home and Foreign Missionary Record* (hereafter *HFMR*). This described the 'calamities in India' that had 'extinguished in blood' the Delhi mission. However, the article urged against the spirit of vengeance apparent in some Indian papers. Justice should be done, and 'the guilty' should be 'condemned to die, as far as their cruelty can be proved, and as far as they persist in rebellion'. But 'our fellow-countrymen in India must see to it that they act as Christians' and not imitate 'the barbarities which, even when perpetrated by heathens, are universally condemned'.[22]

The deaths of Thomas Hunter, his wife and child, were of course recorded, briefly in September 1857, followed in October by a lengthy obituary of Hunter and his wife, Jane Scott. This gave an account of their family background and commitment to Christian work both at home and as missionaries to India, together with an account of their death. Having stayed on at 'Sealcote' when most other Europeans had left for safety in the Fort at Lahore, the Hunters eventually attempted to also make their way there, but were 'murdered on the road'. The author of the obituary speculated as to the reasons for this: 'It seemed to have been no part of the Sealcote mutineers' plan to massacre ladies and children, but perhaps Mrs Hunter had offended the fanatic Mohammedans by establishing a small female school, a crime in their eyes deserving death.'[23] A more detailed account of the Hunters' death was subsequently published as part of the General Assembly's Foreign missions report in July 1858, drawing upon a paper by Hunter's brother, Robert, a Free Church missionary at Nagpur.[24]

Clearly, events in Sialkot put an end to missionary endeavour there for the duration of the uprising, though the Church of Scotland initiated a new mission there as soon as it was possible. Elsewhere, the widespread unrest accompanying the uprising had some impact on missionary operations. In August 1857 Frances Hebron wrote from Calcutta that 'mission work is at a standstill at present' and that recently the missionaries had been 'in great danger'. The 'disturbances' were also preventing new work, such as a planned day-school 'in the heart of a Mohammedan village'.[25] At around the same time, missionaries from Chota Nagpore 'had been constrained to seek refuge in Calcutta', while in April 1858, educational work in Calcutta was interrupted as institution buildings had to be

given up 'for a good many days for the accommodation of European soldiers'.[26] In Bombay the number of pupils had declined, but this was not to be regarded as 'a matter either of surprise or disappointment' when 'the excitement caused by the reception of converts into the Mission, and the condition of the native mind during the past year, are taken into account'.[27]

In general the emphasis in the Church of Scotland *HFMR* was on ongoing mission work, with little discussion of the causes of the uprising, an attitude typified by the 1858 General Assembly's report on Foreign Missions. This stated that 'Opportunities of becoming acquainted with the public transactions that have recently taken place in India, have been so abundant, and so universally embraced' that the Committee 'abstain from entering on any general details'. They therefore contented themselves with a 'passing allusion to the nature and consequences of a revolt, marked by a spirit of treachery and fierceness perhaps unparalleled in the history of the world, and resisted, in circumstances of peculiar difficulty, with a measure of success at once most honourable to British valour and endurance'.[28] In the limited discussion in the pages of the Church of Scotland *HFMR* about the 'revolt' and about the Government of India, the main emphasis was placed on the attention drawn by events in India to the need for its more effective Christianisation, and on the best methods for doing this. These events had influenced the nation's character, since 'by their disasters in India, the British have become a more serious, a more God-fearing people'. This had increased the conviction 'among all classes' that the true plan for Christianising India was 'THE PREACHING OF CHRIST, (emphasis in the original) in season and out of season, early and late' and not the 'English language', 'English literature', 'English politeness'—which, in a rare positive comment about Indian people was described as 'very far inferior to that of the Hindoos'—or 'English science'.[29] A subsequent article on 'The Government in India', in October 1858, was similarly concerned with the best means of promoting Christianisation in India. Though suggesting that the government had been responsible for mismanagement, it refused to explore possible causes of the 'revolution' other than that of God's displeasure: 'even if we could discern enough in the Indian revolt to warrant us in giving an opinion of its causes, that opinion would neither be so profitable nor so indisputable as the inevitable reflection that God must have had a controversy—that He has a controversy—with the British people, in reference to their management of India.'[30]

That the hand of Providence could be seen at work in visiting judgement on the British for failing to carry out properly the Christian duty entrusted to them was a view widely shared by missionaries, missionary societies and churches, also finding expression in the secular press. What particularly rankled with evangelicals was the government's 'obstruction to Christianity and Christian missions' and their giving of aid to 'heathen shrines'. Supporters of missionary activity within the Church of Scotland, as in other denominations, thus reacted to the events in India with a renewed lobbying of government over the issue of

how Christian proselytising should be handled in India, as well as spurring on the church-going public to make greater efforts to support foreign missions.

Missionary Interventions in Scottish Public Debate

The most influential missionary writing on events in India was the series of letters written by Alexander Duff to the Rev. Dr Tweedie, Convenor of the Free Church of Scotland Foreign Missions Board, and published in the Edinburgh newspaper, the *Witness*.[31] The close relationship between the Free Church and the *Witness* meant that it was the natural vehicle for the publication of Duff's letters. The circumstances in which Duff wrote his letters presupposed a wide public circulation, as indeed occurred.[32] A collection of these letters, commencing on 16 May 1857 and continuing until 22 March 1858, was subsequently published in a single volume in 1858.[33] The publication of this collection was by popular demand, as the publishers' note makes clear, while it also offers an endorsement of Duff as a man of judgement and experience. Although 'it was first believed by some that Dr Duff had exaggerated the nature of the Indian crisis', subsequent reports had borne out Duff's views, which were 'the ripe result of thirty years' and would be valued 'as the deliberate judgement of one who has possessed opportunities of observation almost unequalled'.[34] In his history of Free Church missions, Robert Hunter was later to attribute to Duff's letters a significant impact on Scottish public opinion. When the initial news of the 'mutiny' at Meerut and the capture of Delhi arrived, the trial of Madeleine Smith,[35] then taking place in Edinburgh, 'almost entirely occupied the attention of the Scottish public'. However, 'the letters of Dr Duff, which exhibited the peril in its full magnitude ... had no slight influence in dissipating the false security that prevailed, and making it plain that Britain must put forth all her strength if she wished to retain possession of her Indian empire.'[36]

The context of an ordained missionary writing to the church leadership and addressing church members, missionary supporters and a wider Christian public, is important in understanding the character of these writings. They are throughout imbued with religious rhetoric and with religious purpose—primarily that of arousing greater enthusiasm for the task of Christianising India and encouraging greater support for foreign missions. Intermingled with religious rhetoric in these writings were a number of strands: the reporting of events based on news and eye-witness accounts reaching Duff in Calcutta; an analysis of attitudes towards British rule in India; explanations for the causes of the 'rebellion' and debates with the views of others on this; suggestions about appropriate government responses; and criticisms of the 'old traditional' policies of the East India Company and Board of Control for their treatment

of Christianity and of indigenous religions in India. While these strands may be treated separately for analytic purposes, in Duff's writings such topics were invariably accompanied by a religious coda, and the two essential points that underlay Duff's understanding of the existence of British rule in India were that India was a gift of God's Providence to Britain for the purpose of Christianising it and that the 'rebellion' was a sign of God's displeasure for Britain's failure to rise adequately to this duty.

As noted, missionary writings on India had routinely propagated negatively stereotypical views of Indian religions and peoples in the decades preceding the uprising. Accounts of specific incidents, of killings, of Indian leaders, and of other aspects of the uprising thus provided plentiful opportunities for reinforcing these stereotypes, and of elaborating these in ways that intensified their negativity. Thus, characterisations of Indians as 'superstitious' and 'fanatical' were much in evidence. For example, the 'superstitious' nature of the sepoys allowed them to be manipulated over the greased cartridges affair by 'some deep designing men',[37] while the conviction that British rule would end on the centenary day of the battle of Plassey came to be a certainty 'in the minds of an ignorant, superstitious, fanatical people'.[38] To these characteristics were added the further, and more damning ones, of disloyalty, faithlessness and 'Asiatic treachery', while accounts of British fatalities at the hands of Indians were invariably accompanied by epithets such as 'ruthless savages'.[39]

Duff did not stint himself in giving details of 'atrocities', in particular of the killing of women and children, accounts peppered with exclamation marks and sensationalist in tone, though he also confided that many details 'of the most loathsome and revolting kind had been purposely suppressed, to spare the agonised feelings of distant mourning friends'.[40] He hinted that European women were raped,[41] for example at Allahabad, where the rebels' 'treatment of any European females that have fallen into their hands has been too horrible to be expressed by me'.[42] To describe Duff's descriptions of such events as sensationalist is not to deny that the killings were genuinely shocking, but rather to emphasise that such intemperate sensationalism encouraged vengefulness and intensified the racism of missionary representations of Indian peoples and society. Notably, and somewhat surprisingly for a Christian minister, Duff explicitly came to the support of General Neill, criticised for the severity and character of his reprisals against rebels in Cawnpore.[43] The extent to which Duff's accounts were factually accurate has been contested,[44] though Duff himself was at pains to assure readers that he had access to many witnesses and reliable sources. Whatever their accuracy, he was not alone in providing accounts of this nature, and, indeed, extensive coverage of a comparable character, drawing on many supposedly eye-witness accounts, appeared in English and Scottish newspapers for months, as Duff was well aware, judging by the several allusions to his readers' familiarity with the coverage of 'public

journals'. In general these denunciations of Indian 'atrocities', Indian society and religions, served to justify British rule and a robust military response to the uprising.

A striking characteristic of Duff's account was the extent of hostility towards British rule that he imputed to Indians, a view consonant with his assertion that the 'rebellion' was not merely a military revolt.[45] In his view there was never '*anything like affection* or *loyal attachment*' (emphasis in original) to British rule,[46] and although British rule had often been welcomed at first by 'the labouring classes', after a while they were 'apt to settle down into a state of necessitated acquiescence or sullen indifference, or latent disaffection and discontent'.[47] However, there were differences among different groups in India in their attitudes to British rule, with the haters of it 'to be found chiefly among the Mohammedans, Brahmins, Rajputs, and other armed and turbulent classes of Northern and Central India',[48] although, generally, to 'genuine Mohammedans and Hindus our rule, merely as the rule of Christian foreigners, would be a standing grievance and unforgivable offence'.[49] In his earlier letters in 1857, Duff repeatedly declared that the 'revolt' was a 'Mohammedan conspiracy' that had been 'long-concocted',[50] and also made reference to the theory that 'Russian spies' had 'been successfully at work in inflaming the bigotry of the Mussulman and the prejudices of the high-caste Hindu', with Persia too, having a hand in this.[51] By December 1857, however, he had moved to the view that the 'long and deliberately concocted' rebellion had 'been able to array the Hindu and Mohammedan in an unnatural confederacy'.[52] Notwithstanding this recognition of Hindu involvement, it is Muslims who were particularly the object of Duff's vituperation—the 'Mohammedans to a man' were regarded as being against the British government, while not all 'Hindustanis' were.[53]

Though clearly taking the view that government officials had not grasped the potential danger that might arise from disaffection among Indian people as well as among the army, Duff in general applauded the effects of British rule for having brought order, social advancement for the people, and social reforms. However, he inveighed against the 'old "traditional policy" of the Home and Foreign Indian Government' with its 'shrinking dread, if not actual repudiation, of Christianity, and its co-relative pandering to heathenish prejudices'.[54] This issue rankled the most with missionaries, and led them to declare that God was visiting punishment on Britain: 'It is the Lord who, in a strange way, and for the accomplishment of one of the noblest of ends, even that of the evangelisation of its people, gave India to Britain. It is the Lord who, on account of our culpable misimprovement of the awful trust, in His sore displeasure, suffered India to be nearly lost to us.'[55] Stressing the benefits of Christianity for India and for British rule, Duff declared that 'native Christians' were the only Indians demonstrating true loyalty to the British government. He also asserted of missionaries that

> *nowhere has any special enmity or hostility been manifested towards them by the mutineers....* Such of them as fell in the way of the rebels were simply dealt with precisely in the same way as all other Europeans were dealt with. They belonged to the governing class.... (Emphasis in the original.)[56]

For Duff, as for his co-religionists, the fierce condemnation of Indian actions during the uprising served to strengthen the argument for Christianisation of India. The widespread disaffection and resentment towards British rule described by Duff, probably with considerable accuracy, never gave rise to a questioning of the rightness of British rule in India, nor to many aspects of its administration, with the notable exception of the East India Company's reluctance to give free rein to missionary activity. While there was, no doubt, considerable accuracy in attributing the aim of overthrow of British rule to those groups whose power had been or was most likely to be eroded by that rule, it is interesting that Duff stressed the political dimensions of this and downplayed the religious. This is of a piece with the view that no hostility was exhibited towards missionaries as such, and effectively amounted to a denial that missionary activity could have played any role in provoking the uprising. Thus, while Duff's experience and knowledge of India produced an analysis that viewed the causes of the uprising as complex, and which on certain points demonstrated some depth and persuasiveness, overall his presentation of the situation was inevitably shaped by his commitment to the goal of extending Christian proselytisation in India.

Duff's writings have been discussed at some length, both because they provide a more in-depth account than any other Scottish missionary writings on this topic, and because of the wider audience they reached. Duff was not, however, the only missionary who communicated his views on the uprising to the Scottish public, as is evident both from other correspondence in the *Witness*, and from occasional references to public meetings in the press. John Wilson, in Bombay at the time of the uprising, and Robert Hunter, a Free Church missionary at Nagpur, at home on furlough at this time, both had letters published in the *Witness* in 1857. Wilson was critical of the deference to caste within the army, which he saw as having been a major factor in the revolt—a position in line with his general views about caste.[57] Like other missionaries, he asserted the need for greater evangelisation of India.[58] Unlike Duff, however, he thought there was a lack of evidence of Muslim conspiracy at work in the uprising.[59] Hunter was similarly critical of the role that caste had played in discontent within the Bengal army, contrasting favourably the Bombay and Madras armies, which tended to recruit more from lower castes.[60] He demonstrated some sympathy in his understanding of the offence caused by the greased cartridges to Hindus and Muslims, even if their religions were seen as a commitment to 'mere ceremony'.[61] Hunter gave no credence to the theory that Russia had a

hand in instigating the 'mutiny', though like Duff he expressed strong hostility to Muslims.[62] Hunter was unusual in his gloomy prognosis for the future, in which he anticipated greater difficulties for missionary work and further outbreaks of violence in the longer term,[63] in contrast to the typical reaction, which was to call for increased missionary efforts as a means both of civilising and pacifying India. To what extent Hunter's position was influenced by the death of his brother Thomas, with his wife and son, is hard to say. The impact of this event, however, appears to have led to his resignation as a missionary.[64]

Hunter also took an active part in public meetings in Edinburgh at this time, as did John Murray Mitchell, a Free Church missionary in Bombay, in Scotland in this period for reasons of health. Their names were among the proposers of the formation of an 'Association for the removal of all Government encouragement of caste, connection with idolatry, and opposition to Christianity in India',[65] and Mitchell was subsequently a speaker at a public meeting in Glasgow held to establish a similar association there.[66] Mitchell delivered a lecture on the uprising on a number of occasions, with this being published in 1859. His pamphlet, *Indian Missions: viewed in connexion with The Mutiny and Other Recent Events,* was less concerned with the events of the 'mutiny' or its causes, but rather with the lessons to be learned. Like Duff's writings, Mitchell's pamphlet served to encourage support for the missionary cause. For Mitchell, the events in India had revealed the true character of 'Heathenism', which was to be contrasted with Christianity: 'Although, in the sad history of earth, deeds of equal atrocity have been committed, yet never was the spirit of Paganism so clearly and sharply defined against the spirit of Christianity.'[67]

Like Duff and other missionaries, Mitchell declared that no one could deny the connection between British shortcomings and God's punishment, resulting from the government having banned missionaries from contact with the army. He stressed that the 'natives' had no quarrel with missionaries, and argued that the loyalty of 'native Christians' to the British government was a riposte to the criticism of missionaries that they had made few converts. Thus he anticipated that there would be greater support for missions from British Christians for the urgent task of the evangelisation of India. He publicised the increase in missionary activities occurring prior to the uprising, such as translations of the key texts of other religions, which allowed such religions to be exposed to comparison with Christianity, and translation and circulation of Christian scriptures in vernacular languages. The 'positive blessings' of material progress resulting from British rule were also enumerated: railways, the telegraph, mines, irrigation, social reform and education—including education of females.[68] Despite these benefits, British rule was criticised for its 'traditional system' of governance in India, and particularly for the endowment of 'heathen' temples.[69] Thus he welcomed the end of the system of government of the East India Company and the Board of Control.

Representation of Missionary Perspectives in Edinburgh Newspapers

Coverage of the events of the uprising in leading Edinburgh newspapers of the day was extensive, including reports of events with many detailed, supposedly eye-witness, accounts, reporting of parliamentary debates and government action. As noted, the Edinburgh *Witness* provided the major vehicle for the expression of missionary views on events in India, though editorials did not always concur with these.[70] However, the newspaper was strongly supportive of the need for greater freedom to Christianise India, and took a lead in urging a missionary conference to discuss the situation in India and the appropriate response to this.[71]

In the *Scotsman* the main coverage given to the churches' attitudes towards the uprising was occasioned by the national day of 'Humiliation and Prayer', held on 7 October 1857. Queen Victoria had issued a proclamation, 'For a Day of Solemn Fast, Humiliation, and Prayer, in Scotland',[72] on account of the 'grievous mutiny and disturbances which have broken out in India.' The object of the day was that people might humble themselves before God, 'in order to obtain pardon of our sins', and to implore 'His Blessing and Assistance on our Arms for the Restoration of Tranquillity'.[73] The day of 'National Humiliation' was a significant event both in Scotland and elsewhere in Britain. The *Witness* reported that 'Business was everywhere suspended, even the railways in general discontinuing their ordinary trains.'[74] Sermons on the theme of India were preached throughout the country—in London a crowd of 24,000 people gathered at the Crystal Palace to listen to the Rev. Charles Spurgeon.[75]

While the lengthy Fast Day sermons and addresses published in the *Scotsman* generally supported the view that events in India were a sign of God's wrath for the failure of the government to promote Christianity, there were a small number of dissenting voices. Proclamation of the Fast was not greeted with universal approval, since it meant the sacrifice of a day's wage for 'the working man' who could ill afford it. Nor was it obvious how this could have 'any effect in mitigating the mutiny or helping Havelock to relieve Lucknow'.[76] Furthermore, the experience of events in India should have 'taught those in authority that forced prayers are no devotion', since it was evident that the 'attempt to force religion down the throats of the Hindoo and Mussulman' was 'inimical to their tastes and prejudices'.[77]

The widespread notion that the sins of the people of Britain were being punished by God in the form of the Indian uprising was not accepted by all. The Rev. Dr Robert Lee,[78] preaching a sermon at Greyfriars Church, declared that though 'their gracious sovereign' had called on people 'to humble themselves and confess their sins in connection with the disasters in India', it was 'not a matter quite plain what were the particular transgressions which they ought to

acknowledge'.[79] Though 'some religious persons thought that these misfortunes were designed to punish us for not having used our public authority more absolutely and forcibly in promoting the Christian religion',[80] he 'denied that a foreign nation was justified in using the taxes of a people to propagate a religion which the population almost universally rejected'.[81] Lee thought both that a policy of religious neutrality was sound, and such acts of British rule as the abolition of sati were just, but despite such acts of justice, '[p]erhaps the sin which would be least thought of this day was our being rulers in India at all. It was not evident that we had any call to "garrison the world", or any peculiar qualification for the task.'[82] In questioning the imperial project in itself, Lee appears to have stood alone, but even he ended up defending British rule. Since Britain had reached this position, 'we must maintain it if we can'.[83]

The *Edinburgh Courant* similarly provided extensive coverage of the events of the Indian Uprising, though it did not provide editorial comment, and many of the articles printed in it were reprinted from other newspapers, such as the *Times*, and also, occasionally, the *Witness*. For example, some of Duff's letters from the *Witness* were reprinted in the *Courant*. Unlike the *Scotsman*, the *Courant* did not publish the sermons delivered on the 'Day of National Humiliation and Prayer', though the proclamation announcing the day was published. References to missionaries were relatively few, but, where these occurred, tended to give voice to the evangelical view. For example, in an article on 'The Bengal Army and the Missionaries' it was pointed out that missionaries had been banned from contact with the army, an indication of 'the wretched worldly spirit that has guided our Indian Government'. Furthermore, if fear of proselytism had been the real cause of the uprising, 'the property and lives of the missionaries would have been selected for special vengeance'.[84] On a number of occasions the issue of government policy on religion was referred to, mostly in reporting church and missionary meetings, which indicated that in various parts of Scotland church worthies were putting on record their opposition to government policy, urging, for example, that the government should 'openly assert its Christian character', give encouragement to missions, and abolish regulations prohibiting the introduction of 'Scriptures' into government-supported seminaries.[85]

The *Edinburgh Courant* also provided some coverage of the views of missionaries and their supporters on the causes of the uprising. Of the Duff letters it reprinted, one expounded his view that the 'rebellion' was neither purely a military revolt nor a national one.[86] A debate that took place at the City Council in September 1857 moved a resolution critical of the government, asserting that it was not a military mutiny, 'but a revolt of race, religion, and colour against a dominant Power alien in all these respects'.[87] A public meeting in Glasgow had heard from Sir Archibald Alison[88] that, 'It is in vain to speak of the greased cartridges; the revolt was organised by the Mohammedans years before the greased cartridges were heard of.'[89] Alison, like Duff, took the view that it was not a national movement, contrasting the acts of Indians with national heroes

such as William Tell in Switzerland, and William Wallace and Robert the Bruce in Scotland.

Cowan has commented of reaction to the Indian Uprising in the Scottish press in general, that the Church press 'responded most briskly' to the suggestion that missionaries had a role in provoking this, and 'repudiated it as a slander'.[90] And although the *Scotsman* urged respect for Indian institutions, in joining in the call for the day of 'national humiliation and prayer' it supported the view that the calamity arose from neglect of the duty to Christianise. There were of course defenders of the position of 'religious neutrality' adopted by the government, and attacks on evangelicals for their desire to establish a 'theocratic' form of government in India.[91] However, while opinion in the press was not unanimous, it was the demand for enhanced efforts at Christianisation that was to garner more support, since 'public reaction to the horrors of the struggle was predominantly against the view that India had a culture worthy of being preserved, or that its people had substantial grievances against our commercial, administrative, and religious purposes'.[92] This evidence indicates that while newspaper coverage of events in India consisted predominantly of accounts of 'atrocities' and British military retaliation against Indians, the missionary presence in India was also recognised in the press, and the views of the Presbyterian churches had a hearing. Indeed, the complaints of missionaries and their supporters that the government had been wanting in its attitude to Christianity were widely supported, though there were also some dissenting voices. Missionaries and their supporters were thus clearly able to communicate their views to the wider Scottish public. How wide this readership was in Edinburgh is suggested by figures cited by Cowan on circulation and the development of the Scottish newspaper press in the 1850s. In 1850, the *Witness* had a circulation of 2460, compared to 2900 for the *Scotsman* and 1630 for the *Edinburgh Courant,*[93] with the two former papers being Liberal in their politics, while the *Courant* was Conservative. By 1858, the *Scotsman* had achieved a circulation of 10,000. This increased newspaper circulation was due in part to the lower price of newspapers resulting from the removal of the advertisement duty in 1853 and of the compulsory newspaper stamp in 1855, and partly due to 'the adventitious aid of sensational news, as from the Crimea and India', which did much to boost circulation in the short term.[94]

As with the leading Edinburgh newspapers discussed here, it can be assumed that similarly wide coverage of events in India was provided by Glasgow newspapers and those of other cities such as Dundee (particularly given its connection to Calcutta through the jute industry). It is also likely that such newspapers would have given some space to missionary and church opinion, though both the extent of coverage and the views expressed may have varied considerably in different parts of Scotland.[95] In Edinburgh specifically there was an important overlap between the publication of views for the church-going audience as such and for a wider public in the form of the *Witness,* in which Duff's letters were published, and this suggests that missionary and church

opinion may have received more extensive circulation in Edinburgh than in other Scottish cities.

Conclusion

Given the religious nature of Scottish society at this time (25.6 per cent of the population were church-goers in 1851, rising to 50.5 per cent in 1905),[96] missionary literature in itself had the capacity to reach a sizeable audience. During 1857 and 1858, this capacity was enhanced by press coverage relevant to missionary concerns. Moreover, there was active support for foreign missions among leading members of Scottish elites, who were well placed to influence public opinion. In this sense, 1857 represented a new phase in the profile of missions and missionaries in Scotland, which at least in the short-term generated greater support.[97] Thus, while Scottish missionaries were for the most part neither at the centre of events in India, nor at the centre of public discussion of these events in Scotland, they were able to influence public opinion, and with the change in the nature of government in India following the uprising, missionaries effectively achieved their objectives of greater freedom of action to proselytise.

Among a network of missionaries active in promoting their views Alexander Duff was most influential as a shaper of opinion, though his views on the nature and causes of the uprising were not always shared. His writings have been characterised by modern historians as both 'bigoted' and 'sensationalist'. Cox, in discussing the evangelical tradition in India, cites the approach of Duff 'as being in some respects the most defamatory of all' in its attitudes to Indians,[98] with much of the religious discourse of Duff and his fellow missionaries being 'painful reading, transparently awful in its ethnocentric bigotry'.[99] Taylor has commented more generally of accounts of the uprising, that it was 'men of the cloth' who spread the most sensationalist accounts, without attempting to verify their accuracy, and particularly singles out Duff for criticism: 'Dr Duff was a clergyman but his account is bereft of Christian forgiveness—indeed contains uncorroborated sensationalist propaganda.'[100] Taylor implies that this was not merely a matter of journalistic style, but that it perhaps had a more 'sinister' aim of 'preparing the public for a more intense effort to convert India to Christianity'.[101] It is not possible to say to what extent Duff was acting in good faith in reporting the tales of 'atrocities', which he was garnering in Calcutta from various sources,[102] though it is clear that he turned these to account in the promotion of Christianisation in India. However, there is a case to be made that there is more to Duff's letters than 'sensationalist' reporting of 'atrocities', and that, while biased in particular against Muslims, they do offer some insights into conditions in India at the time. It is nonetheless striking, at least to a modern reader, that Duff's view of the widespread hostility and resistance to British rule

did not lead him to question the justifiability of that rule, but rather to a renewed evangelical fervour for Christianisation as the means of generating loyal Indian subjects of the British crown.

In general, Scottish Presbyterian missionaries, together with their counterparts in other parts of Britain, demonstrated the capacity to get their case aired in the press and supported at home, and to influence government decisions. This suggests that they were relatively integrated into the apparatus of temporal power and able to operate its levers in their interest. But at the same time, the extent to which they were (or perceived themselves to be) separate from the state and to which they were peripheral to state action allowed missionaries to persuade themselves that they played no role in provoking the uprising. The distinction missionaries made between church and state, and their emphasis on the prohibition from approaching sepoys as absolving them from any provocative role, were distinctions that were probably not apparent to Indian observers, especially given the penchant of missionaries for seeking support of governors and other civil service dignitaries, for example, at annual examinations in mission schools, and given their links with army officers. That there was apparently regular contact between army officers, soldiers and missionaries in various places in India, that some military men were known to be committed Christians and that some actively supported missions through financial donations, rather undercuts the argument that the army had been free from Christian influence. While it seems to have been largely true that army officers did not attempt to preach Christianity to Indian soldiers (although there were exceptions to this, such as Colonel Wheler, whose case was covered in the newspapers at the time),[103] the social interaction between some officers and missionaries must have nonetheless been apparent. It is also clear from their own accounts that missionaries' actions could provoke a negative response, but whether this was sufficiently intense to motivate rebellion is another question, and any more definitive answer to this is likely to come from investigation of Indian sources about Indian responses. This chapter can therefore do little to answer the question as to what role the activities of missionaries may have played in provoking the 'mutiny', not least because it considers exclusively the views of Scots. The significance of the evidence considered here lies rather in demonstrating the crucial role that even a small number of missionaries could play in the creation of understandings of empire for people at home.

In their representations of the uprising, missionaries used events to reinforce and deepen negative stereotypes of Hindus and Muslims, the latter in particular being the object of hostile comment, and to bolster their arguments for the need for Christianisation. In this, missionaries can be said to have manipulated events to further their own cause, just as some Indians were said to have manipulated religious sensitivities in relation to the greased cartridges affair. The increasingly apparent racism of missionary discourses at this time also perhaps represents a definitive shift towards the dominance of theories of 'scientific' racism as a key

component of imperialist discourses.[104] Moreover, the missionary commitment to global Christianisation was paralleled by a commitment to the British empire and British rule, even if in specific aspects the latter was found wanting.

It can be argued then that the events of 1857 and 1858 represented a crucial stage in the crystallisation of negative, racialised stereotypes of Indians of various faiths, and of consolidation of widespread public support for imperial power. Randall has argued that, in particular, the day of 'national humiliation' on 7 October was 'a key moment, perhaps *the* key moment, in the consolidation of the meaning of the Indian "Mutiny" for England and the British Empire',[105] and has demonstrated the extent to which sermons preached that day drew on the rhetoric of English national destiny and of definitions of Englishness. While there were clearly many similarities between English and Scottish discourses on the 'mutiny'—vilification of Indian peoples and religions, Providentialist interpretations of events, criticism of the East India Company but support for the empire—the relationship between national identity and empire was differently articulated. Although it was often to 'British Christians' that appeals were made to save the British Empire from its own shortcomings, signifiers of Scottish identity were just as frequently present in missionary writings and in the press, whether references to Highland soldiers, fellow Presbyterians such as General Neill, or national heroes such as Wallace and Bruce. In reporting and commenting on the events of 1857 and 1858 the opportunity was afforded to Scottish missionaries to enhance their public profile at home, and to claim their place as interpreters of imperial affairs for a Scottish audience. In making use of this opportunity, they provided moral justifications for empire and imperialism, and thus played a role in fostering imperialist sentiment in Scotland.

Notes and References

1. This is a revised version of a paper given at a workshop on '"Reporting 1857": The Indian Uprising and the British Media', 23 July, 2007, University of Edinburgh. I am grateful for the award of an ESRC postdoctoral fellowship, which enabled this research to be undertaken.
2. See, for example, Ainslie T. Embree, *1857 in India: Mutiny or War of Independence?* (Lexington: D. C. Heath and Company, 1968); and, for a more recent discussion, Nupur Chaudhuri and Rajat Kanta Ray, *1857: Historical Works and Proclamations.* Paper presented to the 'Mutiny at the Margins' conference, Edinburgh University, July 2007.
3. For the 'clash of fundamentalisms' thesis, see William Dalrymple, *The Last Mughal: The Fall of a Dynasty, Delhi, 1857* (London: Bloomsbury, 2006), especially Chapter 2, 'Believers and Infidels', pp. 58–84.
4. See Avril Powell, *Muslims and Missionaries in Pre-Mutiny India* (London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003) (first published 1993).
5. See Ian Copland, 'Christianity as an Arm of Empire: The Ambiguous Case of India under the Company, c. 1813–1858', in *The Historical Journal*, vol. 49, no. 4, (2006), pp. 1025–1054.
6. Quoted in Embree, *1857 in India*, p. 9.

7. Copland, 'India under the Company', p. 1050.
8. The Disruption, in which a considerable proportion of the ministers and congregations of the Church of Scotland left it and established the Free Church of Scotland, as the consequence of a disagreement over the issue of patronage, i.e., whether landowners rather than congregations had the right to appoint ministers, created a major division in Scottish religious life which was to last until 1929.
9. I have followed the usage of primary sources from 1857 and 1858 for place names, though recognise that many have since been renamed or are written differently.
10. It is difficult to provide a precise number for Scottish missionaries in India in 1857, since contemporary Free Church records listed only 'ordained' missionaries, and this excluded missionary teachers, and the wives of missionaries, who often worked as teachers, or ran schools or orphanages. Nor did Free Church records list the women missionaries employed by the Ladies' Association linked to the Free Church. In the Church of Scotland's General Assembly proceedings, lists of missionaries employed were not included. However, such lists did appear in the annual *New Edinburgh Almanac*. The figures cited above are based on missionaries listed in these sources plus an estimated figure for the number of missionaries' wives working in missions.
11. Numbers of Indians working in Scottish missions were not always specified.
12. Embree describes Duff as 'one of the most influential missionaries of the nineteenth century'. Embree, *1857 in India*, p. ix.
13. For a discussion of changing attitudes to Sati, and of missionary representations of this as emblematic of Hindu religion, see Andrea Major, *Pious Flames: European Encounters with Sati* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2006).
14. See *Free Church of Scotland Record*, No XI, December 15, 1861, and Elizabeth Hewat, *Vision and Achievement, 1796–1956: A History of the Foreign Missions of the Churches united in the Church of Scotland* (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1960).
15. Anna Johnston, *Missionary Writing and Empire, 1800–1860* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 81.
16. John Wilson, *Memoir of Mrs Margaret Wilson* (Edinburgh: John Johnstone and London: Whittaker and Co and J Nisbet and Co, 1838), p. 340.
17. Mitchell, J. Murray, *In Western India: Recollections of My Early Missionary Life* (Edinburgh: David Douglas, 1899), p. 120.
18. Duff, Scottish Ladies' Association, *Report*, 1839.
19. Periodicals published by the Church of Scotland and Free Church of Scotland were consulted for this section. Unfortunately, no extant copies of the Free Church of Scotland *Home and Foreign Missionary Record* for 1857 and 1858 have been located. Subsequent issues from 1861 to 1863 reveal only a few passing remarks relating to the uprising.
20. Alexander Duff, *The Indian Rebellion: Its Causes and Results. In a series of letters from the Rev. Alexander Duff D.D. LL.D, Calcutta* (London: James Nisbet and Co., 1858), p. 130.
21. See George Smith, *Life of Rev. John Wilson of Bombay* (London: John Murray, Albemarle Street, 1878).
22. Church of Scotland, *Home and Foreign Missionary Record*, September 1857, p. 241
23. Church of Scotland, *HFMR*, October 1857 p. 253.
24. *Foreign Missions. Annual Report to the General Assembly by the Committee*, Edinburgh, 1858.
25. Church of Scotland, *HFMR*, November 1857, p. 283.
26. Church of Scotland, *HFMR*, July 1858 p. 154.
27. Church of Scotland, *HFMR*, July 1858 p. 155.
28. Church of Scotland, *HFMR*, July 1858 p. 154.
29. Church of Scotland, *HFMR*, February 1858, p. 26–27.
30. Church of Scotland, *HFMR*, October 1858, p. 245.

31. The *Witness* was one of three main newspapers published in Edinburgh in the 1850s. Though not officially under the control of the Free Church, it was a vehicle for its views.
32. Embree describes Duff's letters as written to a friend, while Randall describes them as being 'first posted to private correspondents'. In my view these comments indicate a misunderstanding of the nature of the relationship between a missionary and his employing institution, represented in the form of the Convenor (Chair) of the Board for Foreign Missions, in this instance Dr Tweedie. Therefore the letters cannot in any sense be understood as 'private'—they were always intended for publication and public consumption. See Embree, *1857 in India*, p. 13, and Don Randall, 'Autumn 1857: The Making of the Indian "Mutiny"', in *Victorian Literature and Culture*, 2003, pp. 3–17, p. 15, footnote 2.
33. Given the time taken for letters to travel from India, the first of Duff's letters was not published in the *Witness* until 1 July, 1857. Letters from Duff were published in the *Witness* throughout 1858.
34. Duff, *The Indian Rebellion*, p. iv.
35. Madeleine Smith was a young middle class woman from Glasgow, accused of murdering her lover, Emile L'Angelier, by poisoning him. Much of the evidence in the case consisted of love letters written from Madeleine to Emile, and these received extensive coverage in the press. See, Elizabeth Ewan, Sue Innes, Sian Reynolds, and Rose Pipes, eds, *Biographical Dictionary of Scottish Women* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006).
36. Robert Hunter, *History of the Missions of the Free Church of Scotland in India and Africa* (London: T Nelson and Sons, 1873), p. 118 (footnote).
37. Duff, *Indian Rebellion*, p. 18.
38. Duff, *Indian Rebellion*, p. 26.
39. Duff, *Indian Rebellion*, passim.
40. Duff, *Indian Rebellion*, p. 19.
41. Investigation into the claims of rape after the uprising was over found that there was no evidence for these. See P.J.O. Taylor, ed., *A Companion to the 'Indian Mutiny' of 1857* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1996).
42. Duff, *Indian Rebellion*, p. 20.
43. Duff, *Indian Rebellion*, p. 245–246.
44. See Taylor, *Companion to the 'Indian Mutiny'*, p. 380.
45. Embree describes Duff thus: 'His special contribution to the historiography of the period is his insistence on the deep-seated hostility of most Indians to British rule'. Embree, *1857 in India*, p. 13.
46. Duff, *Indian Rebellion*, p. 98.
47. Duff, *Indian Rebellion*, p. 98.
48. Duff, *Indian Rebellion*, p. 193.
49. Duff, *Indian Rebellion*, pp. 193–194.
50. Duff, *Indian Rebellion*, p. 47.
51. Duff, *Indian Rebellion*, p. 93.
52. Duff, *Indian Rebellion*, p. 219.
53. Duff, *Indian Rebellion*, p. 112.
54. Duff, *Indian Rebellion*, p. 238.
55. Duff, *Indian Rebellion*, p. 263.
56. Duff, *Indian Rebellion*, p. 132.
57. John Wilson, Letter, *Witness*, 1 July 1857.
58. John Wilson, Letter, *Witness*, 3 October 1857.
59. John Wilson, Letter, *Witness*, 18 November 1857.
60. Robert Hunter, Letter, *Witness*, 1 August 1857.
61. Robert Hunter, Letter, *Witness*, 8 August 1857.
62. Robert Hunter, Letters, *Witness*, 8 August and 15 August 1857.
63. Robert Hunter, Letter, *Witness*, 15 August 1857.

64. See Free Church of Scotland, *Missions of the Free Church of Scotland in India and Africa*, no II, June 1858, p. 1; and entry on Hunter in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. www.oxforddnb.com
65. Public meeting advertised in the *Witness* on 7 November, 1857, and report of meeting in the *Witness* on 11 November 1857.
66. A report of the Glasgow public meeting appeared in the *Witness* on 3 January 1858.
67. J. Murray Mitchell, *Indian Missions: Viewed In Connexion with the Mutiny and Other Recent Events* (London: James Nisbet and Co., 1859), p. 6–7.
68. Mitchell, *Indian Missions*, p. 24.
69. Mitchell, *Indian Missions*, p. 28.
70. Cowan notes, for example, that editorials in the *Witness* supported Canning's 'reasonable' response to the 'mutiny', while many missionaries and their supporters were urging sterner measures. See R.M.W. Cowan, *The Newspaper in Scotland* (Glasgow: Outram, 1946), p. 408.
71. See 'Missionary Conference in Connection with the spread of Christianity in India', *Witness*, 14 October, 1857.
72. *The Scotsman*, Monday, 28 September 1857. Separate proclamations were issued for England and Ireland.
73. *The Scotsman*, Monday, 28 September, 1857.
74. Report on the day of 'National Humiliation', *Witness*, 10 October 1857.
75. See Randall, 'Autumn' 1857, p. 3.
76. Letter from 'A Working Man', *The Scotsman*, 6 October 1857.
77. Letter from 'A Working Man', *The Scotsman*, 6 October 1857.
78. Rev. Robert Lee was a Church of Scotland minister, prominent as a reformer of church worship. Although prominent, he often dissented from majority opinion. See *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, www.oxforddnb.com
79. *The Scotsman*, Thursday, 8 October 1857.
80. *The Scotsman*, Thursday, 8 October 1857.
81. *The Scotsman*, Thursday, 8 October 1857.
82. *The Scotsman*, Thursday, 8 October 1857.
83. *The Scotsman*, Thursday, 8 October 1857.
84. *Edinburgh Courant*, 5 August 1857; article reprinted from *News of the Churches*.
85. *Edinburgh Courant*, 2 April 1858. Previous reports of such meetings and resolutions had appeared in the *Edinburgh Courant*, 16 October 1857, and 4 November 1857.
86. *Edinburgh Courant*, 4 January 1858.
87. *Edinburgh Courant*, 23 September 1857.
88. Sir Archibald Alison (1792–1867), born in Shropshire, was a lawyer and historian, and played a prominent role in academic institutions in Scotland in the mid-nineteenth century.
89. *Edinburgh Courant*, 25 September 1857.
90. Cowan, *Newspaper in Scotland*, p. 406.
91. See, for example, discussion of evangelical proposals for the greater Christianisation of India in *The Scotsman*, 9 January 1858.
92. Cowan, *Newspaper in Scotland*, p. 407.
93. Cowan, *Newspaper in Scotland*, p. 280.
94. Cowan, *Newspaper in Scotland*, p. 276.
95. Richard Finlay has cautioned against treating the *Scotsman* and *Glasgow Herald* as being representative of Scottish opinion, and has stressed the importance of local newspapers and how local links informed coverage of issues related to empire. Richard J. Finlay, 'The Scottish Press and Empire, 1850–1914' in Simon J. Potter, ed., *Newspapers and Empire in Ireland and Britain: Reporting the British Empire, c. 1857–1921* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2004).
96. See Callum G. Brown, *Religion and Society in Scotland since 1707* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1997).

97. The missionary periodicals suggest that there was an immediate upsurge in support in Scotland, including very generous donations from individual benefactors, though this does not appear to have been sustained through the 1860s.
98. Jeffrey Cox, *Imperial Fault Lines: Christianity and Colonial Power in India, 1818–1940* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002), p. 24.
99. Cox, *Imperial Fault Lines*, p. 25.
100. Taylor, *Companion to the 'Indian Mutiny'*, p. 380.
101. Taylor, *Companion to the 'Indian Mutiny'*, p. 22.
102. Randall notes that Duff both commented on 'unauthenticated rumours' and repeated 'atrocity' stories that later turned out to be unsubstantiated. He similarly comments that Sir Colin Campbell, while explicitly aiming to tell the 'truth' of the 'mutiny' repeated similar unsubstantiated accounts. See Randall, 'Autumn 1857', p. 5.
103. See, for example, the *Edinburgh Courant*, 14 August 1857.
104. See Susan Thorne, *Congregational Missions and the Making of an Imperial Culture in 19th Century England* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999).
105. Randall, 'Autumn 1857', p. 3.