

Architectural *Triveṇī* of Allahabad and Asphyxiation of a Monumental Dream (P.K. Acharya and his *Mānasāra*)

R. N. MISRA

The city of Allahabad has many histories and one of these relates to the making of its external appearance as seen in its monuments and building—both public and residential—which were constructed over a fairly long span of time from the time of the Mughals, including the colonial, down to the contemporary. Altogether, these seem to make up a *triveṇī* in the enterprise of architectural forms representing the Mughal, the colonial, and the classical Indian tradition. Of these, the last one got snuffed out in the city even before it could appropriately materialize, hence the *triveṇī* metaphor in which a stream that represented Indian classical forms cascaded little, except in fancy.

One may however, perceive the varying tastes of builders in the architectural works accomplished at Allahabad or, even the intentions that are visible in the forms of their making. Except for both the strategic expediency of having a fort and the necessity of providing a resting perch to a Mughal prince (Khusro), there is little source material discussing the circumstances which made the different architectural enterprises possible in the city during the Mughal phase. Similarly, a rapid look at the source material on colonial Allahabad indicates little of any debate about a consensual architectural programme for the city, the choice of its design or the latter's compatibility with the conflicting colonial and indigenous attitudes. As the city grew, both British rulers and their Indian subjects then, apparently in total isolation from each other, made their respective attempts, to embellish the city with mansions, monuments or buildings that would reflect the power, glory and pride of the one and the subservience of the other!

Elsewhere, at Lucknow for instance, one finds undercurrents of a reactive response by the locals to the colonial attitudes of the

superiority. That is best illustrated in Sharar's (1860-1926) work, *Mashriqi tamaddun ka akhiri namuna*—"the last phase of an oriental culture",¹ a work about Lucknow, its rulers and the culture that they represented.² But the early eighteenth century Allahabad does not seem to offer any glimpse of such protestations, which however, surfaced in the writing of Prasanna Kumar Acharya much later.

Prasanna Kumar Acharya, of whom there will be more in the second part of this essay, did strongly advocate introducing Indian architectural forms in public and private buildings. But by the time he appeared on the scene, the dye had already been cast in favour of an architectural programme that suited the British power. Today, however, many of the buildings of colonial vintage stand re-used here, with their original contexts substantially lost or forgotten. But an inquiry into making of the different localities and their settlements along with their architectural profiles at Allahabad from the eighteenth century onwards sheds light on the imposition of a different aesthetic in the wake of new realities that manifested the changing power structures in colonial Allahabad. So, first we discuss here the making of the colonial Allahabad, followed by Prasanna Kumar Acharya's work on the *Mānasāra* and its advocacy and his unfulfilled desire to usher in an architectural resurgence in Allahabad and elsewhere in India in conformity with classical Indian wisdom of which the *Mānasāra* according to him was the ultimate authority. The first part of this essay thus serves as a background to Prasanna Kumar Acharya's academic and structural works after the colonial patterns in architecture had already taken shape in Allahabad.

I

There is no dearth of references pointing to the emergence in the eighteenth-century Allahabad of what Bayly calls 'rulers, townsmen and bazaars'.³ And such evidence tends to fit people into those and many other categories as, first under the East India Company and later under the Crown, the British gradually wrested control registering their dominant presence and power in different capacities—personal, official, commercial and military. In his two volumes, Bayly (1975,1983) has analysed the process of emergence of state control and the different institutions its workings from 1770 to 1920. But there is little in this analysis to indicate how the spaces where the activities that shaped the destinies of the people or the communities, were designed, lived or sequestered? Or, how the

work-places and their choice or even the facilities made available there, pandered to the hierarchies that were imposed under the compulsions of the ruler-subject dichotomies? Or, for that matter, how the British attitudes changed before and after the holocaust of 1857 and how these changing attitudes are reflected in the buildings and architecture they devised for themselves and their subjects?

Some of these points are discussed below but we may also emphasize here the democratic transformation today of almost everything in Allahabad, that once defined exclusivity of its colonial masters. For instance, what used to be the jail is now turned into SRN Hospital; the Secretariat is now converted into the Public Library; the Governor's residence that used to be, houses now a Medical College.⁴ The old Colvin Hospital stands as Motilal Nehru Memorial Hospital. The High Court building of yesteryears (1834,1868) is the office of the Director of Education today. And, the *Gora Hawalat* (Workhouse for European vagrants), built opposite the Collector's court then, is Vikas Bhavan now, with certain additions made to expand it. The once European Club building that was built in 1871, houses the Public Service Commission. The Knox Hall that used to be District Magistrate's Library stands as the Holy Trinity School. Similarly, the DM's bungalow is now turned into Annie Besant School. The Pioneer Press building of 1869 is in the hands of the Fertilizer Corporation of India. The Kotwali of 1874 survives on the south side of the GT Road. These changes amply explain the reuse and also that the old centres of power have lost their significance.

As regards the colonial attitudes about the nature and bearings of the habitations, settlements and their architectural forms in the then Allahabad and their merits or inadequacies, they are best seen in the early Europeans' comments relating respectively, to: (a) the Mughal monuments that they appreciated and/or re-used; and (b) the general scene of settlement that did not find their favour. We propose to highlight them briefly. So, first about what did not find their favour and why so? We will return to the other point later.

Much of the early European understanding of Indian architecture and settlements in the eighteenth-century Allahabad seems to conform to Edward Said's constructions on "Orientalism", defining or constituting the Orient as non-European 'other'—'the ante-type against which Europeans defined themselves.' In that light, it is not difficult to find their response to people and habitations in Allahabad rendered in terms, which are less than complimentary. Impoverishment and squalor is the *leitmotif* of these descriptions. Hodges (1782) has

described Allahabad as consisting of “merely thatched huts worth scarcely a vestige of any house remaining”.⁵ In 1815, “nine out of ten houses” noticed were *kaccha* in construction.⁶ The comment may not surprise us considering that immense destruction was perpetrated on Allahabad between 1720 and the 1770s, caused by raids on Allahabad by the Pathan rulers of Farrukhabad (1720-29, 1750), the Marathas (1736, 1739) and the Bundelas with or without the Marathas; or, by the Nawab-Wazirs of Awadh (1747, 1753) and their rivalry in wresting control over it. Nawal Kishore of Awadh and his ally *raja* Prithipal of Pratapgarh also caused destruction in their effort to regain it from the Pathans. But the city is said to have returned to some semblance of peace, thanks to the efforts of the Awadh-appointed Governor Kripa Dayal who re-laid it by 1775 and brought succour.⁷ But after the Battle of Buxar (1764), the Fort of Allahabad came to be garrisoned by British forces.

Bayly indicates an increase in the wealth here as the ascetic orders of Allahabad, Banaras Mirzapur, etc., emerged as the biggest property owners in 1780s.⁸ But things were not yet quite promising and Hodges (1782) underscores poverty in Allahabad, due to which he preferred to re-christen the city as “Fakirabad”.⁹ Or, the expression may signify that the city earned that name because *sadhu-s* and *fakir-s* lived here, in plenty. Apart from its abject poverty, the city did have a magnificent fort on the Yamuna, the tombs at Khusro Bagh, a garden and a *serai* laid by Jahangir who lived in Allahabad from 1599 to 1609.

Striking a somewhat different note from Hodges, Fanny Parks (1850) evinces interest in the aesthetic bearings of the “picturesque” in Allahabad.¹⁰ But, the poverty of settlements in Allahabad inhabited by non-Europeans surfaces in her writings also. These settlements stood in contrast to the profligacy of the life style of East India Company’s officials whose households employed a large contingent of servants—fifty-four in case of Fanny Park’s household for which she spent Rs.250 per month. Fanny Parks, wife of an influential European, made a record of her times in her book of 1850 which has pictorial sketches of the contemporary buildings in Allahabad including the temple on Dashashvamedha *ghat* in Daraganj and that of Alopshankaridevi at Alopibagh.¹¹

Subsequent to Hodges (1782) and Fanny Parks (1850), the derisive refrain recording the poverty and squalor of Allahabad continues in other European notices too. Reginald Heber¹² (1854), the Bishop of Calcutta, writes of the city as an ill-built, poverty-stricken place, “a

small city” with “very poor houses and narrow, irregular streets confined to the bank of Jumna”.¹³ In 1854, certain structures of Allahabad are similarly described as having no visual distinction. We have the description of a square and pillared “subterranean temple (below the fort) entered by a large passage sloping downwards” containing “a *linga* at one end” and “a dead forked tree, continually watered with great care”, at the other end. The place is described by Tieffenthaler as a “closed loathsome den rendered more hideous by obscene and monstrous figures of Mahadeva, Ganesha and other objects of worship...”.¹⁴

Such condemnations continued in British writings till the early twentieth century and form the subject of discussion in many a significant publication on early European response to Indian art.¹⁵ But that is another story. As for Allahabad, its “wealthy quarters” were now developing in the Daraganj area to which Fanny Parks makes a reference. Ascetic orders also played their role in the creation of wealth in the city to which a reference has been made above. The *daira*-s of the Muslim saints and the *akhada*-s of the orders like the current day Niranjani and Nirvani, etc. might have contributed to the weal of the city through the institution of pilgrimage. But the austere way of life of these establishments yet precluded the possibility of grand buildings for their seats.

An account of the early eighteenth century settlements—some of them going back to still earlier times—may not be complete without a reference to the Ganj localities, which, with the Chowk at the centre, dot the entire city of Allahabad even today. From 1751 onwards, Kripa Dayal, the Awadh Governor of Allahabad re-settled certain Ganj localities where one may plausibly read the hints of battleworthy encampments besides the habitats of the trading communities. The Kydganj-Mutthiganj area was thus turned into a ‘civil station’ with defense gates at Chowk Ganga Das and Loknath. There is a reference to an 1872 dispatch from Fort Williams (Calcutta), about the defense system of this locality. It notes, “in case of emergency these gates were closed to make the entire locality into a fortified compact”.¹⁶ According to the above-mentioned dispatch, this provided the “inner second defense” to the town. Such a protective fortification, secured by gates, indicates the defensive planning in the central habitation complex where Indians carried out their commercial and other activities.

Other Ganj localities perhaps followed this model. Lucknow of 1857 had several ‘Ganj’ localities in the city, which owing to their

military character, served as a bulwark against the marching British columns in 1857. By that analogy, it may be surmised that right from the pre-British days, particularly after the Pathans' incursions, Allahabad came to have clutches of soldiers of fortune and their entourage in specific Ganj localities.¹⁷ Ganj may be derived from *ganjāvāra*, a Sanskrit term for the royal encampments in the battlefield.¹⁸ Some of the Ganj-s, as their names suggest were named after reputed personages, including saints or religious leaders. Others indicate the possibility of some acts of valour (e.g. Himmatganj) or may refer to an administrative settlement (e.g. Subedarganj). Yet others (Lashkar Lines or New Lashkar Lines) have definite military implications. Interestingly, some of the Ganj localities of Allahabad offered stiff resistance to the British forces in June 1857. This is especially true of Kydganj and Mutthiganj. Kydganj also came to have many old monuments dating back to 1798, which have been described as made in the "florid and massive style that prevailed in England in the Victorian era".¹⁹

In contrast to indigenous patterns of living, Europeans lived in opulence and glory. But living in Allahabad was a torment for them due to the oppressive heat and squalor. The city has been mentioned as *chhota jahannum*, "a mini inferno". The Anglo-Indian travellers moved in palanquin (*palki*) and the "Memsahibs of that period (1850s) were less exclusive persons and mixed familiarly with her Indian friends".²⁰

Bayly²¹ describes the settlements of the mid nineteenth-century Allahabad in terms of 'three concentric rings' with the old town and the commercial district of Mirganj with its cloth and grain merchants forming the centre. Around this centre developed a 'complex of trading and residential quarters' with Chowk Gangadas and Rani ki Mandi being predominantly the 'trading areas' and Yahiyapur ('which lay close to the administrative centre of the Mughal town') being 'inhabited by old service families'. Weavers and artisans lived to the north and south of the Chowk area. All this formed the 'first ring' around the central habitation. Outside this ring lay the villages of Sadiapur to the south and Serai Salem and Niwan to the west. Bayly tells us that these villages remained 'distinctly agricultural until the end of the nineteenth century'. They were also 'notoriously turbulent'. The 'third ring' of settlements grew up on the banks of Ganga and Yamuna where Daraganj, Kydganj and 'the adjoining *mohallas* of old town known as Mutthiganj' made a conspicuous presence. Daraganj was inhabited by respectable Brahmana families

and traders and the other two localities were gradually populated by people who came to offer services to the British military cantonment and Civil lines which developed after 1865. This happened with the coming of the railways as the British hold strengthened in the capital of the NWP. Bayly says these riverside townships ‘served the dual function as entre pot points for the river borne trade in cloth, grain and indigo and also as service points for Hindu religious activities’.²²

This was the general pattern of settlements at Allahabad as the Europeans started re-planning the city and commandeered the areas north of the railway line for themselves.

We had, in at beginning, made two points about the early European reactions to the settlements and monuments in Allahabad, referring to what they appreciated and re-used and what they abhorred. Having briefly discussed structures which did not find their favour, we may now return to the monuments that they appreciated and/or re-used. Of the Mughal monuments, at least one namely, Jumma Masjid has disappeared now. An account of 1854 graphically describes this monument. We are told:

The Jumma Masjid...is a solid, stately building, but without much ornamentation. It is advantageously situated on the banks of Jumna. On one side it joins the city and on the other side it joins an esplanade before the glacis of the fort. After the conquest of the province by the East India Company it was filled up as the residence of the general of the station; subsequently, to the purpose of an assembly room; ultimately, (it was) resumed to its former destination. Mussalmans, regarding it as polluted displayed a contemptuous indifference on the subject.²³

The forces of the East India Company took hold of the Mughal fort of Allahabad and the British speak eloquently of its merits. In 1854 it is described as “nearly impregnable” or as a “noble castle” which has ‘suffered in external appearance’ with the passage of time. It has been described as “having gained in strength” through “modernization” thanks to its “present masters”. This “modernization” was achieved (possibly in 1798) by pruning down its “lofty towers”. These were further “reduced into bastions and cavaliers. And its high stone rampart was topped with turf parapets and obscured by a green sloping glacis”.²⁴ The renovations were complete by 1838.²⁵ A document of 1867 from the Qanungo of Chail Pargana describes its twelve palaces, three *khwabgah*-s, twenty-five gates and twenty-three domes (*burj*-s) besides other components that together constituted this magnificent structure.²⁶

To the British, the fort was indeed a “striking place and its

principal gate surmounted by a dome with a hall beneath, surrounded by arcade and galleries” and ornamented with “rude but glowing paintings”, presented an excellent sight. Heber (1824) regards the gate of the fort as “the noblest entrance that he ever saw to a place of arm”. Between 1798 and 1854, the exterior of the fort had been modernized in “Italian” style.²⁷ The officers of the East India Company made many more alterations in the architectural design and elements of the fort. We are told that,

...an ancient spacious palace, overlooking the Jumna has been fitted for the residence of superior officers and the rest of the Europeans are lodged in well constructed barracks. The arsenal, situated in the Fort is one of the largest in India. Altogether it is a place of great strength, probably impregnable to the Native powers and requiring for its reduction a regular siege according to European tactics.²⁸

Yet another monument—the tomb of Khusro—also evoked a favourable response of Europeans.²⁹ The location is mentioned both as a *bagh* and a *serai* and both designations are true. At least till 1858 its character as a Mughal caravanserai was not in doubt. The monument and its surroundings are described as follows:

Among the finest structures of Allahabad is called a *serai* of Khusro, the ill-fated son of Jahangir. It is a fine quadrangle surrounded by an embattled wall along the inside of which are a series of lodges for gratuitous reception of travellers. Adjoining is a garden of pleasure ground, some fine mango trees and three mausoleums in a rich, magnificent yet solemn style of architecture.³⁰

The grandeur of these tombs is once again praised in 1908 when they are described as “plain but massive” and that the “interiors of the principal mausoleum is adorned with painted flowers and birds”.³¹ The Khusro Bagh was obviously the site of a Mughal garden combined with a caravanserai apart from the three original tombs with one more added later, raised respectively for Khusro, his mother and sister with the fourth one for Tambolan Bee (*Tambolan* standing for Istanbul in Turkey).

It may thus be summed up that European response to the pre-existing architectural monuments and works was sometimes adulatory (as in the case of Khusro Bagh and Fort), sometimes ambivalent (e.g. Jumma Masjid) but often condescending or even downright critical and deriding (e.g. the temple near the Fort and the sculptures there). “Loathsome”, “hideous” and “monstrous” are the terms that they used in their criticism of the last category of works. But their greatest admiration was for the Khusro Bagh. They exulted

in its serenity, which was both fit and worthy of its character. Similarly, they glorified the Fort for the security it offered to them.

Europeans as a rule did not like to interfere with the religious structures but at Allahabad, in their early encounters, they appropriated the Jumma Masjid, debunked a temple and totally ignored the Maratha works. For instance, they passed over the temple of Ahilya Bai and Bhosle ka Bada that existed at Daraganj or, the temple built by Baiza Bai at Kotha Parcha. We may here hazard a surmise that Allahabad lost the opportunity of turning into a city of *ghats* like Banaras when the British refused to Baiza Bai, the self-willed and rebellious ex-ruler of the Scindia house of Gwalior, the permission to build a *ghat* at Triveni.³²

Of the Europeans' own habitations and life style, one does find references to their living in opulence and power, amply served by a troop of servants. But their segregation from the Indian community was more or less complete after 1857, with their exclusivity appropriately defined. One of the earliest instance of the Europeans' intention to build something after their own taste and persuasions at Allahabad is to be seen in 1839 when a government grant of a sum of five thousand rupees was sanctioned for building a church for which private contributions were also solicited.³³ Emerson's cathedral (*Patthar ka Girjaghar*) in Gothic style "based on the thirteenth-century choir of Canterbury Cathedral"³⁴ also came up at Allahabad (1871-1887). In certain circles in Allahabad today, it is believed to have been planned for Australia but due to a postal lapse it got assigned to and raised at Allahabad, simply by chance.

In any case, by 1908 many noteworthy European buildings had come up at Allahabad. These included government offices, high court and the bar library, district courts, European barracks, Anglican and Roman Catholic cathedrals and several churches, Muir Central College, Mayo Memorial Hall and the Thornhill and Mayne Memorial which contained the Public Library. The Government House, among these, receives a mention in 1908 for its agreeable surroundings and the complement of its buildings. It "stood in a fine park-like enclosure on a rising ground and had a central suite of public rooms with a long curved wing on either side containing private apartments".³⁵

The beginnings of colonial architecture thus have an interesting history in Allahabad. A list of some important works at Allahabad and their chronological succession, is as follows:

1801: Awadh ceded Allahabad district and the adjoining regions to the British.

- 1834: Allahabad became the headquarters of the NWP, and the High Court (reconstructed further in 1868) was established here.
- 1835: Allahabad ceased to be capital of the NWP (till 1859).
- 1837: Board of Revenue located at Allahabad.
- 1850: Railways (station and offices) established at Allahabad.
- 1857 (to 1860): Civil Lines – Barnett Hotel and Bar constructed.
- 1858: Alfred Park (Company Bagh), Secretariat, and Public Library (1863-64) were constructed.
- 1861-1869: Colvin Hospital (1861); Government House (started functioning under Lieutenant Governor, Sir Alfred Muir (1868-1874) in a building previously used by the 107th Regiment as Mess. A central suite of public rooms was added to it in 1869. Muir's predecessor, James Thompson (1843-1853) lived in the Lowther castle, rented from a local *nawab*). Pioneer Press (1869).
- 1870-1887: European Club (now, Public Service Commission Building) and Mayo Hall (1871) built.
- Emerson's Cathedral (*Patthar ka Girjaghar*: 1871-87), Muir College (1872 or 1874?) and Kotwali (1874); Thornhill Mayne Memorial (1878), Allahabad University (Founded 1887).
- 1901-1910: Vagrants' Home (for Europeans), Evening Christian College (1902), Muirabad (a colony of "native Christians", 1902).
- Churches: Anglican Church in Fort (1826); Holy Trinity Church (1839); Churches of St John and St Peter-1872, 1875; Presbyterian Mission: Church 1877, in Katra (1900); Roman Catholic: St Joseph's Cathedral 1877.

Bridges: were constructed on Yamuna 1865: Curzon Bridge (opened 1905).

Both architecture and planning were serious business and the colonial rulers of India performed their job accordingly. A look into the debates abroad about what kind of architectural design—indigenous or European—should the colonial masters choose for their colony indicates their concerns for power.³⁶ The colonial expansion of Europeans across the continents by the eighteenth-century had created in the colonial mind certain perceptions of a hierarchy where Europeans as the inheritors of classical Greek and Roman architectural tradition and technological and industrial advancement, stood at the top. Africa was somewhere deep down the ladder, and India, with her Buddhist and Islamic monuments and Sanskrit learning, stood somewhere in the middle.³⁷ In recommending a blue print for architectural projects in India, opinion in England was divided in respect of the choice of an appropriate style.³⁸ The classical Indian modes received only a marginal support in this debate.

The British are said to have paid little attention to architecture till

they began feeling secure after the victories at Plassey (1757) and Buxar (1763). However, the Presidency capitals had started developing at Madras, Bombay and Calcutta prior to this. Metcalf therefore has made an attempt to trace the formalization of European interests in architecture at these capitals for, the experiments there, subsequently impacted their architectural activity elsewhere. His survey of architectural works at these capitals indicates,

... each had at its core a massive Fort, the seat of the colonial government for the city and its hinterland; arrayed outside its ramparts were mercantile offices, civic buildings, churches, clubs, official residences and other structures required by the colonial elite.³⁹

As for the stylistic preferences, Nilsson (1968) regards both Calcutta and Madras as projecting Greece and Rome.⁴⁰

During (or even before) the regimes of Robert Clive at Madras (1798-1803) and, of Wellesley (1798-1805) at Calcutta, Europeans had already resorted to different Orders in the buildings at these places and elsewhere between 1780 and 1850. The baroque classicism of Sir Christopher Wren was tried out at Madras (1760) in St. Fort George and the Banqueting Hall, the latter with a high podium and its Tuscan-Doric pillars (1802). The "Doric classicism of the Greek revival" is seen at Bombay (Town Hall, 1833) and the Calcutta Mint (1824) and in Metcalf Hall (1840). The same style mixed with the 'Palladian' occurs in the Calcutta Town Hall building (1807-13).⁴¹ The Palladian style is seen again at Hyderabad and Lucknow in the British Residency buildings, built around 1800.⁴² Thus, the British in India fostered a style of the Greek Revivalism reinforced with Wren Inspired Renaissance architecture besides the Baroque, Doric and classically proportioned works at Calcutta and a predominantly Gothic style at Bombay. All these architectural orders and the buildings patterned on them were indeed meant to project British power even as they supported exclusive European living and catered to their security and administrative requirements.⁴³

But things started changing after 1857. Fergusson (1808-1886), R.F.Chisholm (1839-1915) and Major Mant (1830-1881) had already emerged as chief protagonists in the debates on alternative architectural designs and the style suited to European buildings in India. A debate among the Europeans was still on where alternative options were discussed or debunked. This debate reflects the colonial concerns about the kind of architecture that Europeans preferred for their colonies. Europeans, in any case, intended to cover themselves in glory through architecture. This was specially so because the

“classically educated Briton, as he built his empire, invariably conceived of himself as following in the footsteps of ancient Romans”.⁴⁴ It is also apparent that wherever the colonialists built their structures or whatever, they built not for their subjects but for themselves. The subjects were chiefly to be impressed and awed.⁴⁵

Of the advocates of the design and choice of architecture, Fergusson was originally an Indigo planter but was considered later an expert on Indian architecture; Chisholm and Mant had their respective opinions and preferences; while others like Rôger Smith (1873) advocated that “... our building in India ought to hold up a high standard of European art”.⁴⁶ Pleading for the use of Doric and Gothic orders in India he wanted the European buildings to be significant enough to inspire colonial rulers even as they would evoke the ‘admiration’ of the ‘natives’. On the other hand, William Emerson pleaded for emulating indigenous forms and designs. In the end, for residential purposes, the Europeans settled for residential accommodations that offered relief from the heat of the Indian climate besides allowing a colonial style of life.⁴⁷ For public buildings, a rich fare was available to choose from. And that included classical styles and their revivalist forms—Baroque, Byzantine, Palladian, Italian Renaissance, Doric, Gothic and others. Europeans confined themselves largely to their own tastes and aesthetic while occasionally making concessions to incorporate some Indian designs drawn mainly from the Mughal, Pathan, and Rajput repertoire. The Indo-Saracenic mode, which stood rejected as a ‘style’ later, was thus born out of a debate among the British on a possible choice for European buildings in India.⁴⁸

It may be relevant to examine how all these developments translated into the works that were commissioned at Allahabad. Allahabad district and the adjoining regions were ceded to the British in 1801. It became the provincial seat of the government of the North West Provinces in 1834. After some administrative changes (when the centre was shifted to Agra), it was finally secured as the capital of the province in 1859. The Board of Revenue started functioning in the city in 1831 and the railways arrived here in 1850. The British forces of the East India Company held on to the Fort, securely ensconced there till 1857 but the holocaust of the year made it imperative for the British rulers to dig in for safety and governance. Hence started a vigorous programme of building Allahabad in the image of a provincial seat of British power.

A massive repression that included killings and a destruction of

the defiant villages by the forces of the Company in 1857 led to almost a total subjugation of spaces by them. People in the city stood totally reduced. Soon, the new government succeeding the Company set out to plan the habitations in the city. J.C. Harper (1859) prepared a city plan, which was personally supervised by Lord Canning. A committee of three engineers presided over by Swinburne decided to develop an exclusive European settlement at Allahabad in the area north of the railway embankment from Railway station to the Fort.⁴⁹ The eastern boundary of Cannington was extended up to the Government House on Lowther Road. The Queen's Road (now, Sarojani Naidu Marg) and Hastings Road were laid to connect Civil Lines to the Government House.

These arrangements became necessary as a separate residential area was carved out for European Civil servants who were settled in the Civil Lines, which came up on the debris of eight villages. These villages had been razed to the ground in June 1857 as its inhabitants perished or were dispossessed. Alfred Park (1858) was carved out on the ruins of the two erstwhile villages—Samdabad and Sultanpur Bhava, burnt down in 1857. These two villages were deserted after Col. Neill and Col. Havelock quelled the uprising while hanging most of their inhabitants to death. Those who survived moved to Khuldabad.

Segregation was effected between the city and the Civil lines, as is stated in a dispatch of the government, which also mentions a destruction of the places "occupied by dirty Indian niggers".⁵⁰ Instances however are known when the British administration tried to placate segments of the city's population by offering land to the elites to build their house. Thus, Sir Syed Ahmad Khan was invited to settle at Allahabad and a large plot of land was allotted to him for the purpose. The move was apparently made to placate the Muslims who had been brutalized in Allahabad during the holocaust of 1857. Sir Syed came to Allahabad only for a short while. Yet, out of this dispensation, a beautiful building—Mahmud Manzil—got built where Justice Mahmud came to live, as Sir Syed, his father repaired to Aligarh. Even this dispensation did not last long and Mahmud Manzil changed hands soon. It became 'Pathak Mansion' till it was taken over by Motilal Nehru who made Anand Bhavan of it.

Architecturally, in the private residences the colonial rulers adopted the style of a '... single storied bungalow with pitched roof and expansive veranda, set in a spacious compound ringed with servant quarters'.⁵¹ For public buildings and monumental structures,

indigenous designs were accepted after providing alternatives to suit their comforts and aesthetics. These buildings almost invariably had certain common features like, walls of ample thickness and constant horizontal cornices. This was done to ward off heat, which to Europeans was oppressive. For the same reason, they rejected 'vertical buttresses that might interrupt free flow of air'.⁵² The Europeans' buildings came to have large and frequent openings consisting of doors and windows. In them we invariably see ample use of balconies and corbelled projections, with "roofs sometimes flat, sometimes domical." The buildings also came to have 'ample surrounding spaces'. These were the features recommended for public buildings.⁵³

The public buildings at Allahabad reflect what came to be termed as the "Indo-Saracenic" style of architecture. This style is reflected in the Senate Hall and Vizianagaram Halls of the arts and science blocks of the Allahabad University. The Muir College, planned by its architect William Emerson, came up around 1873 with 'large bell towers' in conformity with its 'Saracenic' design. Its tower was made with a grant of ten thousand pounds from the *maharaja* of Vizianagaram. The Governor of the NWP requested the grant of the *maharaja* who readily obliged. Emerson, its architect, was "determined not to follow too closely Indian art" (in designing it). He wanted "to avail of an Egyptian phase Moslem architecture, and work it up with the Indian Saracenic style of Beejapore and north west, confining the whole in a western Gothic design".⁵⁴ And this he was to achieve in the work eminently.

Despite re-appropriation by the government and by the public at large, there is enough in the surviving buildings of colonial phase, now in re-use, to show the progressive stages of architectural development in Allahabad during the nineteenth century. They indicate the exclusivity of the colonial elite and their predominant aesthetic. Architecture served here as an instrument of British power.

II

Thus grew up the European settlements and edifices in Allahabad where certain locations remained marginalized while others took shape in glory, without any local debate on their choice or imposition. In these developments, except for a feeble protest⁵⁵, this new architectural dispensation by the Europeans eminently came to govern the public taste in colonial Allahabad out of an administered imposition. Alternative options seem to have neither been tried nor

offered, nor even debated. As a result, since 1858, the external appearance of colonial Allahabad kept on changing, with a host of European buildings springing up on the streets extending from Cannington to the Government House, on Queens Road and Hastings Road. Cannington grew up as an exclusive European settlement with residential quarters for Europeans. The university buildings in Allahabad, as they were commissioned one after the other, also came to imbibe the same European-cum-“Indo-Saracenic” style, *sans* any debate.

The protests in favour of Indian forms in architecture surfaced much later (1927-1946) in the writings of Prasanna Kumar Acharya, long after the town had already developed with mutually exclusive colonial and indigenous settlements. Muted and circumspect at the beginning, they grew trenchant in time, appropriately bolstered up by Acharya’s deep understanding of traditional forms of architecture acquired through his concerted research into the traditional wisdom of Indian architectural forms as contained in the *Mānasāra*, an inspiring and definitive ancient Indian *śilpa* text. Some alternative was thereby offered as being a ‘right’ choice for public buildings in the city, long after the conclusion of European ventures.

Acharya’s statements that implicate the validity or otherwise of Indic or non-Indic forms of architectural programmes grew out of his involvement with the *Mānasāra* text. These statements seem relevant in respect of civil architecture as it did or did not develop in Allahabad. And they also indicate how Acharya despaired –a despair, which turned out to be as monumental as was his work on the *Mānasāra*.

It will perhaps be conceded that the statements of protestations by Acharya tend to reflect the peculiar dialectics of his consciousness in making, sometimes marked apparently by the veneer of bureaucratic compulsions of conformity or even by his subservience to European patrons. They also reflect the imperatives of what may be termed as “Swadeshi” (of Bengal vintage of early twentieth century) notwithstanding his initial training as an officer of the elite Indian Education Service.

The materials in the *Mānasāra*, mainly textual and academic, persuade us to believe that while colonial tastes determined the emerging architecture in Allahabad under the British Raj in the nineteenth century, in the perceptions of Acharya an alternative choice based on architectural models from the relevant Indian tradition could have been possible. Acharya seems to have believed

that there was enough scope in contemporary India to promote traditional wisdom on varied kinds of works in civil architecture. He thought that the Indian tradition could offer guidelines for the building of forts, regulating the dimensions and features of buildings of one or more stories, courts, temples, pavilions, mansions, dwelling houses, royal palaces, and a host of other elements of architecture.⁵⁶ He derived these formulations from the wisdom of the *Mānasāra*, “the essence of standards and measurements”, which he published in seven volumes researched since 1914 in Europe (in Holland, London, Oxford and Cambridge), printed at Allahabad and published originally by the Oxford University Press between 1927 and 1946.

Acharya believed that *Mānasāra* was as efficacious in architecture as medical works were so in their domain; that it was the “most practical of Sanskrit treatises”, and that “a trial may be given to its methods and principles, its rules and regulations, because the foreign imitation in architecture for a millennium has proved more or less unsuccessful and un-economical”.⁵⁷

We also find in Acharya’s writings a rejection of non-Indic forms along with his pride in rehabilitating the architectural modes, design and theory of a text, which till then, had appeared to be conspicuously ignored. Using strong words to explain his motivation in pursuing his *Mānasāra* studies, he once satirically spoke of his quest in terms of the “peculiar pain of giving rebirth to a once fully grown “barbarian” child of unknown origin”.⁵⁸ It appears that in criticizing the use of Islamic forms of architecture in India he was indirectly indicting Europeans who accepted these in the “Indo-Saracenic” style, utterly disregarding the classical Indian principles and forms of architecture. And, he therefore is found critical of the attitudes that fostered prejudices against traditional Indian forms.

At times he rejects non-indigenous forms of architecture saying, “our architectural policy of past few hundred years, based as it has been on a foreign imitation ... has not proved quite successful”.⁵⁹ He rejected the forms of Persian architecture denying any “similarity” between the Persian and Indian modes, and even lamented of the missed opportunity in developing a new ‘Indian’ style during the Mughal times for, he thought that the forms that came with the Turkish and Mughal styles were incompatible with those Indian. He thus believed that the “culture and art that (the Mughals) brought could have been merged into the Indian one only to cause it to seek out a new path of development if there were any noticeable modifications of Turkish and Mogul architecture in India far better than it was in

the land of its origin".⁶⁰ He further says,

These works of foreign architecture unsuitable for Indian climate and soil have been rendered possible largely for political reasons. This is mostly due to the natural desire of the conquerors firmly to establish their domination and culture ... by removing the traditions of the conquered as far as possible; and, partly, on account of the ignorance of the scientific method of Indian architecture or a dislike to apply them in preference to their own.⁶¹

He criticized the so-called "Indo-Saracenic" architecture, which the Europeans had advocated and prescribed in India for in his opinion, it only led to "materially dispossessing" the "Hindu" style.⁶²

Some of his arguments might not stand scrutiny or may sound intolerant, sectarian and 'dated' today, but it will be conceded that they have to be weighed against the vigour of his highly competent and scholarly work and his extraordinary insight. We quote them nevertheless to show his disregard for the "Indo-Saracenic" style, which ultimately turned out to be a non-style, propped up exclusively by Europeans at Allahabad during the nineteenth century. Acharya rejected it and so did others like Havell, etc., before him, regarding it only as 'academic'. Acharya rejected it for its being an alien transplant:

Thus, in Muslimised structures of India are seen in abundance the Saracenic domes and arches introduced by the Mohammadans of Syria and Palestine known as Arab-Berber races of Northern Africa, who conquered Spain and Sicily and invaded France. *In fact this style had materially affected the Hindu style ... in civil buildings...*⁶³ (Italics mine)

He further says that "Byzantine architecture introduced by the Turks of Byzantium or Constantinople [and which "materially dispossessed" the Hindu style] is marked by 'the round arch springing from columns or piers, the dome supported on pen dentine, capitals elaborately sculptured, mosaic and other encrustations, etc.' which are largely visible in India where the architectural tradition of Hindus are entirely forgotten".⁶⁴ These modes were not in accordance with the materials he found in the *Mānasāra* or in the monuments of India that he was describing. Even as he indicted British and pre-British architecture which "dispossessed" the Indic forms one can read in his rejections a muted criticism of the Europeans who had espoused and introduced them at Allahabad.

Some of his comments besides the nomenclatures proposed by him in terms of 'Hindu', 'Mussalman', etc, seem patently outdated today. They betray prejudices with little appreciation of forms and the aesthetic and judge alien architectural forms largely in respect of

their roots in the land of their origin. One can also read in his text the dilemma of a (loyal) civil servant in him as he oscillates between criticism and a rejection of Indo-Saracenic while expressing a sense of loss for the indifference in promoting what his *Mānasāra* stood for by the administrations of that period. Thus, he says:

The object here is not to recount the blessing following from the advent of English nor to make a contrast between different conquerors of India in their destructive or constructive efforts or in the matters of modifications, presentation and reconstruction. The critic will be justified in accusing the English people or the British Government in India that they had not done all that they could do for us.⁶⁵

Acharya's outrage against the European experiments in architecture is thus seen prefixed or suffixed by an unqualified praise of British. He found them responsible for introducing forms that were not to his liking because: (a) those forms were alien; and (b) they did not conform to Indian climate, soil, ethos and principles of architecture. Acharya criticizes the European's experiments in architecture but stops short of putting the rulers in the dock. Yet, he does seem to emerge as an ardent advocate of Indian architectural forms trying to uphold these through the perspective of the *Mānasāra*. Such an attitudinal proclivity shown by Acharya surfaces time and again in the text, specially in the sixth and seventh volumes of the *Mānasāra* series, as for instance, in the lament that the Raja of Darbhanga did not emulate the *Mānasāra* designs and prescriptions in the buildings of the rule (1934), or, that the precious opportunity of rehabilitating the victims of Bihar earthquake (1934) in the manner of *Mānasāra* architectural tenets was lost by default as a result of apathy towards those tenets or, that while his *Mānasāra* volumes were sold out in Europe there were only limited buyers of them in India.⁶⁶

This situation existed despite his perceptions that he had "proved" the efficacy and practicability of the *Mānasāra* tenets by building certain temples and *maṇḍapa* in his hometown (Tipperah district in the Bengal of the period) which were in conformity with the *Mānasāra* tenets. Apart from these, he had also constructed in 1935 at Allahabad a grand mansion—the *Swastika* mansion—on the principles and forms recommended in the *Mānasāra*. In doing this he was attempting to set an example, which could be profitably emulated and universalized by others. But that was not to be, which endlessly disappointed a pioneer who first researched the *Mānasāra* and then, apparently started living by it.

Since the *Mānasāra* shaped both the sensibilities and dilemma of Acharya in promoting an appropriate agenda for public and private architecture in colonial Allahabad and in India, it might be relevant now to introduce this text, which was so dear to him and which, in not being emulated, caused his outrage. In the details that follow, first we examine the *Mānasāra* and then dwell on Acharya, its ardent exponent and promoter.

Several ancient Indian *śilpa* texts dealing with architecture and the arts are known today. But in the early nineteenth century, the *Mānasāra* occupied a unique position as the only known Indian text on architecture. This *śilpa* text was first noticed in 1834. It happens to be a manual of traditional Indian architectural forms with materials considered amenable to practical application. Acharya considered it as applicable to the buildings in the north and recommended its emulation in the contemporary buildings everywhere, including the training programs of engineering education in India, or in public and private edifices and so on.

The *Mānasāra* first came to light as a posthumous publication of Ram Raz in 1834. Ram Raz was a judicial officer in Bangalore and, in editing this text, he took the help of traditional *śilpi*-s who were building edifices on its prescriptions. Ram Raz's *Mānasāra* was based on a fragmentary manuscript and it was published as a text of sixty-four pages with forty-eight plates. The situation materially changed when, in 1914, Acharya started his research on the *Mānasāra* and its application. For all this, he had in hand eleven badly preserved manuscripts—eight of them in southern scripts—written in Granth, Tamil, Telugu, Malayalam and Nagari. When it came into Acharya's hands, the text had undergone five recensions and all told, it comprised of 10,000 lines of a language rightly considered by Buhler as "most barbarous Sanskrit".⁶⁷ The magnitude of the colossal labour by Acharya in editing and publishing the volumes on the *Mānasāra* from 1918 to 1934 was exemplary by any standard. Two other volumes of the series were published in 1946. Thus, the following volumes of the *Mānasāra* series emerged as a result of researches from 1914 to 1946 in the following order where the first date indicates completion and the last date, the year of publication.

1918: *Summary of the Mānasāra* (doctoral thesis, University of Leiden (Holland),

- (1) 1927: *Dictionary of Hindu Architecture* (1934);
- (2) 1927: *Indian Architecture according to Mānasāra Silpasastra* (1934);
- (3) 1933: *Manasara on Architecture and Sculpture* (1934);

- (4) 1933: *Architecture of the Mānasāra* (1934);
- (5) 1933: *Architecture of the Mānasāra* (sketches and Plates), (1934);
- (6) 1946: *Hindu Architecture in India and Abroad* (1946);
- (7) 1946: *An Encyclopedia of Hindu Architecture* (1946).

Of these, the *Mānasāra* corpus edited and translated by Acharya in 1934 consisted of the 'Sanskrit text with Appendices, Index and Critical Notes (altogether more than 800 pages), the English translation with a copious Index (another volume of some 800 pages) and the fifth volume of partly coloured plates'.⁶⁸ These plates were not a part of the original text but were prepared by three modern draftsmen, namely S.C. Mukherjee, a Civil Engineer, R.L. Bansal, a draftsman and Sri Siddhalingaswamy, a *śilpi* who did the job on the basis of Acharya's interpretations, making conjectural representations of the textual materials in visual mode. The sheer enormity of the task performed and achieved by Acharya in preparing the volumes was bewildering. It is small wonder then that, after publication these volumes (from 1 to 5 above) received raving reviews from scholars and Indologists like Rabindranath Tagore, Vogel, Keith, Hargreaves, Frederick Grubb, Ramanand Chatterji, Abanindra Nath Tagore and a host of other scholars. The *Mānasāra* thus made an exceptional presence which was to stay for several decades and its author received accolades which will be enviable anywhere.⁶⁹

The magnitude of the task of preparing these volumes has been summed up by Acharya himself in his Foreword to the seventh volume with a sense of achievement tinged with the frustrations of one who was more or less like a long distance runner but who runs alone! In 1946 in the Foreword to his book he states: "This is the seventh and last volume of the *Manasara* series so far as the present writer is concerned.... In fulfillment of the fateful prediction of ... late Professor E.J. Rapson ... the whole of official career of the present writer commencing in the fateful year of 1914 has been fully occupied".⁷⁰

We may now turn to the editor-translator of the *Manasara* and the zeal, which drove him to this work. Prasanna Kumar Acharya of Indian Education Service was an officer-turned-scholar with his Master's degree in Sanskrit from Calcutta University in 1912. One may make a guess that his studentship at the University fell at a tumultuous time of the Swadeshi movement, which was launched following the division of Calcutta in 1904 and its political revocation by Lord Hardinge (1912). This was also the time when Havell and Coomaraswamy "led a verbal attack on the English planners of New

Delhi, urging them to use Indian architects and masons in construction of Government buildings for reasons of economy, excellence and suitability as a much needed example of state patronage of indigenous industry".⁷¹

In 1914, Acharya was "induced by a youthful enthusiasm" to undertake the gigantic task of editing and translating the *Mānasāra*. He first carried out his research on it at the University of Leiden (Holland). In 1918, as a preliminary study of the text, he published a *Summary of the Mānasāra* as his doctoral thesis at Leiden. Then, as a Government of India State Scholar he started working at the University of London on the *Dictionary of Hindu Architecture* after the University changed the title from 'Encyclopaedia' to 'Dictionary'. Later, it became a point of despair for him after Ganganath Jha in his review of Acharya's work questioned this alteration. Jha called it a "freak of fortune" by which the work, which was characteristically encyclopaedic in content, was reduced to a mere 'dictionary' in its emended nomenclature. The irony of this change in the title dawned upon Acharya only after Jha's pointed comments about it in 1934. Acharya became sensitive to the expression "freak of fortune", a phrase of Jha that dogged the path of his work in many other ways. In 1946, he mentions it to underscore his travails in other contexts too.

Acharya was deputed to the University of Allahabad where he worked as a Professor of Sanskrit, Head of the Oriental department and Dean, Faculty of Arts. The trials and tribulations that Acharya encountered for four decades from 1914 to 1946 are encoded here and there in the mass of more than 5000 pages that constitutes his *Mānasāra* volumes. He plodded through the terrains of scholarship where challenges were often in conflict with duties of his office. His work took him to vast geographical expanses of the then India as well as across the Continents, -from Landikotal on the borders of Afghanistan to Rameshwaram in the South, from Mohenjo-Daro in Sind to Shillong in northeast, or to Leiden, London, Oxford and Cambridge.

Reading between the lines of his monumental work, one may comprehend his restlessness, ambiguities and ambivalences when sometimes he tends to reject all non-Indic architectural implants on Indian soil even as he reservedly offers some praise to his European peers and patrons who commended his work or ridiculed it, sometimes even relegating its application to the level of a "schoolmaster's exercise book meant to illustrate the rules and

regulations of Hindu architecture in a pleasing manner".⁷² Yet, we see Acharya upholding Indian architectural forms in a sea of frustrations. His frustrations stemmed from many reasons, *e.g.*: from the apathy of Indian elites and European bosses and the latter's criticism; from insufficiencies of the methods of indexing and interpretations that his seniors like L. D. Barnett and F.W. Thomas recommended; from his advocacy of architectural forms which did not elicit the desired response; his failing health and a partially lost eye sight; from the mishaps of losing the pages of the manuscript in transit and having to re-write the whole with a consciousness of the inadequacy of the second attempt at writing, and so on. In 1946, he rues over the apathy of the University system, writing that,

The difficult Indian conditions presented the familiar dilemma either to give up the self imposed task altogether as is usually done by us after securing a degree and an appointment on a permanent post or to carry it through without encouragement and assistance from any quarter, shouldering in addition, to the peculiar duties of an occasionally unfortunate Professor of an Indian University, the heavy burden of research".⁷³

In 1946, he does not desist from criticizing even the government administration for his misery in serving a University, which he had discovered to be apathetic to his contributions.⁷⁴ The "youthful enthusiasm" that egged him on during the period from 1914 to 1927 was at a low ebb in 1933. It plummeted further in 1946 due to his frustrations with the University of Allahabad on account of the overburdening responsibilities of teaching and administration as also because the University and the Government were tardy in settling the "royalty and rewards" that accrued to him. To the author of the *Mānasāra*—a text that explained architecture not only in India but also in what had come to be addressed as Seri India and Insuli India covering the vast continents overseas—it appeared debilitating that the University and the Government should be tardy in settling, among other things, even the small matters of finances.⁷⁵ The shock was aggravated when an Indian successor of Sir Claude in the Education department of the Government actually questioned in an official correspondence "the public importance of printing Indian architectural researches".⁷⁶

But by 1946, his frustration over public and institutional apathy towards the Indian traditional architectural form was complete. He admits "...there is not much hope either that the governments and the various corporations, municipal boards and other authorities who sanction the plan of a private building or erect a public structure,

will interest themselves in introducing an Indian policy in architecture....”⁷⁷ He was expressing these sentiments post the Second World War and it appeared to him that even “rebuilding the devastated nations” did not hold any promise to his dream. He rues that, “Perhaps a time will come in countries like India when it may be considered as “barbarous” to question “the public importance of architectural research”.⁷⁸ And even in that he advocates valorizing architectural projects saying that they are important markers of civilizational advance for, the “...art and culture of a people are reflected and presented in monuments” and that “they sustain and stimulate natural pride”.⁷⁹ He further asserts that it, “... is necessary to settle the architectural policy of each country in its own way. For India, no better authority containing the experience of generations and experiments of centuries will ever be available than what is revealed by the *Mānasāra* series”.⁸⁰ These laments and protestations stand in total contrast to what he was advocating in 1927, which we quote here in full,

In the *Vāstu-śāstras* architecture is taken in its broadest sense and implies what is built or constructed. Thus, in the first place, it denotes all sorts of buildings, religious, residential, military, and their auxiliary members and component mouldings. Secondly, it implies town planning; laying out gardens; constructing market places; making roads, bridges, gates; digging wells, tanks, trenches, drains, sewers, moats; building enclosure walls, embankments, dams, railings, *ghats*, flights of steps for hills, ladders etc. Thirdly, it denotes articles of house furniture, such as bedsteads, couches, tables, chairs, thrones, fans, wardrobes, clocks, baskets, conveyances, cages, nests, mills etc.

Architecture also implies sculpture and deals with the making of phalli, idols of deities, statues of sages, images of animals and birds, It includes the making of garments and ornaments etc.

Architecture is also concerned with such preliminary matters, as the selection of site, testing of soil, planning, designing, finding out cardinal points by means of a gnomon, dialing; astronomical and astrological calculation.⁸¹

In conclusion, one may recount that four decades of studies devoted to the *Mānasāra* by Acharya had their high point in the beginning from 1914 to 1927 or even in 1934, followed by an abject despair of the protagonist by 1946. The entire venture, its academic value notwithstanding, seems to represent a phenomenon that failed, except academically, in the end because Allahabad got seized with other pressing challenges in which the question of a preferred architectural profile and project for the city found no takers. The

British rulers who had once yielded to the possibilities of Acharya's studies got involved in other pressing matters. Acharya's early elation turned to annoyance when his schedules misfired; to despair when Allahabad failed to get enthused by his prepositions. It was a sad end to his effort of forty years when ultimately he sold out his residence—the *Swastika* mansion, built according to the prescriptions of the *Mānasāra*—a dream project, once considered to be a companion volume of the *Mānasāra* series, and left the city lock, stock and barrel, chastened by disappointments and failure!

Acknowledgements

This essay, now revised, was originally presented under two titles, e.g. "Colonial Allahabad and its Dilemma about Emerging Architecture", and "Travails of a Pioneer: P.K.Acharya and his *Mānasāra*", in the Department of Ancient Indian History, University of Allahabad on April 29, and May 29, 2002. I am grateful to the Faculty and staff of the Department for information about the re-use of the buildings that find mention in the paper; to Professor R.C.Tripathi, Director of the GB Pant Institute of Social Sciences, for library facilities he so kindly extended to me during my stay there and to Dr Navjyoti Singh, Fellow, IAS, Shimla, for discussing this essay with me and for suggesting its title.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. E. S. Harcourt and Fakir Hussain, Eds. & Trs., *Abdul Halim Sharar's Lucknow, The Last Phase of an Oriental Culture*, New Delhi: OUP, 1994.
2. Ram Prasad Tripathi, in his introductory remarks in Shaligram Shrivastava, *Prayag Pradeep*, (in Hindi) Allahabad: Hindustani Akademi, 1937, p.5, refers to *Asarussanadida Lakhnau* as a work on the history of Lucknow. Studies are required of other localities and provinces in understanding architectural history of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. At Banaras for instance, we have the Sampurnanand Sanskrit University (formerly Queen's College), which was designed by Major Kittoe and inaugurated in 1853 by Lt. Governor of NWP, James Thomson. It is a building in Gothic style and resembles a Christian church in its architectural form. This long structure has a "high vaulted ceiling and a large stained glass window in the wall opposite the main entrance door". The walls and the doors of the building have several inscribed verses referring to the donors who contributed in construction of this building. Cf. Michael S. Dodson, "Re-Presented for the Pandits: James Ballantyne, 'Useful Knowledge' and Sanskrit Scholarship in Banaras College during the Mid-Nineteenth

- Century", *Modern Asian Studies* 36, 2, (2002), pp. 257-298, especially pp. 257-258.
3. C.A.Bayly, *Rulers, Townsmen and Bazaara: North Indian Society in the Age of British Expansion*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
 4. Public pleas for providing such a college were made early in the nineteenth century. The Hindi journal, *Pradeep* (1904) describes how a public delegation's plea for a hospital was turned down by the then administration even as it secured its concurrence to name the then newly-constructed railway bridge after Lord Curzon. Thus came the christening of the Curzon (railway) Bridge.
 5. *Gazetteer Of India*, Oxford: 1854, p.24.
 6. Shaligram Shrivastava, op. cit., p. 54.
 7. Bishambhar Nath Pandey, *Allahabad: Retrospect and Prospect*, Allahabad: Municipal Board, 1953; Shrivastava, op. cit. pp. 45-52.
 8. Bayly, op. cit., p.143.
 9. *Gazetteer of India*, 1854, p. 24.
 10. Fanny Parks, *Wanderings of a Pilgrim in search of the Picturesque*, quoted in Pandey, op. cit. p. 25.
 11. Fanny Parks's pictorial sketches may probably be the first essays in European painterly tradition in the Allahabad of the 1840s. It might be interesting to compare them with the products of the art scene in the contemporary Bengal where, from 1780 onwards, British gentry and the emergent colonial class were increasingly patronizing European painters. And Indian artists, in the circumstances, looking for a lucrative career, had started changing over to western idioms in painting, through academic training. In Calcutta, traditional *patuas*, Kalighat and *bazaar* painters were being replaced, making room for the artists like Sheikh Mohammad Amin of Karraya (1845) who worked for a European businessman Holroyd. Others in the same line of transformation included E.C.Das who became famous for painting pictures of different kinds of Indian servants. Nrityalal Dutta, Madhav Chandra Das and Ramdhan Svarnakar, the Kalighat artists, were changing over to other medium of work, trying their hand as wood and metal engravers. Cf. Tapati Guha Thakurta, *The Makings of a New Indian Art*, Cambridge, 1992. Later, at Allahabad (1924-36), artists like B.K.Goswamy, B.K.Das, H.Bagchi, Shambhu Nath Mishra, D.Banerjee (?), U.K.Mitra, Kamla Shankar and others produced paintings to illustrate literary magazines e.g. *Sarasvati*, *Chand*, *Madhuri*, *Manorama*, *Hansa*, etc. These literary magazines, reproducing their work, were printed in the Naval Kishore Press (Lucknow), Belvedere Press, Indian Press, A.L.J.Press and Fine Art Painting Cottage (Allahabad), among others.
 12. For the Bishop and his perceptions of India cf., George P. Bearce, *ritish Attitudes towards India 1784-1858*, London: OUP. Heber was the author of a book: *A Narrative of Journey through India 1824-25*.
 13. *Gazetteer of India*, Oxford, 1854 p.23.

14. *Ibid.*, p.22.
15. Cf., Partho Mitter, *The Much Maligned Monsters*, Oxford, 1977, about early European perceptions in respect of Indian art forms.
16. Cf. Pandey, op.cit. (We have lost the exact reference to the page number.)
17. Today, the Ganj-s of Allahabad stand divested of their original character but their presence, in plenty, defines the character of early non-European Allahabad. We may here mention some of these Ganj localities like, Daraganj, Nur Ali Ganj, Ahmadganj, Qaziganj, Magaharganj, Fakirganj, Lukarganj, among others.
18. For a different interpretation of the Ganj-s, see, Bayly, *Rulers, Townsmen...* pp. 96-100.
19. Pandey, op. cit.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 26.
21. C. A. Bayly, *The Local Roots of Indian Politics: Allahabad 1880-1920*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975, pp.42-43.
22. *Ibid.*, p.43.
23. *Gazetteer of India*, 1854, p.23.
24. *Ibid.*, pp. 22-23.
25. Shrivastav, op.cit., p. 241.
26. Shrivastava, op. cit., pp. 236-238.
27. *Gazetteer of India*, 1854, pp.23-24.
28. *Ibid.*
29. For a comprehensive detail of the tomb including the highly punning verses inscribed at different locations of the structure, cf. Shrivastav, op. cit., pp. 241-250. In 1891, two large water tanks were built to the north of this area for water supply through the Water Works.
30. *Gazetteer of India*, 1854, p.22.
31. *Imperial Gazetteer of India*, Vol.V, Oxford, p.240.
32. Baiza Bai was the widow of Daulat Rao Scindia, a contemporary of Wellesley. The British Resident at Gwalior got tired of her assertions of freedom during the period of her regency when she issued (Scindia) coins in gold bearing her portrait. She was eventually exiled from Gwalior. She repaired to Prayag where the Marathas, sometimes in concert with the Bundellas, remained active in pursuing their territorial ambitions repeatedly from 1720 to c.1729, 1751, 1765-1771. In 1739, they mounted a raid on Allahabad and between 1765 and 1771 they were on the verge of wresting Allahabad on Shah Alam's grant if it had transpired. Afraid of this dispensation, the British intervened to pass Allahabad on to Awadh by a Treaty of 1773.
33. *Gazetteer of India*, 1854, p.23.
34. Thomas R. Metcalf, *An Imperial Vision: Indian Architecture and the British Raj*, London: Faber and Faber, 1989, pp. 98-99.
35. Cf., also Mark Bence-Jones, *Palaces of the Raj: Magnificence and Misery*

of the lord Sahibs, London: George Allen and Unwin, pp.149-160. Originally, the Lowther Castle, a rented accommodation was used for the Lt. Governor. But, during Muir's time, when that castle could not be bought from its owner, it was decided to buy the adjoining property from a bank. This property consisted of "an impressive single-storey block dating from eighteen thirties or forties, in the traditional British Indian classical style with portico on each side". Two wings were added to it in 1869, "... joined to the main block by curving corridors". *Ibid.* pp. 150-151. The plan for building a Government House, according to the design made for it by Lieutenant Cole of the Royal Engineers, got delayed. So, the property near the Lowther Castle at Allahabad was acquired and the Government House invested at Allahabad. In time it hosted several important persons including Lady Dufferin, Lt. Governors Sir Willam Muir, Sir John Strachey, Sir George Cooper and Sir Alfred Lyall (and his sisters). The Prince of Wales lived here with his entourage during the Winter of 1875-76 and Viceroy Lord Ripon was "obliged to stay (here) ... much longer than had been originally intended", due to his illness during his visit to Allahabad. *Ibid.*, pp. 149-160, also, p. 213.

36. Thomas R. Metcalf, "Architecture and Representation of Empire: India 1860-1910", *Representations* 6, (Spring 1984), pp. 37-39.
37. Catherine B. Asher and Thomas R. Metcalf, Eds. *Perceptions of South Asia's Past*, Delhi: OUP & IBH, 1993, p. 2.
38. Metcalf, "Architecture and ...", pp. 37-65.
39. *Ibid.*, p.39.
40. Quoted in Metcalf, "Architecture and ...", p. 40.
41. *Ibid.*
42. Metcalf, *An Imperial Vision ...*, p. 9.
43. Metcalf, "Architecture and ...", pp. 39-65.
44. *Ibid.*, p. 38.
45. *Ibid.*
46. Quoted by Metcalf, "Architecture and ...", p. 37
47. *Ibid.*, pp. 37-39.
48. *Ibid.*, pp. 37-65.
49. Pandey, op. cit. p. 38.
50. *Ibid.*, pp. 3-37.
51. Metcalf, "Architecture and ...", p. 38.
52. Smith quoted in Metcalf, *Architecture and ...*, p. 38.
53. *Ibid.*
54. Metcalf, *The Imperial Vision*, p. 89.
55. *Pradeep* (an Allahabad Journal, in Hindi), Vol., V.
56. Prasanna Kumar Acharya, *Hindu Architecture in India and Abroad*, Manasara Series: Vol. VI, (Rep.) Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, pp. 410-411. He says that the Saracenic style "... materially affected the Hindu style in the lay out of villages, towns, forts as well as in civil buildings". *Ibid.*, p. 415.

57. *Ibid.*, p. 425 as quoted in a review by C.Y. Chintamani.
58. *Ibid.*
59. *Ibid.*, p. 424.
60. *Ibid.*, p. 414.
61. *Ibid.*
62. *Ibid.*, So strong is his opinion in this respect that he says: "If therefore, in order to modernize Indian architecture, the British patterns are to be excluded, it will be necessary to demolish and rebuild not only the Viceregal palace at New Delhi and all Council halls, secretariat buildings and offices in central and provincial towns, but also the bridges, railways, schools, colleges ... down to the prison house and lunatic asylums." *Ibid.* p. 421.
63. *Ibid.*, p. 415.
64. *Ibid.*
65. *Ibid.*, pp. 416-417.
66. *Ibid.*, p. xxiv.
67. Prasanna Kumar Acharya, *An Encyclopaedia of Hindu Architecture*, Manasara Series VII, (Rep.) Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, p.xvii.
68. Cf., J.Ph.Vogel's review of the text in *Actorum Orientalium*, Vol. XIV, Excerptum, pp.224-225, quoted in Acharya, *Hindu Architecture ...*", pp. 434-435.
69. These reviews have been appended in the sixth volume of his *Manasara* series, Appendix III. Cf. Acharya, *Hindu Architecture ...*", pp. 422-449.
70. Acharya, *An Encyclopaedia ...*", p. ix.
71. Roger Lipsay, *Coomaraswamy, 3: His Life and Work*. Princeton-New Jersey, 1977, p. 79.
72. Acharya, *Hindu Architecture ...*", p. xxiii.
73. *Ibid.*, p. ix
74. *Ibid.*
75. *Ibid.*, pp. ix-x.
76. *Ibid.*
77. *Ibid.*, p. x.
78. *Ibid.*, p. xi.
79. *Ibid.*
80. *Ibid.*
81. Prasanna Kumar Acharya, *A Dictionary of Hindu Architecture*, Manasara Series Vol.I, (Rep.), Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, p. viii.