

House/Daughter/Nation: Interiority, Architecture, and Historical Imagination in Janaki Majumdar's "Family History"

ANTOINETTE BURTON

My mother grew up in a small Punjabi village not far from Chandigarh. As she chopped onions for the evening meal or scrubbed the shine back onto a steel pan or watched the clouds of curds form in a bowl of slowly setting homemade yoghurt, any action with a rhythm, she would begin a mantra about her ancestral home. She would chant of a three-storeyed flat-roofed house, blinkered with carved wooden shutters around a dust yard where an old-fashioned pump stood under a mango tree. . . . In England, when all my mother's friends made the transition from relatives' spare rooms and furnished lodgings to homes of their own, they all looked for something 'modern.' "It's really up to date, Daljit," one of the Aunties would preen as she gave us the grand tour of her first proper home in England. "Look at the extra flush system . . . Can opener on the wall . . . Two minutes' walk to the local amenities . . ." But my mother knew what she wanted. When she stepped off the bus in Tollington, she did not see the outside lavvy or the apology for a garden or the medieval kitchen, she saw fields and trees, light and space, and a horizon that welcomed the sky which, on a warm night and through squinted eyes, could almost look something like home.

Meera Syal, *Anita and Me*

In an age of virtual reality, cyberspace, and migration of global proportions, the very possibility of home is being vigorously contested. Whether it is identified as

Antoinette Burton is Senior Lecturer in the Department of History and Associate Director of the Women's Studies Program at Johns Hopkins University.

The author owes a tremendous debt to both Amar and Sally Singh for their willingness to share Janaki and her "Family History"—and to Lucy Knauer, who first introduced her to them all. This essay was given as a talk in the History Department at SUNY Binghamton, at the "Little" Berks in New Paltz, New York, and at the Anglo-American Conference of Historians, London. Many thanks to those audiences, who listened so carefully and made so many helpful suggestions. It has also profited tremendously from readings by Paul Arroyo, Herman Bennett, Paul Walker Clarke, Madhavi Kale, Philippa Levine, Maria Lima, Devoney Looser, Saloni Mathur, Laura Mayhall, Jennifer Morgan, Kathy Dwyer Navajas, Barbara Ramusack, Mahua Sarkar, Nayan Shah, Sally Singh, Mrinalini Sinha, and Angela Woollacott. Special thanks are due to Geraldine Forbes, whose knowledge and willingness to share are, as always, invaluable. Last but not least, this piece is for G.F.B., who has created her share of homes in London and environs.

The Journal of Asian Studies 56, no. 4 (November 1997):921–946.

© 1997 by the Association for Asian Studies, Inc.

“Africa,” England, India or, more subversively, the “black Atlantic,” home is neither a stationary place nor a self-evident trope. Like all historical utterances, it is both fictional and contingent, inflected by the particular social contexts out of which it is fashioned and, of equal significance, defying the very materiality and permanence it appears to embody as well. Because it is one of the organizing fictions of national literatures and ideologies, the project of remembering home has produced elaborate interiors and imaginative architectures that are vivid and, as Meera Syal illustrates, ultimately *approximate* as well. These dwelling places of the mind seduce but do not finally satisfy, precisely because—like the nation itself—they only ever “almost look something like home” (Syal 1996, 35).¹

The frequency with which women writers of different “nations” have made use of home to stage their dramas of remembrance is a sign of how influential the cult of domesticity has been for inhabitants of structurally gendered locations like the patriarchal household. This strategy is neither unique to white elite North American women nor limited to the west—a phenomenon which suggests that home is one of those “ideological configurations which loop and spread across ‘national’ boundaries,” even as it requires those boundaries for its ideological work and remakes them for expressly political purposes (Sangari 1991, 32). As Toni Morrison, Ileana Rodriguez, and others have demonstrated, women novelists have typically figured women’s lived experience—however various and complex, however idyllic or tortured—through architectural images, top-to-bottom reconstructions, and “chants” that remodel as they move from room to room (Morrison 1987; Rodriguez 1994; Wiley and Barnes 1996; Pearlman 1996). Obviously it is not enough simply to observe that “women do this,” because the domain that home houses “has its boundaries drawn for it by the larger culture” and, I would add, by what Kumkum Sangari calls the pressure of historical placement as well (Sangari 1993, 264). Critical analyses of home that do not wish either to essentialize or romanticize its allegorical power must therefore be attentive to the specific languages, metaphors, and tropes through which it is articulated by historical subjects. They must visualize the storeys, in other words, through which women writers have attempted to make home permanent in memory and beyond that, to establish it in history. No. 124 Bluestone in Morrison’s *Beloved* is among the most powerful examples of how memory can be stored in the physical places of home, as well as how one imaginary dwelling place can be reconstituted in another across time and across texts. “Sweet Home” stands, quite literally, at the intersection of past and present, serving as the concrete yet ghostly site for the reenactment and the reproduction of African/American history (Askeland 1995).

But what of narratives that do not take the form of the novel? This is an especially urgent question if we acknowledge that the novel is itself a genre that is historically bound up with the emergent Victorian bourgeois colonial order and hence, by definition, with fantasies of home (Azim 1992; Marangoly George 1996). In order to appreciate the full range of representations available to those who have used home to re-imagine the past, we must move beyond the “the houses of women’s fiction” (Askeland 413) and examine other narrative practices utilized by women seeking to represent their experiences not just *in* history, but *as* history as well. The family memoir is one such practice. There, the (re)built environment has a specific ideological function: to house the interiorities of childhood and, by doing so, to bear witness to

¹Emphasis added. I am grateful to Lara Kriegel for sharing this novel with Alison Fletcher, and to Alison for passing it along to me.

the fact of historical—and, I will argue, national and political—consciousness.² I would not like to deny that such memoirs are also fictional, or to suggest that they always assume a generic form that is, say, distinct from western conventions of autobiography (Sarkar 1993; Steedman 1987, 1995). Nor would I wish to claim that women writers resort to home in their family memoirs more commonly or consistently than men—witness, for example, Kwame Anthony Appiah's evocative title, *In My Father's House* (1992). What concerns me here is how and under what conditions home is recalled when a woman takes up the task of mapping domestic genealogies *as a daughter*, and how the architecture she produces ends up figuring the nation in history. More specifically, I want to examine what this work of reconstruction meant in the context of 1930s Indian nation-building, in the hands of a prominent nationalist's daughter who was bold enough to chronicle her family's history and, in the process, to reveal her own persistent desire for the elusive fiction of home.

Janaki Agnes Penelope Majumdar's "Family History," a narrative of her parents' marriage and domestic life that she wrote in 1935, is organized around the houses of her family's past. Majumdar (b. 1886) was the daughter of W. C. Bonnerjee, the first president of the Indian National Congress, and Hemangini Motilal, a Hindu woman who was married to him as a young girl in the late 1850s.³ In addition to being the child of a famous Indian political leader, Janaki was an English-educated Christian convert who traveled back and forth between India and Britain throughout her adolescence. Although she settled in Calcutta after her marriage to P. M. Majumdar, Janaki grew up largely in Croydon, earned a degree from Newnham College, Cambridge, and spent her formative years either outside India or traveling between Calcutta and southeast England.⁴ She not only reconstructed the "family history" by reassembling the various houses the Majumdar clan inhabited, she staged the story of her parents' life together as a drama about the culturally hybrid, semi-permanent homes they established in Bengal and suburban London in the 1880s and 1890s. As Malavika Karlekar has argued, the genre of personal narrative had been characteristic of the Bengali *bhadramahila* since the 1860s, when middle-class women wrote short stories, periodical articles, and other texts that detailed their experiences and their observations of social and cultural life in colonial India (Karlekar 1993). Majumdar's "Family History" represents a departure from these early traditions in several respects. In the first instance, it details a cosmopolitan life-style which very few contemporary Indian women had access to, and which many Hindus would have considered disrespectable because it involved crossing "the black waters" and thus guaranteed a fall from caste.⁵ Even more distinctive is the fact that the family memoir displays the differences and, at times, the tensions between W. C. and Hemangini as characteristic of Bonnerjee family life. In this respect, Janaki's account provides a "thick descriptive" context to the discourses about companionate marriage that underpinned many of the arguments for Indian self-government produced by elite, progressive Hindu men like Bonnerjee himself in the fin-de-siècle period (Forbes 1996, 61 and ff.).

²This would seem especially apt given what Pollock (1995) has argued about the importance of literary historical practices for nationalism and cosmopolitanism in India and elsewhere.

³Hemangini's father was Nilmoney Motilal. She is described as coming from "a well-to-do and highly orthodox Brahmin family of Calcutta." See Bonnerjee and Majumdar (1975, 7).

⁴She died in England, to which she had returned after her husband's death in 1947. Sally Singh, private correspondence, 21 November 1996.

⁵For a discussion of this with respect to Indian travelers in the west, see Grewal (1996) and Burton (forthcoming).

And yet the “Family History” also participates in the traditions Karlekar has excavated, insofar as it focuses on the interior spaces of family life and the role of the mother as the emotional and organizational force of the household. More specifically, Janaki’s chronicle continues the work of the Victorian *bhadramahila* because it places Hemangini at the center of the narrative, constructing the Indian mother as the angel of the house. In spite of the fact that her adolescence was shaped by the exigencies of Bonnerjee’s political career—and, of course, because of this fact—Janaki chose to represent the 1880s and 1890s not primarily as the moment when organized Indian nationalism emerged, but rather as a period of extended struggle for the preservation of the family household by her mother. Indeed, in her “Family History” W. C. Bonnerjee’s public profile, though certainly never neglected, is arguably eclipsed by the drama of the orthodox Hindu (and, later, Christian) woman struggling to maintain her identity, to guarantee her family’s coherence, and above all to establish a viable, stable home for herself and her children, despite the upheavals of temporary exile. If the physical spaces of home haunt Majumdar’s chronicle, it is not, therefore, simply an historical accident. The recurrent architectural imagery of home is produced by a witness to the historically specific collision between “traditional” Hindu family life, on the one hand, and a particular strand of secular nationalist politics, on the other—even as the cultural terms of that collision were reshaped by Hemangini’s conversion to Christianity in the 1870s.⁶

From the very beginning of the “Family History,” Janaki reconstructs her domestic genealogies by imagining the dwelling-places of relatives past. The text opens with details of her husband’s ancestors and fixes immediately on the physical spaces of home that defined P. M. Majumdar’s *zamindar* (landholder) family existence in the early nineteenth century. The Majumdar family house at Islampur appears on the first page of the narrative, standing as both a symbol of their prosperity and a sign of their social status: as Janaki notes, P. M.’s father gradually rebuilt the family residence as he improved the *zamindari*, establishing a local school and dispensary in the process.⁷ P. M.’s youth, which takes up the first twenty pages of the “Family History,” is figured as a series of escapes from home—to the town of Behrampur, to pig-sticking meets, and eventually to St. Xavier’s College, Calcutta where, we are told, he developed his taste for things English and his ambition “to live [someday] in Creek Row among the flower of Anglo-India” (FH, 8). Following a brief sketch of P. M.’s education at Birmingham University and his call to the Bar comes the early history of W. C. Bonnerjee. In Janaki’s hands it is a tale that radiates from the family house at Kidderpore (and, later, Simla) to his early education and then his betrothal to Hemangini in 1859, when he was 15 and she 10. What the two men had in common, in addition to their middle-class origins, was a skepticism about religious orthodoxy of any kind—doubts that would cause them both to fall away from Hinduism in later life, despite the attachment of both of their wives to practical (Christian) faith. Significantly, however, the accounts of husband and father are otherwise disjunctive. In contrast to the story of her husband’s early life, which takes up almost thirty pages of the “Family History,” Janaki’s account of her father’s young adulthood is brief (four pages) and clearly dependent on the structure of P. M.’s, even though W. C. was the older and more famous man. From the start, then, the “family”

⁶For a different kind of discussion about this collision, see Chatterjee (1989).

⁷Majumdar (1935) TS, 1. The original, handwritten version is in the possession of Janaki Majumdar’s grandson, Amar Singh, and I am grateful to him for allowing me to consult it. All citations refer to the typescript (TS) as FH.

with which Janaki identified in her "Family History" was first the Majumdar and then the Bonnerjees. This is perhaps not surprising, since the text was written primarily for her children and grandchildren—the offspring of her marriage to P. M.—as a testimony to their collective past.

The primary effect of this structural choice is the subordination of W. C.'s very public life to the "domestic" narratives of both her mother's life and, eventually, her own. To this end Janaki privileges the story of her courtship and 1908 marriage to P. M., the event which brings part 1 of the "Family History" to a close. It would be easy to read this gesture as characteristic of Indian women's memoirs, which tend both to sideline the conventionally political in their narratives and to privilege the middle-class woman's movement from family of origin to family of marriage.⁸ Given W. C.'s highly public profile in the nationalist movement in both Britain and India, however, his relative marginalization in the text is quite remarkable. Janaki's determination to structure the narrative around what are indubitably *conjugal* households and, in so doing, to try to keep the activities of the Indian National Congress off-center, is something I will return to—not least because it signals the ways in which her "Family History" ends up recuperating Indian nationalism as a bourgeois project which is dependent on the privatization, as well as the domestication, of "the Indian woman."

If P. M.'s and W. C.'s ancestral homes represent the fixity of patriarchal property, Hemangini's tale makes visible the shifting and impermanent relationships a high-caste Hindu woman might have had to the "family home." At the heart of Janaki's narrative arc in part 2 is Hemangini's struggle to master a family household that is highly unorthodox according to the standards by which she was raised and, as if that were not enough, continuously dispersed and on the move as well. We are first introduced to Hemangini as the sweet and shy daughter of a generous father and a strict mother who was raised in an orthodox Hindu family. Although formal education was denied her, Hemangini "managed to pick up her letters from her elder brothers" and once even tried to stow away in the carriage which took them to school, a trick for which she was "ignominiously" punished. The child's mother was such a disciplinarian that when Hemangini lost a silver chain she had been given she and her father conspired to replace it, so the loss would never be known, and she would not have to face her mother's wrath.⁹ Unlike either P. M. Majumdar or W. C. Bonnerjee, Hemangini had little choice about what her daughter later called "the fate that lay in store for her—early marriage, innumerable children, and hard work under a possibly cantankerous mother-in-law"—though Janaki emphasizes how lucky Hemangini was to secure such a handsome and well-educated bridegroom. In a touching instance of mother-daughter candor, Hemangini told Janaki that they were so shy and nervous in anticipation of their wedding night that "when the bridegroom and the bride were left alone together for the first time, she told me the only remarks exchanged by them was her question as to how far it was from Bowbazar to Simla and his reply!" (FH, 32)

But it is neither these early hardships nor her mother's girlish naïveté that makes her the sainted center of Janaki's "Family History." Rather, it is Hemangini's continual struggle against her limited education and unworldliness that earns her pride of place. Hemangini's timidity, her lack of schooling, and her apparently basic

⁸Thanks to Gerry Forbes for this point.

⁹Anandibai Joshee (1865–87) also recalled her mother as a disciplinarian; see Kosambi (1996, 3190). For a discussion of mothers in Indian men's autobiographies see Walsh (1983).

English might not have been particularly grievous handicaps had she been married to a less ambitious man. These “limitations” were thrown into bold relief, however, because Hemangini was the wife of an aspiring barrister who was also a politically ambitious, unabashedly modern, and anglophilic Indian man. The theme of Hemangini’s vulnerability is foreshadowed by her very early life, where Janaki describes her as a “plain child” whose unremarkable looks were apparently compounded by the onset of leukoderma, a skin disease. But in Janaki’s narrative, it is Bonnerjee’s first trip to England in 1864—when he was twenty and Hemangini was fifteen—that begins Hemangini’s lifelong pattern of suffering and struggle. Bonnerjee was the Bengali candidate chosen to study law in England under the auspices of a scholarship established by a Bombay businessman. His family declared it out of the question, knowing that, for an orthodox Hindu, crossing the black waters meant becoming an outcaste. With the help of an Anglo-Indian attorney, Bonnerjee fled the country alone unbeknownst to his parents and presumably to Hemangini as well. The Bonnerjees senior were horrified and unforgiving when they first discovered he had gone. According to one of W. C.’s biographers, “loud were the lamentations which echoed through the old house,” when Bonnerjee’s flight to England was discovered (Bonnerjee n.d., 13). His father eventually forgave him and sent him money to help him with his studies, though still, according to Janaki, “strongly disapproving of his behavior” (FH, 36). But the consequences fell equally, if not disproportionately, on Hemangini’s head. “My mother told me she also came in for a lot of abuse at that time,” Janaki wrote, “and was called an unlucky girl and taunted with the fact that her husband ran away rather than have to live with her.” Hemangini was taunted, her daughter recalled, especially “for having no children” (FH, 36).

What follows is a chapter-long description of Bonnerjee’s first experience in London in the later 1860s, where he worked hard at law and at perfecting his English (by reading aloud to himself every evening, as he later told her). “My father was very happy in England,” Janaki writes, “and in after life used to look back with pleasure on his student days.”¹⁰ The contrast with Hemangini’s experience of life in the Bonnerjee family household in that same period is startling:

In the meantime. . . my poor mother was not having a happy life during my father’s absence. She was repeatedly blamed for being ‘unlucky,’ and she used to practice all sorts of austerities and perform all sorts of penances to make up for his having lost caste by going to England . . . she suffered vicariously during all the years of his absence.

(FH, 39)

The fact that Hemangini was, according to custom, living in her in-laws’ home at Simla, meant that she might have been the object of family and perhaps even local community disapproval on a daily basis, though Janaki does not specify who the taunters were.¹¹ Nor does Janaki give any indication that Hemangini was embittered by either Bonnerjee’s absence or the criticisms it engendered from her orthodox

¹⁰The story of W. C. Bonnerjee’s time in Britain is more complex, as his letters home testify. See McLane (1988) and Mukherjee (1949).

¹¹There is evidence that her mother continued to visit the household of her family of origin at Bowbazar (commonly understood as “bahu,” or bride’s bazaar; see Nair 1990, 17) while Bonnerjee was in Britain—a regular holiday outing that she evidently anticipated with great pleasure (FH, 33). Judy Yung (1995) notes that nineteenth-century Chinese women whose husbands went to America were often separated for a decade, though the cultural contexts in which the separation was played out differed.

contemporaries. But she does allow that her mother's suffering was manifest in quite specific ways, visiting itself literally on her body—"the geography closest in," as Adrienne Rich calls it (Rich 1986, 212).

She told me that . . . she was hysterical, and sometimes used to suffer from regular fits during which she completely lost consciousness. At one time her elders decided that these fits must be due to devil possession, and accordingly an Exorciser was summoned to drive away the devil; and this drastic treatment used to make her worse than ever. Once she was told, during treatment, to look into a certain mirror and report what she saw there, and to her horror she really saw the face of a terrifying old cook they used to employ, who had died years ago, with his head held at a characteristically crooked angle, as he used to carry it in life. This vision so frightened her that it took her hours to get over it then, and it remained an alarming memory throughout all her life. In later life she completely got over these hysterical affections. (FH, 34–35)

The difficulties were not to abate. When Bonnerjee returned to India in 1868, he made it clear to his family that he would not seek readmission to caste through the formal ceremony. Significantly, he was therefore not permitted to return to his parents' home and he initially stayed in a hotel (FH, 40). Hemangini moved with him to a small house in Entally soon thereafter.¹² Of all the hardships Hemangini had thus far endured, Janaki believed that this move—from the family house to their own in Entally—was the hardest yet, in part because it represented such a departure from tradition, in part because it foreshadowed the unconventionality of things to come. "Having been brought up as a good Hindu, and taught that a husband's word was law, she was able to make a complete break with the past, though what a terrible effort it must have been for her is hard to realize" (FH, 40).

That break would continue to require sacrifice and submission from Hemangini in a variety of enduring ways, most of them centered on the daily practices and rituals of the new and, by nineteenth-century orthodox Hindu standards, extremely unconventional household. The following excerpt enumerates some of the pressures facing an upper-caste Hindu woman married to an outcaste Brahmin in Victorian Bengal:

In after life my mother often used to tell us how very difficult she found it to come out of purdah and live in English fashion. In the first place, she had to give up wearing a sari, and to wear English dress. . . . Then there was the difficulty about food. For an orthodox Brahmin girl to have to eat food cooked and handled by Mahomedan servants, and to have to eat meat—even beef—was a most terrible ordeal, as she had been brought up to think such behavior a most deadly sin. She used to say that she could never have surmounted these difficulties if it had not been for my father's great kindness and consideration. At first, he himself would bring her meals from the kitchen, so that the Mahomedan or low caste Hindu servants should not touch it, and in the desire to save him trouble, she got over her feelings of distaste.¹³ (FH, 41)

As Dipesh Chakrabarty has argued, debates about modernity in colonial Bengal centered around the internal discipline (and in this case, the internal geography) of

¹²After 1889 Entally became an "added area ward" under Calcutta Corporation; before that it had been a "suburb." See Nair (1990, 13). In the 1880s it would have been referred to locally as "Intally," as in Ramanath Das's grid map of 1884. See Dasgupta (1995, 156).

¹³For an account of a much differently ordered Bengali household around the same period see Mazumdar (1989, ch. 1).

the western home. Bonnerjee's willingness to go into the kitchen—and thus to cross a boundary which separated women and servants from “the man of the house”—illustrates the depth of his commitment to refiguring traditional structures in order to have a “modern” household (Chakrabarty 1993). If such a gesture may be read as a demonstration of his love for Hemangini, it is also an indication of the lengths to which he was prepared to go to modernize her along with the conjugal household. Like the objects of sartorial improvements in other “enlightened” Bengali homes, Hemangini was in effect a “captive household female,” subject to the determination of reforming elites to create an “appropriate social subjectivity” for Indian women.¹⁴

Negotiating the spaces, both public and private, outside the physical parameters of “home” also presented challenges for Hemangini:

Although she and her husband were now ‘outcastes’ in the sense that their relations could no longer eat with them or take water from their hands, they were all devoted to her and she loved them all just as much as ever, and used to go visit them frequently. Here again a difficulty arose. She could not be seen by her servants and neighbours leaving her house in a sari; but on the other hand she could not arrive at her Mother-in-law's or Mother's house in an English dress. She solved this problem by taking a sari with her in the carriage, drawing down the blinds and changing on the way, so as to arrive clad in a sari and barefoot. On the way home she had to change back to dress and stockings and shoes, and she went on doing this until her relations got used to her new ways.¹⁵

(FH, 42)

By 1872 the Bonnerjees had moved not once but twice from Entally and were living at no. 1 Store Road (Ballygunge) Calcutta—which, after the suburban railway opened up, became “a citadel of the educated Bengali middle-class” (Nair 1990, 18). Although both Entally and Ballygunge were technically suburbs of Calcutta until the late 1880s, it may be that this new environment did not exact the same kinds of punishing requirements as Entally—though expectations about dress would probably have remained the same on the part of her mother and mother-in-law. If Hemangini resented having to perform these acrobatics, her daughter did not record it. Janaki did however make it clear that her father's expectations could be a trial for her mother when it came to other innovations. Upon his return to India in 1868, Bonnerjee was keen for his wife to learn English as well—a subject she never really mastered. According to her daughter, Hemangini found English “extremely difficult, and never really managed to conquer it completely” (FH, 42–43). The failure took its toll. For Hemangini “always deplored her lack of education, the fact that she had never really learned to speak English as an Englishwoman, though she began so young and had so much practice” (FH, 33). Janaki attributed her mother's persistence in the face of Bonnerjee's expectations to “her great love and admiration for her husband,” believing it was Hemangini's conviction that “whatever he ordered must be right . . . [which] enabled her to adapt to his wishes” (FH, 42).

These adjustments were the consequence of being married to a Hindu man who had crossed the black waters, fallen from caste, and refused to be reinitiated into the

¹⁴Bannerji (1995, 71–73). I am grateful to Philippa Levine for urging me to explore this point.

¹⁵For historical analyses of the significance of clothing see Bannerji (1995) and Tarlo (1996, especially ch. 2).

faith and hence the family community. They were also the result of Bonnerjee's attraction to—one might even say, romance with—English ways of life. He named their first son Kamal Krishna Shelley in honor of the romantic poet. By the time his second and third children were born (daughters Nalini and Susila, known as Nellie and Susie, respectively), he had decided that they should all be educated in England—despite the fact that he himself had to remain in Calcutta to oversee his thriving law practice. With the help of an English solicitor, he arranged for his wife and children to go to England and take up residence with a family called the Woods. Colonel Wood was a retired Army man who agreed to board the Bonnerjees, including Hemangini, in order to supplement his “meagre pension.” If the move to Entally and the break with her orthodox past was the first trauma in the narrative of Hemangini's heroism, the break-up of the household at Ballygunge and its relocation chez Wood represents the second. Again, a brief excerpt provides a sense of the courage such an undertaking required, as well as an indication of the anxieties and fears it engendered:

My father could not possibly afford to take his family to England himself, as he was working far too busily to earn enough money to keep them in England, so my poor mother had to take the voyage alone, with three small children, in the summer of 1874, when Shelley was just 4, Nellie nearly 3 and Susila about 18 months old. She often told me what a nightmare that voyage was! My father knew one man who was travelling on the boat, Dr. Godeve Chakravati, and asked him to help my mother. He promised to do so, but my mother said he was a terrible snot, and was ashamed of knowing another Indian who could scarcely speak any English, and took absolutely no notice of her! She was terribly seasick and miserable and thoroughly scared. The only bright spot was that my father had written to the P. & O. agents at every port of call to look after my mother, and they came aboard at each port and helped her in various ways. She said the last straw was when playing with the children one day she asked the baby ‘Where's Papa?’ and the baby solemnly replied, ‘He's dead!’ However, at last the voyage came to an end, and she arrived at the Woods, who were then living at 8 Harcourt Road, Anerley.

(FH, 44)

The story of the Bonnerjees' residence at Anerley in the 1870s is indeed a grim one. In the first instance, they were living in a home that was not their own—a situation that no doubt exacerbated the pain of displacement and exile, for Hemangini especially. In addition, the fact that W. C. was paying the Woods appeared to be the sole reason that they had agreed to take the Bonnerjees in. As Janaki put it, “they had a strong colour prejudice and disliked all orientals, classing them as ‘natives’ . . . both my mother and her children were subjected to numerous indignities, and never treated equally by the family.”¹⁶ Such indignities—which took place in the confines of the home on Harcourt Road—ranged from mockery because they could never get their dark skin “clean,” to outright physical abuse. In part because Janaki was not yet born when the family was first with the Woods, she includes testimony from her elder sister Nellie about her experience there. Nellie describes being “frightfully severely punished” by the Woods because they believed she was “willfully stubborn and obstinate.” “I think I told you,” she is quoted as saying, “I used to be locked up in cupboards.” As late as the 1930s Nellie could claim, “I bear the marks of being

¹⁶This was of course a microcosm of at least some Victorian English attitudes towards Indians. Bengalis were the objects of derision and scorn in particular ways: “A low-lying people in a low-lying land . . . with the intellect of a Greek and the grit of a rabbit” was “a favorite British sneer,” according to Rosselli (1980, 121).

pushed under an iron bed which cut my head open" (FH, 46). These incidents happened after Hemangini had returned to India, either in 1875 after the birth of her second son, or in 1878, in anticipation of the birth of her third son. Whether she knew about them is not clear. What Janaki found most significant was her mother's willingness to forgive the Woods. "The amazing part," she wrote, in [Part II] Chapter VI, "Hemangini's First Visit to England, 1874-75," "is that my mother never bore a grudge against them, forgave all the indignities, and was extremely good to all the family later on, when she was wealthy and in an established position in her own house in England, and they were poor and unhappy" (FH 45).

The extent to which having "her own house in England" (and the security that that entailed) enabled such generosity from Hemangini is impossible to know with any certainty. Janaki, for her part, interpreted the Bonnerjees' experience at the Woods' as a kind of morality tale. Not only did her mother rise above their treatment of her and her children, but the Woods' sons and daughters ended up giving their parents unspecified "trouble." The sons in particular were "thoroughly unsatisfactory and later broke their parents' hearts by their evil conduct" (FH, 45). Crucial to this tale was the fact that Hemangini converted to Christianity while at the Woods, and went on to become a member of the Plymouth Brethren, whose services in the Drill Hall in upper Norwood were conveniently located, and which she preferred to the Woods' own Church of England.¹⁷ As Janaki's sister Nellie observed, W. C. had not reckoned with his wife's "religious strength of character" for "he did not realize what an ardent Christian she would become." According to her, Bonnerjee never tried to prevent his wife from being baptized—but, "though he did not object to our being brought up as a Christian, he would not allow us to be baptised or confirmed til we were 21" (FH, 40). Hemangini's newly found faith may well have sustained her as she struggled to find a place for herself and her family in England. Indeed, looking back on the Victorian era from the vantage point of 1935, Janaki emphasized that Hemangini's "great support and refreshment was her religion, first as a devout Hindu, and later as a devout Christian" (FH, 34). But as she recorded her mother's travels back and forth between England and India in the 1870s and after, it was not Hemangini's faith that Janaki foregrounded, but the family dwellings—in India and in England—between which her mother migrated and through which she tried to establish stability and permanence for a family that was unusually mobile and scattered. Although the first family house was built in 1876 at Kidderpore, where W. C. Bonnerjee was born, Hemangini did not live there for long. Once W. C. returned from studying law in London, she was continually on the move. After the still-birth of a son in 1878, she and W.C. returned to the Woods, bringing Susie to stay with them; they returned in 1882 to leave Kali behind; and after the birth of

¹⁷There are varying views in the "Family History" as to when Hemangini first became exposed to Christianity in a formal sense. Janaki's sister Nellie believed that it was W. C. Bonnerjee who encouraged her mother to embrace Christianity in the first place—according to her "he thought it would be easier for her when she had to live in England" if she did (FH, 40). Janaki clearly associated her father's own heterodoxy with his first trip to Britain, when "he was glad to break away completely from Hinduism . . . [which] had never had any appeal for him, and he was always very much against what he used to call 'priestcraft,' by which priests of all religions are want to prey upon the ignorance and superstition of the masses." Bonnerjee was evidently also impressed by the lectures of Charles Bradlaugh and Annie Besant, who were frequent and controversial critics of Christian orthodoxy in the 1860s and 1870s—a circumstance which makes it somewhat hard to believe that he "requested" Hemangini to convert, as Nellie later claimed (FH, 40).

their fourth son in 1883 they returned to England for another visit in 1884 (FH, 51). Perhaps because of all these displacements, Kidderpore remains in the shadows of the "Family History." In 1884 the Indian Government developed a scheme for extending the Kidderpore Docks, upon which the family house stood, and the Bonnerjees had to sell their land and find a new home. They purchased a large house at no. 6 Park Street in what, as Janaki proudly recalled, "was the very best part of Calcutta" (FH, 51). More importantly, this house was to be the center of family life well into the next century. No. 6 was where Janaki was born in 1886, where all of Shelley's children were born, and where Hemangini died in 1910. Not only did it "shelter the family for many years," it "was considered a family dwelling" (FH, 51).

Janaki's description of the house at no. 6 Park Street is quite detailed, reflecting her personal attachment to the home in which she was born, her desire to revisit its interior spaces, and her commitment to reproducing them for future generations. Not just the house but its architectural design and geographic layout are all brought to life again as evidence of the family's prosperity and standing. She may have been particularly keen to recreate Park Street with such vividness because although she was born there, she did not return for the first time until 1893, and then only briefly. As a child she remembered "besieging [her sister] Milly with questions as to what 6 Park Street looked like," since Milly was the only one who could recall it at the time (FH, 82). "It was really a beautiful mansion (no other word is grand enough) and had been Sir Elijah Impey's dwelling house, and the imposing gate had sphinxes on each side, put up by him," Janaki wrote in her chapter entitled "6 Park Street, Calcutta, 1885."

A long drive, flanked on one side by a row of servants' go downs discretely hidden behind a hedge, and on the other by an enormous coach-house, led up to the house, with its huge portico and imposing marble entrance hall and beautiful wooden staircase (with 80 steps?) built with galleries on each floor. On the ground floor was a large state dining room in the centre, to the east of which was a suite of three rooms, ante room, study, and bedroom, and a bathroom; to the west was a lesser dining room with a still smaller children's dining room beyond it; and to the west of this, a second suite of three rooms similar to the first. These rooms all led to a deep south verandah, with steps down to the garden. The middle storey consisted of an enormous billiard room, part of which was screened off and used as an extra sitting room, over the portico; a huge central drawing room, with a suite of bedroom, ante room and bathroom on each side of it, leading to another deep south verandah, with an extension westwards, over the ground floor western suite of rooms. The top storey was similarly arranged, with an open verandah over the billiard room. Above all was a flat roof which used to be a favourite playground for the smaller children. . . . There was a pleasant garden with a tennis court on the east of the house, and a range of stables beyond it with stalls for eleven horses; and to the north of the house a flower garden, with narrow paths and two fern houses. On the west and south were narrow paths only . . .

(FH, 53)

She also recalled the servants, "who stayed on till they died or were pensioned off. Among these were Lakshmi Ayah . . . the Sudder Bearer, Ramjan Coachman, the old Kamsamah, and Kumur-ud-din Kitmitgar, some of whom used to come and see us after we were married to get buksis on the strength of having carried us about when we were small" (FH, 87). Janaki's account of interiors, exteriors, and domestic servants effectively re-members the house of the past, bringing alive the children's activities and the family's daily habits, both before she was born and during her own childhood. In addition to the storeys and verandahs and tennis courts, on display of course is her

pride in her parents' achievement, both financial and cultural. Their bourgeois, anglophile status is plainly evident in the variety of rooms differentiated by function and the various signs of upward mobility in the heart of British India: billiard rooms, tennis courts, and stables—each of which provided the equipment for quintessentially English Victorian pastimes. W. C.'s romance with Englishness was thus partially fulfilled, and the house on Park Street remained its most vivid embodiment in the Bonnerjee family history and memory. It was, however, very much a joint venture; for, as Janaki put it nearly fifty years later, "my parents became very fond of this lovely house" (FH, 53).

In addition to the house itself, the grounds that surrounded it are also marked out as evidence of no. 6's importance—not just because it belonged to "the Bonnerjees" but arguably because it was part of the patrimony of the aspiring Indian nation as well. In this sense, Park Street represents a "system of settings" that links the ostensibly domestic with the public domain (Rapoport 1990, 15). The intimate connection between private and public, between home and the nation, is made inescapably clear when we realize where the passage above is situated in the larger text: for the chapter immediately following is entitled "The Founding of the Congress, 1885." It is quite brief and matter-of-fact, giving the most basic outline of the origins of the INC movement and enumerating the major positions Bonnerjee staked out for it at the first meeting at Bombay, where he was elected president. It ends with a reminiscence by S. Sinha about Bonnerjee's speech on that occasion, praising his "splendid oration" and recalling that it had "brought the House down as I have seldom seen" (FH, 56). That the purchase of the new house at Park Street and the founding of the INC should have occurred almost exactly at the same moment testifies to the kind of historical coincidence that came to bear on the Bonnerjee family, and to the inseparability of their family narrative from the story of Indian nationalism. In keeping with the pressure of this historical coincidence, nowhere is Janaki's investment in ordering the relationship between her father's public life and her family's domestic history more evident than at this moment. The chapter immediately following the one devoted to Congress is called "Family Life at 6 Park Street," and it opens with the following disclaimer: "As this is only a Family Chronicle, and not a political history of the times, enough has been said to indicate my father's interests and activities at this time" (FH, 57). Not just the structural imagery but the very architecture of the memoir itself is designed to de-center the political narrative of Indian nationalism and to locate the family's history separately, inside the rooms and in the private domain of the Bonnerjee household.

Although Janaki is at pains to segregate W. C.'s political activities from the story of family life, her narrative ends up revealing how nationalist politics entered into and shaped the domestic scene, in ways that were keenly felt by Hemangini. Janaki recalled that her father "was brought by his political works into contact with many new and interesting personalities" and that in consequence her mother, "while remaining essentially domestic in all her tastes, was obliged to come forward and act as hostess on several occasions. She was always very shy and nervous at such times, but enjoyed small parties and entertaining my father's intimate friends" (FH, 56–57). Even the small parties were evidently quite frequent: W. C. Bonnerjee liked to keep "open house" hospitality, and "every Sunday he had a dinner party of friends and rising junior barristers, which was to include the future Lord Sinha . . . and others . . ." (FH, 57). On these occasions the house was by no means a private space: it was routinely intruded upon by nationalist reformers and their supporters. Although they were often friends of the family, this did not necessarily diminish Hemangini's

anxiety, for she was “very shy and unready in society and very much afraid of people she considered superior in intellect to herself, and formal entertaining was a terror to her” (FH, 34). Janaki represented her father’s house parties as exciting and obviously recognized how important they were for his political ambitions, but she routinely returned to her mother’s discomfort in such settings—not just to emphasize Hemangini’s unease, but to put it in the context of her larger life, and tellingly, to establish that it was not the sum total of Hemangini’s personality or experience. “She was a good gossip with her own relations, and was shrewd in her judgment of people’s characters,” Janaki recalled in the chapter “Family Life at Park Street.” “When at her ease,” she added, “she had a keen sense of humor” (FH, 57).

Meanwhile, the tenor and structure of Hemangini’s life was enormously influenced by W. C. Bonnerjee’s anglophilia, which reached deep into the home on Park Street and, therefore, shaped the household Hemangini ran—or tried to. According to Janaki, “the 6 Park Street house was beautifully furnished in solid mid-Victorian style, and all the appointments were in keeping and of the choicest character. My father had his crockery and cutlery and linen specially made for him in England, and we still have some pieces of his once famous Coalport china dinner service with a large monogram of W. C. and H. B. in the centre of each plate and dish; and the remains of a beautiful hand-painted dessert service” (FH, 57). If Hemangini did not pick the crockery, she at least chose the servants who helped her manage the household, staffing it with English nurses whom she recruited during her sojourns to Britain—first Rose, who left India because she was ill, and then Fanny, who returned to England to marry a coal heaver (FH, 57). As Annmarie Adams has noted, this was the very same historical moment when middle-class English women were being asked by a variety of reformers, architects, and medical professionals to come to terms with household management as an extension of their identities as women (Adams 1996, 3). Janaki, for her part, was quick to point out that Hemangini was “very competent in all household affairs and the management of servants [and] money” (FH, 57). Perhaps she understood, as her mother may also have, that the task of the modern western housewife was “to represent her husband, class and nation through the acquisition and use of appropriate goods” (Auslander 1996, 95). In this context, Janaki’s attention to housing, interior decoration, and consumption practices, like her parents’, marks out the bourgeois preoccupations of the Victorian nation-building project, as well as the connections the Bonnerjees perceived between family patrimony and Indian self-representation.¹⁸

By the late 1880s Hemangini had had eight children, seven of whom had survived into adolescence, and three of whom were being raised in England and attended English schools. Despite the difficulty of raising a large family in two places, often with a husband in absentia, there were comforts to be had from family life nonetheless. “My Mother often told us,” Janaki wrote at the end of her chapter on Park Street, “how proud she was of her well-balanced family—four boys and four girls, and an

¹⁸This remained true long after the Majumdars had left Calcutta for Darjeeling in the wake of the first world war. Janaki’s grandson’s wife, Sally Singh, believes that “the family’s identity was very tied to the house in Darjeeling, Point Clear. Some of its best furniture came from the house in Calcutta, then was shipped to London. The reconstruction of the family again took place through the memories of that house. I think it was very necessary for them to have this ‘created’ base as almost all the descendants ended up in England, Canada, and the States where they were unknowns. No one recognized them as descendants of W. C. Bonnerjee, they were just ‘Indians.’” Private correspondence, 21 November 1996.

elder brother to look after each sister. I think these years about which I am now writing must have been the 'Golden Age' of my parents," she continued:

my father was at the very top of the tree in his profession, with all his political interests and new friends. The eldest son was doing well at Rugby, the girls were very clever and rapidly acquiring English culture, the youngest children were at hand to play with, and the Nursery was presided over by a nice English nurse; the relations were all admiring, and grateful for monetary help, and all the prospects for the future were bright.

(FH, 58)

Whether Janaki's admiration for her family's anglophilic achievements was shared by Hemangini, we do not know. In any event, this idyllic moment was fleeting as the family was soon on the move again. In the spring of 1888 W. C. Bonnerjee decided that it was time for his wife "to move completely" to Britain, so that all the children could have proper English educations. Once again, Janaki's narrative focuses on the physical spaces of home. Hemangini initially took over the home the Woods had been renting, at 44 Lansdowne Road, Croydon. The Woods were moving and wanted to give up the house anyway, so the Bonnerjees decided, in Janaki's words, "to take it over from them 'lock, stock and barrel,' while looking for a suitable property to purchase for themselves" (FH, 60). When W. C. came over during the Pujah holidays, as he usually did, they bought a house at 8 Bedford Park, Croydon—a neighborhood which "was then a very good one, though it has deteriorated sadly now," according to Janaki (FH, 61). She spent several pages detailing the gardens, the stables and the circular drive in front of the house; the property was so extensive that there was a kind of mini-barn at the end of the lawn where Hemangini kept poultry. Significantly, Janaki felt that the house was so impressive—and important for the "Family History"—that it "must have a chapter to itself" (FH, 62).

The house at 8 Bedford Park was enormous—three storeys, ten bedrooms, with drawing room, dining room, "capacious basement" kitchen, scullery, wine and coal cellar, pantry and china closet. What is interesting about Janaki's description of Bedford Park, compared to the one of the house at 6 Park Street, is the emphasis on the way the Bonnerjees remodeled the interior of this Victorian house to suit their particular needs. According to Janaki, "there was no bathroom at all, and only one lavatory . . . this was shocking to Indian ideas, so a bathroom was added on the first floor landing, and two more lavatories; and an extra wing was built on the house containing a billiard and smoking room."¹⁹ The Bonnerjees acted very much in keeping with the times: the 1880s was a period of domestic architectural reform in Britain—when the attention of the middle classes "had been guided back to the interior [not just] as a work of art," but as an expression of cultural achievement as well (Muthesius 1979, 162; Dutton 1954). The interior of Bedford Park was also remade to create a place for the children to play, and the servants' hall was renamed the Schoolroom and was later refitted so that the elder children could do chemistry experiments there. These rearrangements were made to accommodate a large family, but they also helped to make the house in Croydon resemble the one at 6 Park Street, architecturally at least—though in Janaki's memory it could never measure up. "The whole house was beautifully furnished by a London firm called Fox and Co., with good solid furniture, thick nailed-down carpets in every room and on the stairs, as was the fashion in those days. It made an exceedingly comfortable family home,

¹⁹FH, 63. New houses were not required to have a privy or water-closet in England until the Public Health Act of 1875 (Mitchell 1996, 117).

though it was not of course half so grand or luxurious as the Calcutta house." Perhaps for this reason 8 Bedford Park was dubbed "Kidderpore Croydon." This commemoration of the family abode in India served as a continual reminder that the house in suburban London would never be more than a copy, never more than a temporary "home." Given what we know about how Victorian English the house at Park Street was, it seems clear that there was no "model" or even originary house, either in India or England. Like Homi Bhabha's mimic men, the Bonnerjee homes were almost identical, "but not quite"—a likeness that was itself made possible largely through memory (Bhabha 1994, 89). In Janaki's remembering, each interior acts as a mirror for the other, reflecting the growing family's particular needs and, above all, refracting the kind of hybrid cosmopolitanism required by W. C.'s political tastes and aspirations. Thus the trope of interiority that runs throughout the "Family History" signals not just a desire to rebuild the Bonnerjees' past, but to remember their capacity for capital accumulation as well.

Hemangini set herself up as the quintessential Victorian housewife at Kidderpore Croydon, and "everything in her province went on oiled wheels." In so doing she fulfilled expectations of what the "modern" woman would look like as that cultural icon was being remodeled at the century's end both in Britain and among upper-caste Bengalis (Borthwick 1984). Janaki emphasized her mother's housekeeping competency, recalling that

there was never any servant trouble, as the same servants stayed on for years. Of course they used to quarrel among themselves sometimes, and there were various difficulties to cope with, but they always adored my mother. The food too was always of the choicest quality, and she invariably gave us the earliest strawberries, green peas, oysters, etc., that were in the market. From her Hindu upbringing she used to enjoy giving us special food for special days, and we always had pancakes on Shrove Tuesday, and roast goose at Michaelmas. And Christmas Day used to be a time of gor[g]ing for the whole family, my mother making a special expedition to London to get as many dainties as possible from the Army and Navy Stores.

(FH, 64)

Once again, consumption enters into the narrative, not just as evidence of Hemangini's gastronomic anglophilia, but, arguably, as proof of the Bonnerjees' buying power as well.²⁰

Sundays were special days at Kidderpore Croydon, a time when the family was often all assembled and fellow-Indians who were in temporary or permanent exile in London would flock to the house for food and hospitality. Janaki's account is worth reproducing in full:

[the day began] with breakfast in bed, as when the elder sisters began their medical work in London they had a very early start and a late return all the week and liked to get up late on Sundays to make up, and we younger ones thought it a marvellous idea, so my mother would send up as many as 6 trays sometimes! Attendance at the Iron Room was compulsory for the younger ones, and on our return we usually found two or three young Indian students and other friends awaiting us who had arrived for lunch—Mr. K. N. and Mr. P. Chaudhuri were frequent visitors, also Basanta Mullick and his brothers, Sir B. C. Mitter, Sir B. L. Mitter, Mr. C. C. Ghose, and a great many others. After lunch some of us always had to go with my mother to the

²⁰Thanks to Angela Woollacott for this formulation.

Cemetery, and then there was a 'spread tea' in the dining room and after that 'Hymn' in the drawingroom. Each of us in turn chose our favorite hymn, and Nellie played the piano while the rest of the family sang. Sometimes we used the 'Ancient and Modern' Hymn book and sometimes 'Sankey and Moodie's.' Immediately after this ceremony my mother used to go down to the kitchen to cook a real Indian dinner, and as soon as I was old enough I always used to help her. The servants were all given the evening off, and we used to dish up and carry up the things ourselves—My Aunts always sent the spices to us ready ground in tins and we and our visitors all greatly enjoyed this meal. Sometimes my father would come and help, and I remember him and Mr. R. C. Dutt once spending the whole evening cooking a wonderful duck curry which no one could eat because it was too highly spiced ('jhal')! At first the servants were rather 'superior' about Indian food, and my mother always left plenty of cold meat and pudding out for their supper. But she gradually noticed that however many curries might be left over on Sunday nights, there was never anything on Monday morning, and at last a deputation came to her from the servants asking her to cook just a little more of everything if she didn't mind, as they all so much enjoyed it!²¹

(FH, 66)

The image of W. C. and R. C. Dutt, two English-educated barristers in the kitchen cooking the duck for "family" dinner, is just one indication of how the traditional world of the Hindu home was recast, if not turned upside down, *chez Bonnerjee* in Britain. A contemporary of Janaki's and a friend in later life, Mrs. Arthur Alexander, had vivid memories of these Sunday feasts, in which she was included as a young girl. "What an oasis Kidderpore must have been to the dozens of young Indian students who came there on Sundays and were transported in spirit to their own country!" (FH, 72). No. 8 Bedford Park functioned as a gathering place for expatriate Indians: a communal space as well as a little bit of India in England. As Alexander's observation and, indeed, as much of the "Family History" itself illustrates, nationalist politics not only left its imprint on the Bonnerjee family, the Bonnerjee family helped to influence the cultural forms early Indian nationalism took in Britain as well.

Given her role in these proceedings, Hemangini may be said to have actively shaped the conditions under which those first generations of English-educated Indian men experienced the "Indian nation" in exile.²² In this sense, she made a significant contribution to nationalist politics—a fact that helps make clear in quite concrete terms just how domestic space is always inevitably public space as well (Adams 1996, 168). Hemangini's contribution to the cultural politics of Indian nationalism is, however, in danger of being somewhat obscured by Janaki's recurrent insistence that her mother did not feel up to the task of participating in the "political" affairs of the household. For despite her obvious pride in being part of these historic gatherings, Janaki's refrain remained the same as it had through the beginning of the "Family Chronicle." "At best," she wrote of the days at Kidderpore Croydon, "it must have been a lonely life for [Hemangini]." She was "very much out of touch with her eldest children, who rather despised her lack of education—education having been made something of a fetish by them—and really had nothing in common with her, as they scarcely remembered their life in India and their relatives there" (FH, 64). The youngest children, for their part, "were only too ready to take their tone from the

²¹As John Coffey has detailed (1996), Moody and Sankey's mission to Britain was in the 1870s, the decade of Hemangini's conversion, which explains the centrality of their hymn book to her conversion experience.

²²I am indebted to Laura Mayhall for this point.

elders, and book learning and culture was [sic] the order of the day.” The older ones brought their friends home at holidays, and Hemangini “liked some of them very much,” but according to Janaki “it was not usual in those days for parents to be friends with their children . . . and my mother must sadly have missed my father and her own contemporaries” (FH, 65). Janaki does record that Hemangini made the house in Croydon her own kind of social space, sponsoring “Mother’s Meetings” where neighborhood ladies met to read the Bible and discuss related matters in her living room on Thursday afternoons (FH, 76). These local social connections notwithstanding, Janaki believed that “though my mother’s life seemed so prosperous and happy on the surface, except for the inevitable separation of her husband, she really had many worries and anxieties to cope with”—specifically having to do with her children’s lives and futures. In this way, Janaki directs our attention again and again to the most circumscribed, although by no means apolitical, definition of the domestic sphere: managing the children. Shelley was a rather mischievous young man, and although he ended up at Rugby and Oxford, he came close to expulsion from the former. An even greater sorrow was the death of Hemangini’s son Kitty from pneumonia in 1890 at the age of eleven—a death for which she always blamed herself and for which she wore mourning for the rest of her life (FH, 76). So responsible and guilty did she feel that the first time W. C. returned to Britain after Kitty’s death she could not bring herself to meet him, “because he had left his son under her care and she had let him die” (FH, 75).

The splintering and re-creation of the household continued apace in the Bonnerjee family. Janaki narrates this process again through an emphasis on the lives of the children, specifically as the elder ones married and set up their own homes, both in England and in India. W. C. and Hemangini traveled back and forth between India and Britain half a dozen times or more in the late 1890s. Using Kidderpore Croydon as their home base, they took several of the younger children on holidays in the British Isles and to Europe as well. They often rented houses while on holiday, as in the summer of 1903 at Harlyn Bay near Padstow, Cornwall, though these do not figure in any detail in Janaki’s historical narrative. In the last years of his life, W. C. was more frequently in England. He worked at the Privy Council and made two attempts to stand for Parliament—evidence of his desire to inhabit the most important and influential House in the British empire. But his health began to fail and despite a number of trips to spas in and around the southeast, he died in the house at Croydon in July of 1906. In death as in life 8 Bedford Park became a pilgrimage site for Indians in exile; among those whom Janaki remembered coming to pay their respects were R. C. Dutt and G. K. Gokhale, who had been regular visitors during W. C.’s last days. Bonnerjee was cremated at Golders Green and his ashes were buried in Croydon cemetery without ceremony, according to his wish. His epitaph, which he dictated to his daughter Susie the day before he died, read as follows: “here beside the ashes of his son rest the ashes of Womesh Chunder Bonnerjee Hindu Brahmin who died on a visit to England . . .” (FH, 104). His final words are tantalizingly ambiguous, for though they leave little doubt that he viewed himself as a visitor to Britain, they give no explicit indication of where he thought “home” might be. Like Kidderpore Croydon itself, England evidently only resembled “something like home.”

The impact of W. C.’s death on Hemangini was enormous, not least because as the heir to his money she was left “in a sea of business and other worries” (FH, 105). In Janaki’s account it was, significantly, no. 6 Park Street itself which served as the focus of anxiety. Shelley, who had been living there with his wife while working as a barrister, had let the upstairs apartment to “a couple of young English men” without

informing his parents. Hemangini was “terribly upset and grieved about it” because “it seemed to her a sort of sacrilege that any part of my father’s house should be let to strangers” (FH, 106). This contretemps was complicated by the fact that the upstairs flat was initially intended as a nursery; when Shelley’s wife Gertie had a miscarriage, they decided to rent it because they couldn’t bear to leave the space empty.²³ By the time Hemangini returned to Calcutta after W. C.’s death, Shelley and Gertie “were still much estranged from the rest of the family, though still living in the same house, and my mother felt very sad about this” (107). Hemangini, Janaki, and Susie returned to Kidderpore Croydon, leaving Shelley and another brother and wife to share Park Street. The house at Bedford Park proved to be too large for “our reduced numbers” and it was eventually sold. Its owners turned it into an orphanage for army officers’ daughters, which was still in operation when Janaki was writing her family memoir in the 1930s (108). After that, Janaki and her mother returned to Park Street, where Janaki was married to P. M. in 1908 and where Hemangini died in January 1910. According to Janaki, “she was conscious up to the end, and so very thankful to be going to join her husband, as she said.”

I shall never forget her look of intense joy when the doctors thought it right to warn her that she only had a few hours to live. She was, as ever, far more thoughtful about the comforts of her children and nurses than about her own pain, and kept urging us to rest, to go down for meals. She died bravely and gladly, as one really ‘Going Home.’

(FH, 110–11)

If “home” was unspecified for W. C. Bonnerjee, Janaki, at any rate, believed it was self-evident upon her mother’s death. Like a good Hindu and indeed like a good Christian wife, Hemangini followed her husband out of the world to join him in a final resting place—crossing boundaries that were “not delineated in space” in order to realize home (Hong Kingston 1976, 8).

Hemangini’s death did not bring an end to the “Family History” because the narrative is not coterminous with either the Bonnerjees’ marriage or their lives. Indeed, Janaki devotes several sections of the memoir to her own education, both in Croydon High School for Girls (est. 1872) and at Newnham College, Cambridge. Although they provide a further glimpse of Janaki’s subjectivity, these scenes do more to shed light on other possible tensions between W. C. and Hemangini, especially where the figure of Dorinda Neligan, the first headmistress of the Croydon High School, is concerned. As one of Neligan’s contemporaries recalled, Neligan had “a strong personality, a beautiful Irish voice, ‘a dominating presence and great independence of character. She could work easily with men as few women of her generation could” (FH, 91). Janaki elaborated on the portrait as follows:

she and my father were great friends, as they thought alike about politics, both being liberals and great admirers of Gladstone. Irish and Indian political problems had much in common in those days and there used to be great discussions of all sorts of interesting topics whenever Miss Neligan came to see us . . . My father admired her greatly . . . [because] he was always a great advocate of “Women’s Rights.”

(FH, 92–93)

²³Gertie was Gertrude Blair, a white Englishwoman. Nellie, Janaki’s older sister, married Gertie’s brother, George Blair. If these interracial marriages were upsetting to the Bonnerjees, Janaki does not record it, though she does make reference to Indian contemporaries of her father’s whose children’s relationships with English people caused family dissension (FH, 21 and Burton, forthcoming).

Dorinda and her sister Annie were frequent visitors to Kidderpore Croydon and the Bonnerjees also stayed with them after the house at Bedford Park was sold. “Miss Neligan” is the only person to be accorded her own chapter, suggesting how influential she was in Janaki’s adolescence and, not incidentally, what kind of a foil she may have provided to Hemangini’s faithful domesticity—for W. C., perhaps, as much as for his young and impressionable daughter.

Digressions about her education notwithstanding, Janaki’s own story emerges as the central focus of the text only after her mother’s passing. If this is a testament to how bound up her autobiography is with the history of her family of origin, it is also evidence of how constrained the production of a narrative of her own is by Hemangini’s suffering and pathos. Whether or not Janaki would have seen her “own” story as a valuable literary, historical, or even “nationalist” subject is a matter for speculation. She was largely English- and later Cambridge-educated, and she would presumably have come into contact with western literary traditions that privileged the self, though she makes no allusion to the impact of such exposure in her text.²⁴ Nevertheless, Part III, which begins right after her mother’s death and inaugurates the section of the “Family History” that is properly Janaki’s, starts with a chapter entitled “Early Married Life: Park Street; again, 1908,” the year of her wedding. As Janaki’s insertion of the word “again” suggests, this chapter is a bit of a false start, since it recounts the happy events of her courtship and social life prior to Hemangini’s death—including her involvement as honorary secretary of the Calcutta branch of the National Indian Association, whose monthly meetings were occasionally held at Park Street (FH, 112). The overlap of her new life with P. M. and her mother’s death help to account for this recursive strategy, as Janaki exhibits her struggle both to reconcile the joy of those days with the fact of her mother’s continued sorrow and to represent the difficulty of moving beyond the shadows of Park Street into her own story. When she does take up her own story she makes a familiar return to the narrative of the conjugal house, allowing its architecture, interiors, and grounds to tell the story:

. . . our first house after our marriage was no. 66 Lower Circular Road, up a lane almost opposite St. James’ Church. The approach was bad and the neighbourhood somewhat slummy, but the house itself was quite liveable in (a cousin of mine . . . called the house ‘a Lotus on a dungheap’!). It was two storied with two rooms on each floor; the downstairs rooms were rather damp but could be used as dining room and dressing room, and there was a tiny office room and a verandah. Upstairs there was a drawing room and bedroom and a long verandah with a tin roof, which was too hot to be used in the summer though pleasant enough in winter, and a small open balcony facing south which was a great resort on a summer evening. We had a pony called ‘Baby Boy’ and a trap, and also the small brougham from 6 Park Street, but this was not very useful at first, as we had no coachman!

(FH, 113)

Soon after the birth of their daughter Tara, the Majumdars moved again, this time to no. 1 Elysium Row, in “the very nicest part of Calcutta, just beyond the Cathedral, and a few minutes walk from the Maidan” (FH, 115). P. M. was making better money

²⁴Nupur Chaudhuri (1997, 35) suggests that the Santa Devi and Sita Devi, two Bengali novelists contemporary with Janaki Majumdar, wrote female characters who had clearly been exposed to English classics like Dickens by the 1920s.

by then and this was reflected in the larger house and property, which are again brought alive in some detail. Much if not most of Part III is given over to what Janaki calls “life in Elysium Row,” and eventually, to the home the Majumdars built in Ballygunge after the first world war—but not until a brief obituary of no. 6 Park Street has been provided.

We had found that it would be better to sell 6 Park Street as no member of the family could afford to keep such a large establishment, and it was bought by a Marwari merchant and let out in flats. The house (now no. 24) is still there, but the garden was acquired by a motor car firm and a large garage built facing the street so the house is no longer visible from the road . . . The neighborhood also has completely changed from a residential area into a very busy shopping centre, and none of us have ever regretted the sale of no. 6.²⁵

(FH, 113)

If this seems a rather unceremonious and even unsentimental way to mark the end of a generation, it also bears witness to Janaki’s conviction that “home” is still recognizable even when its structures have been transformed and, in this case, its address has been renumbered and its access blocked from view. For Janaki the place remains historically significant because it points to what home was but no longer is: it stands as a testimony to the family’s progress, to the movement of history and to her own historical consciousness as well. Here it becomes evident that Janaki’s purpose in revisiting Park Street (and, by extension, in writing the “Family History” that has helped to preserve it) is to keep the *desire* for home alive precisely because she recognizes that home is ultimately impossible to inhabit except through memory. For it is, in turn, the project of remembering that makes the *house* into (a) *home*.²⁶ The narrative of families on-the-move and family dwellings bought and sold stands in stark contrast to the text itself, which aims to provide her children’s children with an enduring, permanent legacy. In this sense the “Family History” is more than simply a reminder of what home looked like, it becomes a family heirloom—that highly prized commodity that transmits memory while legitimating a collective, middle-class past *as* “History.”

For all its emphasis on interiors and “private” homes, Janaki’s narrative is, finally, the work of a prominent Indian daughter trying to establish a place for her family’s past in history, if not in public.²⁷ The fact that she wrote her memoir in 1935 is surely significant: for that year marked the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the Indian National Congress, bringing her father’s political career again before the public eye as the trajectory of the independence movement was scrutinized and reevaluated. As she observed early on in the narrative, “reading the accounts of the Jubilee in the

²⁵As Dipesh Chakrabarty notes (1989, 52–53), a number of Marwari merchants made their fortunes in the Calcutta jute mills in the first quarter of the twentieth century; see also Bagchi (1990, 216).

²⁶Thanks to Mahua Sarkar for this point. Although no such “obituary” was written for no. 8 Bedford Park, later Janaki was to note that it had become an “Old People’s Home . . . accommodating fourteen women and nine men, and has a long waiting list. It looks extremely nice and well cared for, though the neighbourhood has changed almost beyond recognition.” Majumdar (c. 1974, 7). For another example of the relationship between memory, desire, and the interiors of home, see Lessard (1996).

²⁷The memoir has never been published. Janaki did, however, collaborate with Sadhona Bonnerjee in a pamphlet (1975) that would appear to draw heavily on her “Family History,” especially for the section on Hemangini.

press makes one realise what a lot of water has flowed under the bridge since 1885!" (FH, 54). Janaki committed her "Family History" to paper at an historical moment when the Gandhian movement was entering a new phase. According to Judith Brown, in 1935 Gandhi began to pursue strategies that were increasingly independent of a Congress that little resembled the band W. C. Bonnerjee had led half a century before (Brown 1988). Majumdar did not intend her text as a critique of Gandhi, whose ideas she pronounced "sound," but rather as a reminder of what different incarnations nationalism had had in the past, and, of course, how invested her family was in those representations.²⁸ In an era of mass political demonstrations that often involved the very public participation of women, Janaki's "Family History" foregrounds the contributions of one unsung heroine who made W. C. Bonnerjee's professional success possible by her very private sacrifices. In this respect it contributes to the narratives of Indian women's self-sacrifice that were both produced by the Gandhian moment and, of course, antecedent to it as well (Ray 1987; Kishwar 1986; Patel 1988; Forbes 1996, 1988; Kumar 1994). Janaki constructs Hemangini as evidence of the kinds of profound social and cultural transformations that can occur in the recesses of domestic space, because the private and the public, the home and the nation, are so intimately connected—even as she makes visible how conservative of patriarchal ideals those transformations can be. What makes Hemangini so pivotal to the "Family History" when we interpret it as a cultural product of the 1930s is that she can be read as a kind of anti-heroine: the quiet, subservient domesticated Indian woman whose propriety can never be questioned — unlike some of the women "in public" in this period. To borrow from Kamala Visweswaran, Janaki enables Hemangini's work to count: she makes it function as a certain kind of nationalist "speech," albeit one that harks back to earlier nationalist versions (1996). Thus, even though the "Family History" is structured around a recurrent tension between the public man who represents professional success and national identity versus the woman/mother who embodies personal suffering and sorrow, Hemangini's pathos ends up producing the far more powerful statement about nationalism-in-the-making. In short, Janaki did not actually need to foreground W. C. Bonnerjee, since Hemangini does the work of embodying the values of "Indian nationalism" Janaki wishes to represent even better than he could have.²⁹

Hemangini's pathos arguably throws Janaki's story into shadow; indeed, Janaki's marriage to P. M. and the birth of her children end up being as subordinated to her mother's story as they are to her father's. At the same time the "Family History" performs a service for Janaki as a "nationalist's daughter" as well. Because she devotes so much of her memoir to recounting how her mother must have felt, the "Family History" becomes a vehicle through which Janaki is able to imagine and preserve a very private interior space—her mother's emotional life—which few contemporaries had access to. This is a maneuver of no small significance, given the fact that, as Rosemary Marangoly George has noted, "imperialism, nationalism and women's

²⁸FH, 27. This comment emerges in the context of a story about one of P. M.'s nephews, who was drawn in by the Swaraj agitation in 1921 and wanted to give up preparing for his Intermediate Arts Examination. P. M. dissuaded him from this and, according to Janaki, "he has never regretted it, when he sees how others of his contemporaries who 'came out' in the first flush of eager enthusiasm now swell the ranks of the unemployed. Mahatma Gandhi's ideas were sound, but unfortunately, the bulk of mankind being what it is, at that time little could be done by non-co-operating students, though the spinning and Khadar campaign had a lasting effect on Manchester trade."

²⁹See also Susan Koshy's analysis of Suleri's memoir (1997, 45–61).

movements have collaborated in hollowing out all specificity for Indian women” (1996, 137). It also materializes a certain kind of gendered bourgeois national subject for scrutiny and appreciation—a highly privatized subject that might have been comforting to remember and to claim at an historical moment when the public image of the Indian nationalist woman was less undifferentiated and less indubitably respectable. Hemangini emerges as a modernizing model within the constraints of the nationalist bourgeois (and patriarchal) project (Sinha 1996, 482). Like Anandibai Joshee, her more famous contemporary, she represents “the obedient wife of an allegedly visionary husband rather than . . . an independent agent with a will of her own” (Kosambi 1996, 3196). Janaki’s memoir works as much to serve the family’s history in the nation’s memory as it does to satisfy a daughter’s curiosity about her mother’s past; indeed, in political terms, it makes those two sentimental projects one and the same. To argue this is not to suggest, as Frederic Jameson has, that all colonial writing can be reduced to nationalist allegory, but rather that the nation has a particular kind of purchase on the domestic (1986; see also Ahmad 1992). This is especially true in Janaki’s case, where a daughter is trying to release home from the nation’s grasp precisely in order to preserve its history on her own terms—i.e., through the maternal figure. I would argue that Janaki recognized the combination of coercion and affection that W. C. used to produce this modern mother-as-modernity. Whether she understood that dynamic as also characteristic of her father’s brand of nationalism is an intriguing question.³⁰ Hers is, in the end, a rich and complexly “domestic” history that demonstrates how intimately connected the personal, the familial, and the political were for the first several generations of Indian women writing in both English and vernacular languages (Tharu and Lalita, 1991). It also—and above all—makes Janaki visible as the discerning modern, if not nationalist, bourgeois subject herself.

With its roots in the household, the “Family History,” (or “Hemangini’s story”) is a “situated knowledge” that is produced through an elaborate and finally bourgeois architectural imaginary. It is an imaginary that remodels as it remembers, leaving the “original” always in doubt. Because of the history of her own peregrinations and the transitory nature of her own experience of home, Janaki’s memoir offers home as a survivor of *history* only if it is built and rebuilt through memory—in large part because no “storey” is given, but requires the active and continual work of the imagination for its meaning. At the same time, the fact that her “Family History” was never published, and remains in private hands, leaves the site of “History” itself ambiguous, even as it reinscribes the “Family” as a private, elusive space that is valorized as the right and proper subject of nationalist nostalgia.³¹ Lest Janaki’s narrative be dismissed for its often conservative effects, it is worth remembering that her determination to furnish a domestic genealogy (McClintock 1993) of Indian nationalism was not without risk. As she remarked with some unease at the very beginning of her narrative:

The following is an attempt to jot down the main facts of the family history of both the Majumdar and Bonnerjee families, so that our children and great grandchildren may not be entirely ignorant of the history of their forbears. No apology is required for making this attempt; so many changes have taken place and are still taking place

³⁰Many thanks to Laura Mayhall for encouraging me to reflect on this point.

³¹Although in this piece I have generally avoided drawing parallels between the “Family History” and other texts produced by western women in this period, it is helpful in this context, I think, to consider Janaki Majumdar’s work as an example of what Alison Light (1991) calls “conservative modernity.”

in India and the whole world since the time when this family history begins, with the birth of my father-in-law in 1822, that it becomes almost a duty to try to look back at things as they were then, while records are still available, and people [are] still alive who can remember the past.

(FH, 1)

Although duty may have motivated her, anxieties about the dangers attendant on public exposure and self-representation remained. If imagining home is as political an act as imagining the nation (Marangoly George 1996, 6), Janaki Majumdar's "Family History" attempts to manage the political implications of the past by putting her own narratives of home within reach of national memory, yet just outside the grasp of a fully public history.

List of References

- ADAMS, ANNMARIE. 1996. *Architecture in the Family Way: Doctors, Houses, and Women, 1870–1900*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- AHMAD, AIJAZ. 1992. *In Theory: Nations, Classes, Literatures*. London: Verso.
- APPIAH, KWAME ANTHONY. 1992. *In My Father's House: Africa in the Philosophy of Culture*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- ASKELAND, LORI. 1995. "Remodeling the Model Home in *Uncle Tom's Cabin* and *Beloved*." In *Subjects and Citizens: Nation, Race and Gender from Oroonoko to Anita Hill*, edited by Michael Moon and Cathy N. Davidson. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
- AUSLANDER, LEORA. 1996. "The Gendering of Consumer Practices in Nineteenth-Century France." In *The Sex of Things: Gender and Consumption in Historical Perspective*, edited by Victoria de Grazia. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- AZIM, FIRDOUS. 1992. *The Colonial Rise of the Novel*. London: Routledge.
- BAGCHI, AMYA KUMAR. 1990. "Wealth and Work in Calcutta." In *Calcutta: The Living City*, vol. 1, *The Past*, edited by Sukanta Chaudhuri. Calcutta: Oxford University Press.
- BANNERJI, HIMANI. 1995. "Attired in Virtue: The Discourse on Shame (*Lajja*) and Clothing of the *Bhadramahila* in Colonial Bengal." In *From the Seams of History*, edited by Bharati Ray. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- BHABHA, HOMI K. 1994. "Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse." In his *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge.
- BONNERJEE, SADHONA. n.d. *Life of W. C. Bonnerjee, First President of the Indian National Congress*. Calcutta.
- and JANAKI MAJUMDAR. 1975. *W. C. Bonnerjee and Hemangini*. Calcutta: New Sakti Press.
- BORTHWICK, MEREDITH. 1984. *The Changing Role of Women in Bengal, 1849–1905*. Princeton University Press.
- BROWN, JUDITH. 1988. "The Mahatma in Old Age: Gandhi's Role in Indian Political Life, 1935–1942." In *Congress and Indian Nationalism: The Pre-Independence Phase*, edited by Richard Sisson and Stanley Wolpert. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- BURTON, ANTOINETTE. Forthcoming. *At the Heart of the Empire: Indians and the Colonial Encounter in Late-Victorian Britain*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- CHAKRABARTY, DIPESH. 1989. *Rethinking Working-Class History*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- . 1993. "The Difference-Deferral of (A) Colonial Modernity: Public Debates on Domesticity in British Bengal." *History Workshop Journal* 36: 1–33.
- CHATTERJEE, PARTHA. 1989. "The Nationalist Resolution of the Woman Question." In *Recasting Women: Essays in Colonial History*, edited by Kumkum Sangari and Sudesh Vaid. Delhi: Kali for Women.
- CHAUDHURI, NUPUR. 1997. "Nationalism and Feminism in the Writings of Santa Devi and Sita Devi." In *Interventions: Feminist Dialogues on Third World Women's Literature and Film*, edited by Bishnupriya Ghosh and Brinda Bose. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc..
- COFFEY, JOHN. 1996. "Democracy and Popular Religion: Moody and Sankey's Mission to Britain, 1873–75." In *Citizenship and Community: Liberals, Radicals and Collective Identities in the British Isles, 1865–1931*, edited by Eugenio F. Biagini. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- DASGUPTA, KEYA. 1995. "A City Away from Home: The Mapping of Calcutta." In *Texts of Power: Emerging Disciplines in Colonial Bengal*, edited by Partha Chatterjee. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995.
- DUTTON, RALPH. 1954. *The English Interior, 1500 to 1900*. London: B. T. Batsford, Ltd.
- . 1954. *The Victorian Home: Some Aspects of Nineteenth Century Taste and Manners*. London: B.T. Batsford, Ltd.
- FORBES, GERALDINE. 1988. "The Politics of Respectability: Indian Women and the Indian National Congress." In *The Indian National Congress: Centenary Hindsight*, edited by D. A. Low. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- . 1996. *The New Cambridge History of India*, v. 4, Pt. 2: *Women in Modern India*. Cambridge University Press.
- GREWAL, Inderpal. 1996. *Home and Harem: Nation, Gender, Empire and Cultures of Travel*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
- HONG KINGSTON, MAXINE. 1976. *The Woman Warrior*. New York: Knopf.
- JAMESON, FREDERIC. 1986. "Third-World Literature in the Era of Multinational Capitalism." *Social Text* 15 (Fall): 65–88.
- KARLEKAR, MALAVIKA. 1993. *Voices from Within: Early Personal Narratives of Bengali Women*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- KISHWAR, MADHU. 1986. "Gandhi on Women." *Race and Class* 28, 1: 43–61.
- KOSAMBI, MEERA. 1996. "Anandibai Joshi: Retrieving a Fragmented Feminist Image." *Economic and Political Weekly* 31, 49 (December 7): 3189–97.
- KOSHY, SUSAN. 1997. "Mother-Country and Fatherland: Re-membering the Nation in Sara Suleri's *Meatless Days*." In *Interventions: Feminist Dialogues on Third World Women's Literature and Film*, edited by Bishnupriya Ghosh and Brinda Bose. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc..
- KUMAR, RADHA. 1994. *The History of Doing: An Illustrated Account of Movements for Women's Rights and Feminism in India, 1800–1990*. London: Verso.
- LESSARD, SUZANNAH. 1996. *The Architect of Desire: Beauty and Danger in the Stanford White Family*. New York: The Dial Press.
- LIGHT, ALISON. 1991. *Forever England: Femininity, Literature and Conservatism Between the Wars*. London: Routledge.
- MAJUMDAR, JANAKI AGNES PENELOPE. 1935. "Family History." Manuscript and typescript copies held privately.
- . c. 1974?. *Pramila: A Memoir*. Privately printed.

- MARANGOLY GEORGE, ROSEMARY. 1996. *The Politics of Home: Postcolonial Relocations and Twentieth-century Fiction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MAZUMDAR, SHUDHA. 1989. *Memoirs of an Indian Woman*, edited with an introduction by Geraldine Forbes. New York: M.E. Sharpe.
- MCLANE, JOHN. 1988. "The Early Congress, Hindu Populism, and the Wider Society." In *Congress and Indian Nationalism: The Pre-Independence Phase*, edited by Richard Sisson and Stanley Wolpert. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- MCCCLINTOCK, ANNE. 1993. "Family Feuds: Gender, Nationalism and the Family." *Feminist Review* 44: 61–80.
- MITCHELL, SALLY. 1996. *Daily Life in Victorian England*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.
- MORRISON, TONI. 1987. *Beloved*. New York: Knopf.
- MUKHERJEE, MANICKAL. 1949. *W. C. Bonnerjee: Snapshots from His Life and Letters*. Calcutta: Deshbandhu Book Depot.
- MUTHESIUS, HERMANN. 1979. *The English House*. New York: Rizzoli.
- NAIR, P. THANKAPPAN. 1990. "The Growth and Development of Old Calcutta." In *Calcutta: The Living City*, vol. 1, *The Past*, edited by Sukanta Chaudhuri. Calcutta: Oxford University Press.
- PATEL, SUJATA. 1988. "Construction and Reconstruction of Women in Gandhi." *Economic and Political Weekly* (February 20): 377–87.
- PEARLMAN, MICKEY, ed. 1996. *A Place Called Home: Twenty Writing Women Remember*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- POLLOCK, SHELDON. 1995. "Literary History, Indian History, World History." *Social Scientist* 23, 1–12 (October–December): 112–42.
- . 1995. "Literary History, Region, and Nation in South Asia: Introductory Note." *Social Scientist* 23, 1–12 (October–December): 1–7.
- RAHA, KIRONMOY. 1990. "Calcutta Theatre, 1853–1944." In *Calcutta: The Living City*, vol. 1, *The Past*, edited by Sukanta Chaudhuri. Calcutta: Oxford University Press.
- RAPOPORT, AMOS. 1990. "Housing as Culture." In *Housing: Symbol, Structure, Site*, edited by Lisa Taylor. New York: Cooper-Union Museum with the Smithsonian.
- RAY, BHARATI. 1987. "Calcutta Women in the Swadeshi Movement (1903–1910): The Nature and Implications of Participation." In *The Urban Experience: Calcutta*, edited by Pradip Sinha. Calcutta: Riddhi.
- RICH, ADRIENNE. 1986. "Notes Towards a Politics of Location." In *Blood, Bread and Poetry: Selected Prose, 1979–1985*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- RODRIGUEZ, ILEANA. 1994. *House, Garden, Nation: Space, Gender and Ethnicity in Postcolonial Latin American Literatures by Women*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
- ROSSELLI, JOHN. 1980. "The Self-Image of Effeteness: Physical Education and Nationalism in Nineteenth-Century Bengal." *Past and Present* 86 (February): 121–48.
- SANGARI, KUMKUM. 1993. "Relating Histories: Definitions of Literacy, Literature, Gender in Early Nineteenth Century Calcutta and England." In *Rethinking English: Essays in Literature, Language, History*, edited by Svati Joshi. New Delhi: Trianka.
- . 1991. "The Politics of the Possible," In *Interrogating Modernity: Culture and Colonialism in India*, edited by T. Niranjana, P. Sudhir and V. Dhareshwar. Calcutta: Seagull.

- SARKAR, TANIKA. 1993. "A Book of her Own. A Life of Her Own: Autobiography of a Nineteenth-Century Woman." *History Workshop Journal* 36 : 35–65.
- SINHA, MRINALINI. 1996. "Gender in the Critiques of Colonialism and Nationalism: Locating the 'Indian Woman.'" In *Feminism and History*, edited by Joan Wallach Scott. New York: Oxford University Press.
- STEEDMAN, CAROLYN. 1987. *Landscape for a Good Woman: A Story of Two Lives*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.
- . 1995. "Inside, Outside, Other: Accounts of National Identity in the Nineteenth Century." *History of the Human Sciences* 8(4): 59–76.
- SYAL, MEERA. 1996. *Anita and Me*. London: Flamingo.
- TARLO, EMMA. 1996. *Clothing Matters: Dress and Identity in India*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- THARU, SUSIE, and K. LALITA, eds. 1991. *Women Writing in India 600 B. C. to the Present*, vol. 1, *600 B. C. to the Early Twentieth Century*. New York: The Feminist Press, 1991.
- VISWESWARAN, KAMALA. 1996. "Small Speeches, Subaltern Gender: Nationalist Ideology and its Historiography." In *Subaltern Studies IX*, edited by Shahid Amin and Dipesh Chakrabarty. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- WALSH, JUDITH. 1983. *Growing Up in British India: Indian Autobiographers on Childhood and Education under the Raj*. New York: Holmes and Meier.
- WILEY, CATHERINE, and FIONA R. BARNES, eds. 1996. *Homemaking: Women Writers and the Poetics of Home*. New York: Garland.
- YUNG, JUDY. 1995. *Unbound Feet: A Social History of Chinese Women in San Francisco*. Berkeley: University of California Press.