

The Jewel in the Crown by Paul Scott

A Matter of Point of View

Asst. prof. Munthir A. Sabik, Phd., English Dept., College of Arts

University of Baghdad

Abstract

Paul Scott (1920-1978), a British novelist who served in the British Army in India during the Second World War and remained there during the turbulent years that preceded the Independence of India and the Partition in 1947. He revisited India in the '60s, and like his narrator in *The Jewel in the Crown*, accumulated enough material for his Raj Quartet. With the publication of this Quartet his reputation began to soar so loftily that he was regarded a major novelist and was awarded many prizes including the Booker Prize.

Scott's virtuosity in his skilful use of the various points of view, which increases the joy and interest of his readers immensely, is the subject of this paper. It might seem long, but in dealing with a work of the scope of an epic in prose, how can one manage to be brief and succinct?

**The Jewel in the Crown by Paul Scott
A Matter of Point of View**

Paul Scott (1920-1978), like his namesake and predecessor Walter Scott (1771-1832), was intrinsically a poet, but a staunch admirer of history as well. In his letters, essays, and fiction, Scott underscored Ralph Waldo Emerson's essay "History"—especially Emerson's statement that "Man is explicable by no less than all his history." (qtd. in Reece, 9) In his "Introduction" to *The Heart of Midlothian* by Walter Scott, David Daiches explains that Sir Walter is too often thought nowadays as "an historical novelist whose romantic love of the past enabled him to produce picturesque accounts of the adventures of knights and ladies in olden times" (v), but, in

fact, his historical novels were not his best “—they were often, ..., potboilers which he wrote in the intervals between major inspirations... [for] sorely needed money.” Daiches concludes:

Scott’s real interest as a novelist was not in the glittering surface of the Age of Chivalry, nor in the mere picturesqueness of history, but in the ways in which the past impinged on the present and in the effects of that impact on human character. (V)

Ironically, Daiches seems to delineate Paul’s, not Walter’s, talent when he asserts that “Scott, in his best novels, examined characters and incidents from the transitional period of his country’s history.” But he adds, more ironically (to the purpose of this paper):

Scott looks at his country a generation after the Treaty of Union [Scotland with England] and finds characters and incidents that will provide what T. S. Eliot has called an “objective correlative” of his emotions about it at that stage in history. (VII)

Likewise, Paul Scott, was deeply involved in that transitional period of his country when the British Empire began to decline in India, and like Sir Walter “he was not interested merely in history or merely in character, but in the degree to which one illuminates the other.” (Daiches, “Introduction”, VII) In stating the theme of *The Heart of Midlothian* (1818) by Sir W. Scott, Daiches states exactly the theme of Paul Scott’s *The Raj Quartet*, and especially *The Jewel in the Crown*: “The impact of history on individual personality and ambitions—this is [Walter] Scott’s real theme.” (Ibid., XIII)

Luckily, Paul Scott commented on the composition of his tetralogy, stressing the essence of his story; “*The Jewel in the Crown* is about an English girl called Daphne Manners who falls in love with an Anglicized Indian called Hari Kumar.” He expatiates on his blend of fact and fiction:

Here is a blend of fact and fiction. The riots are real. The historical and political scenes are factual. The dramatic situation of the criminal assault, the

arrests, the treatment of prisoners, is imaginary. But it is based very broadly on fact. (Quoted in Agatucci, 3)

Scott does not merely blend and tell a medley of fact and fiction; he takes in consideration the extremely different points of view of various characters, historical as well as fictional. Of the landmarks of British rule of India, the Amritsar Massacre of 1919, perpetrated by General Dyer and his troops has dominated the collective conscience of Indians ever since. Yet, Scott affirms his objectivity of point of view:

... I must try to see things—in this case, from Dyer’s point of view—from the point of view of the [English] ladies who collected L26,000 [for Dyer’s treatment], and from the point of view of the unfortunate [Indian] men and women and children whose sufferings roused them emotionally, to take an intensely narrow and personal view which in turn led them to take unjust or unworthy actions, themselves. (Quoted in Agatucci, 4)

But how did Scott manage to have the “feel” of the Indian situation during those turbulent years (1942-1947) in Indian history? Paul Mark Scott was born on 25 March, 1920 in Palmer’s Green, a suburb of North London. The younger of two sons of commercial artists, Tom and Frances Scott, he attended Winchmore Hill Collegiate School until the family’s poor financial status forced him to leave, at age sixteen. (Nichols, 1) This was a bitter experience for Scott, for he had aspired from an early age to a future in the arts; this Dickensian mishap darkened his world view and influenced his writing all his life; it also added to “the tension between being a breadwinner and an artist.” (Balkman, 1) Under pressure from his father he trained as accountant with a firm in Regent Street, despite “his earliest inclinations ... towards branches of the arts, including poetry.” (Childs, 1)

In 1940, he was called up for national service in Britain as a non-commissioned officer working in intelligence. Later he was posted to a supply unit; he served in India, Malaya, and Burma until 1946, “spending the last months after the end of the war getting to know the Indian life that

would be the major setting of nearly all of his fiction.” (Childs, 1) Sally Nichols describes what Scott experienced in India:

By the time he arrived it was the beginning of the end of the British Raj in India. He was as surprised at the superior attitude he observed in the British toward their Indian subjects as he was of the hostile and resentful attitude of the Indian population toward the British, issues Scott was to explore in detail in his later novels. (Nichols, 1)

Back in England after demobilisation, he was appointed to the post of book-keeper and secretary at a publishing company, Falcon and Grey Walls Press. In 1950 Scott resigned and became a literary agent for a firm that would evolve into David Higham Associates; among his clients were Muriel Spark, M. M. Kaye, and John Braine. Childs concludes: “Scott eventually became a director of the company before he bravely decided to resign his job to write full-time in 1960” (1). By this time, Childs adds, he had four novels published, although the first he had written, *Johnnie Sahib* (1952) was not accepted soon (Ibid.). By the time he wrote *The Mark of the Warrior* (1958), an army adventure set in the forests of western India, not dissimilar to *Johnnie Sahib*, and was probably written in order to recapture the later success of that novel, Scott was convinced that he had to take writing full-time if he was to improve as author. Childs sums up: “signs of the future development are evident in Scott’s fourth novel in its split narrative perspective and its use of dramatic reconstruction of past events” (1).

During this time as devoted writer, Scott visited India; he returned to India in 1964, and during that visit he conceived the raw material he needed to write his next five novels, all of which centred on the end of British rule in India. The first four novels: *The Jewel in the Crown* (1966), *The Day of the Scorpion* (1968), *The Towers of Silence* (1971), and *The Division of the Spoils* (1975), comprise *The Raj Quartet*. The fifth and final novel, *Staying On* (1977), which was a sequel to *The Raj Quartet*, deals with the lives of the British who chose to remain in India after the independence. Scott was awarded the Yorkshire Post book of the year prize for finest fiction in 1971

for The Towers of Silence and the Booker Prize for Staying On and The Jewel in the Crown. Scott was too sick to receive his award, and died from cancer on March 1, 1978.

So Scott, a British writer, became best-known for his The Raj Quartet; The Jewel in the Crown, the first novel of the Quartet, describes from different points of view the events that led to the end of the British rule in India. Scott was only noted as a master of his craft quite late in life; in The Jewel he wields the various points of view so subtly that his reader hardly senses the change from one stance to the other. Piecing together the evidence of various witnesses of what happened, like a jigsaw puzzle, is the usual method used in detective and suspense novels; Scott uses this manner to enhance the effect of his realism. To offset the obvious dangers of this realism, Scott warns his readers: "This is a work of fiction. All the characters are imaginary." (Jewel, 8) Although Scott keeps the readers on tenterhooks till the end of his book when the journal of Daphne Manners is divulged, he discloses the core of the story at the very beginning:

This is the story of a rape, of events that led up to it and followed it and of the place in which it happened. There are the action, the people, and the place; all of which are interrelated but in their totality incommunicable in isolation from the moral continuum of human affairs. (Jewel, 9)

Before this, like Thomas Hardy in The Return of the Native (1878) in which the image of the "solitary figure", "queen of solitude", Eustacia, opens the story and dominates it till she faces her tragic end, Scott begins his story with the image of a running girl. Scott's narrator addresses the reader:

Imagine, then, a flat landscape, dark for the moment, but even so conveying to a girl running in the still deeper shadow cast by the wall of the Bibighar Gardens an idea of immensity, of distance, such as years before Miss Crane had been conscious of standing where a lane ended and cultivation began; a different landscape but also in the alluvial plain between the mountains of the north and the plateau of the south. (Jewel, 9)

Like Eustacia, Miss Manners dominates the whole story, but unlike her, Daphne Manners is awkward, short-sighted, plain young woman. Yet she wins the reader's heart, at least because he searches her heart and soul through her letters and journal, and Hari Kumar's also. Like Adela Quested in *A Passage to India* (1924) whom she resembles in her plainness, Daphne Manners is newly arrived in India, without the racial snobbery of the other Anglo-Indians around her. (Childs, 1)

Like Forster's *A Passage to India*, accusations of rape parallel with the reality of colonialism and issues of class and race, but Scott categorically denied any direct influence from Forster. Robert Barnard, in *A Short History of English Literature* (1987) comments on this apparent similarity:

Thus the Quartet begins with daring, for what author would not fear comparison with Forster's *A Passage to India*? (202)

In the course of the later novels, after *The Jewel in the Crown*, he adds, the events open out, but the rape remains insistently at the back of things. He concludes by stressing a remarkable difference:

In his reappraisal of the British imperial role, Scott has no time for the bull-headed, prejudiced stereotypes who represent British officialdom in Forster's book. (Barnard, 202)

Scott's "daring" leads him to use the expression "passage to India" many times in his novel, as if this expression was inherited through E. M. Forster from Walt Whitman's famous poem "Passage to India".

Daphne's rape, according to the narrator, sets the chain of violent reactions on both sides; it takes place on the night of August 9th, 1942, in Mayapore. The narrator, called 'the stranger', adds that the incident of the rape:

... ended with the spectacle of two nations in violent opposition, not for the first time nor as yet the last because they were then still locked in an

imperial embrace of such long standing and subtlety it was no longer possible for them to know whether they hated or loved one another, or what it was that held them together and seemed to have confused the image of their separate entities. (Jewel, 9)

Scott, in addition to using a host of images throughout his work, is fond of the word 'image' itself as in the quoted passage above; Childs affirms that "The Birds of Paradise (1962), picks up a strong and suggestive use of symbols from The Chinese Love Pavilion (1960), and from then on 'the image' became Scott's fundamental fictional building-block." (2)

Scott differs from Forster in the period covered by the respective novels, for Forster's story ends early at the beginning of the twentieth-century with the hopeless meeting between Aziz and Fielding, with the former asserting that Indian-British friendship in the prevalent situation is impossible. Fielding, Forster's spokesman for mutual understanding, co-operation, and anti-colonialism, asks Aziz: "Why can't we be friends now? ... It's what I want. It is what you want." The latter shouts vehemently:

Down with the English anyhow. That's certain. Clear out, you fellows, double quick, double quick, I say. We may hate one another, but we hate you most. If I don't make you go, Ahmed will, Karim will, if it's fifty or five hundred years we shall get rid of you, yes, we shall drive every blasted Englishman into the sea, and then ... and then ... you and I shall be friends." (Forster, A Passage to India, 312)

This is quite prophetic, for actually the "Quit India" movement started less than fifty years later, and Scott seems to have taken his cue from this exhortation and began his story where Forster stopped. Moreover, while Forster deals with Anglo-India long before independence, Scott's work deals mainly with the turbulent '40s; his "stranger", the narrator, arrives in India 1964 to meet some of the still-living characters, such as Lady Chatterjee and Mr. Strinivasan, the lawyer, and carries on the investigation.

But the main difference is in the point of view, in the technical sense of the expression; Forster chose to stick to one omniscient, omnipresent narrator with some sporadic authorial intrusions. Scott elected to use similar narrator only to fill the gaps between one eye-witness and another; he keeps changing his point of view, sometimes so imperceptibly that he cheats his reader; Mr. White, the District Deputy Commissioner, writes to the narrator:

I have had a letter from Lili Chatterjee, and gather it is from you she got my address. She tells me that at the end of your stay in Mayapore this year, she delivered into your hands, as well as two letters, a journal written by Miss Manners during the time she lived with her aunt in Kashmere, awaiting the birth of the child. (Jewel, 335)

Robin White, representing the civil authority in the area, is writing to the narrator, commenting on Brigadier Reid's journal, thus collating civil with military points of view of the same period and area, and speaks directly to the narrator in his own voice.

Before that, the reader is provided with extracts from "the unpublished memories of Brigadier A. V. Reid, DSO, MC: 'A Simple Life'." Reid is a professional English military officer, a devoted field commander, who abhors staff (office) work. He leads his brigade into the area surrounding Mayapore in preparation for counter-insurgency operations. As a professional soldier, he confesses, he has limited perception of the politics of the situation; that is why he elects for military action to quash any disturbance and suppress any sign of disobedience on the part of Indians; Mr. White prefers to pacify the situation and play things down. Reading these extracts, written in mild jargon of the British army, one remembers Scott's own military background in India during those same years of turmoil that Reid is reminiscing of:

Unfortunately I found White—the Deputy Commissioner—not wholly alive to the situation I believed might face us if Indian leaders were allowed to continue to speak out against the war effort and rouse the masses to adopt a

policy of what Mr. Ghandi called non-violent non-co-operation, a policy that could bring the country to a standstill. (Jewel, 387)

Again, Daiches describes Sir Walter Scott's kind of characterisation which applies verbatim to Paul Scott:

One could take character after character and show how each could be related to Scott's main concern with the impact of the past on the present and the relation of both to individual psychology. ("Introduction", X)

Brigadier Reid, whose name is General Dyer of Amritsar in reverse, might have been thought a despicable authoritarian commander whose main tactics is the use of force for the most trivial reasons. Robin White, reading an extract from the unpublished memoirs of the now late Brigadier Reid "describing his relationship with the civil authority of Mayapore in 1942," comments to the "stranger" that from the military point of view Reid's account is a viable "reconstruction of what happened." But, from

the civil point of view there are of course some inaccuracies, or anyway gaps in the narrative or alternative interpretations, that would need attention if a more general and impersonal picture were required to emerge.

On the whole civil officers were much better informed about Indian affairs than their opposite members in the military. In the later stages of our administration it would have been rare to find in the civil a man of Reid's political simplicity. (Jewel, 333-4, 338)

White wonders at "how [Reid manages] to make everything that happened look logical in his own terms." (Jewel, 337)

The narrative points of view, according to Tom Gibbons in his Literature and Awareness (1979), are almost endless; in addition to the first-person and third-person narratives, he elaborates, there are a great number of poems and novels which employ more than one narrator:

Chaucer's Canterbury Tales is a series of stories told by a variety of narrators, with linking statements by the third-person narrator, while Browning's long poem The Ring and the Book employs a series of first-person narrators of the central incident in which they are involved (32).

The Jewel in the Crown has an obscure, "stranger"/narrator, like Chaucer's narrator, who is so humble that he is treated insultingly by every pilgrim to Canterbury, and like Browning's poem, has a "series of first-person narrators" as witnesses to the "Bibighar Affair".

Gibbons singles out the concept of "distance" as a very likely consideration for the author to choose his point of view; he explains his idea thus:

"Distance", in this context, refers to the degree of sympathy or antipathy which the reader is invited to feel towards a particular character or characters. (35)

As a general rule, Gibbons informs us, an 'internal' presentation of a character which is detailed and fully developed and portrays that character's supposed inner thoughts and feelings "particularly by means of direct or narrated interior monologue in novels and poems, or soliloquies in plays, is likely to make the reader sympathize and identify with 'him' or 'her'." Gibbons concludes compendiously:

Were we allowed to share the inner thoughts and feelings of the 'villain' in a play or a novel for example ..., we would probably begin to find that 'he' was human like ourselves, with the same human problems, the same hesitations, and the same human mixture of good and bad points in his mental make-up. And then, of course, he would cease to be a villain (35).

Ronald Merrick, the District Superintendent of Police, as the villain of the piece, is never given an opportunity to express his thoughts or feelings; in opposition, Daphne Manners is granted ample chance in her letters and journal. Brigadier Reid is in between these two extremes; he impresses White with his logic, but moves the reader as loving husband and devoted

father; eventually, both his wife and son die. Before her death, she is lying sick, in bed, and although she does not demur against his re-posting in Mayapore, Reid says: “our parting was far from easy.” His senior in command, Tubby, promises to recall him in case of emergency, “but this did not prove to be possible.” He writes:

I shall not write her name again. Goodbye Meg, cherished wife and mother of my children. God willing, we shall be reunited in a happier place. (Jewel, 296)

Before this moving valediction, Reid remembers his good, old days in Mayapore when he first arrived there to have the “feel” of India and to acquire “a sense of oneness with the country [India] and a feeling of identification with our aspirations for her.” He reminisces:

I remembered Meg as she had been in my thoughts then, all those years ago, so calm, so collected, kind and generous, ever ready with a smile—to me the most beautiful girl in the world. And I thought of our son, Alan, and of our daughter Caroline—safe now from Nazi or Japanese frightfulness. (Jewel, 290)

The logical inference is that a loving husband and devoted father can hardly act as a villain, lashing other people unmercifully and dispassionately. It is his earnest conviction that his English “countrymen [have] already laid down their lives to protect India from both Nazi and Japanese tyranny,” that is why he begins his address to his “battalion of ‘modern’ young English lads ... those immortal lines of the soldier’s poet Rudyard Kipling:

—it’s Tommy this, an’ Tommy that, an’

’Tommy fall be’ind’,

But it’s ‘please to walk in front, sir,’ when

there’s trouble in the wind—” (Jewel, 298)

Characteristically, he is happy with his choice of Kipling’s stanza, for he supposes “a psychologist would say that [he] couldn’t have chosen a better

way of putting the situation to them!” (Jewel, 298) White, in contrast, relishes other poets; when he meets the Indian Minister of Education, the latter discovers that he shares with him:

a love of Shakespeare, Mr. Dryden and the novelist Henry James, as well as a concern for the Government Higher School ... they enjoyed a disagreement about Mr. Rudyard Kipling whom Mr. White thought poorly of ... (Jewel, 196)

Ronald Merrick, self-made, lower-middle class young man, to Barnard “a British villain ... a repressed, perverted, disturbing creation” (202), and to Balkman “The Quartet principal villain (perhaps the most finely drawn villain in English fiction)” (3) is excluded from any narrative perspective; Childs summarises his role:

It is in fact Merrick who dominates the four novels [of the Raj] as a driving figure, an animus who is never off-stage for very long and who is the main catalyst for events even though he is pointedly the one character from whose perspective the reader never sees the story. (3)

Balkman sees that Scott’s ability to be compassionate at the individual level and at the same time to despise and savage a class system that produced such men and women made him “critical to the depth of characterization he achieves in the Raj Quartet,” and concludes:

Only an author who knew from personal experience how mixed is any one individual’s goodness or evil, could create heroes as human and villain’s as capable of provoking sympathy as are the heroes and villains of the Raj Quartet. (2-3)

So even this villain, Merrick, is not purely wicked; he is as human at times as to take good care of Daphne Manners and to feel jealous of Hari Kumar, because she loves him. Conversely, Miss Manners is not blind to this human side of Ronald Merrick, even when she turns his proposal down. She writes to her aunt, Ethel Manners: “I like him better than I used to. I can’t

close my eyes to the fact that he's been kind and considerate. It is his manner that's against him ...". (Jewel, 109) Moreover, she tells her aunt what she has been thinking about Merrick:

People don't like you much, but you are fundamentally kind, and that's why you and I have got surprisingly well. ... Our friendship meant a lot to him. (Jewel, 112)

Next to Ronald Merrick comes his rival in love for Daphne Manners; "Hari is the perfect English gentleman in every way, except that he is Indian." (Childs, 1) After his father's death in England, Hari returns to India with no money from a privileged life there; a taciturn, he is unable to naturalise easily to the custom, weather, and people of India. He sets so much store on his Englishness, but he is ignored by English people there, as well as Indians. He is a tragic figure who thinks of England as "home". He keeps in contact with this "home" by corresponding with Lindsey, his schoolmate in Chillingborough in England, but he is ignored even by this putative brother, when he arrives in India to serve with the British Army. This sets the chain of frustrations for Hari, for he is taken drunk by Sister Ludmila (a Russian woman, partly based on the famous Mother Theresa of Calcutta) to her Sanctuary where she tends the sick and dying who are not cared for by the regular hospitals. Hari Kumar is brought there and his first fateful meeting with Merrick occurs the following morning when Merrick comes to make enquiries at the sanctuary. They immediately rile at each other; Merrick is incensed by the fact that Miss Manners prefers Hari, for he is more her "class", as Merrick thinks. (Childs, 1)

Though blind now and thought mad by people, her memory is fresh and her insight without limit; she sees through her interviewer the narrator/ investigator: "Your voice is that of a man to whom the Bibighar is not an end in itself. ..." She tells him of the night when she:

brought the limp body of young Mr. Coomer back to the sanctuary. Coomer. Harry Coomer. Sometimes it was spelled Kumar. And Harry was spelled Hari. He was a black-haired deep brown boy, a creature of the dark.

Handsome. Such sinews. I saw him without his shirt, washing at the pump. ... To hear him speak you might think him Coomer. But to see him, well, Coomer was impossible. And the name of course was rightly Kumar. He told me once that he had become invisible to white people. But I saw white women, how they watched him on the sly. He was handsome in the western way, in spite of his dark skin. (Jewel, 133-4)

This is as precise a character sketch of Hari Kumar as could be, concise, succinct, and to the point. As both of them, Kumar and Merrick, are linked closely in her mind to the Bibighar affair, she renders another character sketch of Merrick, as if to provide a workable foil for Kumar:

The policeman saw him too, I always suspected the policeman. Blond, also good-looking, also he had sinews, his arms were red and covered with fine blond hair, and his eyes were blue, the pale blue of a child's doll; he looked right, but he did not smell right. (Jewel, 134)

The "Englishness" of Kumar, it must be noted, proves to be a liability, not an asset, in his relationship with Ronald Merrick, a very troublesome and prickly one. And, of course, with his own fellow countrymen, the Indians, as well; they despise him for it.

Because of the method used by Scott to tell his story, that of the multiple point of view, we see Hari Kumar through different eyes of the narrators/witnesses. And the story keeps its interest because each witness renders a fresh, peculiar view of this tragic figure. Scott was not absolutely original, in that of using a multiplicity of view-point; there had been so many predecessors who set this mode in practice. The most obvious antecedent is Emily Brontë's *Wuthering Heights* (1847); before her, and long after her, English novelists mostly adopted one of the two principal methods: the autobiographical and the omnipresent and omniscient on-looker. A. C. Ward, in his "Introduction" to the Longman's edition (1967), states that this novel is "perhaps the greatest novel in the English language," for Emily Brontë, who was original in everything she did, adopted a method

which was entirely her own, though a few later writers—Joseph Conrad for example—have since experienced along rather similar lines (XXVII).

Had Mr. Ward read Scott's Quartet, he would have added another example, though Henry James did the same in some of his novels, such as *The Turn of the Screw* (1898).

With Lili Chatterjee, her Indian god-aunt, she loses all her inhibition, weeps, and cries like a child: "I want him. I want him. Bring him back to me, Auntie. Please help to bring him back." (Jewel, 468) Thus, she dies, like Catherine, whose soul haunts *Wuthering Heights* ever since, echoing:

Nelly, I am Heathcliff! He's always, always in my mind: not as a pleasure, any more than I am always a pleasure to myself, but as my own being. (*Wuthering Heights*, 85-6)

Hari Kumar, the most reticent character, occupies not only Daphne Manners' heart, but the whole of Part Five of *The Jewel in the Crown* as well; his life story is related by the "stranger", as omniscient and omnipresent narrator; it begins with a tragedy in England:

When Hari Kumar's father died of an overdose of sleeping pills in Edinburgh and the lawyers told him that there wasn't even enough money to pay in full what was owed to Mr. and Mrs. Carter who ran the house in Berkshire he rang the Lindseys and asked them what they thought he should do . . . They said he must come over to Didbury right away and stay with them. (Jewel, 210)

Harry Commer, as he was called in England, "spent most of his vacations with the Lindseys. Their son Colin was his oldest friend" (Jewel, 210); this same Colin will later ignore him in Mayapore, India. His father, Duleep, chose his name for a historical reason:

Hari was so easily pronounced and was really only distinguishable in the spelling from the diminutive of Saxon Harold, who had been King of the English before the Normans came. (Jewel, 211)

Hari gets his fair share of the limelight, for he is second only to Miss Manners in being a major character; that is why we are told his story from the beginning of his father's, Duleep's, childhood, marriage, and passage to England. Not only that, but Scott shows ingenuity and virtuosity in his characterisation by interconnecting his various characters, by different means:

The story is that Duleep Kumar, against the wishes and with only the reluctant permission of his parents, went to England to study the law, just about the same time that Miss Crane left the service of the Nesbitt-Smiths and entered the fuller service of the mission, about the same time, too, that there died, in a penury as great if not as spectacular as Duleep's, the mother of the young girl who then entered an orphanage and in later years called herself Sister Ludmila. (Jewel, 211-2)

Miss Crane and Sister Ludmila are charity workers; they serve Indian people earnestly, the first in the field of education, and the latter in providing refuge for the dying derelicts. But their characters are not depicted and their stories told for their charity alone; they serve, in addition, as witnesses for the "Bibighar Affair" and people related to it. And from them we learn more about the triangular relationship of Daphne Manners, Kumar, and Merrick.

To her school in Ranpur Miss Crane has brought from Muzzafarabad a picture entitled The Jewel in Her Crown, representing "Disraeli holding up a parchment map of India to which he [points] with obvious pride but tactful humility." Miss Crane explains to the children at the school (here is a spate of Anglo-Indian history):

the jewel of the title [is] India itself, which had been transferred from the rule of the British East India Company to the rule of the British crown in 1858, the year after the Mutiny the picture had been painted after 1877, the year in which Victoria was persuaded by Mr. Disraeli to adopt the title Empress of India. (Jewel, 27)

Of course, Miss Crane, on her journeys to and from school, sees and nods to, “but never speak[s] to the white woman—said to be mad—who dressed like a nun, kept a refuge for the sick and the dying and was called Sister Ludmila by the Indians.” (Jewel, 35) She herself is thought of as “cranky about the [Indian] natives” (Jewel, 39) by the English ladies in the Civil Lines of Mayapore. She meets Ronald Merrick at the club, but although “Lady Chatterjee [is] the leader of Indian society in Mayapore, Miss Crane scarcely [knows] her,” (Jewel, 41) and she comes to know that

a Manners girl, Daphne, a niece of Sir Henry, rather plain, big-boned and as yet unmarried, [is] working in the hospital at Mayapore for the war effort and living in the MacGregor House as Lady Chatterjee’s guest. (Jewel, 43)

On her way to Tanpur to visit the mission school there she is intercepted by Indian villagers who are rioting; they argue with Chaudhuri, her school-teacher, and shouting Ghandi’s famous slogan “Quit India!” they kill him and burn the car, after turning it over. Later, she is found by Mr. Paulson, an assistant of Mr. White, sitting on the side of the road, in the rain, holding the hand of her dead Indian teacher; in a daze, she is taken to the General Hospital in Mayapore. With this serious incident, the English begin to see the seriousness of the situation. They, in fact, panic taking extra-cautionary measures.

There was, to begin with, the story of Miss Crane, although that was almost immediately lost sight of following the rape of the English girl in the Bibighar Gardens on the night of August 9th, at the hour when Miss Crane was lying in the first delirium of pneumonia in a bed in the Mayapore General Hospital. (Jewel, 70)

These two incidents especially the Bibighar Gardens affair, spark off worse riots than have been planned, for, although the Deputy commissioner, Mr. White, has arrested on the morning of August 9, 1942, some of Ghandi’s followers, those “were the right ones to be arrested,” but the action taken in regard to the Bibighar Gardens affair had caused worse disorders than the civil disobedience that was stopped by the arrests. (Jewel, 70)

Despite her plight, Miss Crane, like Daphne later, refuses to identify or indicate the Indians who have attacked her; English people, and especially women, wonder whether she is “over-zealous in the business of being fair at all costs to the bloody blacks.” (Jewel, 71)

At this juncture, the narrator begins to focus on Miss Crane’s consciousness to tell the reader of her feeling and idea of the gravity of the situation. The narrator uses the expression “she knew” to tell us her “stream of consciousness,” indirectly; and, of course, there is this subtle enmeshing of characters:

Mr. White was said to have lost his head and handed Mayapore over to the control of the local Brigade Commander [Reid]. (Jewel, 71)

Again Scott’s narrator carries over his creator’s wish to blend actual historical fact with his realistic fiction; the riots taking place at this time and the way they are suppressed are not unlike what preceded the Amritsar Massacre in 1919. The character of Miss Crane is based, at least in part, on that of Marcella Sherwood, an English Superintendent, the attack on whom ignited the “Amritsar Incident”. (Childs, 1)

She heard Indians say, although she had tried not to listen, that in those few days of Brigadier Reid, things had been almost as bad as in the days of General Dyer in Amritsar in 1919. There had not been any indiscriminate shooting of unarmed civilians, but there had been, apart from controlled shootings and consequent deaths, the forcible feeding with beef ... of six Hindu youths who were suspected or guilty of the rape in the Bibighar Gardens. (Jewel, 71)

Consequently, Edwina Crane takes down “the picture of the old Queen [Victoria] and lock[s] it away, in the chest, against the time when there might, remotely, be an occasion to put it back again.” (Jewel, 73)

Next to Miss Crane, Lady Chatterjee is introduced after a brief description of the setting of the main action; she lives at the MacGregor House not very far

from the Bibighar Gardens. It is, most characteristically, introduced as an image; the narrator begins thus:

Next, there is the image of a garden: not the Bibighar garden but the garden of the MacGregor House: intense sunlight, deep and complex shadows. (Jewel, 74)

The house and the garden are imported from the world of the Arabian Nights where:

Scheherazade told stories to postpone the hour of her execution. The singer sang to guard her honour. When the singer died the prince grieved. People said he died of a broken heart. (Jewel, 75)

The house was “rebuilt by a red-faced Scottish nabob called MacGregor who feared God and favoured Muslims, and was afraid of temples.”

The story goes that he burnt the Bibighar to the ground because it had been an abomination. He died at the hands of mutinous Sepoys. (Jewel, 75)

The House is haunted by the ghost of Janet MacGregor, the young wife who “comes dressed in the fashion of the times and stands on the verandah, swaying to and fro, as if nursing her dead baby, but her arms are empty. There is blood on her bodice.” (Jewel, 75) This ghost foreshadows the appearance later of Daphne Manners, after her rape at the Bibighar Gardens, with blood on her face and hysteria in her heart, not unlike this ghost:

It was on the stone steps leading to the verandah that the girl [Daphne Manners] stumbled at the end of her headlong flight in the dark from the Bibighar Gardens; stumbled, fell, and crawled on her hands and knees the rest of the way to safety and into the history of a troubled period. (Jewel, 76)

At this point, the narrator gives in, deferring to lady Chatterjee, who begins her story with “Yes, I remember Miss Crane” (Jewel, 76); their meeting takes place after the independence, for she tells him that when the constitution stated that India is a “secular state”:

we finally put the lid on our Indian-ness, and admitted the legality of our long years of living in sin with the English. Our so-called independence was rather like a shot-gun wedding. (Jewel, 79)

In the midst of her intimate talk to the narrator she surprises him by her news: “my great-niece Parvati [is] playing the tamboura and singing a morning or evening raga[.] Well, of course you have seen her. But have you understood yet who she is?” (Jewel, 70)

Parvati, training to be a singer, is the love-child of Daphne and Hari; she replaces the dead Indian singer for whom the edifice was built originally by “a prince who conceived a passion for a singer of classical music.” (Jewel, 76) The novel ends with the music of this young girl cavorting in the MacGregor House:

This is the last image then—the MacGregor House—in which there are sounds of occupation other than those made by Lili and Parvati ... These sounds are ones that the casual visitor will today attribute to Parvati’s presence, not the mother’s. But Parvati steps lightly and breaks nothing (except perhaps a young man’s heart). (Jewel, 479)

Now the ghost of Daphne Manners glides around the MacGregor House, hand in hand with Janet MacGregor; the first looking after her Parvati, the latter nursing her baby in her arms. Lili Chatterjee, Nello Chatterjee’s widow, remains “the repository of a tradition established for the sake of the future rather than the past.” (Jewel, 479) Parvati is an inter-racially bred girl, for her “skin is the palest brown and in certain lights her long dark hair reveals a redness more familiar in the north.” (Jewel, 480) With her liveliness and robustness she carries the story further on into the Quartet, an “image” of mixed parentage.

Again the narrator overtakes the story to tell readers that of the quartet of admirable ladies who have overcome the barriers of colour of the skin, “only Lili Chatterjee survives to recall directly the placid as well as the desperate occasions,” and, of course, museums which “arrest history in its turbulent

progress,” thus “the MacGregor House.” As to the fate of other major participants in this Anglo-Indian drama, he resumes his tale:

Of the other actors Reid has gone, and the girl and young Kumar into oblivion, probably changing his name once more. The Whites and the Poulsons and young Ronald Merrick seem to be lost, temporarily at least, in the anonymity of time or other occupation. Miss Crane set fire to herself. They are the chance victims of the hazards of a colonial ambition. (Jewel, 82)

Suddenly, Lili Chatterjee resumes her talk: “When I first saw Daphne ... she struck me as, well, good-natured but inept. She was big and rather clumsy. She was always dropping things.” (Jewel, 83) Then the narrator takes his story over, to relate some of the history of the house and its residents: “Lili Chatterjee was [Sir Nello’s] second wife, fifteen years his junior Nello was Lili’s second husband.” (Jewel, 83) Then Lili resumes her narration, “(she says)” commenting on Crane’s name:

Miss Crane. A bird with long legs and elongated neck trying to flap its way out of danger, too slowly, you know, like in slow motion at the movies. (Jewel, 85)

Like her creator, Lady Chatterjee thinks fondly of Miss Crane as an image, but tells the story of how she visits her at the Purdah Hospital, being snubbed by its workers, despite the fact that she has been awarded the title “Lady” after her husband’s knighthood was granted him by the English themselves. (Jewel, 87-92)

Lili takes the “stranger” to “the room where Miss Manners slept and which she still calls Daphne’s room;” (Jewel, 95) there, in the desk he finds “the letters Miss Manners wrote to her aunt Lady Manners, who afterwards gave” to her and she, in turn, gives to the narrator with a warning: “They do not resurrect the writer.” (Jewel, 96) Two of these letters are included in the novel by which the reader is informed of Daphne’s feelings and ideas of her daily life at the MacGregor House and Mayapore, but especially of her temporary association with Merrick, his proposal, and his warning of

association with “young Kumar”. The second letter she ends with a promise to tell her aunt about Hari Kumar and Sister Ludmila, and tells her of her visit the following morning to the local Hindu temple. (Jewel, 102-116) After perusing these letters, Lili tells the “stranger” that on the night of the rape when Daphne was late and Merrick came to ask where she might be, and if she had been with Kumar; she tried her best to balk and divert his attention from her association with Kumar by asking him about hysteric Crane. (Jewel, 118-9) To her best knowledge they were meeting at the Sanctuary of Sister Ludmila, but she did not divulge any details. She relates to the stranger:

Mr. Merrick had always disliked Kumar and I have to confess that my own feelings towards him were mixed. It always seemed to me that he had too big a chip on his shoulder. And he was in some trouble once. Mr. Merrick had had him in for questioning [from the Sanctuary]. (Jewel, 119-20)

Before the ‘stranger’ leaves to meet Mr. Strinivasan, Lili provides him with all she has already known of Kumar:

Anyhow I asked young Kumar round one evening because my curiosity had been aroused and that’s how he came into my life, or rather into Daphne’s life. (Jewel, 120)

She seems to have full perception of Kumar’s tragic situation in life. His father, she tells the stranger, had tremendous plans for him, but the plans collapsed when he died a bankrupt; consequently, poor Hari was sent home to Mayapore, “only of course it wasn’t home to him.” He was two years old when his father took him to England and eighteen when he came back. He spoke like an English boy, and acted like one. Thought like one, she adds, and:

They say that when he first reached India he was spelling his name the way his father had spelled it. Coomer. Harry Coomer. But probably his aunt [Shalini, his father’s youngest sister] stopped that. [She spoilt him,] letting him waste his time which also meant letting him have time to brood about his bard luck. (Jewel, 120)

This, she says, worried her a bit, “the way Daphne seemed to take to him, worried me, because I couldn’t be sure whether he felt quite the same way about her.” She, as god-parent of Daphne, had at the time her own reservation, and both Daphne and Kumar knew this. She confesses that part of the responsibility for what happened was hers for she “should have come right out with it,” but she did not. She blames herself for the “note of furtiveness that crept into what Mr. Merrick called the association between Kumar and Daphne.” (Jewel, 120) She thinks that Daphne has been at the Sanctuary, because “Daphne was awfully impressed with Sister Ludmila.” (Jewel, 122) Before the ‘stranger’ leaves, Lili Chatterjee tells him of her horrified shock at seeing Daphne after the rape:

She looked up and said, “Oh, Auntie.” She was still in her khaki hospital uniform. It was torn and muddy and she had blood on her face. Even when she said, “Oh, Auntie,” I couldn’t take it in that it was Daphne. (Jewel, 122)

The ‘stranger’ goes round the House, and in a fit of historical present he describes the garden and what took place in it; in his mind the image of Miss Crane, burning herself and becoming a suttee, Hindu-style, is superimposed on that of “Miss Manners, falling on her knees,” looks up, and cries “Oh, Auntie.” Then he flares into a kind of Hardy-esque protest against the gods that kill us, like flies, for their foolish and futile sport:

In such a fashion human beings call for explanations of the things that happen to them and in such a way scenes and characters are set for exploration, like toys set out by kneeling children intent on pursuing their grim but necessary games. (Jewel, 123)

King Lear’s flies killed by wanton boys (Shakespeare) become here toys set up by mischievous children; this passionate demur can be partly explained by the absence of justice (even poetic) in actual life, Scott’s frank article “Why I did not have my children baptized” and his amoebiasis (dysentery). (Nichols, 1)

At the exhortation of Lady Chatterjee, the “stranger” meets Mr. Strinivasan with her; they go down the Club road “in a grey Ambassador that belongs to a lawyer called Strinivasan whom one has not met but is about to.” (Jewel, 170) This part, Four, “An Evening at the Club,” begins with a description of modern Mayapore, especially the population and area, new constructions such as the airport at Banyagani, the old British-Indian Electric factory, “newly extended but still controlled by British capital,” the new British colony, and changed names for old roads and institutions. (Jewel, 169) The year now is 1964, and the “stranger” is on his way to meet a very important witness who, in 1942, was arrested with others as potential rioters led by Ghandi. This does not suppress the narrator’s instinct for recognising the beauty of the place and the weather (poetic description of setting on p. 170). The purpose of this part is to illustrate how racism has outlived the end of the Raj; Scott uses the Club at Mayapore, the Gymkhana, because it was once the bastion of English social life in India and the place at which the colour bar was strongest. Scott’s narrator is still acting as investigator trying to find out the truth behind the story of the “Bibighar”; but first he tries to find out to “which extent the Club has changed since Daphne Manners’ day.” (Jewel, 173)

Except for the “Stranger” who remains till the end anonymous and unidentified, a nondescript figure, each other character, no matter how minor, is fully described and characterised. Mr. Strinivasan is an important character for many reasons: like Lady Chatterjee he lived astride the Independence, a militant Indian, follower of Ghandi in confronting the British in India, and a lawyer who once had interceded with the police on behalf of Kumar. To enhance his probity he is thus described:

Mr. Strinivasan is of medium height, thin, punctilious in manner. His skin has a high polish. He is immaculately turned out. The light-weight suit, the collar and tie, point another interesting difference. The inheritors [Indians] come properly dressed but the English men expose thick bare necks and beefy arms. (Jewel, 174)

One of the rare successes of the old generation, he relates, is the story of Romesh Chand Gupta, Sen; he is quite aptly chosen for Hari is closely related to him; he has maintained his success, Mr. Strinivasan says, because “it has always been a question of business first and politics last. Well, not even last.” (Jewel, 184) Strinivasan tells the “stranger”: “I tell you this because it is perhaps relevant to your interest?” (Jewel, 184) This no nonsense businessman was behind Hari Kumar’s tragedy for:

It was Romesh Chand who insisted that that Anglicised nephew of [Aunt Shilini’s], Hari Kumar, should be brought back from England when her brother, Hari’s father, died and left him homeless and penniless. ... Romesh said he would even be willing to pay Hari’s passage and increase Mrs. Gupta Sen’s [Shalini] monthly allowance. (Jewel, 184-5)

Mr. Strinivasan tells the “stranger” that he knows all this, because he “was what in England you call the family lawyer;” he goes on to interconnect the various actors in this drama; in answer to the ‘stranger’’s query he affirms:

Yes, you are right. Lili bet me you’d cotton on. Indeed yes. It was I. I was the lawyer Romesh Chand sent for that morning. Sister Ludmila went to his office and told him Hari Kumar had been taken by the police. They thought he was arrested. (Jewel, 186)

Earlier, Mr. Strinivasan has already told the ‘stranger’ that he understood what were Hari’s needs, so he put him up for the Indian Club:

because it has something [Strinivasan] felt he needed. We only met a few times. I’m afraid he didn’t like me. He distrusted me because I was his uncle Romesh’s lawyer. Apart from that English manner of his which I found overbearing I quite liked him as a person, if not as a type. If we’d got on better, if he’d trusted me, perhaps I should have been able to do something for him, taken him to Lili Chatterjee’s for instance and got him into a few mixed English and Indian parties. (Jewel, 255)

All these bits of information, in the form of testimonies by different witnesses, render a picture of Hari's character with its various aspects as seen from divergent points of view. As he is a taciturn, and there is almost none of the usual stream of consciousness style of exposing his ideas or feelings so the reader might have a good modicum of sympathy for him. But the "strongest empathy is provided by the most important document of all: Daphne Manners' (Journal Addressed to Lady Manners) Kashmere, April 1943. This is the sub-title of Part Seven of The Jewel in the Crown.

This part, aptly called "The Bibighar Gardens", is the climax of the novel, its denouement, and resolution; it uncovers the secrets of what happened, from the most important point of view; that of Miss Daphne Manners, herself. Moreover, it is addressed to her aunt, Lady Manners, and it begins with a polite apology: "I am sorry, Auntie, for all the trouble and embarrassment I've caused you ... [for being] the aunt of that 'Manners girl'." She wonders why:

... all the marvellous things you and Uncle Henry did to make things seem right in India, for English people, are forgotten. This is really what I mean when I say I'm sorry. Sorry for giving people who criticised you and Uncle Henry the last word, for seeming to prove to them that everything you and he stood for was wrong. (Jewel, 373)

Before the reader is given the opportunity to read, surreptitiously, "the Manners girl" most intimate journal, he is subjected to a barrage of small-scale hints about her character, conduct, and manners. There is a kind of unanimity on her plainness, myopia, and clumsiness, and a concurrence on her honesty and courage. Bhalu, Lady Chatterjee's gardener at the MacGregor House, begs her "to stop young memsahib trying to help him. Because he grew the flowers he thought he should be allowed to cut them." Lady Chatterjee responds graciously:

I told him the young memsahib liked flowers and wanted to help and although she was always smiling had had a lot of unhappiness and had lost all her family except her Auntie Ethel, so we had to be patient.... (Jewel, 86)

But she commits a graver offence to the English residing in Mayapore: for, while she rejects an Englishman's, Merrick's, proposal of marriage, she falls in love with an Indian, Hari Kumar, though an Anglicised who pines for England as "home". She is perceptive enough to see the incentive behind Merrick's proposal:

I think Ronald first took real notice of me that day on the maidan, when I went to the War Week Exhibition; took notice of me because he saw me go up to Hari and talk to him, as a lot of English people did. [As an] Englishman [he] didn't want an English girl getting mixed up with the "wrong" type of Indian. (Jewel, 406)

From then on she lives wondering whether "he [is] genuinely and quite unexpectedly attracted to [her] as a person"; the one constant in her life has been Lili and the MacGregor House while "the variants were Hari on his side, and Ronald on his." They seem to her so far apart she doesn't "think [she] ever referred to the one in front of the other." Then she discovers they were not far apart at all, and that is

why [Daphne] was so angry, felt such a fool, when [she] discovered the truth, that they'd been—what? enemies since that day at the Sanctuary, when Hari was struck and dragged away, and Sister Ludmila had watched it all happening. (Jewel, 407)

Daphne Manners suffers from this triangular liaison; she herself, quite honest in her feeling, confesses her love for Hari, for, on her side "the motive was physical attraction". (Jewel, 426) Other English women were furtively attracted, according to Miss Crane (as already mentioned before), but they were not as honest or candid as "the Manners girl." But that was not all; because she despises "white superiority," she is not forced to hide her feeling for an Indian:

And all the time wanting Hari. Seeing him in my imagination looking over the shoulder of every pink male face and seeing in every pink male face the

strain of pretending that the world was this small. Hateful. Ingrown. About to explode like powder compressed ready for firing. (Jewel, 427)

There were times when Lili Chatterjee thought that Daphne “worked doubly hard at knowing India simply to make up to her father for what he had missed.” (Jewel, 100) This love for India fosters sympathy for Indians; after the Bibighar Gardens’ catastrophic night she wonders whether rape by a white youngster would have generated such an immense reaction in the English:

If I’d been assaulted by men of my own race I would have been an object of pity. Religiously-minded people would probably have advised me as well for refusing to abort. But they weren’t men of my own race. (Jewel, 375, also p. 437)

She has the modesty and integrity to confess to her aunt, Lady Manners, concurring with Dr. Anna Klaus, that she has not been a virgin; she writes: “Of course, I wasn’t a virgin.” Her first lover, she continues, was a friend of her brother, David, and her second a man she met in London during the time she was driving the ambulances. She concludes, still addressing her journal to her aunt:

Two lovers—but, you see, not lovers, we made love but weren’t in love, although for a time I thought I was in love with the first man.

But it was Hari that I have ever loved. Almost more than anything else in the world I long to talk about him to you, even if it were only to say, “Oh, yes, Hari said something like that” ... I’ve given up hope of ever seeing him again. (Jewel, 377)

This is breaking the fundamental laws of the English: “that although a white man could make love to a black girl, the black man and white girl association was still a taboo.” (Jewel, 379)

In a moving part of her journal, Daphne Manners shows her concern for her future child, whom she deems—whether he or she—as “part of [her] flesh

and blood, [her] own typically hamfisted offering to the future!” (Jewel, 376) “If it is a boy,” she asks her aunt to “name him after Harry, or Hari if his skin is dark enough to honour that kind of spelling.” If a girl, she has not “thought of ‘it’ as a girl,” yet if she is:

please don’t call her Daphne. That’s the girl who ran from Apollo, and was changed into a laurel bush. With [her] it has been the other way round, hasn’t it? Rooted clumsily in the earth, thinking [she’s] running free, chasing the son-god. (Jewel, 390)

She shows her modesty concerning her charm; moreover, she has already wondered whether he loves her, and reconsiders herself with her usual humility:

What am I? Just a big-boned girl with a white skin whose mother justifiably accused her of awkwardness, and whose father and brother were kind as the men of a family are always kind to a daughter or sister who is a good sport but not much else. (Jewel, 379-80)

At the beginning, Daphne began to love India for its own sake and for her father’s, who used to show and relate to her, when she came of age and began to understand, “snaps and photographs [and] tales of the “land where [she] was born” (Jewel, 391): this explains why

... when I first came back out here I was always looking for the India I thought I knew because I had seen it in my imagination, like a kind of mirage, shimmering on the horizon, with hot, scented breezes blowing in from far-away hills ... (Jewel, 391)

Daphne chooses the Bibighar Gardens as a rendezvous for her meetings with Hari, because it seems purely Indian, and “no white man or woman would come into” them, as the Maiden has a purely English connexion. (Jewel, 292) Later, in her journal she re-affirms the Indian-ness of the Bibighar:

When I first saw the Bibighar I thought: How Indian! Not Indian as I’ve thought of a place as Indian before I came out, but Indian as it struck me

then ... a place which you see as alien on the surface but underneath as proof of something general and universal. I wish I could get hold of the right words to say just what I mean. (Jewel, 413)

It happens, in each language, this inability to express exactly what one means in the abstract, but Daphne does not fail in expressing her feeling towards the Indians themselves. To her, "white superiority" is a charade that makes her smile; and it does not intimidate her or prevent her from falling in love with Hari. To state her overview of the Anglo-Indian relationship, she thinks that

the whole bloody affair of us in India has reached flush point. It was bound to because it was based on a violation. Perhaps at one time there was a moral as well as a physical force at work. But the moral thing had gone sour. Has gone sour. ... The women look worse than the men because consciousness of physical superiority is unnatural to us. A white man in India can feel physically superior without unsexing himself. (Jewel, 425)

Daphne Manners, Scott's alter ego and spokeswoman, connects, quite metaphorically, her rape with the rape of India by the English; she writes in her journal, commencing with an old disreputable saying: "when rape is inevitable, lie back and enjoy it:"

well, there has been more than one rape. I can't say, Auntie, that I lay back and enjoyed mine. But Lili was trying to lie back, and enjoy what we've done to her country. I don't mean done in malice. Perhaps there was love love as there was between me and Hari. But the spoilers are always there, aren't they? (Jewel, 462)

Daphne has already related stories of respectable Indians, such as Sir and Lady Chatterjee who have been snubbed and insulted in hospital, on the train, and at the club by stiff-lipped English men and women. Now, she reviews these instances of rebuffs that galled Indians and filled them with bitterness:

The Swinsons. The [English] bitches who travelled as far as Lahore [and accused Lili, as Indian, of stealing their luggage]. The Ronald Merricks. The silly little man who summed up his own silly little island history when he whistled and said, “some wog contractor is making a packet.” (Jewel, 462)

This empathy with the Indian people, embodied in Daphne’s love for Hari, not “in spite of his blackness. His blackness [is] inseparable from his physical attraction” (Jewel, 439), is echoed in her aunt’s, Lady Manners’, letter of 31 May, 1943 to Lili Chatterjee, her intimate friend and future trustee of Daphne’s child, Parvati. At first she resents the new-born baby, seen by its mother for “a second or two”, but later she feels that:

If anything its Indian-ness was what first made me feel pity for it and start thinking of it as “she”. (Jewel, 473)

In 1947, Lady Manners writes from Rawalpindi bitterly criticising the English for their legacy to India: “The creation of Pakistan is our crowning failure Our only justification for two hundred years [ironically] was unification.” (Jewel, 473) In her last letter, written from New Delhi in June, 1948, Lady Manners bequeaths Daphne’s testament, letters, and journal to Lili Chatterjee and designates her as trustee for a home called The Manners Memorial Home for Indian Boys and Girls. But she still lashes at the “Hindu-Muslim bloodbath last year that marked the end of our unifying and civilising years of power and influence.” Moreover, she admonishes her to leave Hari Kumar alone “to work out his own salvation” for

He is a left-over, the loose end of our reign, the kind of person we created—I suppose with the best intentions. (Jewel, 475)

This last letter by Ethel Manners ends with a beg: “Will you give Parvati a roof?” (Jewel, 477); the answer, of course, is already known, for she currently lives with Lili Chatterjee chasing her mother’s ghost at the MacGregor House. But there are things beside Parvati that belong to her mother which she might see later in life; just now she in the same loving hands that patted her mother before.

At this point, the “stranger” takes his narrative over, travelling now on flight 115, the Viscount Service to Calcutta, accosting his reader with “Imagine, then, a flat landscape” on which Mayapore and Banyagani are situated. There is also, on the same landscape, “the new English colony [which] live[s] on hand for the Technical College, the factories, and the airfield.” (Jewel, 477) As they gather height and speed, the ‘stranger’ “is able to fix the approximate position of the Bibighar Gardens and the MacGregor House; he depicts a receding image of both to store in mind for continuation of his story in the rest of the Raj Quartet:

The Bibighar Gardens are dark (now, as then)—but from the MacGregor House there is the burst of light that Lili Chatterjee promised: all the lights turned on in the occupied rooms and all the floodlights in the garden; pale from here but suddenly unmistakable, so that foolishly one searches that distant area for signs of Lili herself, and imagines that she stands below the steps of the verandah with Parvati, staring up at the winking red, green, and amber riding lights of the airborne commercial juggernaut. (Jewel, 479)

As the novel begins with an image of a running girl, Daphne, an alarming fugitive figure that prognosticates serious trouble ahead, it ends with a very delicate, slim, pleasing figure of a girl of “the palest brown ... and long dark hair,” singing, aided by a young man with “twin drums, the tablas” to provide the necessary repercussion:

Oh, my father’s servants, bring my palanquin. I am going to the land of my husband. All my companions are scattered. They have gone to different homes.

(A morning raga)

Translated by Dipali Nag

(Jewel, 480)

Whether Parvati’s father is going to hear or see her, or she marries and abandons her surviving parent, is left for the next part of the Raj Quartet; so

the novel, after the fashion of twentieth-century novel, is open-ended, for in actual life most of the stories we come to know do not end dramatically with a happy marriage or a grievous death.

Scott, like “Schaherazade [who] told stories to postpone the hour of her execution” (Jewel, 75) uses some of her techniques in narration such as the split narrative perspective, use of suspense, and especially the use of imagery. And like her he sustains the interest of his readers by providing them with, sometimes, extremely variant testimonies concerning the cornerstones of his epic-story: the Bibighar Gardens, the rape of Daphne Manners, and Miss Crane’s life, catastrophe, and tragic death. It seems that he deserves the encomiums that have been showered upon him: Kathleen J. Balkman, in reviewing Hilary Spurling’s *A Life of the Author of the Raj Quartet* (1991), writes:

... to understand the impact of the end of imperialism, from the individual perspective, one could do no better than to read Paul Scott’s *Raj Quartet*: four novels that tell the story of the end of British rule in India.

But to read the *Raj Quartet*—published (1966-1975) just a generation after the fall of the British Raj—is to wonder at Paul Scott’s vision (1).

Eva Brann maintains that the “*Raj* novels are among the greatest prose fictions of this and of the nineteenth century” known for its “many fine realistic novels” (Quoted by Prof. Cora Agatucci, 1). Moreover she comments on the unnamed narrator, vaguely called the “stranger” or “traveller”, asserting that he “has objective oversight” of various characters’ “retellings that scramble time and multiply perspective accounts.” (Ibid.)

In conclusion, *The Jewel in the Crown* by Paul Scott has an immense affinity to its title: as a novel it is like a jewel with glittering facets, as “a rich jewel in an Ethiop’s ear” (Shakespeare’s *Romeo and Juliet*, I. v. 45). All the elements of fiction, such as theme, reconstructed plot, characterisation, setting, imagery, picturesque English, and dramatisation are all wielded skilfully, but the most interesting features peculiar to Scott’s work are his use of point of view in all its senses, and his enviable understanding of his own countrymen’s plight during the last years of their dominion of India as part of a dying Empire.

Bibliography: 1. Books Cited

Barnard, Robert.A Short History of English Literature (New York: Basil Blackwell Inc., 1984).

Brontë, Emily.Wuthering Heights (London: Longmans, Green and Co. Ltd., 1967) Introduction and Notes by A. C. Ward.

Forster, E. M.A Passage to India (Frome and London: Butler and Tanner Ltd., 1978) Introduction and Notes by Oliver Stallybrass.

Gibbons,Tom.Literature and Awareness (London: Edward Arnold (Publishers) Ltd., 1979).

Hardy, Thomas. Tess of the D'Urbervilles (London: Macmillan Co Ltd., 1960) Edited with Introduction and Notes by F. B. Pinion, M. A.

Hawthorn, Jeremy.Studying the Novel: An Introduction (London: Edward Arnold, 1989).

Lubbock, Percy. The Craft of Fiction (New York: The Viking Press, 957).

Scott, Paul. The Jewel in the Crown (London: Panther, Granada Publishing, 1979).

Scott, Walter.The Midlothian (New York; Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1965) Introduction by David Daiches.

Bibliography: 2. Articles and Reviews from Internet

Agatucci, Prof. Cora. "Paul Scott (1920-1978) "The Jewel in the Crown." 17/07/2004,file:///A:Paul%Scott20&%20Jewel%20in 20the%20Crown.htm.

Balkman, J. Kathleen. Review of Paul Scott: A Life of the Author of the Raj (1991) by Hilary Spurling Federal Reserve Back of Minneapolis. 24/6/2004.

Childs, Peter. Scott, Paul (1920-1978)www.LitEncyc.com.22/7/2004.

. Scott, Paul. The Jewel in the Crown. www.Lit. Encyc.com. 17/7/2004.

Nicholls,Sally.Paul Scott, 1920-1978; Collection 1952-1976. Paul%20Scott%Collection.htm. 24/6/2004.

The University of Tulsa. McFarlin Library, Special Collection Dept. Paul Scott Collection. Revised 9/1996.