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ABSTRACT

When its Indian colony revolted in the summer of 1857, England was caught off guard. Largely ignored before the uprising, India surged to the forefront of foreign affairs discourse as periodical writers attempted to understand the shock by assigning blame through various rhetorical strategies. This finger pointing appeared in the higher journalism of 1857-8 in publications like the *Edinburgh Review*, *Westminster Review*, and *Bentley’s Miscellany*. Though the uprising was quickly suppressed, the Indian Mutiny occupied nearly one hundred percent of foreign affairs articles appearing across all types of periodicals in the next year and a half. As the largest and most comprehensive source of Victorian materials, periodicals provide an accurate measure of the discourse of the time — a gauge that Vann and VanArsdale believe may never occur again with such precision. In the higher journalism of 1857-8, the British understanding of the Indian Mutiny forms through this continual discourse concerning the causes, solutions, and fictionalized accounts of mutiny, all of which comment directly or indirectly on the cause.

That the Indian Mutiny had profound effects on the British imagination was observed in 1897 by Hilda Gregg and has been more recently explored by Christopher Herbert, Patrick Brantlinger, and Gautam Chakravarty. Yet, for all of the critical interest in the Indian Mutiny, none have utilized the tools of digital humanities to aid their research. Because of the volume of periodical publications, a study of the British reception of the Indian Mutiny is well-suited for such an approach. Using the tools of data visualization, this project will attempt to condense all articles about the Indian Mutiny in the *Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals* into a series of graphs tracking the reported causes of mutiny. Data visualization of these articles’ stated causes
results in the opportunity for comparative analysis between articles, journals, political affiliations, and different times. Ultimately, this thesis will not only refine Indian Mutiny explanations previously offered by historical and cultural critics, but will also establish data visualization and other tools of digital humanities as essential methodological approaches to Victorian periodical studies.
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Introduction

“Everybody who has read — and who has not read? — the account of the great Indian tragedy of 1857, must have been struck by the enormous difference of opinions put forward by equal authorities with as equal confidence and vehemence” (“An Anglo-Indian View” 269).

The Indian Mutiny, The Sepoy Rebellion, The First War of Independence, The Great Indian Rebellion — whatever the label, the events of 1857-1859 in British India mark seminal events for both countries historically and artistically. While P.J.O. Taylor suggests in *A Companion to the Indian Mutiny of 1857* that the events “speak for themselves” regardless of the name, the chosen nomenclature for any study betrays a bias for either British imperialism or Indian independence (v). From the British perspective, the Indian Mutiny fractured their position as colonial rulers and, as Christopher Herbert argues, permanently fractured the Victorian psyche as well. At the centennial of England’s rule over India, an uprising in the native army sent the colony into revolt and altered the state of British rule by ending the power of the East India Company.

Though unrest had been growing since January with the introduction of the Enfield rifle’s greased cartridges¹, the Indian Mutiny officially began on May 10, 1857, when the 3rd Light Cavalry and 11th and 20th Native Infantries rose up at Meerut, killing Europeans, setting fire to the town, and departing for Delhi. The next day, the mutineers declared the

---

¹ The Enfield rifle’s cartridges were rumored to have been greased with cow and pig fat, which would have been problematic to native army soldiers of both Muslim and Hindu faith. Because the cartridges must be bitten open, eating this animal fat would cause them to be shunned through breaking caste, a complex religious and social system determining nearly everything about their lives (Taylor).
King of Delhi their leader, and the Mutiny spread rapidly through the rest of the Bengal army, propelling regiments across the country to expel European occupants from their towns by force or to put them to death. Between the initial outbreak on May 10 and its announcement in *The Times* on June 27, regiments across mostly northern India rebelled against their British officers and joined this loosely organized rebellion against their colonizers (Herbert 22). The British suppressed the Mutiny over the course of the next year, reclaiming Delhi in September 1858, but not without first feeling the impact of the shock and completely altering the state of British rule in their colony. By the time the mutineers surrendered and the Crown assumed full control of Indian government, the Mutiny had gone on long enough to affect the English imagination, as shown by the hundreds of paintings, novels, and historical accounts produced by the British in the following years.

From over 5,000 miles away, Indian news took around two months to reach England. When the Mutiny broke out and insurgents damaged communication systems, information could take even longer, especially since the summer rainy season made much of north India impassable (Randall 4). As this information arrived on the island, periodical writers attempted to make sense of the shocking events through assigning blame and eventually suggesting solutions for continued rule in India. While Indian articles compose only a small portion of all articles written in higher journalism, publications like *Bentley’s Miscellany, Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine, and Fraser’s Magazine for Town and Country* printed a combined 45 articles between 1857-8 about Indian affairs, and the event is the topic of 100 percent of foreign affairs articles during the year for publications such as the *Edinburgh Review* (Palmegiano 3).
Although these journals published Mutiny information from the same handful of sources, authors produced vastly different accounts of the Mutiny. In periodical articles, there exists as much debate about the causes as about its name. Eugenia Palmegiano observes that periodical journals, though usually distinctly Tory or Whig focused, wrote about the Mutiny with little to no regard for political affiliation. Instead, the essays appearing in Victorian periodicals are surprisingly contradictory and propose a variety of causes and solutions that Palmegiano cannot contain within either political party. Although she does not connect cause or solution to politics, she does make claims about connections between causes and solutions, noting that there are distinct pairs that frequently appear together.

Though quickly suppressed and relatively low in casualites, the Mutiny made a lasting impression on the British imagination, as evidenced by the outpouring of Mutiny fiction. In 1897, Hilda Gregg identified the Indian Mutiny as the century’s event to take “the firmest hold on the popular imagination” (218). Still in search of “the novel of the Mutiny,” which she hopes will be eventually written by Kipling, Gregg explores nine novels that emerged from the British imagination in the aftermath of the rebellion. However, Patrick Brantlinger points out that there are at least 50 Mutiny novels written by 1900 (227, 199). In these novels, and the preceding periodicals that helped form British rhetoric about the Mutiny, a historiography and stock set of stories were quickly established that mostly served to enhance and reinforce British nationalism. Heroic tales, such as Englishmen nobly killing their wives before they could suffer worse at the hands of the natives, abound in the aftermath of the Mutiny. The British attention was particularly drawn to events that exhibited native cruelty against the Europeans, such as the massacre at Cawnpore, where
women and children were brutally murdered before being thrown down a well. Narratives like this recur in the explosion of Mutiny literature appearing in the following years.

**Historical and Cultural Mutiny Reconstructions**

One hundred and fifty years after the outbreak, historical debates remain divided over nomenclature and facts such as the causes and extent of the rebellion. Although the Mutiny has been the focus of numerous historical, literary, and cultural studies, many of these historical elements are still unsettled because of the extremely different accounts produced. Historical studies, much like the choice of name for the event, reflect either a British imperialist or Indian independence bias. In an early British account of the Mutiny, Sir John Kaye and George Malleson published their *History of the Mutiny of 1857*, a six-volume set expanded by Malleson from Kaye’s original two-volume work entitled *The History of the Sepoy War in India*. After thoroughly enumerating the events leading up to the rebellion, Kaye considers at the end of the second volume whether the event was a mutiny or a rebellion, a distinction that implicates the expanse of the movement. If a mutiny, the events are contained within the army, but if categorized as a rebellion, the movements take on a larger, national character. Although Kaye partially depicts the event as military mutiny, his work also criticizes British policies, and he ultimately concludes that some parts of the country witnessed a national character to the rebellion while others were restrained to the military. The second volume ends by expressing faith that the “manhood of England” will meet the challenges of returning heathenistic India to a noble colony (II.453). While Kaye’s imperialist account calls for British dominance over an uprising, Vinayak Damodar Savarkar’s Indian nationalist history, *The Indian War of Independence*, published in 1909, attempts to inspire revolt in India through its presentation of the events
as a national revolution. Savarkar’s account asserts the uprising to be a unified effort of the Indian people to overthrow British rulers. Through their British imperialist and Indian independence histories, Kaye and Savarkar represent opposite ends of the historical discussion surrounding the Mutiny.

In an attempt to understand these vast differences in Mutiny accounts, Ainslie Embree anthologizes articles from Mutiny participants, British leaders, and contemporary scholars in *India: Mutiny or War of Independence?*. Because Mutiny writers, “whatever their final conclusions, all used much the same sources, the divergence of interpretations provides a fascinating study in historiography” (vii). Embree’s historical study is less interested in asserting facts than exploring the historiography of the event, and it shows the great differences of opinion concerning the Mutiny from both camps. However, these variations are not confined to differences among British and Indian accounts. Embree’s observation about Mutiny sources also applies to differences between British accounts, particularly contemporary periodical articles. Historical accounts, however, represent only one side of the British response to the Mutiny. In the largest artistic response to the event, mutiny novels explode in the following years and continue to provide rich ground for English studies.

English studies tend to focus specifically on the novels produced concerning India because they represent the largest artistic response to the event, but there have recently been more attempts at interdisciplinary analysis of the mutiny and its imaginative effects. In current literary studies, Christopher Herbert, Guantam Chakravarty, and Patrick Brantlinger have written extensively about the Mutiny and its influence on the British. In his 2009 book, *War of No Pity: The Indian Mutiny and Victorian Trauma*, Herbert argues
that the Mutiny was a psychologically traumatic event for the British that inflicted wounds permanently altering the British psyche. The core of Herbert’s study focuses on explaining the disproportionate Victorian response to the relatively minor Mutiny. Although following the more costly Crimean War, the Mutiny produced far more literature and cultural change. Herbert argues that the “psychological and spiritual wound” of the Mutiny fractured the Victorian moral world irreparably, and this cultural trauma appears in “derangements of various kinds in cultural media such as novels, poems, historical scholarship, newspapers, [and] paintings” (19, 54). He suggests the study of literature and other artifacts as replacements for “scientific polling data” for 1857, but this desire for a cultural pulse makes the periodical press a valuable resource, as explained by Vann and VanArsdale (54). However, while the overall diversity in opinion observable in causal patterns supports Herbert’s claim that Victorian opinion was not uniform, the distinct political patterns emerging from the differences challenge his theory of trauma, as political opportunism retains priority over a psychological response.

Guantam Chakravarty’s historicist literary-political work, The Indian Mutiny and the British Imagination, has two goals: first, to show “the ways in which the rebellion was explained, and how explanations differed” in order to explore the second, how “these meanings shaped narratives historical and literary” (17). The latter is thoroughly explored in Chakravarty’s analysis of historical and literary works following the Mutiny, but his former would be greatly supported by a reading of the periodical press, where Mutiny causes and explanations were initially explored and circulated. His interdisciplinary approach requires the study to include historical, first-hand, and political accounts in addition to the typical literary corpus of novels. Showing the extent to which the Mutiny
grasped the British imagination, Chakravarty’s work uses several forms of Mutiny documentation and makes a case for periodical study, although Chakravarty himself includes relatively little from the journals. Tracing the development of the Mutiny in periodicals through data visualization supports his historiography by expanding the time and materials covered and also supporting many specific patterns he finds emerging in the histories, such as the political effect on narratives, the difference between a military and national revolt, and the use of “Indian difference” in the British response (31).

Herbert and Chakravarty devote entire books to their Mutiny studies, but Patrick Brantlinger’s Rule of Darkness presents a survey of British rule and literature from 1830 to 1914. Brantlinger’s literary post-colonial study of British imperialism includes a section on the Mutiny in which he argues that Mutiny accounts deploy racist rhetoric, which separated the event and its participants into binaries of good and evil. Mutiny writings of all kinds express “a general racist and political hysteria about the Mutiny” (202). He proposes that Mutiny accounts in Victorian history and literature are dominated by “an absolute polarization of good and evil, innocence and guilt, justice and injustice, moral restraint and sexual depravity, civilization and barbarism” (200). This polarization finds it core in the Well at Cawnpore, where Indians commit unprovoked acts of violence on women and children, the innocent English victims. At the well, “the world splits apart,” and Brantlinger explores the Mutiny literature following the event to support his claims (204). He theorizes that these representations allowed the British to displace “guilt and [project] repressed, sadistic impulses onto demonized Indian characters” (222). This post-colonial reading applies to Brantlinger’s larger interests in British imperialism when he theorizes that the racism, prejudice, and violence found in these literary forms reveal the methods through
which the British ended the Mutiny and returned to power. This literary focus, however, does not address the periodical representations that preceded these novels.

**Potential for Periodical Studies**

Despite the critical interest in Mutiny literature, few literary studies have included the periodical press in their research. Chakravarty in particular laments the field’s lack of interdisciplinary engagement surrounding the Mutiny and explains how “the rebellion acquired form, meaning,” and its historiography first through the periodical press (3). Although the novels represent the most thorough and prolific response, Mutiny rhetoric and narratives were first introduced to the public through periodicals, which Vann and VanArsdel describe as being so accurate a pulse on a culture that it may never again exist. As the point of entry into the British imagination, periodicals play an indispensable yet often ignored, or sidelined, role in the resulting Mutiny fiction. While Herbert asks why the Indian Mutiny gripped the British imagination so strongly, periodical studies have the potential to investigate how military reports became popular reading, flourished into a set of rhetorical devices to speak about British nationalism, and eventually were written into numerous Mutiny novels.

One such frequent cause appearing in these articles is the Indian military, which Douglas Peers identifies as the “strand that runs through [Victorian periodicals’] various agendas and literary strategies” (109-10). Beginning with the Burma War of 1824-26, the British public’s fascination with India centered primarily on military matters, and since journals are financially concerned, military stories were frequently published to sell the most copies. In Mutiny articles 30 years after, Peers notices the beginning of periodical interest in the military, the native army consistently composes a large percentage of the
blame from periodical writers, and Peers’s article provides possible reasons for the constant focus on the military element of mutiny. While Palmegiano and Peers draw qualitative conclusions from their readings of periodicals, their claims have potential to gain extra support from a digital humanities approach allowing the critic to handle a large corpus, such as Victorian periodicals, more easily.

**Digital Humanities**

As a developing approach to humanities research, digital humanities offers a variety of tools utilizing technological developments to aid scholarly pursuits. These tools include digital archives, text analysis, corpus studies, and data visualization. While this approach attempts to further humanities research, the work has been met with criticism during the “awkward and painful transition” from print to digital technology as noted by Jerome McGann (184). In a recent panel at the Modern Language Association, scholars explored “The Dark Side of Digital Humanities,” during which panelists argued that “DH is ‘a blind and vapid embrace of the digital’ [that] insists upon coding and gamification to the exclusion of more humanistic practices” (Pannapacker). Their critiques of digital approaches range from at best, creating false hope for humanities jobs in an economic downturn, and at worst, that digital humanities have the potential to threaten the very nature of humanities research. However, McGann argues in his 2011 article “On Creating a Usable Future” that technology has not “altered the fundamental mission of the humanities: to preserve, monitor, investigate, and rethink our cultural inheritance” (184). Instead, the stressful changes evident in panels such as “The Dark Side” will result in more opportunities for textual analysis and computer-designed graphic analysis (184-5). As a
tool for humanities work, digital humanities expands research opportunities, rather than rendering them extinct.

**This study**

Although the volume of Mutiny novels and periodical articles makes the material well-suited for a digital humanities study, the tools of this approach, particularly those of data visualization, have yet to be applied to the topic. This study seeks to explore the often-ignored periodical response to the Mutiny by analyzing all articles about the Indian Mutiny published in Victorian higher journalism as indexed in the *Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals* from August 1857 to July 1858, when the British foreign affairs attention shifted to Italy. In order to analyze such a large body of material, data visualization will show patterns of causation on a monthly basis. By visualizing all of the articles’ stated causes of mutiny, the entire response of higher journalism will be made available quickly and enable large-scale connections and statements about the Mutiny as it originally entered the British imagination. Ultimately, this thesis will not only refine Indian Mutiny explanations previously offered by historical and cultural critics, but will also establish data visualization and other tools of digital humanities as essential methodological approaches to Victorian periodical studies.
Methodology

The data for this project was selected using the *Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals*. In its four volumes, the *Wellesley* sought to identify authorship in the mostly anonymous periodical press, but, as Rosemary VanArsdel observes, the project undertaken by Walter Houghton also worked to establish periodical studies in English departments (258). Houghton’s work catalogs 45 monthly and quarterly periodicals, and from these journals, all of the articles for this study were selected through their titles. These articles were identified using title key words such as “India,” “Mutiny,” “Sepoy,” “Bengal,” “Rebellion,” “Oude,” and “Delhi.” For articles with titles not directly indicating the Mutiny, the *Wellesley Index* labels them with a bracketed comment referring the reader to the Mutiny. For example, the *Bentley’s Miscellany* article “A Day of Humiliation” does not use any key words suggesting Mutiny content, but the *Wellesley* editors list the entry as “‘A Day of Humiliation’ [Indian Mutiny]” (IV.86). Between August 1858 and July 1858, the *Wellesley* records 83 articles using these terms in the title or otherwise indicated to be about the Indian Mutiny. Of these 83 articles, 65 are visualized in this study, which is 78 percent of the total. The remaining 18 articles that are unused did not fit into this study for various reasons. Some articles printed toward the beginning of this time frame appear to have been written without Mutiny information, such as the *Quarterly Review’s* October 1857 article “Communication with India — Suez and Euphrates Routes,” in which the author explores advances in transportation and their use in India. Some fictionalized accounts were unusable if they did not comment either directly or indirectly on causes of Mutiny, but, more commonly, other pieces that advertised themselves with a key word like “India” in the title had
nothing to do with the Mutiny. “Lady Falkland’s Journal in India” printed by *Dublin University Magazine* occupies this latter category because the selection contains excerpts from a larger, two-volume publication of a journal kept by the Viscountess Falkland of her time in India before the Mutiny. In the excerpts, she recounts meeting an Indian peddler and describes the exhausting nature of sight seeing in India. With fictionalized accounts, article selection was particularly challenging because allegorical meaning had to be ruled out in order to eliminate the article from making an indirect statement about the Mutiny.

Though the revolt began in May 1857, August serves as a starting point for this project because of quarterly publication cycles and the time lapse between English and Indian affairs. In addition to the two months news took to reach England, newspapers diminished the issue until the end of June, when *The Times* admitted the situation in India was serious, and the end of July, when Benjamin Disraeli gave his famous parliamentary speech on the critical condition of India (Pionke). Beginning in August, monthly periodicals regularly published their thoughts on causes and cures for the crisis, but because of their publication schedule, quarterly journals were unable to print until October. These quarterly publication months present the greatest quantity of articles published because both quarterly and monthly journals publish. Thus, these months are the most substantial, but by October 1858, a quarterly month, only one journal publishes on the Mutiny. This indicates that Mutiny publication had become irregular, which makes July 1858 a logical stopping point because it is the final quarterly publication month that offers enough articles for interesting visualization.

Political and religious leanings of journals were determined from the *Wellesley*, and the journals were classified using the editor’s introductions to each journal. Based on the *Wellesley*, these articles are classified in one of the following categories: liberal, conservative, radical,
evangelical, or Catholic. When multiple leanings existed, political categories were given priority, followed by religious and national. For example, the Wellesley editors classify Blackwood’s *Edinburgh Review* as a “Scotch Tory” publication, so its conservativeness is selected over its Scotch leanings (I.8). Occasionally, the *Wellesley* editors did not provide enough information to classify the journal, and when this occurred, the leanings of the editor and contributors during Mutiny publication were used as determining factors. As in the case of *Fraser’s Magazine for Town and Country*, the *Dictionary of National Biography* was consulted to determine the leanings of an individual editor, since the affiliation of the journal seemed to change with its editorship. In 1847, John William Parker, owner of the liberal Christian John W. Parker & Son publishing company, became editor, and under his leadership, Parker “significantly realigned” the previously conservative *Fraser’s* (Dean). The *British Quarterly Review* also posed a methodological problem when determining its affiliation. The *Wellesley* describes the journal as moderate Nonconformist journal, and the *BQR*’s moderate stance causes its views expressed to align with a variety of other affiliations. There are two immediate choices for addressing this problem: the creation of a separate classification for moderates or a flexible category that allows the journal’s moderate ideas to overlap with others. The second option best adds to the strength of the visualization by allowing *BQR* to share the same view as another classification. By placing this journal into a flexible category, the charts can show the variability of the moderate’s views and more strongly visualize these connections.

**Building a Visualization**

Visualizing the selected articles is a two-step process. Data about causation must be identified in the articles, and then the information can be turned into a visual form. First, close reading identifies Mutiny causes, and they are categorized as one of the following: condition,
cause, root cause, or negation. These categories indicate the various degrees to which an article can blame a cause. When asserting a cause, an article can assign three different levels of blame. A condition allowed for Mutiny to happen or caused dissatisfaction, but did not directly spur any action. A cause directly began the rebellion, and a root cause represents a sole inciter of mutiny. The final category is negation of cause, which shows when a cause is actively denied. When assigning these classifications to the article’s stated causes, it is important to note that the causes in this study are infinitely expandable, and every new cause mentioned in an article was added. As with the problems arising in article selection, close reading to determine causation was often tricky, especially when determining differences such as cause and root cause. In order to make these distinctions, I relied on contextual evidence and phrases surrounding the cause that indicated the attitude toward it. Some authors were straightforward in their evaluations, asserting that there was “no one single cause” (“The Indian Mutinies” 238). I differentiated conditions using phrases that suggest a cause made the revolt worse or stopped the British from containing the uprising, such as the Persian War drawing too many soldiers away from India with the assumption that the full ranks would have stifled the uprising. Though uncharted, these distinctions also required a separation of inciting and root causes. While an inciting cause may have begun the action, the root cause was the underlying, real cause. Phrases indicating this difference, especially concerning cartridges, often align the cartridge with a spark and the real cause with the train itself: “It is certain that the cartridge was the spark which fired the train, and the train itself was the general suspicion of an intention on the part of Government to bring the natives to Christianity” (“The Company’s”). From this phrase, it can be inferred that the cartridge is a cause, but the real cause was a problem with religion.
The classification process results in raw data that can be visualized in charts. The charts are created using Adobe InDesign CS4, a desktop publishing software for print layout. Thus, the charts are not generated using a program that generates their image when the data is input. Instead, the visualizations are designed manually using the information. Because of this choice of software, the charts are laid out using typographic measurements and print design principles. The pica, a typographic measurement of 1/6th of an inch, is composed of 12 points, and together, picas and points are used to measure everything in this visualization. The design elements of this visualization are line, shape, type, and color. Using these four design elements, the charts visualize the causes of the Indian Mutiny to show their connection to articles, political and religious leanings, and their relative presence in a given month.
Fig. 1. October + Articles.

An understanding of the methodology behind the charts is essential to reading and interpreting them. The charts are designed to register visually and, thus, facilitate intuitive understanding. For example, the chart for October 1857 shows how this method of data visualization renders all of the causes in that month. Rectangles represent the articles in a given month while the circles symbolize the causes stated in the articles. Each rectangle is labeled with the article name, journal abbreviation, and date. In October, seven articles are printed, as shown by the seven rectangles.
Fig. 2. October + Circles

Next, circles are added to represent the causes blamed by that month’s articles. The circles are scaled according to their discussion that month, and they are all sized relative to a 100 percent circle sized at nine picas (9p0). This measurement was chosen for its visual scale within the page measurement because it was large enough to allow for a visible difference from the smaller scaled circles but small enough to not overwhelm the page, which allows space for multiple full-sized circles. A nine-pica circle can be seen in this chart representing caste, as all articles cite this cause. All other circles are based on this original measurement. This scale can be
seen in the circle representing the Indian press. Because four out of seven articles point to the Indian press as a cause, that circle becomes scaled to 57 percent of the nine-pica circle. Circles represented by a solid line are blamed as direct causes of mutiny while dotted-lined circles indicate only conditions allowing for the rebellion.

**Causes of Mutiny: October 1857**

Then the left side of the chart is filled with circles representing causes negated by the articles. On both sides of the chart, the larger the circle, the more articles that point to the cause. This scale is likewise used on the left side, where negations appear in proportion to their frequency and are connected by a solid line. Placed in a chart together, all of the circles’
comparative sizes, even without exact measurements, reveal their prevalence among the articles of that month.

Fig. 4. October + Lines

Next, lines connect the circles to the rectangles, which show which articles discuss which causes. Three different types of lines are used to indicate the three different classifications of cause: dotted, solid, and bold. Because of the software choice, the project was designed in typographic units. Design measurements are also used in the lines, which are based on points. Cause and condition lines are both sized at 1pt, which is the standard page design measurement. Root cause lines are 2.5pts to distinguish them as indicators of primary cause.
The three types of lines indicate the varying degrees of causality assigned, and each type is used in this month regarding annexation. A solid line connects an article to a direct cause of mutiny. In October, the *British Quarterly Review* explains how the annexation of Oude caused the uprising because it angered the Sepoys, who saw the act as part of “a design to subvert their religion” (“The Government” 488). A dotted line indicates a condition that allowed for mutiny but not a direct cause. In this chart, the dotted line connects annexation to the *Edinburgh Review*, whose author identified this English policy as a condition that created discontent in the Sepoys but is one of many circumstances that “were not sufficient to create that revolt” (“India” 566). Finally, a thick, solid line represents a root, or primary, cause of mutiny. This line connects the *London Quarterly Review* to annexation, which is identified in that article as “the bitter fountain of our present troubles” (“The Sepoy Rebellion” 212). This assertion makes annexation a primary cause over all others discussed in the article. This line also serves to separate articles that indicate multiple causes and those that suggest one major cause.
**Fig. 5. October + Color**

The final addition to the chart is color indicating political or religious affiliation of the journals, and this color is added first to the center rectangles representing articles. Then, the lines connecting to those rectangles assume the color of their party, and finally, circles and type change color when only one type of affiliation discusses it. The colors selected for each classification are as follows: blue for conservative, yellow for liberal, green for evangelical, red for Catholic, orange for radical, and multi-colored for the moderate *British Quarterly Review*. This flexible category for *BQR* allows it to overlap with other affiliations, as seen in the yellow roads and railways cause, but it also allows the journal to retain causes that are uniquely...
moderate, such as double government. In addition to analyzing circle sizes, the colors of circles and lines show how political and religious affiliations affect an article’s Mutiny interpretation. Circles that are discussed by more than one type of journal, such as the native army, remain black. However, causes that are pointed to by only one category are shown in the color of that classification, and this can be seen in the circle representing prophecy, which appears yellow because only liberals discuss the cause.

When focused in different ways, the charts produce different information. First, a single article’s views can be determined by looking at the lines connecting to its causes. Articles can then be compared within a chart by the lines connecting to shared and unshared circles. Turning to look at the causes, circles can be compared by relative size within a chart. Similarly, negations of cause can be compared both with each other and in relation to positive assertions of cause. Colors of the lines and circles can provide information about the relationship between political and religious leanings and certain causes and negations. Comparing multiple charts opens the largest perspective for understanding differences in causes and articles. Between charts, the number and boldness of lines reveal the month’s temperament for blame, and the varying sizes of the circles trace the development and prevalence of a cause over time. Differences in circles, connecting lines, and colors highlight each individual chart and the system as a whole. Collectively, the graphs attempt to explain the process of understanding a highly unknowable event.

In the following chapter, the results of these visualizations will be presented in chronological order with commentary for each month. Every chart will be examined for overall trends, “major causes,” political patterns, and the difference between imaginary readerships of only-conservative or only-liberal journals. “Major causes” are eight causes selected for their
prominence throughout the charts, and they include the native army, religion, the British
government, the East India Company, caste, cartridges, conspiracy, and Asiatic character. These
eight causes are the most frequently cited, receiving a combined 76 percent of citations in the
entire series. Discussed as causes 340 times out of the total 446 citations in this project, these
eight causes classify as “major causes” in the following discussion. In addition to each month’s
divisions, the months are also grouped into quarters, which allows for broader pattern
observations.
Results

Quarter 1: August - October 1857

“Treachery, mutiny, villainy of all kinds” (“The Government of India”)

As writers begin to receive information on the Mutiny in this first quarter, assigning blame appears to be the most immediate response. With the most black circles appearing in this quarter, articles blame causes with the greatest amount of overlap between different types of political affiliations. This series of charts contains the most 100 percent and black circles, which indicate more than one type of journal citing a cause. Of all the circles in this quarter, 47.5 percent appear in black, and this shows the rate at which causes are cited across the different political and religious classifications of journals. A reader in this quarter would have engaged with 14 Mutiny articles from four different classifications, and readers of conservative and liberal journals would have a relatively similar experience in the initial stages of Mutiny discourse regarding the causes stated in articles. However, the two readerships differ the most in the number of articles available to each side.
August 1857

**Causes of Mutiny: August 1857**

![Diagram of Causes of Mutiny: August 1857]

Fig. 6. August 1857.

Although the Mutiny began in May, higher journals publish for the first time in August, which is a non-quarterly publication month. Thus, only monthly journals print in August, and they include *Dublin University Magazine*, the *North British Review*, and *Fraser’s Magazine for Town and Country*, which publishes two articles for a total of four Mutiny articles this month.

On the right side of the chart, 32 lines connect the articles to 12 causes, which averages to eight assertions of cause per article. Of these 32 assertions of cause, two represent conditions as shown by the dotted lines, and the bold line connecting the *North British Review* to religion indicates a
root cause. The 12 causes on the right side are mostly either completely agreed upon or only discussed by one article. Five causes appear in 100 percent circles, and four are cited by only one article, which leaves three causes that fall somewhere in between. In these early discussions of the Mutiny, the native army, caste, Asiatic character, cartridges, and religion appear in every article as a cause. On the left side of the articles, five circles represent the month’s negations, and with eight lines connecting them, this averages to two negations per article. Three articles defend the British government, and none blame it. Noticeably missing from the right side of the chart are causes more directly connected with British rule, such as the British government, East India Company, and annexation. In the initial stages of understanding the Mutiny, these three causes appear only on the left side; however, the British defense of them wavers in the following months.

All eight of the major causes appear in this chart with two on the left and six on the right. On the left side, the British government and East India Company are defended by three and one articles, respectively. The other major causes are blamed this month, and five of them are blamed by every article. The native army, caste, Asiatic character, cartridges, and religion appear in full-sized circles, and 75 percent of the articles cite conspiracy, as shown by the circle’s relative size. Of these major causes, only one receives support from a single political or religious leaning, a distinction made by the East India Company’s green circle. This indicates that only evangelical sources discuss that cause. All other major circles remain black, which shows they are causes that cross political and religious agendas at this stage of the Mutiny reception.

Opinions from conservative, liberal, and evangelical journals are all printed in August. Because Fraser’s Magazine publishes two separate articles about the Mutiny, this month presents a slightly more liberal voice. However, at this moment, politics seems to have less
impact on Mutiny opinion than in later charts, as nine of the circles remain black because they are discussed by more than one type of journal. Both liberal articles are unique in their defense of annexation and the British government, but other than these two negations and an assertion of the role of prophecy, the liberal articles point to causes mostly overlapping with the other journal types. The conservative journal, *Dublin University Magazine*, creates the most blue circles with its defense of native princes and missionaries, which both the liberal and evangelical journals blame for the Mutiny.

The reading experiences of a conservative and liberal reader would mostly be different in quantity of articles. A conservative reader would have one article while the liberal reader would have two. Both readers would have seen the native army, caste, education in India, Asiatic character, conspiracy, cartridges, and religion as causes of Mutiny. Missionaries are the only cause about which readers would have received opposite opinions, with conservative journals defending them and liberal ones blaming. A couple more differences exist in causes that are unmentioned by the opposite party’s articles. While liberal readers would have found defenses of the British government and annexation, these are causes that a conservative reader would not have seen discussed at all. Only the liberal journal explores the role of prophecy in the Mutiny. However, a liberal reader would have heard nothing about the native princes, double government, or the road and railways, but a conservative reader would have been exposed to opinions on these causes.
September is also a non-quarterly publishing month, and thus only monthly journals appear in this chart. However, none of this month’s journals printed in August. *Bentley’s Miscellany*, *Blackwood’s Edinburgh Review*, and the *Dublin Review* print a total of three articles about the Mutiny and assert blame a combined 30 times to 15 causes. Of these 30 lines, two of them are conditions, and two represent root causes. With an average of 10 assertions of blame per article, September’s journals blame more causes per article than in any other month. As in August, five causes are blamed by every article, but some of them have changed since the last month. Asiatic
character, cartridges, and religion remain in full-sized circles while the British government and annexation have switched from the left side of the chart into 100 percent circles on the right. On the left, Blackwood’s negates three causes while no other journal does in this month. At an average of one negation per article, September has one of the highest cause-to-negation ratios and continues the early trend to focus on blame.

All eight major causes fall on the right side of the chart in September, and half of them are cited by every article. September brings no change for religion, cartridges, and Asiatic character, as they all remain cited as causes by 100 percent of articles. Conspiracy increases in popularity as all three articles discuss the cause but are split in opinion, with two blaming and one negating. The native army and caste decrease in popularity and shift to solely conservative concerns as they reduce to 67 percent blue circles. In the biggest change of major causes, the British government and East India Company change from being defended to being blamed. The East India Company, which was previously negated by one article, is currently blamed by both conservative journals, and it appears in a 67 percent blue circle on the right side of the chart. While three of four August articles defended the British government, the government falls into disfavor in September with all three writers, as indicated by the 100 percent black circle, and this may be partially explained by the political affiliations of this month’s articles.

While three different types of journals published in August, two print in September. Two conservative journals, Bentley’s and Blackwood’s, and one Catholic, Dublin Review, publish, and their respective blue and red coloring reveals some difference in their affiliations. The conservative journals agree on a few causes that the Catholic one does not, including the native army, the East India Company, Indian Press, and caste. While the conservative journals disagree with each other on the matter of conspiracy, the conservative Blackwood’s negates missionaries
while the Catholic *Dublin Review* blames them for agitating the Sepoys. In addition to the comparisons between conservative and Catholic journals, the colors also help reveal a few conservative patterns that appear to be emerging. Both conservative journals assert a root cause, and although they are different causes, the conservative likelihood to define a primary cause continues throughout Mutiny publication. In this chart, conservatives also assign blame at or above the average rate for the chart while the Catholic journal falls below average. Noticeably missing from this chart are liberal journals, and with the liberal party in power, this may help explain why August defends the government but September finds fault. Half of August’s articles were from the liberal *Fraser’s*, but no liberal organ publishes in September, which leaves opinions from only conservative and Catholic journals.

In September, the difference between the conservative and liberal reader would be as great as it can be, as no liberal articles are published this month. Thus, while the conservative reader would have two articles, one from *Blackwood’s* and one from *Bentley’s*, the liberal reader would receive no new information about the Mutiny. The conservative reader would continue to see a defense of missionaries, but would be introduced to the possibility of a Russian influence, prophecy, and the Indian press. This reader would receive mixed messages about conspiracy as the two articles are split on this topic, and the conservative reader would see change in opinion concerning the role of native princes in the Mutiny. This month also marks the beginning of a distinctly conservative trend toward blaming the British government and East India Company. With the liberal party currently in power, this trend continues reliably until a ministry change in March 1858 complicates the political opinion on the government. Overall, a conservative reader would continue to hear about the major topics and engage with more articles than a liberal reader.
Fig. 8. October 1857.

October’s chart looks different from the previous two because quarterly journals publish for the first time in this series along with the monthlies, which accounts for the increase in number of articles and the chart’s busy appearance. Seven journals publish this month and make a combined 54 assertions of 16 causes. This averages to 7.7 assertions of blame per article, and although there are more causes and articles, the average assertions of blame decreased from September’s 10 per article. The London Quarterly Review identifies one root cause, and, as a journal, it tends to blame a primary cause. Three conditions for Mutiny are discussed, and this is
the first month in which no cause reaches a 100% circle. Several of the causes previously highlighted in full-sized circles reduce to 86 percent. On the left side of the chart, more circles appear than in the previous two months, with 12 negations of seven total causes, which is an average rate of 1.7 per article.

Considering the major causes, the most prominent changes occur with the British government and East India Company. While 75 percent of articles defend the government in August and all blame it in September, opinion divides in October, with three articles blaming and three defending, and this is partially due to the reintroduction of liberal journal articles. The East India Company slips slightly out of popularity with three defending it and only one citing the Company as a condition. Both the Company and the government have split the opinion, and they continue to be two of the most divisive issues of the Mutiny. Although there are no full circles, the native army, Asiatic character, conspiracy, caste, cartridgess, and religion remain among the most popular on the chart, each receiving blame from six out of seven articles. All seven articles discuss Asiatic character because, while six blame it, the Quarterly Review negates it. In this month, the major causes all remain popular, but the British government and East Company become causes with little unanimity.

Between the seven articles, four biases are voiced: liberal, conservative, evangelical, and moderate. Three conservative articles are printed from Bentley's, the Dublin Review, and the Quarterly Review. The Edinburgh Review prints the only liberal article, and the London Quarterly Review and the National Review each print one evangelical article. Fourteen of the 24 circles remain black because they are discussed by more than one affiliation. At 54.17 percent of causes appearing in more than one type of journal, October has the second highest rate of agreement in the series. October is also the first month in which the moderate British Quarterly
Review publishes, and its moderate position allows the journal to overlap with other types in ways that the other classifications do not. Through its color scheme, BQR fits into causes that are otherwise distinctly liberal and evangelical. The liberal blame for road and railways is shared with the moderate journal, and the article’s negation of the East India Company joins the evangelical defense.

While this month has a high rate of overlap between biases, apparent differences remain between the reading experience of conservative and liberal readers. The biggest disparity continues to be the volume with which readers would encounter Mutiny writing. While conservative journals publish three articles, the liberal reader would receive only one article from the Edinburgh Review. The most frequent disagreement between the two biases begins to emerge more strongly in October as conservative journals tend to blame the British government and East India Company while liberal ones defend the government. They defend the Company to a lesser extent, as shown in October when the Edinburgh Review does not discuss the Company at all. Readers of these two different biases would be receiving quite opposite information about the role of the government and the Company in the Mutiny, and this pattern continues throughout these imagined reading experiences.

Quarter 2: November 1857 – January 1858

“The true causes which led our soldiery to defy their masters” (“Our Indian Empire” 660)

The final quarter of 1857 brings a more focused analysis of the Mutiny, as articles tend toward identifying root causes and show a refinement in causation, citing between 10 and 14 causes compared to the first quarter’s 12 to 16. While causes decline, negations rise as articles become more focused on defending than blaming, and this creates more causes divided between
both sides of the chart. This quarter focuses on defense more than any other, and this divides many causes that were previously only discussed on one side of the chart. While demonstrating a refinement in opinion, this reduction as of yet does not appear any more greatly influenced by political or religious agendas than in the previous quarter. This quarter decreases only 0.1 percent in black circles from 47.5 to 47.4 percent. Although politics seem to affect opinion very little more than before, the conservative and liberal reading experience would be more differentiated this quarter by quantity of articles and more defined patterns.

November 1857

**Causes of Mutiny: November 1857**

---

Fig. 9. November 1857
Although November is a non-quarterly month, only two fewer articles publish than in the quarterly month of October. Collectively, these five articles assign blame 29 times to 14 different causes. At an average of 5.8 accusations per article, this chart shows a decrease in the rate of blame seen in the first quarter. There are fewer causes, accusations, and less agreement between them. As in October, no circles are full sized, and religion appears in the largest circle sized at 80 percent. Another three circles representing the British government, conspiracy, and Asiatic character are connected to three of the five articles. After these four, no cause is identified by more than one or two articles. In an increase from previous charts, there are three root causes assigned to the British government, religion, and conspiracy. On the left side of the chart, the circles have decreased from the previous month to six negations of five causes.

All eight majority causes appear in this month, but their appearance has changed. Religion remains the most similar to previous charts with four of five articles citing it as a cause. Both the British government and East India Company lose some support on the left side of the chart, but opinion remains divided as they still appear among both assertions and negations of cause. Three articles blame the British government, and one defends it. The East India Company receives slightly less attention as two articles blame it and one defends. Discussion of the Company comes exclusively from conservative journals, as shown by its blue circles, and this is the third consecutive month that the Company has been blamed by only conservative sources. As in previous months, every article discusses Asiatic character. As in October, opinion on Asiatic character appears on both sides of the chart, with two defending and three blaming. Conspiracy also causes some divide in opinion with one defending and three blaming. Caste, cartridges, and the native army decline this month, with only two articles blaming each. The major causes this month either decline or appear to have declined due to split opinions, which places smaller
circles on both sides of the chart. Although only three journals publish, four articles are from conservative voices while one represents a liberal organ. Bentley’s causes this imbalance because the journal publishes three separate articles about the Mutiny. Although the conservative articles, and even all of the articles from Bentley’s, do not completely agree with each other, noticeable differences separate the conservative and liberal opinion. Three of the four conservative journals blame the British government while the only liberal defends it. As in October’s chart, no conservative journal defends the British government while the liberal Edinburgh Review does, and this opinion on the British government continues to be one of the most distinct divisions between conservative and liberal journals. Conservative articles continue to assign root causes, with three of the four conservative articles blaming the British government, religion, and conspiracy. Additionally, three conservative articles also assign blame at a rate higher than average. In a decrease from the previous month, only 36.8 percent of causes are cited by more than one political affiliation, and this decline makes sense because only two political leanings print this month. With four out of five articles printed from the same classification, it follows that there would be less agreement across types because there are fewer journal types present.

The difference between conservative and liberal readers becomes more defined in November, as shown by the color in the chart. The seven black circles show the only overlap between the two readerships, and they represent the causes of religion, conspiracy, native army, road/railways, Asiatic character, cartridges, and caste. Every other cause has become polarized by the political concerns, and the gap in number of articles appears to have contributed to a gap in content because the liberal reader would only hear about eight different issues while the conservative reader would be thinking about 14. The liberal reader would differ most not in
opposing opinions on causes but in the large number of causes completely unmentioned by the liberal article. Only a conservative reader would be alerted to taxation, native princes, annexation, double government, the East India Company, the British government, and the Persian war as causes. The conservative readership would also receive a large difference in opinions on these topics because the four articles are split in opinion on Asiatic character, conspiracy, the East India Company, and annexation.

**December 1857**

*Causes of Mutiny: December 1857*

Fig. 10. December 1857.
As in November, December’s journals print five articles with a more conservative leaning, but this chart appears less cluttered than the previous because there are fewer lines and circles overall. Ten circles on the right side are connected to the articles with 24 lines, which is an average of 4.8 accusations per article. One condition is identified, and four out of five articles state root causes. In combination with the reduction in quantity of circles, this tendency towards primary causes suggests that December’s writers are particularly desirous of refining reasons for Mutiny. Two of these root causes, the British government and religion, return from the last month, and the other two root causes are directed at the native army, a cause new to bold lines but not 100 percent circles. The native army and religion occupy the month’s only full-sized circles, and they are the first in this size to appear since September. The left side of the chart shows an increase in total negations, but the rate of agreement between them remains the same, as six causes are defended a total of seven times.

The most popular of the major causes this month are religion and the native army, with each cause receiving blame from four of the five articles. Caste receives slightly more attention in December, with three articles blaming it. Five of the eight major causes appear on both sides of the chart, indicating mixed opinion on them as causes. Conspiracy, Asiatic character, the British government, East India Company, and cartridges receive both blame and defense. For the third consecutive month, Asiatic character appears on both sides of the chart, and all of the division still comes from within the conservative journals. While some conservative journals, along with other types, blame Asiatic character, they have also been the only ones to refute it, as shown by the blue circles on the left side of charts dating back to October. This marks the third consecutive, and forth total, month in which the British government and East India Company have appeared with both assertions and negations of cause. With much consistency through
March 1858, liberal journals defend both causes while evangelical and conservative journals blame them. The British government also continues to receive more attention overall than the Company. Cartridges remains one of the least popular of the major causes, and its two mentions are divided on opposite sides of the chart.

Although the number of articles remains steady from November, more colors show an increase in journal type this month. Blackwood’s publishes two Mutiny articles this month, which, when added to the one from Bentley’s, results in a total of three conservative articles in December. The Eclectic Review prints for the first time on the issue and presents an evangelical bias, and the liberal Fraser’s returns with one article. The earlier conservative pattern of assigning root causes continues in this chart as all three conservative articles identify a primary cause. Only two of the three conservative articles exceed the average accusation per article, a trait that fades as the charts progress. Although conservative patterns seem somewhat more easily spotted because of the quantity of articles, this month makes a couple of liberal tendencies more clear, including defending of the British government and blaming the native army. In December, only Fraser’s negates the British government, and this position has been shown in every preceding liberal article thus far. Every liberal article has also blamed the native army as a cause and annexation as either cause or condition.

December continues to be revealing about the conservative and liberal reading experience. Volume of publication remains the biggest difference between them as conservative journals print three articles to the liberal journal’s one. The native army is the only cause on which a conservative and liberal reader would receive the same opinion, something partially caused by the disagreement within the conservative articles themselves. Readers would have continued to receive opposite views on the British government; while the liberal reader would find a defense,
the conservative one would be told that the government was to blame as a cause and root cause. Annexation continues to be defended to the conservative reader, but the liberal reader would once again find annexation at fault. A few causes are exclusively mentioned by one leaning. Only the conservative reader would have considered taxation, religion, conspiracy, and caste as causes, and only the liberal reader would continue to read about the cartridge grievance.

January 1858

Although the London Quarterly Review reflected on “how little additional light the lapse of
three months has thrown on the causes of the mutiny,” January’s articles show definite changes in understanding and knowledge, especially through its most striking difference — the number and size of circles appearing on the left side of the chart (“Crisis” 532). Another quarterly publication month, January prints eight articles, which is the highest number published about the Mutiny so far. There are 44 lines connecting the articles to 14 causes, which averages to 5.5 assertions of cause per article. There are three conditions, three root causes, and no full-sized circles. The most popular causes — Asiatic character, the native army, and religion — are discussed in six out of eight articles. The left side of the chart shows the most distinct characteristic of January’s articles, as this month contains the highest number of negations. Eight causes are negated 24 times for an average of three per article. At an 11:6 cause-to-negation ratio, January’s articles are defending causes more than half as much as they are blaming, and this month shows the most evenness between the two sides.

The majority causes divide more as negations increase. The British government, East India Company, and Asiatic character remain split on both sides of the chart but are joined by caste and religion. The British government and East India Company lean heavily towards the left side of the chart with a 5:2 ratio of negations to assertions of cause each. Oppositely, Asiatic character, caste, and religion receive much more blame than defense, each receiving six assertions of blame and only one or two negations of cause. With five of the eight major causes split, only the native army, conspiracy, and cartridges appear on one side of the visualization. January shows resurgence of a few causes that had faded in the previous month, especially caste and cartridges.

Politically, this month is the most diverse so far, with articles from conservative, evangelical, liberal, moderate, and radical journals. Two of three conservative and one of two
evangelical journals assign a root cause, keeping the tendency to blame root causes with these types. Only one of the three conservative journals exceeds the average blame rate, which continues the decrease in this trend that began in December. Liberal journals continue to defend the British government, the East India Company, and annexation. More interesting things happen with the moderate BQR this month. In its second Mutiny publication, no cause cited by the journal is unique to the moderate position. Every citation overlaps with another cause, and it continues to overlap with evangelical journals, making the British government and double government exclusively evangelical causes. BQR also overlaps with the radical Westminster’s blame for the East India Company. With 54.5 percent of circles black, January is the month of most agreement between journals. While all quarterly publication months show an increase in black circles due to more types of journals, this quarter’s refinement of causes may have helped contribute to the overlap.

The reading experience of conservative and liberal readers continues to be most differentiated by quantity, with three conservative articles and one liberal. Both readers would have found blame for Asiatic character, the Native army, caste, religion, and conspiracy. However, the liberal reader would have found conspiracy cited only as a condition while the conservative reader would hear that conspiracy was a root cause. Distinctly conservative causes would be the Indian press, cartridges, the Persian War, annexation, and race differences while taxation would have been a liberal-only cause. Both readerships would also have heard defense for the British government, native princes, annexation, and the East India Company. The conservative reader would have heard additional defense of missionaries, Asiatic character, religion, and caste.
Quarter 3: February – April 1858

“Three months add sensibly … to the opportunity of calm combination” ("Our Relation" 249)

The third quarter presents months with both the most and fewest number of articles published in this study. There is also a great variety of journal classifications, with one month containing only one type and another printing from each type. While February shrinks to only three conservative journals, April prints eleven articles, with at least one from each classification identified in this project. In this quarter, Mutiny publication becomes irregular, and political biases become more distinct and defined. With an average of 35.4 percent of black circles among the three months, this quarter shows a decline in overlap suggesting a greater influence of political and religious agendas on Mutiny opinion. Just as overall journal classifications become more divided, so does the difference between the conservative and liberal reading experience.
Fig. 12. February 1858

Visually, February is the most strikingly dissimilar of all of the charts because every article, line, and circle appears in conservative blue. The conservative presence, which has been the majority voice in three of the months so far, is the only outlet speaking this month in three articles published from *Bentley’s* and *Blackwood’s*. There are 16 assertions of blame pointing to 10 causes, and this averages to 5.3 per article. This average returns downward after January’s slight increase to 5.5 from December’s 4.8. There are no conditions, and every article identifies a root cause. *Bentley’s* identifies the British government as the root cause, and both articles from
Blackwood’s point to conspiracy. Following the month with the most negations, February has the least, with only one negation made. This averages to 0.3 negations per article, which makes February the lowest in both total negations and average negations per article. There are no 100 percent circles, which at first appears surprising considering that all of the journals are published from the same political leanings. However, the conservative articles up to February have also been quite different from one another, so this may be an indicator of difference in the conservative perspective on the Mutiny.

For the first time, not all of the eight major causes appear in the chart. Caste does not appear in any of these articles, and this is noteworthy because it was discussed in seven of the nine total articles and all conservative journals in January. The elimination of caste anticipates the trend in following months that makes caste a distinctly liberal cause. The other seven causes are each discussed by two of the three articles. Two out of three articles blame the native army, Asiatic character, the British government, conspiracy, cartridges, and religion, and one blames the East India Company while another defends it, which keeps the Company as one of the most divided topics, even within the same political affiliation.

Politically, the conservative opinion appears exclusively. Conservative writers’ tendency towards root causes and conspiracy continues as all three have identified a root cause, and two journals point to conspiracy as the primary cause. For the first time since September, a liberal reader would not have had any new Mutiny information, and this marks a great difference between the reading experiences since the conservative would still be encountering ideas about the Mutiny at the same rate as before.
Fig. 13. March 1858.

Five articles publish in March, blaming 11 causes a combined 23 times. At an average of 4.6 assertions of blame per article, March’s rate of blame reduces from February even while increasing in number of articles. There are no conditions again, suggesting that writers became more sure of their positions on the Mutiny in the new year. Fraser’s assigns the only root cause to Asiatic character. Between the five journals, all of them agree on a single cause: the Native army. Though consistently popular throughout, this cause returns to a full-sized circle in March for the first time since August 1857. On the left, there are six negations of five causes, averaging
to 1.2 negations per article.

All eight major causes appear this month, with the native army, East India Company, and British government receiving the most attention. Only the native army appears in a full-sized circle, and all five articles do not share another cause. The East India Company and British government are each discussed by four articles, and their opinions continue to be split between the right and left sides of the chart. For the first time, liberal writers blame these two causes when previously they had mostly received the attention of conservative journals. Asiatic character, conspiracy, caste, and religion appear in black circles, and, along with the Native army, are the only causes shared between conservative and liberal journals. Cartridges are discussed by only one liberal journal.

Politically, March and the following months show some definite alterations as the party in power changes. In February 1858, Lord Palmerston and his liberal party were forced to step down after the failed Conspiracy to Murder Bill (Steele). In March, the charts show changes between liberal and conservative trends and attitudes toward government that are interesting considering the political change. The previous trend of conservative journals to blame the government at or above the average appears to decline as liberal journals rise in number of assertions per article, and this pattern continues for a couple of months. Although liberal articles have occasionally blamed causes overall at an above average rate in previous charts, a consistent pattern emerges between March and May, in which liberal journals blame at an above average rate while conservative ones fall below the average. Considering the shift in political power, this trend suggests that the party out of power becomes more vocal than the one in power. This also seems related to the pattern of blaming the East India Company and British government. In the months before March, neither the British government nor the East India Company has received
any blame from a liberal journal, but in this month, two of them blame the government. All three blame the Company. This shakeup in previously consistent political trends seems appropriately timed with the actual political changes happening in parliament.

Although great unanimity does not exist between the three liberal articles, especially since they all come from the same journal, there are definite liberal causes shown by the seven gold circles, and only six causes overlap between conservative and liberal journals. Readers of both types of journals would find defense for the British government and blame for five causes: conspiracy, Asiatic character, religion, the native army, and caste. These readers would have received opposite opinions on the East India Company and double government, with liberal journals blaming both while conservatives defend. There are an additional four causes that would have been seen by one reader. Only the conservative reader would consider the Indian press as a cause, and the liberal reader would continue thinking about cartridges and annexation as causes while also seeing a defense of missionaries.
With 11 articles published, April produces the greatest number of articles about the Mutiny. Fourteen causes are blamed a total of 50 times for an average of 4.5 accusations per article. For the third month in a row, there are no conditions. This elimination of conditions combined with the decline in average accusations continues to suggest that writers became more certain of their Mutiny theories after a few months. There are no full-sized circles, and there are two root causes that have been assigned by an evangelical journal to religion and one by a conservative journal to the native army. There are 10 negations of seven causes for an average of
0.9 negations per article. With five of these seven cited by only one article, there is little overlap between journals on the left side of the chart, but on the right, nine of the 14 causes appear in black circles, indicating citation from more than one political or religious affiliation.

All eight major causes are blamed on the right side of the chart, and three of them also receive defense on the left. This split opinion continues for the British government and East India Company, and Asiatic character reappears on both sides of the chart for the first time since January. Religion and the native army are each identified as a root cause by one article each. The least popular of the major causes this month are caste, conspiracy, and cartridges, which are mentioned in only two or three articles. Conspiracy continues to be a mostly conservative cause, but also appears as a radical cause in this month. Of all majority causes, all circles are black except caste, which appears in a yellow circle indicating solely liberal attention.

Every classification of journal appears in April with five conservative, two liberal, one radical, one Catholic, one evangelical, and the moderate BQR. Even though almost half of the articles come from a conservative bias, there are only two circles that remain colored blue, taxation and double government. All other conservative opinion overlaps with another type of journal. The conservative and evangelical tendency toward root causes continues this month, with one of each type citing a primary cause. The radical Westminster shows a distinct bias with four circles in only orange, which makes the radical journal the most different from others this month. The moderate BQR continues to print only causes that overlap with other classifications, but this time it does not align with any circles cited by only one other type of journal.

Much like the previous months, the greatest difference between a conservative and liberal reading experience would be the volume of Mutiny materials. With five conservative articles to the liberal two, the conservative reader would be engaging with Mutiny ideas from more sources
than a liberal one. The conservative reader would hear 20 accusations of 11 causes, and the liberal reader would be exposed to 14 accusations of nine causes. All liberal articles continue to blame at an above average rate while three of the five conservative ones do. Eight of these causes would be the same: the native army, native princes, British government, religion, Asiatic character, the East India Company, cartridges, and annexation. The distinctly conservative causes would be taxation, conspiracy, and double government while the only the liberal reader would hear about caste. Both liberal and conservatives would also read divided opinions on the British government and East India Company

**Quarter 4: May - July 1858**

*The time is come when we must acknowledge our own errors*” (“British India” 276)

In the final quarter of Mutiny publication in this project, a reduction in causes and rates of blame shows a dwindling interest in this foreign affairs topic, as attention turns to Italy. Fourteen articles publish this quarter, and twelve of them come from either a liberal or conservative bias. On average, only 18.2 percent of the total circles appear in black, which means that the remaining 81.8 percent of causes are isolated to only one political or religious affiliation in that month. The reading experience of conservative and liberal readers continues to become more differentiated along with the overall reduction in black circles. By July, which is a quarterly publication month, only four articles are printed, and Mutiny publication becomes irregular after this point.
Fig. 15. May 1858.

After April’s peak, May features a decline in the number of articles, accusations, causes, and average assertions per article. Six articles are printed from Bentley’s, Blackwood’s, the Eclectic Review, and Fraser’s. Nine causes are blamed a total of 17 times, averaging to 2.8 accusations per article, which is the lowest average in this study. There are no conditions, and conspiracy is the only root cause identified. There are no full-sized circles, and Asiatic character receives the most blame while the British government receives the most defense. On the left side of the chart, five causes are negated eight times, for an average of 1.6 negations per article. Of
the 14 circles on both sides of the chart, only five are connected to more than one article, and four of them are cited by more than one journal type.

All eight major causes appear on this chart. Five appear on the right side only, one on the left only, and two split between both sides. Conspiracy, the native army, Asiatic character, religion, and cartridges are blamed, and the British government is defended by four out of six articles. This is the first month since August in which the British government has not been cited as a cause. The East India Company and caste appear on both sides of the chart. The Company is blamed once and defended once while caste is blamed twice and defended once. For the second consecutive month, caste appears in a yellow, liberal-only circle, but it is joined by a blue, conservative defense on the left side of the chart.

The conservative trend to produce more Mutiny articles than other affiliations continues in May as three conservative, one evangelical, and two liberal articles are published. Four out of the 14 circles appear in black, and the overall agreement between different classifications of journals has continued to decline. Conservative journals continue the trend began in March of citing fewer cause per article and falling below average while the liberal articles cite the highest number of causes. Conservative journals continue to favor root causes and conspiracy, and this is a trend that has been consistent throughout. With 28.6 percent black circles, May begins the steep drop off of agreement between classifications.

With three conservative and two liberal articles, the reading experience is closer in quantity than it has frequently been in other months. In this fourth quarter, the reading experience in terms of content has separated as causes between all types of journals have also become less likely to cross over different classifications. A conservative reader would have seen four accusations of blame to three causes and three negations of three causes. A liberal reader would have seen eight
accusation of six causes, and two negations of a single cause. Both would have read that the native army and Asiatic character were to blame for the Mutiny, and both would have found defense for the British government. These three circles are the only ones shared between the two readers. Only the conservative reader would be discussing the role of conspiracy and the defense of annexation and caste. Oppositely, a liberal-only reader would find blame for caste, the East India Company, cartridges, and religion.

**June 1858**

Fig. 16. June 1858.

Four articles are published in June, and these articles blame 10 causes a total of 14 times.
At an average of 3.5 accusations per article, this month increases from May’s 2.8 average, but still shows the overall reduction in blame in this fourth quarter. Not only are there no full-sized circles, but there is also nothing greater than a 50 percent circle. Four causes are cited by two articles, and all of the remaining causes and negations are cited by one article only. There are no conditions, and no root causes. There are six negations of six individual causes, and June averages 1.5 negations per article. However, the chart clearly shows that the majority of negations come from a single article.

All eight major causes appear on the right side of the chart, and four of them receive additional attention on the left. Conspiracy, caste, the native army, and religion occupy the largest circles, and are cited by two articles each. Cartridges, the East India Company, religion and the British government are conservative-only causes while Asiatic character and the Native army are liberal causes. Religion, the British government, caste, and the East India Company all appear on both sides of the chart, and, thus, the British government and East India Company remain two of the most divided issues throughout the series.

With two conservative and two liberal articles, June is the most evenly divided month between these two classifications. While nine out of 12 times the conservative articles outnumber the liberal ones, this month is even. Breaking recent trends, the conservative journals are blaming more than the liberal ones. This return to earlier charts marks the end of the trend for liberal articles to blame above the average rate. Dropping to 12.5 percent black circles, June is the lowest month of agreement between journal types as only two causes appear in both conservative and liberal articles.

Although the difference between quantities of articles is even this month, there is greater difference between the content of the articles. In this month, both readers would have
encountered only two of the same causes – conspiracy and caste. These two causes appear in both the liberal and conservative journals while the remaining 88 percent of causes would be isolated to only one readership. This means that a conservative reader would be the only one to see blame directed towards cartridges, religion, the East India Company, annexation, and the British government. Conservatives would also see missionaries defended from blame. None of these causes would appear in the pages of the liberal reader’s publication. Instead, the liberal reader would be concerned with blame for the native army, native princes, and Asiatic character. Additionally, several causes blamed by the conservative position would only appear as negations in the liberal eye, and these are religion, the British government, annexation, caste, and the East India Company.
Fig. 17. July 1858.

Four articles are published in July, and they cite 10 causes and four negations. As a quarterly publication month, this quantity of articles shows the reduction in opinion concerning the Mutiny; through the rest of the year, only seven articles are published, with two months publishing no Mutiny articles. This is the fourth month in which no full-sized circle appears, and this continues to suggest that Mutiny opinion has become more influenced by politics in the third and fourth quarters. There is one root cause identified by BQR. One article in this month does not blame or cite any causes or negations, but as part of a series of other Mutiny articles, still
belongs in the chart. As the fifth article in a series of Mutiny accounts, the fact that this one does not discuss the causes of the Mutiny strongly suggests that the initial desire to point fingers has diminished. The largest circles are causes identified by two of the four articles, and these are conspiracy, religion, annexation, and the British government. Of these four, the first three appeared in the largest circles from last month, and the British government switched sides.

Seven of the eight major causes appear in this month, with the missing one being cartridges. Not in a majority circle since February, it is interesting that one of the most frequently cited causes in current cultural and historical criticism fades and then disappears by July, reappearing only once more in the rest of 1858. The British government, religion, and conspiracy remain the most popular of the major causes. The native army, Asiatic character, the East India Company, and caste are all blamed by one article, and the native army and Asiatic character also appear on the left side with one article defending each.

As political leanings have become more distinct from each other, only two causes overlap between affiliations this month, shown by the color of the circles. Two of the 14 circles appear in black circles, while all others are colored to indicate a presence in only one leaning. The only causes that are discussed by more than one type of journal are conspiracy and religion. As they had since June, conservative journals blame at a rate higher than average again, and liberal ones have returned to a below-average rate. In this month, the moderate BQR differentiates itself from other leanings in significant ways that haven’t been seen in other charts. While the journal previously blended with a variety of affiliations, the moderate stance appears to have developed as something distinct from the others. Two of its five causes overlap with conservative ones, but the other three only appear in the moderate journal. The BQR, which was previously fluid in opinion and overlapping with various affiliations, appears to have solidified its own opinion in
July as something distinct from others, and this is further supported by the pattern visible in the chart that suggests political and religious ideologies begin to play a larger role in Mutiny ideas as time distances writers from the event.

With one liberal and two conservative articles, the division in quantity of article returns to the usual heavier-weighted conservative side in July. However, the number of articles assigning blame is the same because one conservative article makes no assertions or negations. The only common causes shared between the two readerships are religion and conspiracy, and this is because they are the only two causes cited by the liberal article at all. The conservative reader would have also seen blame directed toward annexation, the British government, race differences, the East India Company, and caste. While the liberal reader would not have seen any causes defended from blame, the conservative reader would see defense for the native princes, missionaries, Asiatic character, and the native army.

**Summary**

Throughout the first four quarters of Mutiny publication, 65 articles were printed from 14 journals representing six different political or religious affiliations. Overall, Mutiny publication decreases over time, with the greatest reduction in the fourth quarter, as fewer articles publish about fewer causes. These diminishing causes and the near-elimination of conditions after November 1857 suggest that writers became more sure of their stated causes over time, and as shown by the increase in colored circles, also became more sure of political agendas attached to the revolt. Some visible political patterns include a conservative trend towards blaming conspiracy. Conservative and evangelical journals are most likely to cite a root or primary cause. Until the conservative party takes over in parliament in February 1858, conservative writers were more likely to blame more causes per article, but after falling out of power, liberal writers
become more likely to blame at a high rate. Also reflecting current party politics, every liberal writer before March 1858 defended the British government from blame. This, along with the difference in number of articles published, marks the greatest difference observable in the charts between a conservative and liberal reader. Conservative journals publish 33 articles while liberal journals print only 16.
Application

Although it is possible to use the results of this project to talk about many Mutiny issues, I want to focus on the critical issues presented in my Introduction. I will first discuss questions of military mutiny and national revolution, the cartridge grievance, and Orientalizing rhetoric. Next, I will discuss how patterns in the visualization’s colors reveal a strong political bias in the Mutiny periodical response. Lastly, this chapter will explore this study’s implications for further periodical studies and the use of digital humanities in periodical research. As representatives for Mutiny study approaches, Sir John Kaye, Vindyak Savarkar, Guantam Chakravarty, Patrick Brantlinger, and Christopher Herbert characterize a variety of ways critics have attempted to interpret the event, and these results will speak to their individual criticism as representatives of larger approaches.

**Military Mutiny or National Revolt?**

These results address the most pressing question about the event: whether it was a military mutiny or national revolt. The visualizations reveal the degree to which periodical writers adhered to either end of this question, and although the British response is portrayed by many subsequent historians as uniformly suggesting a military mutiny, the results show otherwise. By examining patterns in causation, these results show a divided opinion, as writers blamed military causes, such as the native army and the greased cartridges, but also were critical of the British government and blamed national causes, such as religion. These results support
Herbert’s theory that British opinion was divided and challenge reconstructions that simplify or polarize the response.

The stakes of asserting either label are great. As Chakravarty points out, these titles represent a difference in opinion on the role of the British in India. While a national revolt implies that an entire nation rose against British rule, a military mutiny allows for blame to fall on a portion of the Indian populace and away from the British. If a mutiny, the British could reclaim their right to rule in India because the event would have been “unprovoked and unreasonable,” both excusing the British from blame and reasserting their right to govern in the nation (“The Military” 28). If a national revolution, British rule in the country could be called into question. As Herbert points out, Mutiny critics often act as if this distinction is a modern one imposed on the historiography well after the event, but it was a debate from the very outset (8). He cites Benjamin Disraeli’s parliamentary speech, in which Disraeli asserts that it was “of primary importance to know whether it was a military mutiny or a national revolt” (qtd. in Herbert 8).

Herbert’s assertion that the debate existed from the beginning of the British response is supported by data visualization of the periodical response, and the charts show divided and varied opinion concerning causes indicating either a military mutiny or national revolt. Causes suggesting a military mutiny are localized to dissatisfaction within the army alone. The native army and cartridges work to deflect blame by rooting the cause in the military. Causes supporting a national revolt include both directly British causes, such as the British government, the East India Company, and double government, but also causes indicating a dissatisfaction of the Indian populace, such as religion. In order to examine how writers talked about a military mutiny, the native army and cartridges will be traced. For a national revolt, religion and the
British government show that opinion was not as uniformly pro-military mutiny as Herbert believes modern critics have made it appear. By tracing the patterns of these causes, the visualizations reveal that the periodical press was more divided concerning a mutiny or revolution than popularly believed. The native army finds frequent blame, but the British government and religion are blamed in even greater numbers and more consistently while the cartridge grievance loses popularity only a couple months into the periodical press’s Mutiny discourse.

Articles asserting the native army as a cause indicate the Mutiny was drawn entirely from the military, even while sometimes acknowledging that the British formed the army. The native army is one of the most popular causes in the series of charts, receiving 41 assertions of blame over the course of the year, and it shows up consistently, cited by a minority of articles during only two months. It is blamed as a root cause twice and defended once. This negation appears in the final month, and *The Quarterly Review* writes that “the Sepoy army was part of the people, its grievances are those of the population from which it had been drawn” (“British India” 228). While this article conflates the native army with the larger population, other articles blame the army as a localized entity. This supports Douglas Peers’s observation that the native army is consistent in Mutiny publication, but the question of military mutiny or national revolution becomes more complicated when causes indicating national disaffection are examined.

A reading of causes indicating national revolution further supports Herbert’s claim that the British interpretation of the event was not exclusively as a military mutiny. There are two types of causes suggesting a national revolution: causes that affect the entire population and causes that directly blame the British government’s rule. By tracing religion as a representative for national issues and the British government as an obvious cause pointing to their rule, the visualizations
show that the initial response contained much blame directed at national causes and very divided opinion on British rule. As one of the most popular major causes, religion dips below 50 percent assertions of blame only once in the 12 months following the Mutiny and is blamed a total of 44 times. While the cause is negated twice, religion is also the most cited root cause, with four articles assigning this attribution. This popularity shows that periodical writers attributed causation to more than military disaffections.

As another representative for causes indicating a national revolt, the British government is blamed 27 times and cited as a root cause twice. Unlike other causes discussed in this chapter, the British government was a more divisive issue, as it appears 22 times on the left side of the chart, indicating negations. Observing political patterns, in which every liberal article negates the cause while their party is in power, can partially explain this split. These citations of the government show the press was examining the role of the British in India, and also that they were more comfortable with assigning national causes not directed at British rule. These causes aligning with a national revolt best support Herbert’s argument for “inner contradiction” within the Victorian response because their prevalence in the periodical response shows that both sides of this argument received full attention in the press (5). While the difference between a military mutiny and national revolt still matters greatly for critical scholarship, the visualizations show that the debate was as divided then as now. By blaming both the native army and national causes like religion and the British government, the press shows an inconclusive decision on the actual nature of the event.

**The Cartridge Grievance**

Although citing the cartridge grievance was one way that writers indicated a military mutiny, this individual cause is of further critical importance because Mutiny reconstructions cite
it frequently. However, the results show that the cartridge grievance was less popular than many other causes in the periodical response. The grievance’s lackluster presence and eventual disappearance from the visualizations makes a strong argument against modern reconstructions’ reliance on greased cartridges to explain the Mutiny. This challenges any study relying heavily on this cause.

Relative to the seven other major causes discussed in the previous chapter, the cartridges are one of the least discussed, receiving 29 assertions of blame in the year, compared to the more popular religion’s 44. Though appearing in full-sized circles for the first two months of Mutiny publication, the grievance reduces to 40 percent in November and 20 percent in December. In 1858, the cause waffles, sometimes appearing in majority-sized circles and in other months reducing to one assertion. However, after February, the cause does not appear in a circle larger than 27 percent. In the fourth quarter, cartridges are blamed once in May, once in June, and disappear completely in July.

All cultural and historical reconstructions discuss the cartridge grievance, but the degree to which they use the cartridges to explain the causes of the Mutiny shows distance from contemporary opinion as expressed in periodicals. Historical and cultural reconstructions that return to cartridges as a main cause return to 1857 but not 1858 by relying on a cause the Victorians themselves discredited by the end of the year. A reading of Kaye’s history further supports this. While he discusses the cartridge grievance, Kaye determines the Mutiny was caused by larger issues, with which cartridges had “no connexion” (III.306). From an Indian nationalist perspective, Savarkar argues that blaming the cartridges compares to putting “all the responsibility on the match instead of on the man who struck it” (6). By the end of 1858, it seems the Victorians agree with him, as cartridges have disappeared as a cause but the British
government remains. This further supports Herbert’s claim that the Victorian response was not as uniform as it is often represented.

In modern reconstructions, Brantlinger most relies on cartridges to explain the Mutiny. Calling it “the most immediate cause,” the cartridge grievance is the only cause explained in any length in his work (200). He acknowledges that there “were more important causes,” but he only explores cartridges because “most British analysts found discontent only within the native regiments, which saved them from acknowledging widespread unrest” (200). This conflation and simplification of the British response is unsupported by a reading of the periodical press, in which cartridges died within a year and national disaffections such as religion are fully acknowledged. The resurrection of the cartridge issue in modern reconstructions becomes more problematic when viewed in context with not only the periodical response but also with contemporary histories, both British and Indian.

**Othering India: Racist and Orientalist Rhetoric**

Although periodical writers admitted to causes indicating a national revolt, Chakravarty and Brantlinger theorize that the British attempted to defend themselves and their right to rule through racist and Orientalizing rhetoric. This othering appears in the visualizations as Asiatic character, a cause in which writers blamed a variety of characteristics depicting Indians as uncontrollable barbarians or creatures of less intelligence. Chakravarty argues that this othering of Indians places the British as racially superior and allows for explanations of both the cause and failure of the Mutiny. Because of a lack of racial character, the Indians mutinied against British rule, which circularly supports continued British governance because of superior character. Brantlinger uses the polarization he finds in Mutiny literature to explain how the British were able to deal with their guilt over the event and then return to power. The results of
the visualizations suggest that while this rhetoric was not as ubiquitously deployed as Chakravarty and Herbert theorize, the patterns connecting Asiatic character to the British government support their arguments for racism as a way out of blame.

Though as popular a cause as the native army, Asiatic character is much more divided, with 42 assertions of blame and eight negations. While conservatives and liberals both blame Asiatic character as a cause, no liberal article denies the cause. This difference is important for Chakravarty’s claims that racist rhetoric was used to bolster administrative needs because the party in power never negated the cause. This suggests that while other types of journals may be more comfortable with undermining British rule, and thus, not needing Asiatic character as a cause, the government’s party relied more heavily on blaming the differences in Indians in order to preserve their reign.

Because Chakravarty and Brantlinger argue that this othering was used to justify British rule, comparing citations of Asiatic character with the British government, the visualizations show a connection between being able to admit blame and forcing more blame on someone else. Twenty out of 27 times an article blames the British government, it also blames Asiatic character, which suggests that the British may have attempted to sidestep blame and reassert power, even while acknowledging some fault, through highlighting race. These findings are interesting considering Kaye’s history, in which he acknowledges the national nature of the rebellion and criticizes annexation, but calls the participants “heathens” who need the “manhood of Britain” to repress the rebellion and return to power (II.453). The development of “Indian difference” in the British history of the event is seen in several histories explored by Chakravarty, and in these portions of the account, he observes efforts to show this difference between not only Indians and Britons, but also among Indians themselves, both of which work to
justify British rule (31). Environmental, biological, racial, national, and cultural differences between Indians and Britons are distinguished, and this distance makes the British more justified to rule. Additionally, these histories are focused on the differences between the cultures and religions in India. By blaming the rebellion on racial terms, this difference between peoples ultimately “vindicated the necessity of governing a people who had signally failed to take a united stand” (31). This concern noted by Chakravarty in early histories is supported by the visualizations and patterns not only of Asiatic character alone, but also those in conjunction with the British government. Additionally, these patterns support the demonizing of Indians that justifies reconquering the colony, according to Brantlinger. Of the articles that direct some blame at the British government, 74 percent can do so only while also blaming Asiatic character. Combined with Brantlinger’s and Chakravarty’s close readings of Mutiny history and literature, this pattern seems to validate their readings, which in turn, helps support the visualization.

**Political Patterns**

One of the strongest ways that these results speak to other cultural and historical reconstructions of the Mutiny is through their use of color to indicate political or religious biases. The charts show that the British reception of the Mutiny was affected by political and other biases through observable patterns and the increasing number of colored circles. The patterns offer an answer for Ainslee Embree’s question about how Mutiny writers produce such vastly different results from limited, similar information, and support Chakravarty’s claim that political needs affected Mutiny historiography. The results also challenge Herbert’s trauma theory by showing the extent of politicized interpretation in the periodical response.

The political trends identified in the previous chapter show that there were definite differences between various affiliations’ Mutiny representations, and this offers an explanation
for the range of responses observed by Embree. If information was affected by political or religious biases, then the representations of the Mutiny would be different even when the information provided was the same. These patterns also support Chakravarty’s argument that the administration’s needs altered Mutiny opinion. Chakravarty observes in the early histories a strong political effect that shows how “historiography worked in tandem with the administrative needs of the colonial state during periods of crisis, producing narratives, explaining events and enlisting opinion” (21). This work being done by early histories was not the first time politics affected the Mutiny’s historiography, as seen in the visualizations. With increasingly colored causes, political and religious biases were always a factor in the Mutiny’s representation, and the changes from month to month in periodicals provide an interesting beginning for explaining how the events were represented and why they were different in the later histories. However, while the existence of definite patterns between types of journals helps explain Embree’s question and support Chakravarty’s connections between politics and Mutiny historiography, the ratio between black and colored circles challenges Herbert’s trauma theory.

The overall downward slope of Mutiny publication suggests that the trauma felt by the British might not have been as permanent as Herbert argues. Data visualization shows that the periodical culture had begun to move on a little over a year after the event and completely only a few months later when Italy became the more interesting foreign affairs topic. In Herbert’s theory, this trauma had long-lasting, permanent effects on the British psyche, which he argues is why Mutiny novels were written at a high rate for years after the event. However, the waning interest evident in the periodical press across the first 12 months of publication suggests that the event was not perhaps the “watershed event deserving exhaustive, minutely detailed documentation” that Herbert argues (134). When Italy became more exciting, the need to “relive
the Indian war again and again” disappears from the periodical press, which shows either the “compulsive” need has faded or was never truly a compulsion (135).

Political trends present an even stronger challenge to Herbert’s trauma theory by showing that not only does interest in the Mutiny dwindle within a year but also that political agendas are always present in Mutiny publication. The rate of change between black and colored circles challenges not only the permanence but also the validity of Herbert’s trauma theory as the periodical press demonstrates somewhat less-than-overwhelming consensus between politics throughout the year of Mutiny publication. As interest in the Mutiny fades, political influence increases, as shown by the increase in colored circles. In the visualizations, political patterns can be traced through a comparison of black to colored circles, which shows how many causes appear in more than one political or religious affiliation in that chart’s month. While the first and second quarters average to 47.5 percent and 47.4 percent black circles, respectively, the third quarter drops to 35.4 percent of black circles. In the fourth quarter, only 18.2 percent of causes are agreed upon by more than one type of journal. When calculated for slope in a linear trend line, these rates reveal that, if continued at the same rate of change in the first 12 months, no journal would agree on any cause after the 19th month of Mutiny publication. While this may not be the actual trend continued in the periodical press, this slope shows the sharp changes in Mutiny publication concerning political interest during the time charted. Additionally, with the highest average for a quarter at 47.5 percent and the highest individual month at 54.5 percent, consensus across political affiliations does not appear at any great rate at any time throughout the first year of Mutiny publication, which suggests that political and religious ideologies were

---

2 A computer generated linear trend line tracking the rate of change between black and colored circles per quarter for the first year produces a line with a slope of -9.98. This line approaches zero just after the nineteenth month, which mathematically suggests that, if steady, black circles would completely be eliminated from the visualizations by this time.
always present, and increasingly so as time increased from the event, in the minds of Mutiny writers.

**Periodical Studies**

In addition to influencing Mutiny criticism, these results show the need for further periodical research. Patterns in these results raise questions about authorship studies, the *British Quarterly Review*, and broader approaches to periodical studies. Furthermore, these results demonstrate the ability of digital humanities tools, and data visualization specifically, to aid this research.

While the *Wellesley* has identified authors, more research is needed to explore what difference authors’ identities have on the journals to which they submit articles and the opinions represented therein. This study raises this question by virtue of omission. Because it treats articles as they originally appeared — anonymous submissions — information about authorship is not addressed. As a result, some questions remain missing from the visualization that would have been more thoroughly explored with a consideration of authorship. Patterns concerning authors cannot be traced, and this question is important concerning writers publishing frequently on the topic and in different journals. In particular, there are a few authors who dominate the discourse, including Sir John Kaye, who wrote seven out of this study’s 65 articles. Although a few authors, such as W.D. Arnold⁴, publish a comparable number of articles, Kaye’s work stands out because it appears in a variety of journals and affiliations. While Arnold publishes five articles in only *Fraser’s*, the *Wellesley Index* has identified Kaye as contributor to six different journals during his lifetime and three during the years studied in this thesis. Kaye’s seven Mutiny articles from 1857-1858 were printed in the conservative *Blackwood’s*, liberal *Edinburgh*

---

⁴ William Delafield Arnold was “the first public director of instruction in the Punjab” (“Arnold”). His articles on the Mutiny appear exclusively in *Fraser’s*. 

71
Review, and evangelical North British Review. This raises questions about how authors like Kaye, who submitted to multiple journals, may have altered their opinions in attempts to be published by different political organs. Additionally, this consideration of authorship would be particularly useful to Chakravarty’s section examining Kaye and Malleson’s history. As he devotes a portion of his section to the difference between the volumes contributed by each individual, Kaye’s earlier writings in the periodical press may provide insight into this work’s development. This research into authorship also has the potential to explain patterns in political affiliations and further define the particularities of individual journals’ biases and leanings.

The political considerations of this study also reveal a need for more research on the moderate British Quarterly Review. As a moderate, the journal’s stated causes stand out from others by aligning with other political affiliations that, in this visualization, allow circles to change color. Over the 12 months of visualization, BQR publishes four Mutiny articles with 25 stated causes, five of which overlap with other exclusively evangelical, radical, or conservative journals. These intersections with otherwise one-party causes make the journal an outlier in this study. With this flexibility, the moderate journal presents a distinctly malleable opinion. Additionally, the journal publishes five causes that are distinct to the moderate organ in that month: double government and missionaries in April 1857 and the native army, Asiatic character, and native princes in July 1858. Because the journal’s political leanings allow it to overlap with multiple affiliations in unique ways, the visualizations suggest that the journal deserves a place alongside “the great triumvirate of nineteenth-century periodicals,” joining the Westminster Review, Quarterly Review, and Edinburgh Review (Houghton III.528). In addition

---

4 Kaye is credited by the Wellesley Index with writing seven articles: Edinburgh Review’s “India” and “Conquest of Oude”; North British Review’s “The Crisis in India”; and Blackwood’s “A Familiar Epistle from Mr. John Company to Mr. John Bull,” “A Few More Words from Mr. John Company to Mr. John Bull,” “Mr. John Company to Mr. John Bull,” and “John Company’s Farewell to Mr. John Bull.”
to revealing more about the journal, study into BQR might also further define moderate politics by understanding its major organ.

Most importantly, this work suggests the need for broader approaches to periodical research. This project examined all Mutiny articles in the Wellesley Index, which allows the results to cover a more complete sampling of Victorian periodicals than other approaches. This success challenges cherry picking for anecdotal evidence in periodicals and validates the exploration of periodicals more broadly. While Chakravarty occasionally uses quotes from the periodical press, a handful of quotes does not support his work with the same fullness that broader research can offer. The results of this study would not be possible with only a limited reading in selected articles, and this shows that anecdotal use of periodicals is not the most effective use of the information.

One of the ways that this type of broad periodical research would be sustainable is through the tools of digital humanities. This thesis shows a need for further studies in periodicals, but also argues for the use of digital humanities in periodical research. Because of the volume of periodical materials, digital humanities offers a way to embrace the whole of periodical studies without reducing it to a resource for opportune quotes. Visualization in particular provides a lens into a great number of texts that might be otherwise unmanageable, especially in tandem with a larger project such as Mutiny representations across different disciplines. Additionally, the term “digital humanities” encompasses many approaches, tools, and methods. The type of digital humanities undertaken in this project seems especially useful for research in periodicals because it combines close reading with technology. However, visualization is one of many tools offered by digital humanities, and other tools have the potential to continue the work begun here.
Conclusion

Although this project establishes digital humanities tools as essential methodological approaches for periodical studies and begins to unearth the periodical response to the Mutiny, there is more research to be done. Data visualization is one of many tools available through digital humanities, and examining more articles, expanding the analysis to stated solutions, and pursuing corpus-based research all offer opportunities for continued inquiry. However, these approaches are ultimately limited by the availability of Mutiny texts in a digital format allowing for text manipulation.

Two possibilities for expanding on this project include adding more articles and altering the visualization to include stated causes. While this project only engages journals as indexed by the *Wellesley*, there are many more journals and Mutiny articles. The *Wellesley* provides an authoritative and reliable source for framing a project, but it also limits the scope of the work since the *Wellesley* does not include every periodical. Additionally, it only catalogs monthlies and quarterlies, which leaves out weekly and daily periodicals. An expanded version of this study could have many new aspects to consider, including how different-sized journals vary on the Mutiny. How publication speed affects the stated causes may prove fruitful since a daily’s finger-pointing would be out of circulation within 24 hours, while a quarterly’s claims would last for three months before being replaced by an updated opinion. Additionally, the rates of change between different types of publications would be traceable in this expanded format, and it would be interesting to investigate whether publications with shorter print cycles exhausted topics more
quickly that longer print cycles, since the shorter cycles have more opportunities to discuss the
topic in any given time frame.

By visualizing a different data set, this work could examine Eugenia Palmegiano’s claim
that articles stating one cause often cite the same solution. These connections could be visualized
by creating an additional chart or perhaps through a revised version of the charts featured in my
results chapter, in which causes appear on one side of the chart and solutions on the other. This
would allow for connections between causes and solutions through the center row of articles.
This visualization may be especially effective since, if Palmegiano’s theory proves correct, a
perfect agreement between causes and solutions would render each side of the chart a mirror
image of the other. Thus, visual symmetry would provide an immediate sense of the overall
connection between the causes and solutions before even attempting a close analysis of the
graph.

In addition to expanding the visualizations, other digital humanities approaches offer new
routes of inquiry, most notably through corpus-based research. Chakravarty’s and Brantlinger’s
interests in Mutiny language surrounding representations of Indians may be supported by corpus-
based studies or word cloud visualizations, both of which use the entirety of a text to break down
its individual words and patterns. Corpus research and word visualizations would offer the ability
to see Mutiny rhetoric on a larger, more complete scale. As a visual form of corpus research,
word clouds such as those generated by Voyant Tools could be useful tools for making
arguments about rhetoric. Voyant Tools is a web-based text analysis tool that produces a variety
of corpus tools in a single window, including word clouds, frequency trackers, word trends, and
keywords in context.
Fig. 18. Voyant Tools Analysis of “The Religions of India”

As shown by the above figure, Voyant Tools’s interface allows for a variety of corpus-based inquiries that would offer additional possibilities. Research using a corpus tools such as this one could examine the overall word use, including the identification of words most frequently within a given corpus. A word cloud, as shown in the upper left corner, generates the most frequent words in a visual form. A statistical breakdown appears underneath, and it includes total number of words and word counts for all unique words. Regarding specific critics such as Chakravarty or Herbert, individual words could be traced for placement within articles, as shown by the line graph in the upper left corner, and in relation to surrounding words, as shown in the lower right corner of the image.

However, many of these research possibilities are hindered by the absence of the material in a digital form that can be manipulated by digital tools. In order to pursue corpus studies, such
as those available through Voyant Tools, Mutiny articles would need to be accessible in plain text format. This problem partially explains why my visualizations used close readings to gather data and perhaps why others have not previously applied digital humanities tools to Mutiny studies. Although subscription databases and free archives hold an increasing number of periodicals, there are a variety of problems with the current state of Mutiny texts, including issues of completion and format.

Currently, periodicals are available through subscription and free archives, but neither resource offers a complete collection of journals. Proquest’s subscription archive British Periodicals Database contains many of this project’s journals, including Blackwood’s, Bentley’s, and the Dublin Review. However, the archive does not contain all of the journals in the Wellesley and, thus, does not provide access to all of the articles in this project. Google Books offers free access to a variety of publications, but because Internet users upload these texts, their collection is spotty and unpredictable. Although completion is an issue, the biggest problem with subscription and free archives of Mutiny texts is that the data is not raw enough for corpus study.

In order to manipulate data in a program like Voyant Tools, the works must be available in plain text format. Both BPD and Google Books present texts in portable document format (PDF), which are images and do not allow for text manipulation. Google Books contains a setting that converts the image into plain text, but the optical character recognition technology is unreliable, especially when used on older texts. The rate of error in this technology makes Google Books’s plain text transfer an unsuitable resource for scholarly research. BPD also displays its holdings as PDFs, and plain text versions are only available through negotiations with Proquest. However, these versions still contain similar problems to Google Books’s due to the OCR technology.

In order to better understand the Indian Mutiny, we need a fully digitized archive of
Mutiny articles. Currently, the only resource for accessing articles in this form is the *Victorian Web*’s archive, which gives plain text access to 22 articles, and these are the only Mutiny articles that can be approached using Voyant Tools. Although a start, the current resources are not sufficient for the research that needs to be done next.
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