Romanticism and Parenting
For my mother, Ann M. Drake,
who, by enduring example,
gave me a deep love of reading
and an even deeper love of parenting.

- C.A.W.
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In the introduction, Carolyn A. Weber explores the themes of Romanticism and the child, drawing on the works of William Blake and William Wordsworth. She contrasts the child's purity with the exploitation of self and world, highlighting how children serve as icons in Romantic discourse. Children, according to the Romantics, bring us back to our original oneness with divinity. The text includes a reference to Felicia Dorothea Hemans' poem "Indian Woman’s Death Song," which is part of the collection "Romantic Women Poets." The introduction concludes with a reflection on how children remind us to re-imagine the world, a reminder that imagination, for them, is the most legitimate, if perhaps only, reality.
And yet such “romanticised” notions of the child are not, plainly, so unwaveringly “romantic”. No surprise, given the slipperiness of the term “Romanticism” itself. Despite the fact, however, that children were being sentimentalized, even transcendentalised, long before Wordsworth and Blake were using them for symbolic fodder, the child does evolve into something distinct and unique under the pen of the Romantics, something more transfixing because of its ambiguities and even inconsistencies. Alan Richardson aptly identifies it as thus: that the Romantics “succeeded at popularizing an image of the child which was no less powerful for being somewhat incoherent, intermingling the sentimentalism of eighteenth-century verse, the transcendentalism of Vaughan, a Lockean emphasis on the child’s malleability, and a Rousseauvian faith in original innocence and “natural” principles of growth”.

And yet what of the representation of actual parenting in Romantic texts? The relationship between children and their parents in Romantic literature still remains critically overlooked at large. Whether in overt or encoded terms, whether between two fictional characters or between an author and his or her own children, the complications of ideological constructions of children by the parents themselves in Romantic discourse beg further discussion. In Felicia Hemans’ poem “Indian Woman’s Death Song,” from which I took the epigraph above, the speaker, a Native American mother betrayed by her lover, tells her infant girl of the promise of escape from their current suffering in the afterlife. The poem is constructed as the mother’s justification of her act of suicide (and of infanticide) before their canoe’s fatal plunge over the waterfall. These lines offer an appropriate point of departure because of their complex capturing of several themes that will be examined in this volume regarding parent-child relationships as well as constructions of parenting, especially against notions of “audience,” whether it be the child him or herself, an intimate coterie or a larger, even more political, readership. The ways in which one constructs oneself as parent find parallels in authorial implications of power as well. Whether “family” involves one parent warning his or her same sex child of the gendered trappings of the world, or an educator attempting to reconcile (or not) theoretics with the pragmatics of procreation, or a politician acting as patriarch to a burgeoning nation, we see that the Romantics show us how parenting assumes an aesthetics of responsibility from a position of empowerment, or at the very least, decodification. The great parent is the great teacher and vice versa; while the poet may help us see things anew, the parent

1 Richardson (1999), pp. 23-43.
helps us navigate life as it is. Writing thereby becomes a form of parenting, not only in its generating of textual progeny, but in its patriarchal or maternal stance (whether conformist or subversive) towards a readership that needs to be “taught” something. The effect is not merely didactic, though certainly ideas or “facts” are conveyed to this end. But rather, as many of the ensuing essays explore, parenting principles, as tied up with desires to particularly bestow moral responsibility, become means by which to claim “legitimate” ways of rejecting or reinstating the “other”.

Taken in this light, children of such Romantic discourses are not limited to poetic or iconic symbols, but in fact reflect the appropriation, victimization or, at times, attempted healing of not only their parents, but of those who behold them. Parents teach us how to “read reality;” they help us de-code the world and, in turn, they also form how we encode it. Does this de-coding necessarily lead to a de-mystifying? And does this encoding necessarily lead to the creation of “isms” (racism, classicism, and so forth) that classify our perceptions, and thus, in turn, our actions? In response, the essays of this volume look at how parents create ways of being in the world; they both liberate and implicate as the experienced guides and signifiers of the “innocent”, moved by motives as seemingly mutually inclusive, but which prove at times to be interdependent, as love and power.

This collection has its roots in discussions from the 2005 Romanticism and Parenting Conference held at Seattle University in Seattle, Washington. To date, no other single volume exists in the academic market with such a specific focus on Romantic representations of parents and parent-child relations through such a wide spectrum of perspectives. Other works address Romanticism and related themes, such as the family and domesticity, or the cult of the child, although books in this field tend to remain limited to the contexts of specific authors or groups (such as the Godwin/Shelley circle). For instance, Judith Plotz provides a fascinating study of how seemingly enchanting Romantic textual depictions of childhood’s beauty and power actually come to betray a darker vision that problematises Romantic childhood joy and idyllic innocence. Plotz’s claim that the “embrace of absolute child is both a creative and destructive force”, however, remains limited to her study of four Romantics, namely Lamb, Coleridge, Wordsworth and DeQuincey. The other thread dominating existing studies involving the Romantic child privilege theories of education and language, as influenced by philosophers (such as Locke, Rousseau, and Godwin) and proto-child psychology movements, social reform acts or linguistic theories. Important discussions in this field include Lessons of Romanticism: A Critical Companion, eds. Thomas Pfau
and Robert F. Gleckner (Duke University Press, 1998), *The Educational Legacy of Romanticism*, ed. John Willinsky (Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1990), and, of course, Alan Richardson’s very important *Literature, Education and Romanticism* (Cambridge University, 1995). Substantial discussion exists not only of the development of the child as cultural symbol, but also of parenting, such as depicted in Roger Cox’s sweeping study of the child in history, from the “child of Puritanism” through the Enlightenment, Romanticism, Victorianism and into the millennium (*Shaping Childhood: Themes of Uncertainty in the History of Adult-Child Relationships*, London and New York: Routledge, 1996). However, such work stems from primarily a sociological platform as opposed to a literary one. No collection as of yet has been dedicated fully to a discussion of parent-child relations, and an analysis of their discourses and aesthetics, in Romantic literature and the arts. Perhaps the closest to achieving this aim thus far are the two very insightful volumes edited by James Holt McGavran, Jr.: *Romanticism and Children’s Literature in Nineteenth-Century England* (University of Georgia Press, 1991) and *Literature and the Child: Romantic Continuations, Postmodern Contestations* (University of Iowa Press, 1999). While the focus with both collections remains relatively on the symbolic figure of the child, representations of childhood and the politics of children’s reading, they do offer interesting forays into how parenting can assume poetic and even religious instructive paradigms, such as in McGavran’s own essay in the former collection “Catechist and Visionary: Watts and Wordsworth in ‘We are Seven’ and the ‘Anecdote for Fathers’”. Just this year, Julie Kipp published her exciting study entitled *Romanticism, Maternity and the Body Politic* (Cambridge University, 2007), but its emphasis remains with mothering, as opposed to wider notions of “parenting”. Caroline Gonda provides a compelling complementary point of view to parenting in her volume *Reading Daughters’ Fictions, 1979 – 1834: Novels and Society from Manley to Edgeworth* (Cambridge University, 2005). But again, prominence is given to feminist discussions and to the “child”, or in this case, “daughtership”. In general, then, as we can see, new criticism in the area of understanding implications of “Romantic parenting” is needed, as most recent discussions date primarily from the 1980’s and 90’s. Otherwise, the still fledgling scholarship in the field of Romantic parenting remains limited to single articles in scholarly journals, or focused studies within a range of authors, rather than within a convenient or sustained collection on the topic across many perspectives. Addressing this need in Romantic studies propelled the collection of these essays for the purpose of this book.
This collection acknowledges traditional discussions of such quintessentially “Romantic” themes as the child, education and familial politics while building upon contemporary innovative arguments, such as cognitive and family systems theories. As a result, the essays in Romanticism and Parenting: Image, Instruction and Ideology offer a fresh, timely, and cutting edge contribution to the field of Romantic studies. Chapters in the collection range from examining didactic children’s literature to complicating constructions of the family politic at personal, communal and nationalistic levels. As its title indicates, the collection addresses parent-child discourses among Romantic writers along three venues: image, instruction and ideology. “Image” pertains to the aesthetics of such discourses, in the semblance and structure of family systems (such as in Ingrid Rieger’s essay on Goethe’s representation of the family) as well as in actual visual arts (as seen in Catherine Anderson’s examination of paternalism in Romantic British art and in Amy Reeves’s article on Blake and Wollstonecraft). “Instruction” represents the educational values extended between parent figures and their audience, whether it is the instruction of a nation (as argued in Jeff Morgan’s essay on Benjamin Franklin) or of the soul (as seen in Brian Hollingworth’s discussion of the Edgeworths). “Ideology” conveys the dynamics of privatized discourses that take on larger political significance (as seen, for example, in the adaptation of myth in my discussion of Mary Shelley’s Proserpine, or in Robert Hale’s study of mourning mothers, or in David Ruderman’s examination of the problematically fictionalized “Romantic child”). While challenging and deepening an understanding of Romantic studies, the collection also makes connections to current issues (as exemplified in Sarah Moss’s comparison of pregnancy manuals and social dictates, then and now).

We contributors came together in the greatest collegial spirit as academics interested personally and professionally in the politics of parenting. For, as scholars steeped in the politics of production and the attractions and yet ironies of (pro)creation, how can one be a Romanticist without being drawn to the child, and thus, back to the parent? As Richardson writes:

In its threatened dissolution, childhood brings us up against the limits of certain canonical forms of Romanticism even in registering their cultural force. It may equally, however, raise questions regarding both the limits of a postmodern devaluation of Romantic values and the potential for finding
something to recuperate in a discourse that, as it recedes from us in time, throws our own cultural practices into sharper outline.\textsuperscript{4}

Consequently, the collection reveals how the Romantic period has come to profoundly influence our own current constructions of the family and such related terms as maternity, paternity, childhood, the body and “generation” in western culture.

**Works Cited**


In the spring of 1792, word reached England that Lord Charles Cornwallis, Governor-General of India, had at long last defeated Tipu Sultan, the so-called “Tiger of Mysore.” Tipu, king of the southern state of Mysore and Britain’s greatest foe in India, had agreed to Cornwallis’ terms of surrender, which included the handing over of two of his sons as hostages. This event quickly became the most celebrated aspect in contemporary visual accounts of the victory over Tipu during the Third Mysore War, providing artists with material both propagandistic and sentimental. Cornwallis, assuming the role of the boys’ father, demonstrated magnanimity toward the sons of his enemy, thereby inverting captivity narratives such as those of British subjects held prisoner by Tipu. Later, during the Fourth and final Mysore war in 1799, two of the sultan’s sons surrendered themselves to General David Baird in an effort to save their family. Baird, like Cornwallis, became another surrogate father to the boys. Visual and literary descriptions of both the hostage-taking and the later surrender center “on the transfer of paternity”: as Kate Teltscher has noted, “Cornwallis accepts Tipu’s sons as his own in a ceremonial enactment of the British appropriation of the East.”\(^1\) Clearly, this is the overriding message that the pictures conveyed. However, I shall demonstrate that a larger narrative emerges once the images are placed in the context of more global events. British anxieties over the French

---

\(^1\) Kate Teltscher, *India Inscribed: European and British Writing on India, 1600-1800* (Delhi: Oxford UP, 1995), 248.
Revolution permeate these Indian subjects through the trope of paternalism, an interpretation made even more compelling by Tipu’s own alliances with the French. Additionally, the question remains of how tearing apart one family—removing the boys from their actual father—could be made acceptable in the eyes of the British public, particularly in light of the fact that this era marked the height of the anti-slavery campaigns in England in which abolitionists attacked planters and slave traders for destroying the families of the Africans they enslaved. Here we need to investigate how Tipu was constructed as a bad father—alternately tyrannical or effeminate—and how Cornwallis, and later Baird, were presented as the boys’ good and therefore rightful father. By extension, since Tipu was a bad father, he was a bad king, and the British Governor-General or his officers emerge from the narrative as the beneficent and rightful rulers of India.

Cornwallis’ encounter with Tipu began when the Mysorean ruler, whose father Haider Ali had also been staunchly resistant to British incursions, attacked the neighboring territory of Travancore in 1789. The Rajah of Travancore sought help from the British, and the East India Company, under Cornwallis, declared war on Tipu. Though British forces advanced towards Tipu’s capital of Seringapatam, Tipu cut off their supply lines and forced them to retreat before they were finally able to regroup and attack the capital in 1792. In February of that year, Tipu agreed to the British terms of surrender in the Treaty of Seringapatam, wherein he gave up half of his land and a large sum of money, ending the Third Mysore War. In order to ensure that Tipu would abide by the terms of the treaty, the British kept two of his sons as hostages. When Tipu fulfilled the terms of the treaty in 1794, his sons, who had been kept in Madras, were returned.

The story of Cornwallis’ reception of the hostage princes was rapidly disseminated through periodicals and books, and illustrated by several artists in oil paintings and engravings. Major Alexander Dirom’s version of the story, published in 1793 and apparently based on an eyewitness account by the artist Robert Home, offers a detailed description of the spectacle at Seringapatam, and merits quoting in length:

2 Linda Colley discusses the significance of the Mysore-France connection in Captives: The Story of Britain’s Pursuit of Empire and How Its Soldiers and Civilians were Held Captive by the Dream of Global Supremacy, 1600-1850 (New York: Pantheon, 2002), 296-7.

3 The First and Second Mysore Wars had been fought in 1766-69 and 1780-84, respectively, between the British East India Company and Haider Ali.
On the 26th [of February] about noon, the Princes left the fort, which appeared to be manned as they went out, and every where crowded with people, who, from curiosity or affection, had come to see them depart. The Sultan himself, was on the rampart above the gateway. They were saluted by the fort on leaving it, and with twenty-one guns from the park as they approached our camp, where the part of the line they passed, was turned out to receive them. The vakeels [Tipu’s representatives] conducted them to the tents which had been sent from the fort for their accommodation, and pitched near the mosque redoubt, where they were met by Sir John Kemnaway, the Maharatta and Nizam’s vakeels, and from thence accompanied by them to head quarters.

The Princes were each mounted on an elephant richly caparisoned, and seated in a silver howder, and were attended by their father’s vakeels, and the persons already mentioned, also on elephants. The procession was led by several camel harcarras, and seven standard-bearers, carrying small green flags suspended from rockets, followed by one hundred pikemen, with spears inlaid with silver. Their guard of two hundred Sepoys, and a party of horse, brought up the rear. In this order they approached head quarters, where the battalion of Bengal Sepoys, commanded by Captain Welch, appointed for their guard, formed a street to receive them.

Lord Cornwallis, attended by his staff, and some of the principal officers of the army, met the Princes at the door of his large tent as they dismounted from the elephants; and, after embracing them, led them in, one in each hand, to the tent; the eldest, Abdul Kalick, was about ten, the youngest, Mooza-ud-Deen, about eight years of age. When they were seated on each side of Lord Cornwallis, Gullam Ally, the head vakeel, addressed his lordship as follows. “These children were this morning the sons of the Sultan my master; their situation is now changed, and they must look up to your lordship as their father.”

Lord Cornwallis, who had received the boys as if they had been his own sons, anxiously assured the vakeel and the young Princes themselves, that every attention possible would be shewn to them, and the greatest care taken of their persons. Their little faces brightened up; the scene became highly interesting; and not only their attendants, but all the spectators were delighted to see that any fears they might have harboured were removed, and that they would soon be reconciled to their change of situation, and their new friends.

The Princes were dressed in long white muslin gowns, and red turbans. They had several rows of large pearls around their necks, from which was suspended an ornament consisting of a ruby and an emerald of considerable size, surrounded by large brilliants; and in their turbans, each had a sprig of rich pearls. Bred from their infancy with infinite care, and
Dirom’s description dwells upon the exotic, picturesque aspects of the scene, allowing readers in England to imagine the colourful procession and noisy fanfare of the event. The richly attired princes, though mere children, are duly noted to be models of aristocratic bearing, befitting their noble birth. The importance of the princes’ royal status, evidenced by their regal conduct and appearance, recurs as a common theme in narratives of the hostage taking: their appearance and manner bespeak their nobility, indicating the essentiality of their birthright. Commentators consistently note how the British army treated the boys with great respect, a point calculated to reassure the royalist public in the wake of the French Revolution. Finally, while the head vakeel, Ghulam Ali Khan, may not have uttered the exact words quoted by Dirom, readers of the account and viewers of the images would have perceived Cornwallis’ role as the boys’ new father.

Robert Home’s painting of Lord Cornwallis Receiving Tipu Saib’s Sons as Hostages, Seringapatam, 25 February, 1792 (Fig. 1-1) has become the best-known image of the subject. The large canvas, begun in India and exhibited in the artist’s room at the Madras fort before being sent to England, was displayed at the Royal Academy in 1797. Home, the son of an army surgeon, was one of the few artists actually present to depict the Mysorean subjects, and in fact has included himself to the left of the scene, his portfolio under his arm. Prior to becoming official war artist to Cornwallis in 1790, he had trained under Angelica Kauffmann. Certainly the image of the small princes, in Home’s work and others, resonates with Kauffmann’s famous depiction of Cornelia’s children in Cornelia, Mother of the Gracchi (c. 1785), where the Roman matron presents her children as her “treasures.”

4 Alexander Dirom, A Narrative of the Campaign in India, which Terminated the War with Tippoo Sultaun, in 1792 (1793; facsimile reprint, New Delhi: Asian Educational Services, 1985), 228-29.

Home’s canvas, the most elaborate and apparently the most faithful visual account of the ceremony, is a panoramic scene replete with British and Indian troops in colorful uniforms, as well as elephants, tents, and a view of Seringapatam in the distance. Through the open space in the foreground and his arrangement of the figures, most of whom face the central action, the artist draws our attention to Cornwallis as he reaches with both hands to the youngest prince, Muiz-ud-Din. In turn, the little boy (age eight at the time) gently takes the general’s right hand with his own as he steps gracefully toward him. In fact, the prince seems to rush eagerly to Cornwallis; his long, loose, pink and white garment swirls behind him and emphasizes his effeminate, dance-like movements. Several Indian attendants on the right gesture actively, while the British on the left stand solemnly, demonstrating control over their emotions as they observe the event and thereby indicating their civilized and gentlemanly demeanor. Seated on a raised platform behind Muiz-ud-Din, Ghulam Ali Khan stands in for the boys’ actual father as he hands them over to their new, surrogate father. The vakeel’s gesture indicates his sadness, and therefore Tipu’s sadness, at giving up the children: while his right hand reaches toward
them, his left hand rests over his heart. The British officials nearest Ghulam Ali Khan convey sympathy for him: one draws his hands together and the other touches his comrade’s shoulder, as they both gaze at the sorrowful vakeel. Another Indian attendant, his back to us in the right foreground, covers his face with his hands as if so overcome with emotion that he cannot bear to be seen. Between these expressive figures, Muiz-ud-Din, in his fluttering robe, appears like a delicate wild animal—a bird or a butterfly—that Ghulam Ali Khan has released. While Home draws our attention to the central drama of the boys happily and elegantly entering their term of hostage (particularly to Muiz-ud-Din’s expression as he looks affectionately at Cornwallis with sparkling eyes), the overall scene conveys a sense of tension. The British and Indian forces appear to be at a standoff centered around the handover of the boys, and each side holds weapons at the ready. One Indian figure, on camelback at the right, waves his stick in the air—an exuberant gesture which could indicate excitement, encouragement, or anger. Indeed, the British officer standing in the left foreground looks at this man with an expression of concern, as does the artist himself.

The year in which Home’s canvas debuted at the Royal Academy saw significant turmoil for the British military. 1797 marked the Spithead and Nore mutinies on Royal Navy ships in April and May, and England appeared to be losing to France in the ongoing war. Images like Home’s, and those of other artists discussed below, offered a reassuring view of the military as a good family, rather than an oppressive force against which to rebel. These are images of inclusion and benevolent paternalism, promoting a positive view of the monarchy (represented here by its officers). They demonstrate that one should look to one’s father/government for protection. Of course, this implied a British father or government, as contemporary viewers would have perceived the boys’ real father as a tyrannical ruler, characterized at times as a Muslim fanatic or a bloodthirsty killer. Tipu and his father had taken many British prisoners during the Second Mysore War in the early 1780s. Following the Peace of Mangalore in 1784, all British prisoners were to be released, though according to historian P. J. Marshall, “those that were released quickly spread stories about their barbaric treatment while captives and about the numerous British subjects who remained behind.” Several accounts revealed that Tipu had not, in fact, released all his prisoners as he

---

had agreed to do. Some former captives reported that “younger soldiers and sailors” and all “craftsmen had been [kept] … and forced into Tipu’s service. Many of them had been circumcised and had subsequently been seen in Muslim dress.” One former midshipman, William Drake, published an account in the London Gazette in 1792 wherein he “related how ‘several of the European boys were taught dancing in the country style, and forced to dance in female dress before Tippoo.’”7

---

Fig. 1-2. Joseph Grozer after Henry Singleton, Departure of the Hostages from Seringapatam (Tipoo Sultan delivering to Gullum Alli the Vakeel his two Sons, who are taking leave of their Brother previously to their departure from Seringapatam), engraving, 1793. Courtesy of the Council of the National Army Museum, London.

7 Marshall 70.
Interestingly, Tipu himself was frequently described as effeminate: one account claims that “his bust was corpulent,” and another contemporary description notes that “he was of low stature, corpulent, with high shoulders, and a short thick neck, but his feet and hands were remarkably small” and that he had “small arched eyebrows.” This feminized Tipu appears in several visual images of the hostage princes as well. In Henry Singleton’s *Departure of the Hostages from Seringapatam* (Fig. 1-2), the two young princes, dressed in white robes, say their last goodbyes to their father as they turn to leave the palace. It is highly unlikely that any Western observer witnessed the scene when the boys left their father, but artists took the opportunity nonetheless to depict Tipu and his attendants as emotional, effeminate males in contrast to the princes, who appear calm and resigned to their fate. In Singleton’s image, Tipu and his officials wear garments resembling the high-waisted gowns then fashionable among European women, along with several heavy strands of beads. One guard, at the right, sports a uniform recalling the “skeleton suit,” an outfit just becoming popular for young boys in England. Though some Indian men’s clothing of the 1790s may have resembled European dresses or juvenile wear to a small degree, Singleton’s image would have reinforced the perception of such men as feminine or childlike. Both of these associations also serve to indicate Tipu’s unfitness as a father for his sons, who, in all of the images where they are shown with Cornwallis, appear pleased to become wards of the British. Mather Brown’s painting of *Lord Cornwallis Receiving the Sons of Tipu Sultan as Hostages* (Fig. 1-3), for instance, replaces the figure of Tipu with that of Ghulam Ali Khan on the left, and shows the boys happily stepping away with Cornwallis, hand in hand, from their entourage of elephants and lavishly dressed attendants. They
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8 Quoted in Colley 298.
9 “Major Allan’s Account of his Interview with the Princes in the Palace of Seringapatam, and of finding the Body of the late Tippoo Sultaun,” in Alexander Beatson, *A View of the Origin and Conduct of the War with Tippoo Sultaun* (London: 1800), Appendix XLII: cxxxi.
11 Constance McPhee argues that, in various images, Brown has connected Tipu to Richard III (sometimes through the figure of his lame vakeel) and therefore has presented him as the villain in an eighteenth-century version of the Little Princes in the Tower story. McPhee claims that Brown’s images “suggest that the sultan was a scheming, ignoble father and thoughtless husband who happily turned his young sons over to his enemies just as Richard had callously consigned his own nephews to the Tower” (211). Her argument is persuasive, but considers only one artist out of several who depicted these events. The story of the princes in the Tower is a
are clearly being led toward civilization (indicated by the rows of British officers standing at the right) and away from their previous “barbaric” lifestyle.

Fig. 1-3. Daniel Orme after Mather Brown, *Lord Cornwallis Receiving the Sons of Tipu Sultan as Hostages*, engraving, c.1793. Anne S. K. Brown Military Collection, Brown University Library.

In contrast to Home’s and Brown’s detailed, descriptive scenes, an anonymous print of the same subject, published by Robert Sayer in 1792, eliminates the regalia and elephants to focus on the main characters involved (Fig. 1-4). Here, the British army is represented by only three soldiers standing behind Cornwallis. One, a very flat-looking figure carrying a bayonet, appears more like a toy soldier than a human being, and the artist may in fact have based these figures on toy models.

clear precedent for the Mysorean narrative, though not one which is evident in all of the representations. Even in Brown’s images, it is not clear that Tipu “happily” turned over his sons to the British. See Constance C. McPhee, “Tipu Sultan of Mysore and British Medievalism in the Paintings of Mather Brown,” in *Orientalism Transposed: The Impact of the Colonies on British Culture*, ed. Julie F. Codell and Dianne Sachko Macleod (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998), 202-19.
Cornwallis himself is young and slim, an inaccurate representation. Tipu’s vakeel hands the boys to the general in a gesture of submission, watched by another, androgynous, Indian figure standing behind them. This unusual figure may represent one of the boys’ mothers, neither of whom

Fig. 1-4. Anonymous, *Tipoo Saib’s Two Sons deliver’d up to Lord Cornwallis*, hand-coloured print, 1792. Anne S. K. Brown Military Collection, Brown University Library.
was present at the ceremony. In fact, Muiz-ud-Din’s mother reputedly “died of fright and apprehension” after the British attack on Seringapatam, a story which enhanced contemporary interest in the youngest prince. In this rather crude image (compared to representations by Home, Brown, and Singleton), the boys step from “nature,” indicated by a palm tree, toward “culture,” symbolized by the army and its tents. The empty tent in the center, though likely meant to be part of the British military encampment, reinforces the idea that the boys have left their home, and are now dependent on Cornwallis as their new parent.

Images like this print, as well the paintings by Home and Brown, also offer an interesting inversion of allegorical representations of Britannia and the East, such as Spiridone Roma’s 1778 ceiling painting The East Offering Its Riches to Britannia from East India House. Roma’s composition employs the traditional formula of female figures representing continents or nations. Here, the East, or India, holds up strings of pearls to Britannia. In contrast, the military images replace such female figures with contemporary male individuals. Cornwallis now stands in for Britannia, and the two princes embody the “riches of the East,” duly offered up by Tipu or his vakeel representing “India.”

Muiz-ud-Din (Fig. 1-5), supposedly the sultan’s favorite son and his intended heir, was described by Major Dirom as “remarkably fair, with regular features, a small round face, large full eyes, and a more animated countenance” than his older brother, who was said to be “rather dark in his colour, with thick lips, a small flattish nose, and a long thoughtful countenance.” While such differences between the two boys are not evident in visual accounts, artists often depicted them both with lighter skin than either their attendants or other members of their family. In the anonymous print, Cornwallis and the British soldiers are pale white (in fact, in the print illustrated here, their skin has been coloured with white pigment) and the Indians are dark, although where Muiz-ud-Din’s hand touches that of Cornwallis, his skin takes on the same hue as the general’s, as if he is becoming white upon contact with a European. The print seems to indicate visually that the boys, once under the paternal care of the British, will become European in their taste and conduct, a notion shown by their literally becoming whiter once they have a “new” European father. In fact, during their stay at Madras while hostages, the princes

---

12 Dirom 230.
13 Dirom 229-30.
14 This notion counters the contemporary idea that British “nabobs” turned black after living in India. See, for instance, the 1797 print of “Count Rupee in Hyde
were “anglicized” by being taken to performances of Handel’s *Judas Maccabeus*, *Messiah*, and *Esther*, as well as amateur dramatic productions. They were also treated to European-style dancing in the form of a minuet, a cotillion, and a Scottish strathspey at a party given by Lady Oakley, the wife of the Governor of Madras. In return, the princes hosted a dinner “à la Seringapatam” for Governor and Lady Oakley.¹⁵ Again, their treatment at the hands of their captors inverts their father’s treatment of his British prisoners, who were made to perform Indian dances, apparently against their will.

![Fig. 1-5. John Smart, *Muiz-ud-Deen*, graphite, 1794. © Copyright the Trustees of the British Museum.](image)