University of Pardubice
Faculty of Arts and Philosophy

Public *versus* Private History in the Works of J.G. Farrell

Bc. Jaroslav Soukup

Thesis

2012

Univerzita Pardubice
Fakulta filozofická
Akademický rok: **2011/2012**

ZADÁNÍ DIPLOMOVÉ PRÁCE

(PROJEKTU, UMĚLECKÉHO DÍLA, UMĚLECKÉHO VÝKONU)

Jméno a příjmení:	**Bc. Jaroslav Soukup**
Osobní číslo:	**H10589**
Studijní program:	**N7503 Učitelství pro základní školy**
Studijní obor:	**Učitelství anglického jazyka**
Název tématu:	**Veřejná versus osobní historie v dílech J.G. Farrella**
Zadávající katedra:	**Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky**

Zásady pro vypracování:

Práce se bude zabývat vybranou románovou tvorbou postmoderního britského spisovatele Jamese Gordona Farrella (Troubles, 1970; The Siege of Krishnapur, 1973). Vzhledem k tomu, že postmoderní filozofie obecně odvrhuje objektivní poznatelnost reality a tedy i dějin, se autor pokusí vystopovat, jak Farrell zobrazuje zlomové momenty britských dějin (indické povstání z roku 1857 a irské nepokoje dvacátých letech minulého století). V obecné rovině bude student rozebírat vztah mezi jedincem a zásadními dějinnými procesy. V prvé řadě prozkoumá dopad veřejných událostí na osobní a všední život jedince/postav. Dalším předmětem analýzy bude míra rozporu mezi veřejnou a osobní interpretací dějin - otázka mocenského aparátu (např. tisku) a oficiálního dobového diskurzu, individuální zkušenosti, atd.). Pro své úvahy využije relevantní zdroje (např. Michel Foucault, Guy Debord), které mu umožní prozkoumat problematiku pojetí reality a dějin v postmoderním myšlení a literatuře.

Rozsah grafických prací:

Rozsah pracovní zprávy:

Forma zpracování diplomové práce: **tištěná/elektronická**

Seznam odborné literatury:

Primární zdroje: FARRELL, James Gordon. The Siege of Krishnapur. 2nd Impr. London : Weidenfield and Nicolson, 1973, 344p. ISBN 0297765809. FARRELL, James Gordon. Troubles. London : J.Cape, 1970, 445p. ISBN 0-224-61900-4. Sekundární zdroje: ATTRIDGE, Derek., BENNINGTON, Geoffrey., YOUNG, Robert. Post-structuralism and the Question of History. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1989, 304p. ISBN 978-0521367806. BERGONZI, Bernard. ?Fictions of History?. In: The Contemporary English Novel. Ed. BRADBURY, Malcolm., PALMER, David. New Jersey : Holmes & Meier Publishers, Inc., 1980, ISBN 978-0841905719. BERTENS, Hans. The Idea of the Postmodern: A History. 1st Ed. Routledge, 1994, 296p. ISBN 978-0415060127. BRADBURY, Malcolm. The Modern British Novel. Penguin Books Ltd., 1994, 554p. ISBN 978-0140230987. DEBORD, Guy. The Society of the Spectacle. Michigan : Black & Red, 2000, 132p. ISBN-13: 978-0934868075. FOUCAULT, Michel. Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison. 2nd Ed. New York : Vintage Books Inc. , 1995, 352p. ISBN 978-0679752554. FOUCAULT, Michel. The Order of Things ? An Archaeology of Human Sciences. 2nd Ed. Oxford : Taylor & Francis Group Ltd., 2001, ISBN 978-0415267366.

Vedoucí diplomové práce: **Mgr. Ladislav Vít**
Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

Datum zadání diplomové práce: **30. dubna 2011**

Termín odevzdání diplomové práce: **31. března 2012**

L.S.

prof. PhDr. Petr Vorel, CSc.
děkan

Mgr. Šárka Bubíková, Ph.D.
vedoucí katedry

V Pardubicích dne 30. listopadu 2011

Prohlašuji:

Tuto práci jsem vypracoval samostatně. Veškeré literární prameny a informace, které jsem v práci využil, jsou uvedeny v seznamu použité literatury.
Byl jsem seznámen s tím, že se na moji práci vztahují práva a povinnosti vyplývající ze zákona č. 121/2000 Sb., autorský zákon, zejména se skutečností, že Univerzita Pardubice má právo na uzavření licenční smlouvy o užití této práce jako školního díla podle § 60 odst. 1 autorského zákona, a s tím, že pokud dojde k užití této práce mnou nebo bude poskytnuta licence o užití jinému subjektu, je Univerzita Pardubice oprávněna ode mne požadovat přiměřený příspěvek na úhradu nákladů, které na vytvoření díla vynaložila, a to podle okolností až do jejich skutečné výše.

Souhlasím s prezenčním zpřístupněním své práce v Univerzitní knihovně.

V Pardubicích dne 31. 3. 2012

Jaroslav Soukup

Acknowledgements

I would like to use this opportunity to thank my supervisor Mgr. Ladislav Vít for his professional and willing approach and the time he spent during the consultations of my work. Without his careful and patient guidance, it would not be possible to finish this thesis.

ANNOTATION

The main topic of this work is the post-modern interpretation of history and the issue whether it could be objectively researched and recorded. A special emphasis is placed on defining the concepts of the so-called personal history of an individual and the so-called public history falling under the influence of the social discourse. The work predominantly focuses on the relation of an individual and particular historical event and investigates to what extent an individual can contribute to the overall portrayal of this event or on the contrary, how the society, or rather the system, can influence the individual and through that it can influence the overall perception of history as well. These findings are subsequently applied to the historical novels *Troubles* and *The Siege of Krishnapur* by James Gordon Farrell.

KEY WORDS

J.G. Farrell; history; private; public; historical novel

SOUHRN

Hlavním tématem této práce je postmoderní interpretace historie a otázka, zda je historie vůbec objektivně poznatelná a zachytitelná. Hlavní důraz je kladen na vymezení konceptů tzv. osobní historie jedince a tzv. veřejné historie podléhající společenskému diskurzu. Práce se převážně zabývá vztahem jedince a určité historické události a zkoumá, nakolik osobní zkušenost jedince může přispět k celkovému vyobrazení této události, nebo naopak, jak společnost, respektive systém, může jedince a tudíž i vnímání historie samotné ovlivnit. Tyto poznatky se posléze snaží aplikovat na historické romány *Nepokoje* a *Obléhání Krišnapuru* Jamese Gordona Farrella.

KLÍČOVÁ SLOVA

J.G. Farrell; historie; osobní; veřejná; historický román

Table of Contents

Introduction

What actually is a history? What is it comprised of? Is the history only a vivid collection of various personal experiences of different individuals or, on the contrary, just a blunt summary of solid, proven facts and dates? What role the historical sources play in the interpretation of history? To what extent they cay be trusted? These are the questions that many philosophers have been interested in through the ages and also questions for which there is no single or right answer.

The views of the past have never been static; the concept of the past has been continuously changing throughout the history with the development of the society and new scientific discoveries. Probably the most radical shift in this matter happened in the 19th and subsequently in the 20th century. The theoretical part of this thesis then presents different definitions of history and views on its interpretation, those of Richard Slotkin and Professor Alun Munslow, and in an broad strokes, tries to describe how far the post-modern concept of history departed from more traditional concepts of the past.

In a similar manner, the second chapter of the theoretical part briefly, on the basis of the literary theory of Georg Lukács, outlines the development of the historical novel as an independent genre and defines its basic characteristics. Even though, from the present perspective, the Lukác's theory may be considered obsolete in some of its aspects, it was truly foundational in its time. From the example of Sir Walter Scott's writings, it depicts several key features of the historical novel – e.g. distinctive characters with strong individual personalities, morally, and in any other way, protruding above others, set within the context of their particular time epoch, whose example can be subsequently found in works of James Gordon Farrell.

Secondly, the theoretical part focuses on James Gordon Farrell as an author. Farrell had quite an interesting literary career. During the early period of his life, he exchanged several occupations and travelled a lot. Due to his family relations, Farrell was always interested in history, and according to some of the contemporary literary critiques, depiction of some of the key moments in the history of the British Empire became his *metier*. Due to their historical setting, Farrell's latter novels are often labelled as "historical". However, such straightforward categorization may be a little

misleading. Farrell's writings are generally quite complex and it is possible to examine them on several different levels. Yes, they are historical in terms of their setting, but Farrell alone was never interested in actual history. For him, stories of regular people and their everyday banalities were much more important than great battles, flanking manoeuvres and political treaties. The key element of his writing is a demystification of these important events; he tends to portray them from an unusual and sometimes unexpected perspective. In relation to this, his characters are then not great historical figures but rather ordinary individuals trapped on the background of history. Additionally, as an author, Farrell had an excellent sense of humour and a gift for over exaggeration and absurdity. Thus many scenes in Farrell's novels have almost bizarre, or even anecdotic impression. Yet again, to label Farrell's novels as pure comedies would be quite incorrect as well.

Lastly, the analytical part of this thesis focuses on a detailed analysis of Farrell's unique writing style and attempts to define the concepts of the so-called "personal" and "public" history. As an important theoretical background for such analysis it uses the works of Jean Baudrillard, Guy Debord and Michel Foucault and subsequently it tries to apply these social theories to Farrell's novels. Even though, *Troubles* and *The Siege of Krishnapur* are works of fiction, due to Farrell's focus on individual characters, it is possible to, on their basis, describe how the personal history of an individual can influence the process of creating the public history; or vice versa, how the system can influence the individual and how the resulting portrayal of the actual event, submitted by the system as the public history, could be severely distorted and distanced from the reality.

1. Definition of History

To define the history is not an easy task. The matter alone could be approached from several different perspectives – e.g. in terms of social, political, demographical and other forms of development; thus the definitions of history are numerous.

One of the basic definitions of history, provided by the Cambridge Dictionary Online (2011, online), is that it is either "the study of or a record of past events considered together, especially events of a particular period, country or subject" or in its more informal definition "something that happened or ended a long time ago and is not important now, or a person who is not important now, although they were in the past". Unfortunately this definition that the history is simply an event or collection of events that happened in the past is too general and simplistic. In contrast, Encyclopaedia Britannica (2012, online) approaches the matter from a slightly more complex perspective and takes into consideration not only the events or historical sources alone but also their critical examination: "history – is the discipline that studies the chronological record of events (as affecting a nation or people), based on critical examination of source materials and usually presenting an explanation of their causes." Additionally, historiography could be according to Encyclopaedia Britannica (idem) interpreted as: "the writing of history based on critical examination of sources, the selection of particular details from the authentic materials in those sources, and the synthesis of those details into a narrative that stands the test of critical examination."

Similarly, Richard Slotkin (2005, 222) somehow expands the idea and compares the historical research to a novel writing. Even though the historians usually tend to compare their field with other disciplines from the area of the social sciences, their biggest disadvantage is that the data they are working with and the results of the research they are obtaining from these are always abstract. An economist or sociologist can use statistics, axioms or equations to support his or hers findings and these findings could be subsequently quite easily verified or disproved. The same rule applies to natural and mathematical sciences. A chemical compound is still a chemical compound regardless of how the man decides to name it. It existed long before its discovery and it will continue to exist long after it. Its physical properties do not change as the time

progresses and there are no ambiguous or biased interpretations them. Sulphur was the same sulphur in the 16th century as it was in the 19th or any other century. The basic rules of mathematics are still true even after two thousand years since their discovery and so on. However, in terms of history, due to its abstractness, varying interpretations, missing or incomplete pieces of information and different variables involved in it or simply just due to its practical separation from the present, the one clear or true interpretation is not possible. Once it elapses, it is impossible to revert. And the more remote the historical event is on the time line from the present the worse it is for the historian. Due to this, according to Slotkin (2005, 222) any historical writing incorporates a certain degree of imaginary or even fictive representation of the past:

> History is what it is, but it is also what we make of it. […] Events undoubtedly occur: the Declaration of Independence was signed on 4 July, 1776, yesterday it rained, Napoleon was short, I had a nice lunch. But to be constructed as 'history' such facts must be selected and arranged on some sort of plan, made to resolve some sort of question which can only be asked subjectively and from a position of hindsight. Thus all history writing requires a fictive or imaginary representation of the past.

Professor Alun Munslow (2001, online) claims, that the post-modern views regarding the past, at least in terms of the western culture, are a result of the European 18th century Enlightenment belief in the power of reason and following 19th century philosophical critique of the previous trust in seeming objectivity and clarity of the historical knowledge:

> The nineteenth century European critique of that vision, particularly in the work of Hegel and Nietzsche, moved beyond how knowledge is derived, to concentrate more how it is represented, and the effects the process of representation has upon the status and nature of our knowledge.

Munslow call this ideological shift and sudden preoccupation with representation of the historical knowledge the "linguistic" or "narrative" turn, because according to him, the history is rather a narrative about the past written here and now than a distanced yet

objective mirror of it. In relation to this, he also questions the historical sources and the historian's ability to represent them accurately. He rises a question and asks, where does the meaning come from in history; whether it is the past itself, and thus historian's only task is to describe it as accurately as possible or, on the other hand, no such thing as the past itself exists and its meaning is only artificially created in the process of historical research:

> In history how can we trust our sources – not because they are forgeries or missing, but because of the claims empiricism is forced to make about our ability not only to find the data, but also just as importantly represent their meaning accurately? […] Is the historian merely the midwife to the truth of the past? Or is the historian unavoidably implicated in the creation of a meaning for the past. […] Is there one story to be discovered or several that can be legitimately generated? (Munslow, 2001, online)

According to Munslow, post-modern history, due to its nature, can not escape its authorship. In the process of historical research the past is not re-interpreted only according to the historical evidence but also through self-conscious act of re-writing by the historian. Thus it is important to distinguish between past and history. These terms are not mutually interchangeable in the sense that the latter, no matter whether we like it or not, is always principally just a narrative about the former. Such implication indeed puts a lot of power in the hands of a historian. Munslow also, through mentioning works of e.g. Jacques Derrida or Michel Foucault, briefly touches an issue of ideological role of history and its existence within a certain discourse.

To conclude, the biggest issue relating to the post-modern concept of history remains that whether the recorded history really is what had happened or what someone else told us that happened. The matter of the distortion of historical facts or events and susceptibility of public views towards these is subsequently in greater detail discussed in chapter four.

2. Concept of Historical Novel According to Georg Lukács

The definition of a historical novel could be as broad and many-sided as the definition of history itself. In the introduction to his work, Jerome De Groot (2010, 1-2) claims that historical writing, especially in past decades, became immensely popular and experienced a significant increase in sales. The genre of the historical novel is relatively flexible and according to De Groot it can take place within numerous fictional locales – namely detective, epic, fantasy, horror, thriller, mystery etc., and that is why it continually attracts new writers and their readers. On the other hand, Georg Lukács (1989, 19-22) sees the historical novel as a genre as a very specific product of the French Revolution of 1789 and subsequent socio-political changes of the early 19th century. As an umbrella term for these changes, Lukács uses the term "bourgeois revolution".

In his theory, the first truly historical inquiry began with the Enlightenment struggle against the totalitarian monarchies of its era. This trend was somewhat an ideological preparation for the French Revolution. The Enlightenment thinkers were seeking for the evidence upon which they could portray the unreasonableness of the totalitarian rule. The decline of the classical, feudal states and the creation of the so-called "reasonable society" was one of the most important theoretical preliminaries for the future transformation of the society:

> And here we must stress that the history writing of the Enlightenment was, in its main trend, an ideological preparation for the French Revolution. The often superb historical construction, with its discovery of numerous new facts and connections, serves to demonstrate the necessity for transforming the "unreasonable" society of feudal absolutism; and the lessons of history provide the principles with whose help a "reasonable" society, a "reasonable" state may be created. (Lukács, 1989, 20)

In relation to spread of the "historical awareness", Lukács then compares the situation in France, England and Germany. France was the spiritual leader during the period of

militant Enlightenment, thus the most radical and as the result, the historical inquiry had more propagandist or political character (Lukács, 1989, 19). The position of England in this matter was rather different. From the political perspective, England was already a post-revolutionary country, undergoing changes caused by English Civil War and The Glorious Revolution of the 17th century, so there was no need for another struggle against the absolutist rule. The matter was approached, almost exclusively, on the basis of the economic transformation, because England of the time was one the most economically developed countries in the world, and was in the midst of the Industrial Revolution. As an example, Lukács uses economist James Steuart and his theories regarding the birth of capital and transformation of manufacturing industry (21). This widespread interest in economical transformation and its effects on the society, particularly in the genre of the great social novel of England, drew "the attention of writers to the concrete (i.e. historical) significance of time and place, to social conditions and […], it created the realistic, literary means of expression for portraying this spatio-tenporal (i.e. historical) character of people and circumstances." (ibid) And lastly, Lukács presents a picture of Germany, where the idea of historical inquiry was approached from a totally different perspective (23). In England and France, the economic, political and ideological transformation of the bourgeois revolution and the establishment of a national state were practically the same process. However, this was not possible in Germany, because the state at the time was economically and politically fragmented into several independent states, principalities or courts. These individual, small courts were seen as a severe hindrance preventing German political unity and ideological and cultural development. Thus the German Enlightenment thinkers were struggling to liberate themselves from the outside influence and initiate the sense on national unity and patriotism via turning to the national history: "The inevitable result of this situation is to turn to German history. Partly it is the reawakening of past national greatness which gives strength to hopes of national rebirth." (Lukács, 1989, 22)

Yet none of the previously mentioned initiatives managed to spread the historical awareness among the general population. They were only isolated attempts, results of particular situations in individual states. What, according to Lukács (1989, 23), made "history a mass experience, and more over on a European scale" were the

revolutionary wars and the rise and fall of Napoleon at the beginning of the 19th century. In previous centuries wars were fought only by small, professional, mercenary armies conducting limited tactical manoeuvres around their points of interest – e.g. cities or enemy encampments and forts they besieged, and thus the mutual contact with an ordinary populace was minimal. The era of the Napoleonic wars and the transformation of the army to a modern conscript model, supported by rapid technological advance and development of new, more lethal weaponry, ultimately changed the face of war. This gradual "quantitative" expansion of war, had according to Lukács, several important effects.

Firstly, the conflicts suddenly embraced a larger percentage of the population, including not only greater numbers of soldiers on the battlefield, but also a civilian population, that was directly affected. Wars were no longer struggles for stationary positions, but the front was changing rapidly as massive armies marched across the continent from one end to another. Additionally, these conflicts, to a greater extent than in previous times, became somehow globalised and internationalised. Peasants from France fought in Egypt, then in Italy and again in Russia, Italian and German auxiliary troops accompanied the French army during its campaign against Moscow, Russian troops occupied Paris after Napoleon's defeat etc. Inevitably, the war efforts affected everybody, disregarding their age, social class, nationality or the fact of whether they were civilian or military: "what previously was experienced only by isolated and mostly adventurous minded individuals, namely an acquaintance with Europe or at least certain parts of it, becomes in this period the mass experience of hundreds of thousands, of millions." (Lukács, 1989, 24)

And secondly, more importantly the bourgeois revolution withdrew the power from the hands of aristocracy and mitigated the estate barriers between the individual strata of society. The "national idea" became the property of the broadest masses, so even the poorest members of the society, of the nation, could play an essential part in its creation. In the period of the bourgeois revolution, almost every nation of Europe underwent more upheavals that it had previously experienced in centuries. And the rapid succession of these upheavals gave them a more prominent character that they would have been given if they were experienced as isolated, individual instances. Essentially, by participating in series of events having a significant impact on the

structure of the whole society, a man realised, that history may not be something fixed, something predetermined, and that it could actually be affected by his own actions: "Hence the concrete possibilities for men to comprehend their own existence as something historically conditioned, for them to see in history something which deeply affects their daily lives and immediately concerns them." (Lukács, 1989, 24) This particular "awareness of history" played an important role in creation of the historical novel as an independent genre.

In terms of a literary style, Lukács (1989, 19) claims, that the historical novel is a continuation of the great realistic social novel of the 18th century. The very first historical novel, which appeared in 1814, was Sir Walter Scott's *Waverley*. Of course, Lukács claims that there had been literary works with a historical setting before Scott, as an example he uses Madeleine de Scudéry, Gauthier de Costes or Horace Walpole's *Castle of Otranto*, however they could not be called a truly historical novel according to his concept. They were historical only in terms of their "external choice of theme and costume" (ibid). Additionally, in terms of their manners and psychology, the characters portrayed in these novels, regardless of the age they were supposed to be set it, were also usually depicted according to the writer's own timeframe. Thus, it was, for example, possible to encounter a medieval knight with manners and opinions of an 18th century gentleman and so on. But the historical novel is not historical only in terms of its temporal settings and contemporary manners. Paradoxically, the historical novel should embrace a certain degree of timelessness, a certain level of abstractness in portraying of historical place. Faithful recreation of the novel's historical settings is not that important. What according to Lukács matters more, is how the individual characters are situated into these settings and if they can somehow liberate themselves from the limiting boundaries of their particular historical era: "What is lacking in the so-called historical novel before Sir Walter Scott is precisely the specifically historical, that is derivation of the individuality of characters from the historical peculiarity of their age." (Lukács, 1989, 19; 42) According to this principle, French novelist and playwright Alain-René Lesage was able to transfer his highly truthful pictures of France of his day, or the works of the great masters of satire, Swift, Voltaire and even Diderot, were able to deliver their message even though they were set between the "never and nowhere".

Subsequently, the purpose of the historical novel is not to describe in detail an entire historical era or to provide any complex view of a particular historical event. Whenever an author tries to do such thing he or she faces the severe risk of over-generalising, being too superficial or even complete misunderstanding of the event or the era. A purpose of a historical novel, according to Lukács, is not to present any complex "historico-philosophical" analyses. The true virtue of historical writing lays author's ability, author's power of selection, in being able to capture the general spirit of the age or the event without burdening his or hers readers with useless literary effusions. As an example Lukács (1989, 43) uses works of Lev Nikolayevich Tolstoy and his depiction of the Napoleonic wars:

> Thus would be a mistake to think that Tolstoy, for instance really depicted the Napoleonic wars in *extenso*. What he does is, every now and then, to take an episode from the war which is of particular importance and significance for the human development of his main characters. And Tolstoy's genius as an historical novelist lies in his ability to select and portray these episodes so that the entire mood of the Russian army and through them of the Russian people gains vivid expression.

And yet again, it is not the important events themselves or great battles, what gives the description its depth and peculiarity, it is the deeds of individual characters.

In relation to the characters of a historical novel, Lukács (1989,39) thus uses a term the "world-historical individual". The concept of this figure was based on a philosophy of Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel. He was distinguishing between the so-called "maintaining individuals", who constitute the majority in the society but they are apathetic in terms of their actions, their only purpose is the physical reproduction of the society; and "world-historical individuals", whose role is the maintenance of stagnating moral life of the society, derived from the indifference of the majority. The world-historical characters clearly protrude and stand above the others. According to Hegel, they are the initiators of actions, they are the bearers of historical progress, or spirit, "in a sense of granting consciousness and clear direction to a movement already present in society." (Lukács, 1989, 39)

In historical novel, the concept of world-historical individual is quite similar. It is possible to apply it to both real and semi-historical or even entirely non-historical figures. As an example, Lukács names Oliver Cromwell, Mary Stuart, Rob Roy or Vich Ian Vohr appearing in Sir Walter Scott's novels. These individuals also stay above the average characters. Even thought they may not necessarily need to be present the entire time in the novel, they play the crucial role in resolving a "crisis" present in the plot. Their significance is usually contrasted with broad and many-sided picture of everyday life, of ordinary people and their joys and sorrows. In order to fulfil their mission, the world-historical characters should always be portrayed as the complete personalities with distinctive personal qualities and clearly defined opinions. Seeing the development of the character from an early age, for example as in traditional *Buildungsroman*, is not important or it may even damage the image of his significance. However, this completeness does not mean that the characters can not undergo a certain type of change, yet this change is rather socio-historical, rather than personal or psychological: "He may therefore, indeed he must, be complete in a psychological sense when he appears before us, for he appears in order to fulfil his historic mission in the crisis." (Lukács, 1989, 38) The introduction of such individual to the scene, too, requires a careful preparation. The crisis needs its time to build up. To ensure the greatest impact of his actions, the magnificent historical hero can not enter the scene until the reader becomes familiar with all participants of the crisis, until he or she understands clearly for what reasons the crisis has arisen, or what are the attitudes of various sections of the population towards this crisis (ibid).

Relating back to Lukács' original concept of the historical novel, Sir Walter Scott's works are historical in a sense, that unlike the other authors of his age, he did not use the historical settings as a mere external costumery or facade. Scott managed to liberate himself from limiting boundaries of portraying a particular historical era with impersonal precision. Instead he created a harmonic and believable portrait of the age, which let him to display the distinctive individual character traits of his protagonists and explore the complex relations with the age they were supposed to live in and also to explain their role in history:

> Scott's great art consists precisely in individualizing his historical heroes in a such way that certain, purely individual traits of character, quite peculiar to them, are brought into a very complex, very live relationship with age in which they live […]. Scott represents simultaneously the historical necessity of this particular individual personality and the individual role which he plays in history. (Lukács, 1989, 47)

Even though Lukács approached the matter from a Marxist point of view, i.e. he quoted passages from Marx's work or was interested in the class revolt and the so-called bourgeois revolution; and he, in the preface to the English edition of his *The Historical Novel*, acknowledged several shortcomings of his writing (namely Lukács mentioned its relative obsolescence, because he was not able to update it, or revise it since its original release in 1936/7, and a fact, that several of his claims or expectations had been proved rather too optimistic or false in the context of following years); his theory still clearly defines several key milestones in the development of the historical novel as an independent genre and describes features of the historical novel, that can be traced even in works of authors publishing in the second half of the 20th century.

3. James Gordon Farrell as Author

James Gordon Farrell (1935-1979) was one of the unjustly overlooked contemporary British authors. Even though his works were given a certain level of critical awareness during his life, and were awarded with some of the prestige literary prices, they were never given as much of an attention as other works of his piers. As an author, Farrell had to come the long way before he managed to develop his specific literary style and build up his reputation on his later works of the 1970's.

Farrell was born in Liverpool into a family of Anglo-Irish background. His mother was an Englishwoman; however he was brought up at the Irish countryside. Farrell's father worked as an accountant in Liverpool, but as the manager of different trade companies, he travelled to different countries, mostly in the Far East. This family background finally, to a great extent, influenced his literary career, mostly when writing his so-called "Empire Trilogy" (Hilský, 1990, 359). During his life, Farrell exchanged

several professions. In the 1950's he spend several months in the Canadian Arctic as a fireman, however he proved to be a rather "ineffective" fire fighter, because instead of manning a hose, he was often taking photographs of the fire because it, according to him, looked beautiful against the snow. Subsequently, when he returned back to England, he began attending Brasenose College in Oxford, firstly studying Law and then switching to French and Spanish. After graduation Farrell spent two years in France where he was employed as a language teacher (Hilský, 1990, 359; Dean, 1993, 201-203).

His first novel, *A Man from Elsewhere*, was published in 1963. Probably under the influence of his experiences in France, the entire novel was set in Provence. It focused on questions of politics and history and contained several ideological discussions, and recollections of the French resistance movement during the World War II and the Warsaw uprising. Even though, it generally received mostly positive reviews, Bernard Bergonzi (1979, 57) called it "flat and unconvincing, being too much of a cerebral construct." The second novel, *The Lung*, a comedy about a man trapped in the so-called "iron-lungs", a medical device in the form of a chamber that surrounds the entire patient's body and helps him or her breathe when standard muscle control had been lost, was subsequently published in 1965. According to Ralph J. Crane (1999, 10) *The Lung* was probably a revised version of a manuscript of an unpublished Farrell's novel from the 1950's. Additionally, Martin Hilský (1990, 359) sees several autobiographical aspects in *The Lung*, because Farrell himself suffered a form of polio during his studies at Oxford and had to spend several months in the device. Similarly to *A Man from Elsewhere*, the book was positively appreciated by critics and Farrell was awarded with Harkness Fellowship in 1966. Farrell's third novel, *A Girl in the Head*, released in 1967 was a not very succesfull attempt to mimic experimental techniques typical from British literature of the time. However, despite the critical success of the earlier novels, Farrell was not entirely contended with them. *A Man from Elsewhere* was later on disowned and removed from the list of books "By the same author" published in all his later novels, and the other two, *The Lung* and *A Girl in the Head*, even though they remained on the list, Farrell "have developed a degree of ambivalence towards these novels too, referring to his first three novels collectively as 'casting around'." (Crane, 1999, 10)

Yet, the novels that brought him the most commercial success and the works on which his subsequent critical reputation had been build came later in the 1970's by publishing the loosely connected so-called "*Empire Trilogy*". It consisted of *Troubles,* which won the Faber Memorial Prize in 1970, *The Siege of Krishnapur*, awarded with the Booker Prize in 1973, and lastly *The Singapore Grip* from 1978. In these novels Farrell abandoned the contemporary settings and according to Ralph J. Crane (1999,10) finally found his *metier* in describing some of the critical moments in the rise and fall of British Imperialism.

Regrettably Farrell's literary career was cut short at the age of 44. Due to increased financial income from the commercial success of his works and from winning several literary prices, Farrell was able to buy an old farmhouse on the Sheep's Head peninsula on the isolated West Coast of Ireland. Farrell decided to move there partially because of family ties, he had relatives in Ireland on both sides of the family, and partially, because he wanted a change from a slightly monotonous social live in London. He wanted a nice, quiet place where he could accommodate his friends. Unfortunately, as a result of suffering polio at younger age, Farrell never was a good swimmer. His legs were practically unaffected, he was able to enjoy several miles-long walks through London parks on a regular basis, however the disease left him with severely weakened muscles from the waist up. His diaphragm no longer worked properly and his shoulder muscles and right arm were restricted. Farrell drowned during a fishing accident in August 1979, when a wave thrown him into the sea (Dean, 1993, 195; 205). According to Martin Hliský (1992, 93): "British literature lost one of the most distinctive prose writer of the middle generation in him, moreover an author on the peak of his creativity[1]." (my translation) Similar view provided Ralph J. Crane (1999, 11) when he quoted Francis King's interview for the BBC Radio 4 from 1980:

> […] I felt that he (Farrell) was a novelist who had not fulfilled his potential. He fulfilled it to a certain extent, but not entirely. And there are a lot of novelists, great novelists like Graham Greene you feel, well Greene may produce another two, three, four interesting or perhaps even … extremely good books; but you

[1] Britská literatura v něm ztratila jednoho z nejvýraznějších prozaiků střední generace, navíc spisovatele na vrcholu tvůrčích sil.

> feel that Graham Greene is getting near the end of the road. But with Farrell I felt like he wasn't even half way down the road, and I do think he had this terrific potential, and it really is very tragic his life was cut short so soon.

Additionally, both Hilský (1992, 93) and Crane (1999, 11) acknowledge that, despite some of the positive reviews of his works, British literary critique never paid Farrell as much attention as he undoubtedly deserved. The critical enthusiasm for his works subsided rapidly after his death and his reputation was kept alive only through dedicated endeavours of a small group of Farrell's friends. Several essays, namely by John Spurling, Margaret Drabble and Malcolm Dean were published together in 1981 alongside with Farrell's last unfinished novel *The Hill Station* and his own Indian Diary. In terms of literary critique, Bernard Bengonzi or Ronald Binns also contributed to the topic of Farrell's works in 1980s, yet he never became a subject of such interest of the academic critique as for example John Fowles.

3.1 Farrell's literary style

In terms of a literary style, James Gordon Farrell wanted to be different than other contemporary British writers. In the middle of the 1960's, Farrell was working as a lector in the Hutchinson Publishing Company. According to Martin Hilský (1992, 92), this position allowed him to read hundreds of manuscripts, which were usually not bad in terms of quality. However, their biggest disadvantage according to him was, that they were quite dull and their authors did not have much new to offer. Comparably, Bernard Bergonzi (1979, 53) also acknowledges the lack of an interesting material in English prose of 1970's:

> One of the recurring problems of contemporary English novelists is a fundamental lack of material. This much is apparent in many run-of-the-mill realistic novels about middle-class adultery, teenage revolt or whatever; and the advent of the problematical novel has had a bad effect insofar as it has permitted authors to write at length about nothing other than the fact that they are writing.

Farrell thus did not want to follow the path of the indistinctive, easily predictable, aesthetically un-ambitious novels, set mostly in the provincial settings so typical of the average majority of prosaics of his era. Yet at the same time he strongly disapproved of the extravagant literary experiments of Samuel Beckett or B. S. Johnson. Therefore, while Farrell had been predominantly working with the realistic technique, he modified it to his own needs and enriched it with his own specific elements. His style could be then the best described as: "symbolic realism augmented with grotesque and absurd elements[2]." (my translation) (Hilský, 1992, 92) Again, a quite similar view is provided by Bernard Bergonzi (1979, 64), who also claims that Farrell departed from conventions adhered by other authors of his period, and calls Farrell's novels realistic, yet different and, to a certain, degree innovative:

> In these two novels Farrell seems to me to have broken out of the impasse that many British novelists have lately found themselves in. Far from abandoning realism as useless, he has rethought its possibilities. In *Troubles* and *The Siege of Krishnapur* he has shown both a respect for the past and a vivid sense of how it has made us what we are; this, truly, is the historical imagination at its finest, combined with impeccable invention.

Due to their historical setting, Farrell's later novels were often called historical novels. From a very young age, Farrell was interested in history; in fact, the very first book he had read in his childhood was Sir Walter Scott's *Ivanhoe*. Due to his family relations, Farrell was also interested in memoirs, diaries and travelogues. He even read Lukács *Historical Novel*, and a lesson, he obtained from it, was that a historical novel must address its contemporary readers to the extent that they would consider it as their own history. Yet, at the same time he was aware, that this attractiveness for the contemporary reader should not be forced, or feel autotelic in any way, because it would loose its desired effect. As Bergonzi (1979, 58) quotes Farrell, he wanted to use the past as a mirror or a metaphor for present:

[2] Symbolický realismus s umocněnými prvky groteskna a absurdna.

> What I wanted to do was to use this period of the past as a metaphor for today, because I believe that however much the superficial details and customs of life may change over the years, basically life itself does not change very much. Indeed, all literature that survives must depend on this assumption. Another reason why I proffered to use the past is that, as a rule, people have already made up their minds what they think about present. About the past they are more susceptible to clarity of vision.

Thus, Farrell's works were never intended to be the traditional historical novels. He was never interested in describing great battles, conclusions of treaties or other important events. Because as Lukács (1989, 42) stated: "What matters therefore in the historical novel is not re-telling of great historical events, but the poetic awakening of the people who figured in those events, […] the social and human motives which led men to think, feel and act just as they did in historical reality." Farrell somewhat demystifies these events. More than an actual history, he wanted to portray what no one else tried to capture, the trivial, or even meaningless circumstances, the every day banalities, the mere acts of being alive, that accompany those events. This attitude is probably the best summarized in the Farrell's interview with George Brock from September of 1978, for the Observer Magazine: "The real experience in not composed of signing of treaties or flanking manoeuvres, but of the smother that irk your eyes and of the blisters on your feet[3]." (my translation) (Hilský, 1992, 95) The characters of Farrell's novels are not burdened with being great historical figures or with acting as the world-historical individuals according to Lukács' concept, they are "undergoing" the history rather then they are creating it. However, it does not mean that Farrell's characters do not have distinctive personalities or strong moral standards; on the contrary, they protrude above the others just as sharply as for example characters in Sir Walter Scott's novels.

First and foremost, Farrell was an excellent storyteller. Despite his solitary nature or even shy character, he was famous for regaling his friends in his small two-room apartment in London with numerous stories that he had been gradually polishing until the almost absolute perfection:

[3] Skutečná zkušenost nesestává z podpisu smluv či z obchvatných manévrů, ale z kouře, který vás pálí do očí, a z puchýřů na noze.

> Appropriately, it is his storytelling that stands out most vividly in my memories of Jim. I know of no other person who could tell a story so well or who would be urged so strenuously by friends to retell a tale even though everyone around the table had heard it several times before. Paradoxically, for a shy and private man, he not only told the stories brilliantly but also quite clearly enjoyed providing the performance. […] When, late in the evening, the storyteller was persuaded to tell one of his tales, it was clear that it had been lovingly polished and improved over the years. (Dean, 1993, 192; 203)

In his story telling, all his shyness and "ums" and "ers" present in his normal conversation, disappeared. Farrell was focused only on providing a good story and he managed to transfer some of this virtue of storytelling to his literary works. According to Martin Hilský (1990, 361), Farrell usually based the point of his stories on one particular scene or it revolved around one particular character and his or her specific oddities. Due to Farrell's intention to create a metaphor or an imaginary mirror for the present, his stories comprise numerous absurd and bizarre scenes, or scenes that have almost anecdotic character. A quite similar view is provided by Malcolm Dean (1993, 200), who, for example, in his memoir mentions how Farrell was able to persuade one of his girlfriends that his middle name was "Grapefruit", because his eccentric Edwardian parents wanted to name all their children after fruit. Farrell simply had an impeccable sense of humour. He often managed to pick one particular thing, even a slightest detail, and made the most of it: "A prime ingredient of his humour was exaggeration. He would fasten on to certain salient characteristics of people, refine and exaggerate them so that their quirks became quite absurd." (ibid)

These bizarre scenes and anecdotic insertions, however, have their specific purpose. They are not supposed to entertain the reader; on the contrary, in most of the situations they are supposed to point towards more serious issues presented in the novels. Farrell was not writing a pure comedy either. Prior to writing his novels, Farrell studied numerous historical resources and thus carefully, and with attention-to-detail reconstructed authentic periodical background contrasts with Farrell's bizarre caricature and over exaggeration. It is what gives his works their profundity. They are integral to all his later writings: "This comic undercutting is not merely a sugaring of the pill,

though it does serve to enliven otherwise unpalatable chunks of thoroughly researched information. It is integral to the work." (Drabble, 1993, 180)

In his works thusly, Farrell managed to combine the almost incompatible. He combined the realistic writing technique, the strong sense for morale and ethical code together with his impeccable endowment for nonsense, bizarreness and absurd exaggeration. "This crossover could be determined as the basis of Farrell's novel poetics, yet at the same time it denotes temperamental eclecticism of Farrell's method – his novels almost always fluctuate between satirical hyperbole and lyrical nostalgia[4]." (my translation) (Hilský, 1990, 361)

By coincidence, Farrell started to write *Troubles*, his first novel of the Empire trilogy, shortly before a new wave of the Irish troubles of 1970's arouse. This gave his work an unintentional actuality and topicality but at the same time, due to Farrell's focus on everyday banalities and the fact, that he did not try to force the reader into any direct moral judgements, the impact of his historical works were much greater and they also managed to obtain a certain level of timelessness.

4. The Clash of Personal and Public History in Works of J.G. Farrell

The subsequent literary analysis is going to be focused on two of Farrell's later novels – *Troubles* and *The Siege of Krishnapur* respectively. Even though it was not the author's primary intention, due to his focus on stories of individual characters, it is on the basis of these two novels, possible to analyse how the personal experiences of an individual can influence the interpretation of a certain event or vice versa, how the system or the social environment in general, can influence the individual in these matters. Additionally, in these novels, it is also possible to identify traces of Lukács' theory of the historical novel, by which Farrell was partially influenced.

[4] Toto překřížení lze snad označit za podstatu Farrellovy románové poetiky, zároveň naznačuje i bytostnou eklektičnost Farrelovy metody – jeho romány téměř vždy kolísají mezi satirickou nadsázkou a lyrickou nostalgií.

4.1 Troubles

The novel is set in the early 1920's in Ireland during the Irish struggle for independence prior to the signing of the Anglo-Irish Treaty and the establishment of the Irish Free State in December 1922. A significant part of the plot takes place in the Majestic Hotel, a monumental structure from the Victorian times with numerous storeys and several separated wings, once merrily inhabited with life, with hundreds of rooms filled with members of Anglo-Irish nobility attending annual summer regattas, fancy balls and evening parties. However, at the time of the novel the hotel is only a shabby ruin, an empty hulk remotely resembling its former glory. Apart from the owner, Edward Spencer, who had bought the structure in a half-derelict state, before its complete downfall at the turn of the century, the hotel is inhabited with an assortment of faithful customers: a group of old ladies, widows of high ranking state representatives and local profiteers or old spinsters from aristocratic circles, as well representing a slowly fading-out remnant of previous times. With nowhere else to go, they had chosen the Majestic as a peaceful place to spend the rest of their lives.

The hotel itself is situated on a peninsula near small, fictional, rural town of Kilnalough, a godforsaken place with only several hundred inhabitants, and somehow shielded from the chaotic happenings described later in the novel. Martin Hilský (1989, 439) described the Majestic Hotel as a certain kind of *micro-cosmos*, a world with its own rules, being a symbolic place, almost resembling the house from *The Fall of the House of Usher* by Edgar Alan Poe. It is a vast maze of deserted rooms and empty hallways that gradually change shape as the main character's line proceeds in the plot. Yet at the same time, it can be interpreted as a realistic place, a variant to the so-called "Big House Novel".

The Big House theme was quite common for the Irish or Anglo-Irish writers of the 19th and partially of the early 20th century; typical representatives may include Maria Edgeworth's *Castle Reckrent* and *The Absentee* or works of George Moore, W. B. Yeats or Molly Keane (Tamplin, 1999, 51). It was focused on portraying the decay and misrule of the Anglo-Irish landlords and their overall disability to manage the estates in Ireland that they owned. It was usually written from an inside perspective portraying relationships of the Big House dwellers and their Irish servants, and the landlords'

striving to preserve their houses and their profligate way of life. The Big House on its own in the novels is never depicted as an aristocratic palace. It is often rather, an ill-cared for and untidy cabin, a homestead, or a summer residence; yet it assumes a certain symbolic status and it's gradually more and more wretched state becomes a midpoint for these novels (Tamplin, 1999, 51-52). In this sense, the Majestic is a masquerade of a Big House (Tamplin, 1999, 53). It is not a residence, however it is depicted in a state of severe decay and its dwellers, namely the old ladies or the owner, Edward Spencer, are also stuck in the past and are, to a certain degree, struggling to retain their old ways of life. Nevertheless, Farrell never intended to use the Majestic as a focal point of the novel, trying to describe on its basis these struggles of Anglo-Irish ascendancy in Ireland during the early 1920's or to, in greater detail, analyse any particular problem of the period; he merely used it as an interesting background for his characters and their individual stories.

The main character of the novel is Major Brendan Archer, a former officer of the Royal Armed Forces, who was honourably discharged after suffering shellshock during his battle experiences during the World War I. He is a man of traditional values, polite, considerate, and well mannered but sometimes a bit too naive in his views. Initially, the Major seemed completely displaced, as he had gotten into Ireland almost by chance. In the story he serves as a "freelancing" impartial observer, practically unconcerned with his surroundings, but eventually as the plot proceeds forward, he becomes gradually more and more personally involved. The main reason the Major decided to arrive in Ireland after his recovery in 1919, was because of Angela, the eldest of the three daughters of Edward Spencer. The Major had met her for the first time in Brighton, during his summer leave from trenches in the year 1916. Even though they had not engaged intimately during their short encounter, Angela started to sign letters to Brendan as "his loving fiancé". He never proposed to her, actually the only time he expressed his feelings towards her was during their leave-taking. By accident Brandon pinned his hand to a cactus and the suppressed expression of pain gave his words false intensity. This kind of a grotesque situation, typical for Farrell's writings, created the basis for the following actions in the story. And typically for him, Brendan did not resist this idea of marriage; he just passively accepted it as a fact.

After the Major's return to the trenches, Angela kept quite frequent correspondence with him. In her letters, she described with almost mechanical preciseness and persistency even the slightest details concerning her family, the Majestic or happenings in Kilnalough, but there was not even a trace of emotion in them. They felt almost cold and distanced. The Major noticed this considerable change in Angela's behaviour but he did not mind it. It seemed unimportant to him. In fact, letters from her created a certain feeling of security for him, because apart from an old aunt in Bayswater, he had no other family. He accepted Spencer's family as his own. Piece by piece the Major created an image of everyday life in the Majestic in his mind:

> After he had been receiving a letter a week for a number of months he acquired a remarkable skill for reading these letters and totting up the new facts, even sometimes peering past them into the lower depths where the shadow of an emotion occasionally stirred as a pike. […] In this way, thread by thread, he embroidered for himself a colourful tapestry of Angela's life in the Majestic. Soon he knew the place so well that when he went there at the beginning of July he almost felt as if he were going home. (Farrell, 1993b, 7)

Unsurprisingly, when he arrived, everything was different. He was able to recognize certain places or guess names of certain people according to the description but it did not feel right. Angela was acting rather strange, and slightest sign of emotion for Brendan was gone; she was completely distant. It was like he was just another visitor that arrived to the hotel and not her fiancé.

This short passage points towards the importance and also severe limitations of personal experience. We, as humans, are able to comprehend world around us solely through our senses; basically only according to what we see, hear, taste, touch, and so on. We are able to store these "experiences" in our memory and recall them when needed. However, because our perception of the world is extremely limited, at any time in our lives, we are able to comprehend only a small fraction of reality. Additionally, a personal experience is exclusive to every individual and it cannot be transferred to anyone else. Of course, two or more individuals can experience the very same event, grab the same object, smell the same scent, etc. but they still perceive these "experiences" individually. The problem rises when we actually need to transfer this

personal experience to another being - e.g. a person wants to describe his or her experiences from a holiday in a distant, exotic country to a group of friends. None of these individuals has ever been to that type of country, but according to the description, they are able to imagine how hot the tropical climate probably would be, how sweaty they would get in the humid environment, how a tropical rain would feel on their skin and other such things. Even though the personal experience is intransitive from one person to another, we are, at least to some extent, able to recreate the experience, or the perception of reality, according to our own. These people probably experienced some of the things described – e.g. they know how it feels to get wet during rain or get sweaty during hot summer day. However, their recreation of reality will always be different from the actual one, because they lack that one particular experience. And, the Major did exactly the same thing; he recreated his image of Majestic according to someone else's' personal experience and naturally, the reality was then completely different.

In his book *For a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign*, Jean Baudrillard describes several ways of how to approach the value of a certain object. Basically, he deals with four basic types of value. The first type of value is the functional value – the object is then identified through its function; a refrigerator is supposed to keep groceries fresh and so it cannot be replaced e.g. by an oven, because it has a completely different function. The second type of value is the exchange type of value – a refrigerator is worth a certain sum of money or it can be exchanged for other commodities. The third type of value is the sign value of the object with relation to other objects. Some objects, even though they have no additional functions than others, gain additional value because of what they represent – a refrigerator may be considered a symbol of wealth, a symbol of higher social class etc. (1981, 65-68). The last type of value is the symbolic value. For example, the wedding ring is different from an ordinary ring because of what it symbolises for the married couple and so on:

> *The wedding ring:* This is a unique object, symbol of the relationship of the couple. One would neither think of changing it (barring mishap) nor of wearing several. The symbolic object is made to last and to witness in its duration the permanence of the relationship. Fashion plays as negligible a role at the strictly symbolic level as at the level of pure instrumentality. (Baudrillard, 1981, 66)

Even though Baudrillard was approaching this matter purely from the material perspective (certain objects posses a certain value), and through this he was criticising western consumerist society, it is also possible to apply his theory to abstract concepts, like personal experience. Using exactly the same types of value, a functional type of experience may represent actions we perform every day in order to achieve some goal – we eat in order to feed ourselves, we sleep to get rest, we travel somewhere to get to work, etc. The exchange value is the only type which cannot be used in relation to experience, because personal experience is naturally intransitive. The sign type of experience can contribute to various, lets say, "official" events in our lives - e.g. a graduation day, in our culture, symbolises a certain type of achievement on the field of education or a wedding day symbolises that two people are from that day onward engaged in a certain kind of permanent relationship. And lastly, the symbolic value of experience may refer to events which are somewhat special for us, because of certain emotional aspects in them, or generally because of any other kind of uniqueness. For another person that one particular day may not seem important at all, but for you it was a day when you first met your girlfriend, a day when you entered school for the first time or a day when you tried something new, etc. All these types of experiences can be combined or they can even overlap. The aforementioned graduation day includes both the sign value with a strong emotional aspect; or an ordinary lunch in a restaurant is generally not very memorable or important event for us unless something interesting happens – e.g. we meet a friend we have not seen for a long time. Life is not a detailed painting with polished edges that was gradually created from the beginning of the painting process till the end; it is rather a rough mosaic in which some of the pieces are more prominent, (because we link those with one particular moment or with certain feelings, memories, places etc.) and other less prominent pieces like our everyday routine, things that do not have any specific value for us, and are slowly fading away. Basically, it is an incoherent batch of more or less important personal events that creates a personal history of every individual.

In the Major's case this can be observed when he attended The Victory Parade in Dublin. Even though he was aware of the formal importance of this moment – because of all the flags hanging from the buildings, crowds of people lining the streets

and newspaper articles reporting about the event in advance. However, he saw only a small portion of it. He was stuck in his hotel room with Mr. O'Neill, his wife and teenage daughter who tried to flirt with him:

> Viola O'Neill who had stationed herself at another window with the Major, kept turning to bestow smiles and lingering glances on him […] And her small hand slipped into Major's large pawn, gripping it tightly. Frozen with alarm, the Major stared down at the grinning, jauntily striding Munster Fusiliers. The child was flirting with him! And she was certainly no more than fifteen years old.
>
> (Farrell, 1993b, 93)

The scene is a typical example of Farrell's "demystification" of a great historical event. We may see the streets with parading soldiers as an imaginary foreground, the official depicture of the event that would go to the front pages of newspapers. In contrast, Viola's flirting with the Major in the hotel room is then the invisible background of the event that no one is interested in portraying. Additionally, it also demonstrates a certain relativity of the personal experience. The Major did not perceive the event as a whole. His perception of the event was limited to that what he was able to see from the window and what he experienced in the hotel room. He would not remember it as a glorious day when hundreds of soldiers walked in squared lines, for him it would be the day when he was stuck in his hotel room with the annoying O'Neill family. We can imagine the Major's immediate surroundings as a bubble that is inside another much larger bubble, which represents the whole event. The smaller bubble is inside the large one, because the Major was a part of the entire event but experienced only a very limited fraction of it. He was not able to expand his bubble, broaden his senses somehow and grasp the event as a whole. And the very same thing applies to each and every individual attending the Victory Parade. A person standing in the middle of a crowd on the street would probably remember the event from the completely different perspective than a soldier marching in line with his comrades in arms. As a result we get numerous little bubbles, pieces of mosaic, creating the final image of what happened.

Then if a human, as an individual, is able to comprehend events surrounding him or her only on the basis of his or her personal experience, how is then possible that

such a thing as an objective, unified record of history, exists? Theoretically, if the Major was a complete stranger who arrived in Ireland and the first thing he saw was the Victory Parade how would he find out that it is an important event? Well, based on his observation he could have guessed it because of all the commotion and hundreds of people in the streets. But crowds generally do not gather outside unless there is a reason for such thing. It was an impulse given from the outside. Primarily, the Victory Parade was important for the government – it was announced in newspapers a long time before, there were leaflets hung around the city and several public speeches preceding it. Of course, there had to be at least some personal interest in it for the participants, otherwise they would not come, but all those people were part of the same system, thus they were aware of the formal importance of the event and why they should attend it.

In the preface to his book, *The Order of Things – an Archaeology of the Human Sciences*, Michel Foucault distinguishes two types of order. The first type of order is the natural order that is defined by the basic characteristics of particular objects, i.e. their so-called "inner law", and by the mutual interaction between these objects; and the second, artificially created type, is that defined within our society, our culture, and which is in a way ethereal and hard to define. These two types of order are able to coexist next to each other; however the natural order existed long before the first examples of organised human society appeared. The seasons of the year were changing for thousands of years before man started wondering why; water in a stream was running downwards, or a small rock was able to fall from the cliff down to the sea, long before the laws of gravity were discovered, and so on. But it was man who started reorganizing and categorising things. It is a part of our human nature to try to analyse and understand the world around us (2001, xix-xx). In relation to this, Foucault claims that for every period in our history, each culture in its development created a certain kind of a discourse against which everything was compared (for example the arts, natural sciences, culture, etc.). This artificially created framework basically defined how the society of that particular culture was able perceive the world around it. However, this discourse was not stable and was prone to change over the time as the society further developed. Foucault was mostly concerned with development of the

discourse of philology, natural history, biology and political economy throughout 16th to 20th century:

> Thus in every culture, between the use of what one might call the ordering codes and reflections upon order itself, there is the pure experience of order and of its modes of being. […] I am concerned to show its developments, since the sixteenth century, […] in what way, then our culture has made manifest the existence of order […] in order to create the positive basis of knowledge.

Man ever has been and still is a solitary creature. When an individual is born, regardless of the time period, he or she immediately becomes a part of the discourse, no matter if he or she agrees with it or not. Our perception of the world is created by the society we live in. We accept its rules and more importantly, even though we do not want to think about it in this particular way, we are willing succumb to its authority. Man tends to think of himself as an independent being. However, there is always some kind of authority we have to obey – represented either by our parents, our teachers at school, our boss at work or even by our legal framework. From an early age, we grow up with this sense of an invisible order around us; but until we reach a certain age, until we are able to understand the principles of such abstract concepts like order and authority, we are not able to notice it.

Consequently, in another book, *Discipline and Punish – The Birth of the Prison*, Foucault presented his idea of a "Panopticon", a special type of prison building designed by English philosopher Jeremy Bentham, at the end of the 18th century. To understand Foucault's theory, it is important to understand the architecture of the prison first. The building was of rectangular shape built around an observe tower in the middle. The outer circle of the structure was divided into cellblocks. In each cell there were two windows – one on the inside, allowing an observer in the tower to observe what is going on in the cell and another on the outside, allowing the light to cross the cell from one end to the other and creating a backlight. It was thus possible to observe convicts but they were unable to spot the guard inside the tower or tell if they really were being observed:

> Visibility is a trap. […] He (the convict) is seen, but he does not see; he is the object of information, never a subject in communication. The arrangement of his room, opposite the central tower, imposes on him an axial visibility; but the divisions of the ring, those separated cells, imply a lateral invisibility. And this invisibility is a guarantee of order. (Foucault, 1995, 201)

The concept of Panopticon proved very effective because the illusion of sustained surveillance was permanent in its effects, even though it was actually discontinuous in action as the guard was not always present, and thus assured the automatic functioning of power even without applying drastic enforcement methods. Furthermore, Foucault uses this idea as a parallel to how modern governments were able to maintain their power. He writes about the formation of the so-called disciplinary society. Every system in human history, both democratic and theocratic, has struggled with the same three problems: firstly, how to acquire power ideally at the lowest political and economical expenditure possible – the more subtle and more invisible the change is, the better; secondly, how to gradually expand, ergo to acquire even more power without either failure or interval; and lastly, how to increase both the docility and the utility of all the elements of the system in order to ensure its persistency. According to Foucault (1995, 218-227), most of the modern political establishments achieved these goals. Individual governments changed over time, however the basis of the system has remained almost the same for the last hundred years. In the disciplinary society, the system has several means to directly and instantly influence every individual within the system, mostly through legislature and judicature. Legislature creates a legal framework, which represents invisible boundaries denoting what an individual can or cannot do. Judicature then symbolises the monitoring and punishing element in the case when an individual breaks one of the rules. An individual, on the contrary, has no direct means to, in return, influence the system or way to escape its reach.

Panopticon can as well illustrate a general position of an individual within society. Man, as an individual, lacks the ability of insight. He is unable to ascend himself, unable to see beyond the boundaries created by the bubble of his personal life. He is condemned to a very confined space representing his home, work, town he lives in etc. (in other words, the cell); he is able to meet a limited number of individuals – family members, friends, co-workers (other convicts from surrounding cellblocks); but

he is unable to see what is happening on the opposite side of a prison or see the building from the outside as a whole in order to obtain a broader picture. It thus represents a majority of those who are not able to see, trapped in a maze created by a minority of those who can observe.

During his visit to Dublin, the Major also witnessed the murder of an old man by members of Sinn Fein. The old man had been gunned down right on the street when he was asked "What time is it?" by group of three young men. He was still gripping his golden watch in his hand when the Major saw his body. The Major was deeply shaken by this event. He was aware of the rising tensions in Ireland, but this was his first direct experience with overt violence. Prior to the shooting, the Major only had heard rumours about the situation from Edward, Mr. O'Neill or other characters, yet it all seemed distant and unrelated to him. The next day, the newspapers paid no special attention to this particular incident. It was just another name on the already quite long necrologue page. After reading the column, the Major commented on the increasing violence of the age:

> A raid on a barracks, the murder of a policeman on a lonely country road, an airship crossing the Atlantic, a speech by a man on a platform, or any of the other random acts, mostly violent, that one reads about every day: this was the history of the time. The rest was merely the 'being alive', that every age has to do.
>
> (Farrell, 1993b, 99)

Even though the Major witnessed the shooting with his own eyes, he was not able to form a clear opinion about it. For him the events in Ireland poured into a shapeless mass of nonsensical violence – too crude, too brutal and too chaotic to understand. So, he just accepted an opinion provided by someone else. However, then the question rises, to what extent a newspaper can actually be considered as an objective source of information? From their essence, newspapers cannot offer a direct experience, due to the lack of necessary means or space, they are only able to mediate it. They do not represent a complex portrayal of reality either. Again, they represent only a very limited fraction of it. Basically, newspapers can be considered only as a selection of reports of certain events that happened in certain period of time and that someone considered

important. Yet, this selection is rather relative and makes a newspaper a quite subjective source of information. Who can decide what is important and what is not?

The issue of the lack of objectivity in contemporary media is partially discussed by Guy Debord in his thesis, *The Society of the Spectacle*. He works with a slightly different point of view than Baudrillard or Foucault. He states that modern society no longer perceives the world around itself through an authentic personal experience of an individual, but rather through its mere representation provided by some kind of an outside source. For this false representation of reality, Debord (2002, 7) uses the term "spectacle":

> The spectacle is not a collection of images; it is a social relation between people that is mediated by images. The spectacle cannot be understood as a mere visual deception produced by mass-media technologies. It is a worldview that has actually been materialized. […] It is not a mere decoration added to the real world. It is the very heart of this real society's unreality.

The spectacle generates a certain paradox. Post-modern society lives in an era when information is widely and almost instantly available to the general public but no one questions or attempts to verify the image that is provided for him or her. Even if an individual wanted to contest the spectacle it is not entirely possible. Because the spectacle represents a dominant model of life it doesn't only propose "what" to see, but also "how" to see it. The spectacle, by all its means – like advertisement, news, entertainment or propaganda, posses the ability to define and directly influence public opinions and tastes. These tools are in a special relationship towards the spectacle. They can be regarded as bearers of the spectacle's message, but at the same time they help to create and extend the spectacle itself. It is like a living organism that constantly changes its shape and adapts to new conditions, and that gradually expands simply just by existing. An individual growing up under the permanent influence of the spectacle is no longer able to recognise reality, because reality is being constantly, mostly on a sub-conscious level, replaced with an artificial image provided by the spectacle. It is completely inevitable. Of course, it can be argued that not all individuals within the society share exactly the same sets of opinions and that there is always someone who goes against the "mainstream". However these opposing groups are created on the basis

of the spectacle. While some are directly opposing it, others may change only some of its elements, but they are still more or less directly based upon it (Debord, 2002, 8).

In relation to this, Debord (ibid) also talks about a degradation of knowledge and gradual disintegration of critical awareness. The society, during its development, changed from a collection of individuals to a shapeless mass, a mindless herd, which willingly consumes everything that is served in front of it. This idea can be compared with Foucault's depiction of the system inside the disciplinary society. The system provides a set of rules and then through certain disciplinary measures and the idea of constant supervision, ensures its fulfilment. The spectacle on the other hand does not need any disciplinary measures or means of supervision, it can widely influence masses without them, simply by providing different images or altering the image of what is "good", "bad", "legal", "fashionable", "healthy" and so on, and the masses will consume its message. They will unwittingly succumb to its power. In this relation, it is possible to consider the spectacle as part of the system. It can be seen as another controlling element helping to spread the image created by the system. Through the spectacle, the system possesses the power to determine what is "right" and what is "wrong".

However, the idea of the system or the spectacle is more or less focused on directly controlling or influencing the present; what is then its relation to the past or the public history? The concept relates back to Foucault's theory of the natural and artificial, man-created order. In regards to the previous idea, it is possible to consider the actual events in the past as "natural" for the purpose of this definition the causes leading to the events or participants involved in them are not important. Basically, something happens somewhere at some time. But this is not how we perceive history. As Alun Munslow or Richard Slotkin pointed out, history is not comprised of actual events, it is comprised of our interpretations of them, and these interpretations can, in some cases, depart from reality. Thus the correlation is: "the natural history" (i.e. how it really happened) - the system - "the public history" (i.e. how the event was recorded and how we perceive it in the present). By influencing the public views in the present, the system, or the spectacle can influence the general perception of the past or it can decide how the present events will be recorded.

In Farrell's case, we can observe this by the example of periodical newspapers. On one hand, Farrell quite successfully used these numerous authentic newspaper articles to recreate a general feeling of the period the novel is set in. In the novel, the reader can find a vivid collage of the transcripts of political speeches, reports of important events from various places of the Empire and also numerous examples of rather tabloid journalism. These articles comment both on the events from all around the world as well on the events in Ireland. However, apart from the one particular case, with the murder of the old man on the streets of Dublin, they are not in any way incorporated directly into the plot. On the other hand, the period newspaper articles are used contradictory to the common practice. Commonly, newspaper articles in fiction are regarded as a source factual knowledge. Farrell specifically had chosen rather tabloid articles not as a source of facts but rather in order to create absurd, sometimes even ironical background scenery for the plot (Hilský, 1992, 95).

In the novel, The Major does not question the newspaper articles. On the contrary, he overly and almost exclusively considers them truthful. When reading a newspaper describing racial disturbances in Chicago, disputes along the north-western border in India, the Amritsar massacre, and other events, he noted: "In late 1919 hardly a day went by without an eye-witness account of such horrors being confided to the press by some returned traveller who had managed to escape with his skin." (Farrell, 1993b, 110) For the Major it was unimaginable that any of the confided and most certainly eye-witnessed stories in the news may be distorted, biased towards someone or something, or may be exaggerated. He accepted them in the exact way they were written. In other words, he just passively consumes an image presented by the spectacle. This Farrell's ironical portrayal of the historical events and the Major's passive acceptance of their description could be contrasted with Debord's claim concerning the disintegration of critical thinking within society.

The reader, generally, also does not have any immediate reason to intentionally question the newspaper articles inserted in the plot. In the first part of the novel, Farrell (1993b, 126) presents a short article about the dreadful experiences of two young Irish ladies who were forced to flee from the Ukraine during the ongoing Russian Civil war:

> Reuter's representative has just had an interview with two Irish girls, the Misses May and Eileen Healy, who have just reached London, having escaped from Kieff with nothing but the clothes – thin linen dresses – they were wearing.
> They tell a terrible story of the Bolshevist outrage, of which they were personal witnesses. They said that the mental strain was awful and one, Miss Eileen Healy, has lost 3 st. in weight […]

At the first glance, this particular newspaper excerpt does not seem any different from the others. However, it could be indirectly compared with a scene from the second part of the novel during which a group of old ladies, permanently accommodated in the Majestic, sets out to Kilnalough. With the increasing number of incidents – namely Irish kids sticking out their tongues in front of the English ladies, Ms. Archer being pushed into a gutter by a couple corpulent Irishwomen and Edward being beaten during his night walk around the hotel, the old ladies decided that they would not go into the town on their own anymore and started forming groups of three, in order to better "defend" themselves. Unfortunately, these group expeditions soon ended up causing even more incidents rather that preventing them. With almost witch hunt-like determination the old ladies started seeking out problems where they were not, and engaged in pointless, completely ridiculous quarrels because of nothing. Ms. Johnson, for example, attacked with her umbrella a farmer, who, standing backwards towards her, in the middle of a crowded market, dared to spit on the ground approximately 20 feet away from them, or she verbally assaulted a clerk, who had the impudence to respond to her with his hand in his trousers pockets:

> In no time at all the ladies developed a remarkable skill for discerning traces of insulting behaviour in the townspeople. A lack of respect would be detected (in a turned back, in a 'saucy' smile, in a cheeky 'Good day!') and quick as a flash it would be dealt with. […] Miss. Johnston, in particular, stimulated by the admiration of her companions, already appeared to have refined her skill to the point where she could sense an insult before it was delivered.
>
> (Farrell, 1993b, 257-258)

Journeys to the city became a source of a rather rare excitement for the old ladies. With an increasing number of incidents, more and more of them were sitting in the hotel's

guest room, playing whist waiting with impatience to hear the newest experiences of those who ventured to the town that day. Even the Major, originally self-appointed guardian of these old ladies, had to admit that they maybe went too far with their behaviour and were the most certainly acting irrationally.

It needs to be stressed that Farrell never directly linked these two events together nor provided the reader even the slightest hint that they should be interrelated in any way. But in contrast to the absurd, furious crusade of a pack of grumpy old English ladies throughout the city streets, the story about two Irish ladies escaping from a Bolshevik grasp seems rather over exaggerated. It is hard to imagine these two ladies going through barns full of dead bodies, seeing blood splatters on the walls and crouching in dismay behind the locked doors of their hotel room trying to hear what is going on. Maybe the story was not exaggerated at all and the ladies actually did undergo such horrific experiences, however the aforementioned newspapers article is too brief, too shallow, and there is simply not enough information for drawing any serious conclusions. It is up to the reader to decide whether or not he or she considers the newspapers article to be truthful. The reader possesses a crucial ability and that is the ability of insight. The reader stands above all the characters, he or she can detach himself or herself from the plot, skip several pages, and compare two completely different events or see a particular event from an unusual perspective. It is the ability, which Major Archer, as an ordinary human being in the novel, completely lacks.

Another important character in the novel is Sarah Devlin, who, after Angela's tragic passing away, became the sole reason why Major Archer decided to stay in Ireland. The death of Angela Spencer is a typical example of Farrell's tragicomedy. Soon after his arrival, the Major discovered that his journey to Ireland may not be as successful as he had thought. Angela barely noticed the Major's presence and almost avoided any personal contact with him. As he watched her pale, reserved face, the Major began to wonder if their first kiss in Brighton "might have taken place only in his imagination […]" (Farrell, 1993b, 42) and everything he had seen so far was only some kind of a wicked illusion. Other members of the family also did not make the best impression. Edward Spencer, Angela's father and the hotel owner is, according to the Major, only a haughty weakling, a character that is a mockery of its own self. And Ripon, Angela's brother, that she had completely forgotten to mention in her letters, is

just an odious young man of unacceptable manners. The Majestic is not a place for a gentleman of Major Archer's qualities either. At best, the hotel's condition could be described as desolate and to his annoyance there was no one who after his arrival would have helped him with his luggage, showed him the way to his hotel room or brought him clean bed sheets. He had to do everything on his own. After the first dinner, the Major even found a rotten sheep head hidden in his bedside nightstand. However, his tactfulness and gentlemanly manners prevented him from fleeing the place immediately without leaving a notice; or from addressing the topic directly, for example, during a common breakfast or dinner. It would not be appropriate to speak about such a delicate thing in front of the other guests. The Major was waiting for a suitable moment so he could speak with his fiancé alone. Unfortunately, it proved to be an almost impossible task and he never really got a chance to do so.

The Major just passively accepted the engagement with Angela only on the basis of their previous correspondence and as he noted, after his personal experience in Ireland, he never really felt anything truly intimate towards her, yet when it came down to cancelling the engagement he was unable to make any straightforward steps and just left the whole situation to resolve itself. To make his decision even harder, as the days passed, the Major discovered that Angela was probably ill, however the nature of her illness remained unknown to him. "Angela remained behind a closed door (it was impossible to tell which, there were so many) […]. Indeed, nobody made any reference to her at all in his presence. Perhaps they thought that he would 'understand';" (Farrell, 1993b, 67). The only hard evidence was trays full of food carried back and forth by the hotel cook. Major felt highly irritated by this kind of secrecy.

At first, he tried to address Edward directly and ask him about Angela's health. However, Edward completely misunderstood the Major's intentions and instead of revealing Angela's condition, he only thanked the Major for everything that he had done in the matter. Failing to obtain any solid piece of information from Edward, the completely confused Major tried another source of information, a portly Irish female cook with an almost incomprehensible accent. He walked into the kitchen in a good mood. Trying to engage in a friendly conversation with the cook, joking and acting like a small boy stealing strawberries and apples from her, dipping his finger into a bowl, trying to taste the dough, etc. But the cook felt rather uneasy and seemed embarrassed

by his actions, so the Major had to leave the kitchen. "Anyone might have thought he was some kind of sexual deviant the way she behaved! It was simply no use at all." (Farrell, 1993b, 72) Even old Dr. Ryan, the Major's last resort in his seeking for information, the Spencer's family doctor and at the same time, the only doctor in Kilnalough, was not able to provide accurate information. He told the Major, that it is nothing serious, probably a just cold, and "she" should be fit in few days. However, as the Major later discovered, Dr. Ryan was most probably talking about Sara Devlin instead about Angela Spencer. Running out of patience, Major subsequently decided to spend few days in Dublin as a kind of a compromise, hoping that the situation in Kilnalough would settle down in the meantime, only to discover that Angela had passed away due to leukaemia.

Aforementioned situations create a collection so absurd, so ridiculous that they may as well fit into some kind of a farce. Nevertheless, they are a key part of Farrell's writing. Martin Hilský (1992, 97) described Major Archer as:

> […]a man lost in the world, whose love adventures are full of painful misunderstandings, a man overly gracious and considerate, […]. Farrell's Major is a study of an honest man with a sense for justice, who finds himself in numerous embarrassing, difficult and partially tragic situations[5]. (my translation).

It can be also implied that, in Farrell's works, Major Archer represents a character that, to a certain extent unwillingly lets himself be dragged along by ongoing events. And even when he tries to fight against his own fate and tries to regain control over what is going on around him, there is always something, either his own indecisiveness, the unexpected actions of other characters, various misunderstandings or simply bad luck, that manoeuvres him into a position other than what he originally intended. He acts like a fallen leaf twisting and turning as the stream in a river helplessly carries it away.

Quite similar view presents Chris Ferns (1999,132), who compares Major Archer, and other Farrell's characters to the "mediocre" heroes of Sir Walter Scott's

[5] […] člověk ztracený ve světě, jehož milostná dobrodružství jsou plná bolestivých nedorozumění, člověk až příliš zdvořilý a ohleduplný, […]. Farrellův major je studií slušného člověka se smyslem pro spravedlnost, který se ocitá v celé řadě trapných, svízelných a napůl tragických situací.

literary works. According to him, Farrell's characters posses strong human qualities (like practical intelligence, moral fortitude and decency and even capability for a self-sacrifice), through which they gain a certain sympathy of the reader, however they are unable to ever use these personal qualities to achieve what they desire or at least influence whatever happens around them:

> Farrell's somewhat bumbling and ineffectual, but by no means unsympathetic protagonists - Major Archer, Fleury, Matthew Web – share many of the characteristics of what Lukács terms Scott's mediocre heroes (35): […] who, while displaying sometimes unexpected physical courage, remain generally passive, sometimes bewildered observers, acted upon by historical circumstances, rather than influencing them.

When mentioning Lukács, Ferns relates to the passage in which he claims that the majority of minor characters are in fact more interesting than the main hero, yet the main protagonist plays an irreplaceable role in the plot. He serves merely as a centre of gravity, a kind of a central hub, around which the events unfold. But this certain insignificance of the main hero is purely intentional. In epic, the individual is subject to the event. The event overshadows a single human personality by its magnitude and importance. The hero cannot be more significant than the event. Firstly he would drag the reader's attention away from the event and also if the protagonist had to cope only with minor events he would not be considered a hero (Lukács, 1989, 35). However, Farrell never positioned the Major into this position of a hero that has to overcome an event of great significance.

The previously mentioned Sarah Devlin is the only daughter of Mr. Devlin, a Catholic, somewhat servile and unctuous bank owner in Kilnalough, a man that Major Archer to a certain extent also despises. When first met, Sarah is described as a bright and beautiful although cynical Irish young lady, probably in her late twenties. Being a Catholic in Ireland is, according to her one of the "biggest tragedies", yet she is proud of her religion and of being Irish. Therefore she intentionally mocks the Major's elegant and cultivated behaviour, his gentlemanly manners and reminds him continually of his "Englishness". In the first part of the novel, she is stranded in a wheel chair or on some occasions she walked using a pair of wooden crutches, however

lately, she was able to walk normally without any problems. Being stranded in a wheelchair only strengthened the first impression of her bitter personality: "Ah, she's cruel, though the Major, his feelings hurt afresh. Nevertheless he took hold of the wheelchair and began to push her […] He tried to picture himself in a wheelchair for the rest of his life and it did indeed seem terrible." (Farrell, 1993b, 28-29)

Sarah plays two important roles in the novel. Firstly, she gradually became the Major's *femme fatale* as he had deeply fallen in love with her. They developed a kind of a complicated relationship. After Angela's death, the Major temporarily returned back to England in order to take care of his old infirmed aunt. During that time, he exchanged several letters with Sara. The Major was more than eager to hear any news from Ireland, or more specifically from the Majestic hotel, and she, typically for her, wrote her responses in a slightly cynical tone, mocking his curiosity, often stating that these letters are definitely not what the Major wants to read. Nonetheless, after some time, he eventually managed to persuade Sarah to visit him for a brief period in London, during her convalescence journey to France.

After her arrival, Sarah acted as a completely different person. Apparently, she had left her malicious character back in Kilnalough. Sarah acted almost like a little girl. She was so affectionate. She asked him numerous questions about the social life in London, how she looked adorable not knowing which knife or fork use in a restaurant etc. They walked through the city for hours. Amazed by her sudden enthusiasm and the absolute lack of cynicism, the Major found himself seeing the live from a completely different perspective. It was a moment that ultimately changed their relationship. Thanks to Sarah, the Major was finally able to reconcile with his traumatic war experiences:

> And soon the Major was telling Sarah about incidents that until now had been frozen into a block of ice in his mind. In the warmth of her sympathy he found he could talk about things which until now he had scarcely been able to repeat to himself […] the bubble of bitterness in his mind slowly dissolved and tears at last began to run down his cheeks for all his dead friends. (Farrell, 1993b, 135)

The Major was glad that he finally found someone he could openly talk to, someone who shares the same opinions as him. After Sarah's departure to France he wrote her a

long, passionate letter in which he revealed his feelings towards her, but was never able to send it, because Sarah had not mentioned where she was going to stay. As a result, this brief encounter in London symbolised a peak in the relationship between Sarah and the Major. She was never entirely honest with Brendan. Her behaviour varied from overtly flirting with him, through kissing him on a sofa at one time in the Majestic hotel lobby, to almost completely ignoring him or constantly mocking him with her cynical remarks. He was just a toy, a pleasant amusement, supposed to break Sara's boredom in Kilnalough. On the other hand, the Major's feelings towards Sarah were more or less platonic: "He understood her so well when she was no longer present; it was only when they were actually together that he experienced some difficulty. […] Once or twice, indeed, she even managed to be both in the linen room at his side and down below […] playing whist with the old ladies and perhaps with Edward too." (Farrell, 1993b, 260) Even though the Major tried to purpose a marriage with her, he never truly achieved anything in their relationship. He had been waiting for too long. Sarah just slipped through his fingers and remained unattainable forever. As with Angela, the Major was wandering through a maze created by his own indecisiveness and absurd circumstances. This another failed love affair only strengthens the overall description of the Major's character by Martin Hilský and Chris Ferns.

Secondly, and more importantly, Sarah Devlin managed to erode to some of the Major's stereotypical views concerning Ireland and the Irish Troubles. During one of their conversations they touched the issue of the Easter Rebellion in Dublin in 1916. Major Archer considered the uprising foul and devious. According to him, the Irish rebels had been just a bunch of hooligans who attacked the Empire from within in the most inappropriate moment when the British army was defending it against a much greater enemy in Europe. Such opinions to a great extend infuriated Sarah. She contradicted the Major's views by stating, that she regards the British army as an occupational force and sees no difference between whether British or Germans had invaded the Ireland. In her opinion, the people of Ireland had not asked to be defended or to be a part of the kingdom. In her eyes, participants of the Easter Rebellion were heroes defending their country not criminals and named several of their valiant deeds. Naturally, the Major refused to believe her and contradicted Sarah's, to him seemingly

idealised, depiction of Irish nationalists by referencing to a newspaper articles stating otherwise:

> But you ask me to believe in these operatic characters when one reads entirely different things in the newspaper. Just the other day I was reading about a woman who had pig rings put into her buttocks for supplying milk to the police […] a donkey stabbed to death for carrying turf to the R.I.C barracks […]. Such things are invented by the British to discredit us. We've way of knowing whether the newspapers tell the truth. Everything belongs to the British in Ireland. Everything.
>
> (Farrell, 1993b, 80)

The Major and Sarah's argument, quite nicely contrasts the limitations and bias of a personal experience on one side and the aloofness and superficiality of an opinion created on the basis of an outside source. The Major is a product of certain environment, or, according to Foucault, a particular system. He created his opinions according to a set of newspaper articles, regardless of how they actually might have been simplified, distorted or even twisted in order to fit an image desired by the spectacle. For him, they unquestionably reflected reality. When Sarah contradicts these opinions, she is right in a sense that they reflect mediated views of the system in which they were created, rather than the views of an individual. And so, because of their separation, their lack of any direct contact with the actual event, and their numerous possible inaccuracies, these views cannot be considered objective or truthful. However, Sarah's point of view, created on the basis of her own personal experience, is not objective or any more truthful either. On the contrary, her views are probably biased, at least, to a certain extent. She could not have personally witnessed every incident in Ireland that she argued about with the Major and even if she would have, it would not have made any difference. In this sense, Sarah, exactly as Major Archer, is a product of a certain environment. In her case, her opinions are influenced by the fact, that she is proud of being Irish and that she strongly despises everything English. The problem is if the Major wanted to change his views and decide to accept Sarah's perspective, he would not learn anything better about the situation in Ireland. He would just replace one outside source, the newspaper articles, for another, Sarah.

Another example of a clash between personal and public history may be an argument between Edward Spencer and one of the Oxford University undergraduate students accommodated in the hotel. Edward is a representative of the Anglo-Irish ascendancy in Ireland and a tenacious opponent of the Irish autonomy. He likes to promote himself as a member of the higher class, even though he lacks the elegance and more gentle manners. Edward is believed to possess a fairly large amount of wealth due to his endeavours in India; however the exact sum is never mentioned. "He had a profound lack of interest in money, never having been sufficiently short of it […]." (Farrell, 1993b, 120) Martin Hilský (1992, 98) puts Edward into a direct contrast with Major Archer. On one hand, he is being described as an ultraconservative madman, who conducts nonsensical scientific experiments on his Irish manservant Murphy and dissects toads, a man that at the end of the novel kills a young Irish nationalist in cold blood. On the other hand, as many other Farrell's characters he is not completely flat, exercising just one personal quality. At the same time, Hilský (ibid) also sees him as a deeply unfortunate man, affected by a personal tragedy, by the lost of his wife and the eldest of his daughters. He represents a man torn apart by his own unfulfilled ambitions and by acknowledging the slow decline of the entire world around him. Suddenly, his personal believes and life principles do not have any meaning in the new environment that is being created. It that sense, Farrell's character of Edward Spencer embodies a study of a decay of a human personality as well as the overall decline of English dominance over Ireland.

The group of Oxford undergraduate students arrived at the hotel in the middle of the second part of the novel, after the situation in Ireland had become even more escalated. The purpose of their travel was to thoroughly study the Irish question and by personal experience get a grasp how the situation really was. Because of this, Edward was initially more than impatient to meet them. In his words, he had not had an intellectual debate for ages. Unfortunately, it did not go as he originally planned.

As with Sarah and Major Archer, the debate touched on the issue of the Easter Rebellion and Irish independence. Naturally, Edward, in front of the students, called the Irish nationalists bandits and cowards and considered the refusal of Irish representatives to take their seats in the House of Commons after the election in 1921 as an example foolish stubbornness, only postponing the resolution of the current

situation. On the contrary, Danby, the group's spokesman in terms of political and intellectual matters, stated that the Rebellion was only a natural part of the Irish struggle for independence and that Edward is wrong in saying that by not going into Westminster, Irishmen are not going to achieve anything. According to Danby, this is the Irish way to finally make a stand, because their previous representatives had not achieved anything in the parliament.

Failing to gain the upper hand in the argument, both Edward and Danby were looking for anything that would support their arguments and turned the tide of their imaginary verbal battle. They turned to Major Archer and Captain Roberts, a former Oxford student who had to suspend his studies after the war had broken out, asking them what they thing about the Rebellion, because at the time, the Major and the Captain were serving in the armed forces. Both debaters were using personal experiences of their friends as a kind of the "ace in their sleeve" put there in order to crush the opposing side's arguments. Like if the Major and the Captain's personal experience was some kind of the ultimate evidence, the ultimate testimony supposed to end not only their personal dispute but also resolve the entire Irish question. Yet the two former officers failed to meet the expectations put onto them. They delivered their personal testimonies but those did not achieve the desired effect:

> At length the Major heaved a sigh and said, softly but audibly: 'You're perfectly right, Edward. I think we all felt we'd been stabbed in the back.'
> 'There, you see,' cried Edward triumphantly.
> But Danby, his eyes twinkling with the pleasure of doing battle with this redoubtable old juggernaut, appeared not in the least abashed. […] My friend Captain Roberts here, for example, served most heroically in France and I believe he feels, as we all do, that the Easter Week affair was perfectly justified. […]
> But then at last Captain Roberts cleared his throat and murmured hoarsely: 'Perfectly justified … We all thought so …' (Farrell, 1993b, 418)

Personal experience is not the ultimate. In fact, it can be implied that both Edward and Danby are right in a certain way. Danby is right that the Irish have a right to democracy and their own independence. However, the acts of violence are undeniable and one cannot simply pretend that they are not happening or that they are justifiable. Danby is

missing some of the Edward's personal experience: He did not directly witness the riots in Ireland. He had not lived there for a large portion of his life. He was not physically attacked as was Edward. On the other side, Edward was over generalising when he regarded all Irishmen murderers, fanatical papists and sinners. Additionally, he was stuck in his ultraconservative views and his personal grudge against everything Irish, thus he was unable to see the matter from a more rational perspective. In both arguments, the Major and Sarah's and Edward and Danby's, it is impossible to determine who was entirely right and who was entirely wrong. There is no supreme truth. Everything is just a matter of interpretation.

4.2 The Siege of Krishnapur

The novel takes place during the Sepoy Rebellion, or the First War of Indian Independence, as the event is sometimes called, in year 1857. It depicts the fortunes of a community of British colonists stationed in the cantonment near a small town of Krishnapur. Even though it is a fictional place, events in the novel were based on the actual siege of Lucknow. Similarly to *Troubles*, prior to the writing of the *Siege of Krishnapur*, Farrell had studied numerous historical materials – works by professional historians, periodic pamphlets, military documents, newspaper articles and family letters and administrative correspondence relating to the mutiny. They again serve as a detailed background for the plot, yet in this occasion they are not directly incorporated into it, as were the periodic newspaper articles in Troubles (Hilský, 1990, 362). It is also important to stress that despite the detailed study of these historical sources, Farrell is not interested in writing the accurate portrayal of the Indian Rebellion. He does not present any deep study of its causes nor does he describe its consequences and subsequent British reprisals on the Indian population. The historical background is limited to an absolute minimum. The only presumed reason for the rebellion mentioned in the novel is the Sepoy fear of contamination by the new Enfield rifle cartridges, which are thought to contain pork and beef tallow (Ellis, 1999, 103). Instead of the factual portrayal of history, Farrell is interested in individual characters, their personal experiences and sometimes even tragic-comical fates: "He does not try to analyse or describe the actual causes and progress of the rebellion (he mentions only necessary

facts about its origin) and focuses on fates of British inhabitants of Krishnapur, who during the siege end up caught in the complete isolation[6] […]". (my translation) (Hilský, 1992, 98)

The *Siege of Krishnapur* is thus probably the most faithful to Farrell's quote that his intention is to write stories of ordinary people on the background of history. If it was, on the basis of *Troubles*, possible to analyse the creation of the so called public history and analyse how an individual succumbs to the power of the system and how his personal perception of a certain event can be influenced, the *Siege of Krishnapur* shows the contrary. And that is, how a personal experience of the individual can influence the process of formation of the public history. There is a greater number of characters than in *Troubles*, some more significant than others. They represent a cross-section of various spheres of the Victorian society – there are representatives of high state officials, rich plantation owners, simple opium and indigo growers, railroad engineers, soldiers, clergy, etc. Some characters can be divided into couplets that are even the exact opposites of each other or at least have certain contradictory views. And naturally because of this, each of these characters perceives the event from a different perspective. If then one of them happened to be the sole survivor of the event he or she would have told a different story.

The most prominent character of the novel is the Collector, a high representative of the British East India Company. Mr. Hopkins is a large man, probably in his mid-forties, with low side-whiskers hanging from his face, always fastidiously dressed – wearing high collars and a tight suit even in the warm Indian climate. He was a man of considerable dignity, sometimes a bit moody and overbearing about his family, and sometimes not entirely eager about the bureaucratic aspects of his work, however his strict sense of duty and social proprieties made a great impression on anybody who saw him. The Collector was a well-respected figure in the Krishnapur cantonment.

He was deeply fascinated with scientific progress, particularly with the Great Exhibition of 1851. The fact was very well known in the cantonment, so even the ladies

[6] Nepokouší se analyzovat či popsat přesné příčiny a průběh povstání (uvádí jen nezbytně nutná fakta o vzniku povstání) a soustřeďuje se na osudy britských obyvatel Krišnapuru, kteří se v průběhu povstání ocitají v naprosté izolaci […].

in the local poetic circle, the Krishnapur Poetry Society, often decided to compose poems about it in a semi-transparent attempt to please the Collector:

> Miss Carpenter had begun to read a poem in praise of the Great Exhibition; the Collector groaned inwardly, not because he found the subject unsuitable, but because it had so evidently been chosen as homage to himself; poems about the Exhibition recurred every few weeks and seldom failed to excite Magistrate's most cutting remarks. This was undoubtedly because his own interest in the Exhibition was as well known to the Magistrate as to the ladies; […] (Farrell, 1993a, 16)

In his office, the Collector kept numerous, and in his words ingenious and indeed brilliant, inventions, or their scaled-down replicas, souvenirs that he obtained during his visit of the Crystal Palace. A model of a carriage that was supposed to build its own rails as it moved through the terrain, laying them down as it advances and picking them up after passing over. A drinking glass with separate compartments for soda and acid, that were combined together just at the moment before entering the mouth. The magnificent Turtons' file that cut through steel as easy as a knife cuts through butter or the rapid-firing revolving pistol by Adams, both carefully laid down on red velvet in Collector's showcase.

The Collector believed in the constant human progress, the *Humani generis progressus*. In his perception society had come a long way from the aridness and ignorance of the 18th century. He almost looked down on the previous centuries with disdain: "They did their best, no doubt, but they were at best only a preparation for our own century. […] The poor fellows had no conception how far Art, Science, Respectability, and Political Economy could be taken. Where they hesitated and blundered we have gone forward…" (Farrell, 1993b, 200) Every human invention, being it a simple gorse bruiser enabling gorse to be fed to cattle, expedient opium tax supplying the British government a great revenue from its sales to China or the specimens in the Collector's office, all this was, for him, a sign of the unstoppable progress of the entire human race, the entire human culture on its path to perfection. A collective effort brought to the final object of the ascension of each individual. And naturally, the Victorian culture or the British culture in general was the most advanced, the most morally elevated and thus its mission was not only to display it's superiority

through technological progress but also to carry it's legacy forward and promote those who had not yet reached the similar state. "What use is it if we bring the advantages of our civilisation to India without also displaying a superior morality? I believe that we are all part of a society which by its communal efforts of faith and reason is gradually raising itself to a higher state." (Farrell, 1993a, 80)

The Collector was also aware, that scientific progress alone is not enough. In order to be a complete man, one must embrace the virtues of art as well. "For science and reason is not enough. A man must also have a heart and be capable of understanding the beauties of art and literature." (Farrell, 1993a, 88) Thus, his office was also decorated with several oil and water colour paintings, electro-metallic statuettes of Molière, Keats, Voltaire and Shakespeare, accompanied by showcases of minerals, stuffed birds and a cobra floating in a bottle of bluish alcohol. Two of his most favourite pieces of art were two marble bas-reliefs – *The Spirit of Science Conquers Ignorance and Prejudice,* in which the merciless sabre of Truth is disembowelling the figure representing the Ignorance, and *Innocence protected by Fidelity* portraying a young girl, asleep with a garland of flowers in her lap, and a dog with his paw on the neck of a snake which is preparing to bite her. The two sculptures represented the embodiment of Collector's views.

In terms of views, it is possible to compare both characters of Major Archer and Collector Hopkins. Whereas the Major gradually created his opinion on the basis of an outside source and was not able to change it even after his personal experiences in Ireland, the Collector had a very distinctive opinion from the very beginning. However, he was eventually forced to abandon it under the weight of his experiences during the siege. Also, the Major was quite passive in his actions, and in numerous occasions, he simply let the situation to resolve on its own. While, the Collector tried to actively influence what was happening around him, he was one of the key reasons why the residents of the Krishnapur cantonment survived the siege. It was he who first discovered small pieces of "chapati" (a native flatbread made from wheat flour and baked on a flat skillet), left in the dispatch box in his office and in various other places around the cantonment, and identified it as a possible presage of the upcoming events. Despite the mockery from several residents and despite being called a superstitious fool, panicking for no valid reason, by members of military garrison stationed in

Captaingangj five miles from Krishnapur, it was he who gave the order to dig a series of clay ramparts and trenches which later on proved to be the basis of cantonment's defence. It was he who, despite severe protests from the Padre, ordered the stockpiling of food rations in the church, without which the residents would not been able to survive the siege for that long. Everything in the enclave happened at his behest. The Collector was the heart and soul of the entire cantonment during the siege and even during the most desperate times he tried to keep a straight face, harnessing the very last bits of his own strength to give others hope, because he was aware of the countless pairs of eyes constantly watching him, seeking for any signs of weakness. He could not falter:

> Between the ranks of bared heads (one or another of which would occasionally turn to take a quick glance of inspection at his own face) he could just make out the graceful figure of Mrs Wright herself, kneeling on a hassock in front of the table. Beyond her, there were more ranks of bared heads, this time facing the Collector; their eyes too, scanned him greedily, looking for fissures … and further away still, two or three faces of sick or wounded men watched from the open windows of the hospital. (Farrell, 1993a, 246)

Yet, even though the Collector managed to save the lives of many enclave residents, he was not able to save himself. Of all the characters in the novel, the Collector undergoes the biggest change and is affected the most. His loss can be seen both as material and spiritual. During the course of the siege, the Collector was forced to sacrifice all his beloved possessions, all his souvenirs from the Great Exhibition. Silver cutlery, ornamented drinking cups and fragments of the marble bas-reliefs were used to form "canister shots"; electro-metallic statuettes of great literary figures were used as cannon balls, sweeping through lines of charging enemy infantry; and the rest, including oak tables from the dining hall, bookcases from the library or decorative paintings, was buried as bracing into ramparts slowly dissolved by the persistent Indian rain. But more importantly, he completely abandoned his views. He was no longer fascinated by the unstoppable and undeniable human progress and the noble cause of bringing the fruits of civilisation into India. Everything had been gradually shattered into pieces until there was nothing left:

> It may be said that, although he survived it, the siege nevertheless had a bad effect on the Collector. […], he resigned from Fine Arts comities, and antiquarian societies, and societies for reclaiming beggars and prostitutes; nor did his interest in crop rotation appear to have survived the siege. He took to pacing the streets of London, very often in poorer areas, in all weathers, alone, seldom speaking to anyone but staring, staring as if he had never seen a poor person in his life before.
>
> (Farrell, 1993a, 351-352)

The very last thing the Collector saw during his departure from India, was two men accompanied by a pair of bullocks drawing up water in huge leather bags from a well in a small native village surrounded by bamboo grooves. It is not a coincidence, that Farrell used nearly the same scene at the beginning of the novel. Both Martin Hilský and Juniper Ellis point out this fact.

Martin Hilský (1990, 363) sees this portrayal of two fatigued native men doing monotonously the same labour endlessly from dusk till dawn as the dominant scene of the whole novel. The scene itself may seem irrelevant, because it is not highlighted or stressed in any way, yet it is crucial for the novel's overall point. It reveals how insignificant the whole siege was. Despite all the horrors and the harshness residents of the Krishnapur had to go through it meant absolutely nothing in the overall context. The two native men represent the ordinary Indian population which was completely unaffected by the mutiny. For them nothing happened, nothing changed. Thus in this sense, *The Siege of Krishnapur* does not show the whole picture of the Indian Rebellion. It is rather a snapshot, or series of snapshots depicting the deeds of individual characters, cutaways from a much larger portrait of the entire event. The Krishnapur residence and the surrounding cantonment becomes a kind of a stage in the novel, in both the literal and figurative sense. In its figurative meaning, the residence is similar to the Majestic hotel from the *Troubles*; it also represents a kind of a *micro-cosmos*, an inner world with its own rules. The literal meaning is realised when Farrell introduces groups of observers, comprised mostly from the wealthy locals, gathered on a hillside above the residence, who, with a certain twisted delight, watch the entire siege as if they were actually watching a play in some kind of an open-air theatre:

> Hardly the rains stopped when the spectators began to return to the slope above the melon beds, coming in greater numbers than ever before. […] Some of the wealthier natives brought picnic hampers in the European manner, and their servants would unroll splendid carpets on the green sward; while their banquets were spread out on the carpets they could watch what was going on through telescopes and opera-glasses which they had had the foresight to bring with them.
>
> (Farrell, 1993a, 277)

This comparison with a theatre stage can be also interpreted in terms of a personal history. Because every historical event or any event in general, is made up from a collection of smaller, relatively unimportant events; various side and back stages, creating the final whole.

Juniper Ellis (1999, 103) also notices the fact that apart from a few native servants, who are given rather pejorative names like Ram and Monkey, or a few representatives of the Muslim minority in India, ordinary Indians are practically non-existent in the novel. Most of the native population is never described in detail. They are either too distant, like the spectators observing the cantonment, or just anonymous crowds gathering in a marketplace or on the streets of small settlements scattered through the terrain. Sepoys also form a kind of a shapeless, uniform mass that is gradually being turned into a pile of mutilated corpses. During the desperate defence of the residence near the end of the novel, during which the defenders were fighting for every room, trying to delay the enemy advance, the Collector noticed this when he saw two dead bodies of two seemingly almost the same Sepoys:

> Soon the bodies began to pile up here, too, and yet again the Collector and his men had to put their shoulders to the carnal barricade to prevent it from being ejected into the hall; and yet again, as if in a dream, the Collector found his face an inch from that of an amused Sepoy and though: 'It surely can't be the same man!' for from this corpse's moustache there was also a scent of patchouli.
>
> (Farrell, 1993a, 296)

The only Indian character that is described in greater detail is Hari, a son of the local Maharajah. Although Ellis (1999, 103-104) considers him only as a mere copy of his ancestors, whose portraits are hanging all around the Maharajah's palace, and his old

father, having the same fat, pale cheeks and glittering black eyes. According to Ellis, everything in India is somehow identified with repetition and multiplication.

Additionally, it is important to point out, that Hari is also a product of British education. He was educated at home by an old English teacher, thus is quite fluent in English, even though he retains several oddities. For example, he calls the Collector Mr. Hopkin instead of Hopkins or ends most of his sentences with shouting: "Correct!". Hari is to a certain extent a parody of British customs. He eats a boiled egg for breakfast as he reads *Blackwood's Magazine* and is showing his passionate interest in science. As a hobby, he takes daguerreotypes of his guests and other residents of Krishnapur in his small laboratory. However, Hari is a parody only from the British perspective. Naturally, for the British residents at the time, the Indian culture seemed quite strange or even backward compared to their own. This cultural gap is expressed in several ways in the novel. For example when Hari guides Fleury, one of the major characters, around the palace and they discuss the Bible. In contrast, he mentions a story of the God Kartikeya, who had been born in river Ganga as six little babies, but then was merged into a single person, having six faces and twelve arms and legs, by Parvati, lady of Siva, who, in an act of love, embraced her babies so much that she squeezed them into one. The contrast is even more apparent, because even though Hari also looks down on native customs they elicit a kind of a sentiment in him. Another example may be when Ram, one of the native servants, explains origins of a religious song to Fleury:

> 'It is a name of God, Sahib,' said Ram respectfully. As the old pensioner listened to the song, which was now accompanied by the ringing bells, Fleury saw an expression of tender devotion come over his lined face, and he, too, thought, as the Collector had thought some weeks earlier in the tiger house, what a lot of Indian life was unavailable to the Englishman who came equipped with his own religion and habits. (Farrell, 1993a, 285)

All this contributes to the fact that the *Siege of Krishnapur* does not try capture the entire Rebellion. It represents the Rebellion only from the perspective of a small British community trapped at one particular place. And naturally, if the book had shown the

events from the Indian perspective their opinions and views would have been entirely different or maybe even opposite.

The Collector's direct opposite is the Magistrate, Mr. Willoughby. Who is slightly younger than the Collector and is described as a born atheist. A cold and calculating person with an almost constant expression of cynical surprise on his face, with one eyebrow raised and the corner of his mouth compressed. He was also interested in science, however in a different way than the Collector. The Magistrate was fascinated with phrenology, a pseudo-science developed in late 1790's and quite popular in the first half of the 19th century, based on a concept that all human character qualities (like courage, cautiousness, articulacy or eagerness to learn) are determined by the shape of a man's skull and by development or non-development of certain "mental organs" (Farrell, 1993a, 13). His secret desire was to measure the brains and skulls of the Collector and other residents of the cantonment. The Collector's skull in particular was a great mystery to the Magistrate because it evinced significantly contradictory features. Partially, he considered him a fool who was constantly making hasty decisions, despite the fact that his "organ of Cautiousness" was unduly developed. Yet at the same time the Magistrate fully acknowledged his own deficiencies.

He was also not so optimistic about the scientific progress or the highly praised cultural advancement and the justice, that according to the Collector, the British were bringing with themselves to India. According to the Magistrate, it was only a mere illusion created by the false sense of British colonial superiority:

> 'The great majority of natives have yet to see the first sign of our superior culture,' said the Magistrate. 'If they are lucky they may have seen some red-faced youth from Haileybury or Addiscombe riding by once or twice in their lives.' […] 'This justice is a fiction! In the Krishnapur district we have two magistrates for almost a million people. There are many districts where it's worse.' (Farrell, 1993a, 159)

The Magistrate did not try to hide his quite radical political views, as he was an overt supporter of Chartism or even Marxism. He strongly despised private property, which according to him, only resulted in cupidity in the society, and the greediness of capitalism. Where the Collector saw a gradual human progress, in which every

individual had been working on the behalf of the greater good for everybody, like a bee in a beehive, the Magistrate saw only selfishness and acquisitive intentions. These contrasting views can be probably the best illustrated by their discussion about the Prince Albert's Model Houses for the Labouring Classes that the Collector had discovered during his trip to the Great Exhibition and which he praised for their functionality and decency. Airy, square and simple in design, with large windows upstairs and downstairs, that was, according to the Collector, definitely the long-desired improvement in the living standards of the working class, and the end to the overcrowded and filthy poor neighbourhoods. He expressed how he almost envied the workingman his luck of being able to live in such delightful structures. On the other hand, the Magistrate called them a sop to the royal conscience, camouflaging the exploitation of the working class, having nothing to do with the noble intentions:

> The Collector had protested that he was certain that the Prince's houses had been prompted, in a genuine spirit of sympathy, by the reports published by the Board of Health's inspectors about the wretched home accommodation of the poorer classes, the utter lack of drainage, of water supply and ventilation.
> 'What prompted these trivial improvements, on the contrary,' the Magistrate had replied, 'was a fear of a cholera epidemic among the wealthier classes!'
>
> (Farrell, 1993a, 124)

The Magistrate was also highly irritated by human stupidity. He hated the primitive and superstitious behaviour of the local Hindu farmers who instead of reinforcing the river embankments rather asked Brahmins to sacrifice a black goat in order to stop the floods worsening every year and devastating their crops. He was disgusted by the arrogance of the British residents of the enclave. By their helplessness, demonstrated by the fact that even during the siege, when everyone was fighting for his or her own survival, they were not able to get past the stereotypes concerning their class or position in the society, and how they acted like a herd of sheep and were easily manipulated. In a fact, the Magistrate called himself a "reason being savaged by a pack of petty stupidities which, because of their number, would in the end bring him down." (Farrell, 1993a, 242) He had not changed at all. On the contrary, the events of the siege only strengthened his cynical remarks and his despise towards human obtuseness. The

Magistrate was no longer a passionate revolutionary fighting for the rights of the exploited working class, because as he discovered the poor were as foolish as the rich. He completely lost his interest: "He realised now that his belief in people was no longer alive … he no longer loved the poor as a revolutionary must love them. People were stupid. The poor were just as stupid as the rich; he had only contempt for both of them. His interest in humanity was now stone dead and probably had been for some time." (Farrell, 1993a, 258)

The Previously mentioned George Fleury, is another important character of the novel. He was a son of a director of the East India Company, an elegant and sensitive young man with interest in poetry and literature, who used to play a violin in a pagoda at the end of their rose garden. Fleury liked sad, maybe even morbid things like autumn, graveyards, old ruins or death, however, he was sometimes a little too melancholic or even clumsy: "The decision was not a very sudden one. From the age of sixteen when he had first become interested in books, much to the distress of his father, he had paid little heed to physical and sporting matters. He had been of a melancholy and listless cast of mind, the victim of the beauty and sadness of the universe." (Farrell, 1993a, 36) The Court of Directors had dispatched him to Calcutta in order to elaborate a volume evaluating the Company's endeavours in India but more importantly, he was supposed to accompany his recently widowed sister Miriam.

Fleury was a romantic and idealist, and similarly to the Collector, he was initially also interested in human progress. But from a different perspective, he saw human progress mostly in the spiritual rather than in the material sphere. He was strictly rejecting the "emptiness of life" caused by the materialism and the consumerism of the 19th century. Individual objects, regardless of the purpose they were supposed to serve, meant nothing compared with the noble feelings. They were pathetic and useless. According to him, they were only limiting a real spiritual advance. In his opinion, the great Greek philosophers had done more for the advancement of humanity than all the inventors of the Victorian era. Thus, a man should rather listen to his heart, his inner voice, if he wants to ascend to a different level of being: "Only the person capable of listening to the tenderest echoes of his own heart is capable of making that aerial ascent which will unite him with the Eternal." (Farrell, 1993a, 51) Fleury rejected civilisation as a whole. He spoke about it as about a "disease that

denatures the man". Due to these opinions he often got into arguments with other characters, mostly with the Collector or with the Padre, Mr. Hampton:

> 'But what I think this is,' declared Fleury when the rubble had ceased to fall, determined at last to get his word in. 'It's wrong to talk of a "superior" civilisation because there isn't such a thing. All civilization is bad. It mars the noble and natural instincts of the heart. Civilization is decadence!'
> 'What rubbish!'
> 'I have seldom heard such gibberish,' agreed the Collector, chortling as he got to his feet. (Farrell, 1993a, 159)

During the siege, he befriended Lieutenant Harry Dunstaple, a son of Dr. Dunstaple, a civil surgeon at Krishnapur. Despite his young age, Harry was a very skilled artilleryman and his skills proved invaluable at many times in the prolonged defence. Even though they did not seem to have much in common they soon became a firm friends. The Collector stationed them both with a group of a few pensioners, at the improvised artillery battery at the banqueting hall, which was supposed to defend the entire southern side of the residence. It had been erroneously considered the safest spot in the enclave because the banqueting hall stood on a rise, which corresponded with a hill with melon beds and enabled the defenders to observe almost the entire riverbank. Any attack from this direction seemed unlikely, because the attacker would have to cross large sections of open ground under fire. Yet, the Sepoys decided to carry out their first attack just there. In spite of some initial difficulties, Fleury became quickly accustomed to his new role. Predominantly, he was helping Harry by tending a cannon - cleaning the bore, pouring gunpowder into the chamber, carrying cannonballs etc. He regarded the siege as a daring and noble enterprise, an adventure full of heroic deeds such as rescuing girls from the saddle of a galloping horse. Which was later on realised when he, accompanied by Harry and few Sowars, native cavalrymen, attempted to rescue Lucy Hughes, who stayed behind at the cantonment; or even when he started courting Louisa, Harry's sister. At one time during the battle, he even envisioned himself posing for a newspaper:

> ‘Fleury, for God’s sake!’ shouted Harry, who knew how desperate the situation was. […] Fleury found himself appending captions to himself for the *Illustrated London News*. ‘This was the Banqueting Hall Redoubt in the Battle of Krishnapur. On the left, Mr. Fleury, the poet, who conducted himself so gallantly throughout; on the right, Lieutenant Dunstaple, who commanded the battery, and a faithful native, Ram.’ (Farrell, 1993a, 139)

According to Chris Ferns (1999, 132), Fleury, similarly to Major Archer, represents a character that is supposed to attract most of the readers’ sympathies. He is also a character that is linked with most of the comical situations in the novel. For example, during the counterattack against the Sepoy encampment, on July the 7th, he suddenly remembers that it’s his birthday. He proudly wears a bright green coat and hat made from the cloth cut from billiard tables, a present from Louisa and his sister Miriam, despite the fact it attracts attention of the Sepoys, who can not resist the urge to shoot it. According to Harry, he “looks as if he has just come from Sherwood Forest”. (Farrell, 1993a, 192) Inspired by thorough investigation of the Collectors collection of books about the military arts, he tries to invent a new revolutionary weapon against cavalry charges. He designated it the “Fleury Cavalry Eradicator” but basically it was nothing more than an up-scaled pitchfork with two prongs roughly at a distance of a man’s outstretched arms, supposed to pierce two enemies at once, with addition of a long handle, curved at the end, intended for dragging riders of their horses. Unfortunately, despite all the effort put into it, the Eradicator was a design which of course, failed miserably.

However, probably the best example of Farrell’s slightly morbid sense of humour is a scene in which Fleury splatters one of the Sepoy’s insides on a wall. The scene happened during the last desperate defence of the residence, when everyone else was pulling back, yet Fleury had by accident stayed behind. As the weapon of choice he had picked up a fifteen-barrelled pistol. It was an utterly unpractical piece of weaponry, the Collector himself had rejected, because it was too bulky and a man was barely able to lift it even with both hands. Despite that, Fleury was absolutely enthusiastic about it. He had seen himself wreaking havoc upon the whole squad of enemy infantry. However, the weapon completely failed to meet his expectations. Even

though, he disassembled and reassembled it during the fight, it did not fire for several times until he engaged in a sabre fight with one of the Sepoys:

> The object he had tripped over was the pistol; it was so heavy that it was all he could do to raise it. But when he pulled the trigger, it fired. Indeed, not just one barrel fired, but all fifteen; they were not supposed to, but that was what happened. He found himself confronted now by midriff and a pair of legs; the wall behind the legs was draped in scarlet. The top half of the Sepoy had vanished.
>
> (Farrell, 1993a, 295)

Due to its absurdity, the scene itself seems almost out of place, it resembles rather a farce or even a gag from a cartoon. It is full of somewhat bizarre motives. For example, the Sepoy is a much larger and more powerful man than Fleury and mocks his pitiful attempts to take him down. Fleury tried to leap for the chandelier and kick the Sepoy in the face, then jumped on his back and tried to strangle him by the strings of a broken violin. Until the Sepoy's obliteration by the salvo from Fleury's weapon, it was a "David and Goliath fight". Yet, despite its absurdity, the scene has its place in Farrell's work like Major Archer's failed love affairs or the eccentricities of some characters.

Fleury managed to survive the siege and marry Louisa, his long desired love. However, as with the Collector, he completely lost his views. He gradually lost his interest in spiritual matters; he was no longer interested in the "tenderest echoes" of a man's heart, and inclined rather towards the material sphere. Poetry and literature, he had been previously so fond of became a sham for him, a "cosmetic painted on life by rich people to conceal its ugliness." (Farrell, 1993a, 313) This seemingly sensitive young man from the beginning, had grown into a tyrant that terrorised his family with his own opinions: "Fleury, too, had grown stout and perhaps rather opinionated; he and Louise had a number of children whom Fleury was inclined to hector with his views, showing extreme displeasure if they disagreed with him." (Farrell, 1993a, 312) He is another example of how a person can change under the influence of extreme personal experience.

Another relatively tragic-comical figure is the Padre, Mr. Hampton. He looked upon the siege purely from the religious perspective. He saw it as the ultimate test of his own faith, and God's punishment for the immoral behaviour and lack of faith of the

others. He was thus determined to seek and wipe out all traces of sin in the cantonment in order to win back God's favour and reverse the nearing inevitable doom:

> If they found themselves in moral danger it could only be that God was displeased with them and was preparing to punish them as he had punished the Cities of the Plain! And yet the Padre, in his blindness, had believed that he was having some success in ferreting out sin among his flock.
> […]But Sin is hydra headed; chop a sin off here and a dozen more are bristling in its place. (Farrell, 1993a, 131)

He was tireless in his mission, frantically hurrying from one group of wretched residents to another, casting fire and brimstone, preaching about Sodom and Gomorrah, blasphemy and heresy, human humbleness, belief in Lord and return to the true path. After an argument about the Bible and God's creations, he was predominantly focused on Fleury, because the cantonment misery began shortly after his arrival, so then logically according to the Padre, Fleury's attitude and improper opinions about religion were the sole cause of the siege:

> But what puzzled the Padre was the nature of the particular divine grievance for which they were now suffering such an extreme punishment. What it could be? […] In the eye of his mind, whose blindness had been cured, the Padre again saw Fleury sitting among the children at Sunday school and shaking his head as if he did not believe in the Atonement. […] It could not be anything else. Their troubles had begun soon after the arrival of Fleury in Krishnapur. (Farrell, 1993a, 193-194)

From that moment, the Padre was pursuing Fleury and trying to lecture him about the faultiness of German Rationalism, a vain belief that the power of reason is capable of investigating and understanding religious matters. He spoke about the decline of the local clergy and about their daringness to doubt the undeniable Word of God.

The Padre also did not agree with the Great Exhibition, and near the end of the novel, he tried to persuade the Collector that the forces of darkness and evil had created the inventions at the exhibition. They were only the semblances of "Original sin", because it was human eagerness for knowledge that had misled him. Humanity during

its development through centuries, had departed long from its original purpose in the Garden of Eden, and that was only to obey its Creator. According to him, the man had no right to play God by trying to change the world's order and reinventing something that had been already invented:

> "Thy wisdom and thy knowledge, it hath perverted thee! […] If we turn to the history of man's creation in the sacred volume, we find that his mission was simply to dress and keep the Garden of Eden and to serve and obey his Creator … and that, so far from having any mission to pry into the laws by which the Almighty governs His creation, he was expressly forbidden to do so. The only forbidden tree in the garden was the tree of science and intellect. (Farrell, 1993a, 196; 307)

Unfortunately neither Fleury nor the Collector paid any attention to the Padre's words and thus his fiery and over exaggerated sermons turned rather empty or even comical. Despite that, similarly to the Magistrate, the siege only strengthened the Padres opinions.

The last two important characters are doctors Dunstaple and McNab, whose argument about the treatment of the Cholera epidemic in the cantonment nicely illustrates how easily the local residents could be manipulated. Dr. Dunstaple was noticeably older than Dr. McNab, had a short, slightly dumpy physique and a jovial character. He was a well-known figure in the Krishnapur residence, he knew most of his patients personally, and he even assisted during the childbirths of several local ladies. According to many, Dr. Dunstaple was almost an embodiment of a true physician, warm and good-humoured, yet authoritative and strict when the situation required. He had spent the most of his life in India. He was a traditionalist and was inclined to what at that time, was the widely spread conviction that Cholera as a disease transfers from patient to patient through the air, by the so-called "invisible cholera cloud" (Farrell, 1993a, 253). When inhaled, the cholera poison according to Dr. Dunstaple impaired the function of the ganglionic nerves resulting in lung failure, and turning the blood dense due to lack of oxygen, resulting in a patient's coldness typical for the disease. The best cure was then, an attempt to restore patient's body heat via warm baths, flannel packs, applying blister and mustard plasters to the spine and the pit

of the stomach, and administering pills consisting of several grains of opium and calomel.

On the contrary, Dr. McNab was not as popular. He seldom smiled, was cold and reserved, so to many he appeared rather bleak. He was appointed as Regimental Surgeon to the Captaingangj garrison, however in Dr. Dunstaple's absence, he served in Krishnapur as well. Dr. McNab may not have been as experienced as Dr. Dunstaple, but he used several progressive methods, which the latter mentioned doctor was not so fond of. Disregarding professional ethics, Dr. Dunstaple was often mocking his Scottish origin, trying to mimic the Scottish accent even though McNab did not have even traces of it. He called him a butcher or charlatan in front of the patients: "Cholera, evidently, had been the cause of the dispute between him and McNab which had brought about an unfortunate rift between the two doctors. Now, he began, once again, to speak with a terrible eloquence about the iniquities of McNab's 'experimental' treatments and quackery cures." (Farrell, 1993a, 165)

Dr. McNab was a quiet professional. Disregarding the personal attacks from his colleague, he was able to support his views by logical arguments. He proved that Cholera, as a bacterial disease transfers from patient to patient not via air but via their digestive tracts. Patients usually suffered severe vomiting and diarrhoea and excreted colourless fluid without any odour, the infamous "rice water". In poor sanitary conditions, where everyone was eating and sleeping together, usually in tight, overcrowded spaces, it was not hard for the bacteria to contaminate water and food supplies. As a proof he used an example of two neighbourhoods in London, which were supplied with water by two separate companies. The Vauxhall Company drained water from the area in the Thames River where London's sewage poured out, whereas the Lambeth Company moved south, beyond the influence of the river's tide (Farrell, 1993a, 252-253). How was it then possible, that despite the fact that in the households where individual houses were only meters apart, only those supplied by the company which drained the water near the sewer entrance, were severely infected and others were not, if the Cholera was supposed to spread through the air? He also disproved of Dr. Dunstaple's purposed treatment of the disease. According to his theory patients suffered from extensive dehydration. So, the best treatment was to restore the fluid and salts lost from the blood, simply by carbonate or phosphate solutions dissolved in warm

water, injected directly into the patient's bloodstream. Dr. Dunstaple's solution of warm baths and flannel packs was only worsening the patient's condition by causing sweating and further loss of minerals and fluids from his or her body.

Unfortunately, regardless of all the logical arguments or hard evidence, most of the residents still agreed with Dr. Dunstaple, not because he was right, but solely on the basis of the fact that he was a member of the Royal College of Physicians:

> 'Let me now read to you the conclusion of Dr Baly in his *Report on Epidemic Cholera*, drawn up at the desire of the Royal College of Physicians and published in 1854.' […] Dr Dunstaple paused triumphantly for a moment to allow the significance of this to seep in.
>
> Many supporters of Dr McNab exchanged glances of dismay at the words they had just heard. They had not realised that Dr Dunstaple had the support of the Royal College of Physicians … and felt distinctly aggrieved that they had not been told that such an august body disagreed with their own man. (Farrell, 1993a, 253)

So far, the residents of the Krishnapur cantonment were portrayed as individuals with distinctive opinions and different personal experiences. However, this act of agreement quite nicely depicts the "mass-ness" of a majority. Naturally, it could be argued, that people, in general, when facing tough decisions incline towards something already know, proven or familiar, like the warm and good-humoured character of Dr. Dunstaple. However then, why was the name of the institution alone capable of wiping out all McNab's reasonable explanations and setting the imaginary tip of the scales in Dunstaple's favour? Until the mentioning of the Royal College of Physicians the number of supporters was equal for both doctors. The sudden change was not made on a conscious level. It relates to Foucault's concept of the system, disciplinary society and the willing succumbing to authority. All members of the enclave had grown up in a system where the Royal College of Physicians represented a certain kind of authority or prestige. And the prestige of the institution meant, in that particular situation, more than the actual truth or the right way to cure the ill. It did not matter whether the institution was right or wrong. The institution or a person representing that institution simply stood above them in the hierarchy of the system and only few would dare to oppose it. For the majority, it was much easier, much safer to mindlessly stick with the

crowd. Ironically, Dr. Dunstaple passed away a few days after the passionate quarrel with his colleague. To prove his point he drank a dose full of fluid extracted from a patient's rectum and inevitably contracted Cholera himself.

The character of General Sinclair, who led the forces that were supposed to liberate the enclosed Krishnapur community from the Sepoy grip, closes at last, the list of the presented characters. The reinforcements came in the middle of September, after three and a half months of the siege. Unfortunately, these desperately awaited reinforcements played a less than marginal role the cantonment's liberation and the General was eventually severely displeased by the fact, that the survivors of the siege might receive higher credit in the depiction of the event than his troops::

> And he would have to pose for hours, holding a sword and perched on a trestle or wooden horse while some artist-wallah depicted 'The Siege of Krishnapur!' He must remember to insist on being in the foreground, however; then it would not be so bad. With luck this wretched selection of 'heroes' would be given the soft pedal … an indistinct crowd of corpses and a few grateful faces, cannons and prancing horses would be best. (Farrell, 1993a, 311)

The scene with General Sinclair imagining himself posing for a painter, is again showing how everything is just a matter of interpretation. It partially relates to the Debord's concept of the spectacle. Individual personal experiences, the individual personal histories of the participants of any event, historical or not, mean nothing in this sense. The only thing that matters is how they are subsequently transformed into public history, in other words, how their stories will be interpreted to those who did not have a chance to participate in them. In this example, the General also represents a system, an authority that stands above the residents of Krishnapur. And the authority, on the basis of what is the most suitable for the moment or what most suits its needs, possesses the power to transfer the survivors' stories either into a celebratory praise of their acts of heroism or, on the other hand, a meaningless story of a few ragged individuals on some godforsaken place not even worth remembering.

Conclusion

The theoretical part of this work arrived to the conclusion that the post-modern concept of history departed from the European 18th century Enlightenment idea that reality, and thus history as well, could be objectively and truthfully investigated and recorded, and shifted rather to the idea that history is an image of the past reinterpreted in the present. Post-modern history simply, due to its nature, cannot escape its authorship. History is not how something actually happened, it is what we make of it. And in the process of historical research, there is always a danger of misinterpretation or distortion of historical facts, both intentional and unintentional.

Through Baudrillard's theory it was possible to demonstrate that various personal experiences in the life of an individual can have different symbolic value. At the same time, however, this theory also depicted the severe limitations of personal experience. Personal experience is unique and it is impossible to transfer it from one individual to another; Major Archer experienced this when he, in his mind, had created an image of the Majestic Hotel according to detailed description in Angela's letters and subsequently found out that his "projection" was completely different from how it actually looked. In the perception of the world around us, every individual is dependent solely on his or her senses and thus at any moment in our lives, it is possible to perceive only a limited fraction of reality. This could be quite nicely illustrated in *Troubles* during the scene when the Major observes the Victory Parade in Dublin from his hotel room. Even though, he is aware of the formal importance and overall greatness of the event, because of the crowds of people on the streets, newspaper articles or simply because of the general atmosphere, the Major was unable to experience the event as the whole. He was limited only to the imaginary bubble marking the boundaries of his own senses, so he rather saw a snapshot or a cutaway segment of the event. And exactly the same thing is applicable for any person attending the parade. The personal experiences of individuals participating in the same event can be significantly different. As an example of this, it is possible to use the contradictory perceptions regarding the Easter Rebellion provided by Major Archer and Captain Roberts. Additionally, personal experience often tends to be biased.

In relation to the previous, another important theory for this thesis was Michel Foucault's idea of the system. Because of the nature of human society, every individual is inevitably a member of a certain system and this system is permanently influencing the individual even before he or she is able to realise it. According to Foucault it is completely unavoidable and practically, every individual is then only a product of the environment in which he or she grew up. And this outside influence is then what contributes the most towards the bias of the personal experience. In the novels the Major has different views than Sarah, Edward Spencer than Danby, The Collector than the Magistrate, the Padre than Fleury and so on. Each one of these characters is a distinctive personality, however their opinions are in most of the cases only reflecting opinions of the environment that they are a product of. Sarah was defending Irish revolutionaries because she was Irish and she had spent most of her life in Ireland. In exactly the same manner, Edward was opposing the Rebellion because he had grown up in the Unionist environment. The Collector was acting under the influence of the scientific positivism of his time and thus he approached the siege purely from the rational perspective and, on the other hand the Padre saw it as God's punishment because he was a church representative. Yet, it does not automatically mean that these opinions are fixed and cannot change when facing new information or when moved from one environment to another. Major Archer, for example, had gradually built his opinion about the situation in Ireland on the basis of an outside source, i.e. the newspaper articles, and was not able to change it even after personally witnessing some of the events, whereas the Collector had had a very distinct opinion from the very beginning but he eventually completely abandoned it under the influence of the events he experienced. The system rather creates certain presuppositions according to which he or she would react in a particular situation.

Moreover, when speaking about the system's influence over the individual, Foucault presented the idea of the so-called disciplinary society. Even though man usually tends to think about himself as of an independent being, at any time of his life, there is always some kind of authority he has to obey – be it for example parents, teachers at school or a boss at work, etc. The system then represents another layer of authority, and the concept of the disciplinary society is based on a presumption that the constant illusion of supervision by the authority and the fear of subsequent punishment,

ensures order. This can be demonstrated by the scene from *The Siege of Krishnapur* during which the quarrel about the treatment of the Cholera epidemic in the cantonment broke out. Despite the logical arguments and evidence provided by doctor McNab, most of the residents decided to rather believe doctor Dunstaple only because he was a member of the Royal College of Physicians. In this case, the truth or logical argumentation does not matter. The process happens on a semi-conscious level. It does not say that all members of the society will willingly obey its rules. No, the key factor is that most of the general population would – i.e. most of the drivers would put their foot down from the pedal if they see a traffic warden, etc. And the same logic applies to the example with the two doctors. Generally, because of the authority or prestige the official institutions represent within the system, most of the people tend to consider official reports more legitimate or plausible, but not exclusively.

Additionally, in close relation to the Foucault's idea of the system, the analytical part of this thesis also worked with Guy Debord's idea of the spectacle. The key point of this idea was the gradual degradation of critical thinking. In other words that the post-modern consumerist society is no longer able to perceive the world around itself through the personal experience of an individual but it rather uncritically consumes a mediated portrayal of reality provided by some kind of an outside source. The spectacle, by all its means – like advertisement, news, entertainment or propaganda, simply represents a dominant model of life, it does not only propose "what" to see but as well "how" to see. In Farrell's work, it is possible to demonstrate this phenomenon on the basis of numerous periodical newspaper articles which he included in *Troubles*. Commonly, when used in fiction, actual newspaper articles are regarded as a source of factual knowledge. However, the analytical part pointed towards the question of whether the newspapers, or media in general, can be used as an accurate source of historical information. As the biggest issue in this matter was identified, that newspapers due to their nature can provide only a mediated perception of reality as they do not posses the means or necessary space to provide a complex picture of it, there will always be a certain degree of selection simplification or superficiality present. How the newspaper articles can depart from reality was subsequently demonstrated by the article about two Irish ladies escaping from the Ukraine and by the following scene with the old ladies from the hotel. Even though these scenes were not directly linked together in

the novel, the latter quite nicely indicates the over exaggeration of the former. Yet, Major Archer, unable to distance himself and approach the articles critically as the reader, considered all periodical newspaper articles in the novel as almost exclusively truthful. At this point, it is important to stress that Farrell never intended to criticise the bias or inaccuracy of the media in his works. He specifically had chosen rather tabloid articles, not as a source of facts but rather in order to create absurd, sometimes even ironical background scenery for the plot. But this ironical portrayal of the historical events and the Major's passive acceptance of their description quite nicely corresponds with Debord's claim about the degradation of critical thinking.

All three theories combined together then, result in the basic implication of this thesis, and it is that the objective portrayal of history or historical events is not possible. It is a kind of paradox. Even though the personal history of an individual can in some cases contribute to how the event might be interpreted, as seen in *The Siege of Krishnapur*, where the individual experiences of individual characters created a vivid collage resulting in the final whole, personal history provides only a narrow view, capturing only a fraction of reality, and often tends to be biased, because no matter what, an individual and his or her mindset is always only a product of a certain system. On the other hand, public history, as for example presented by the media, is usually too distanced or superficial; unfortunately this distorted portrayal often represents the only way in which history is recorded. The key factor is that the actual events are not important, what matters is how they are subsequently interpreted. And the power of interpretation lies entirely in the hands of the system, which through the spectacle possesses the ability to change the general perception of the present and subsequently the past as well.

Another important claim of this thesis is that even though Farrell had studied numerous historical sources and paid substantial attention to detail when describing even the slightest details of the historical time periods of his novels – i.e. his use of periodical newspaper articles in *Troubles*, or his brilliant portrayal of Victorian era stereotypes in *The Siege of Krishnapur*, he never wanted to write classical historical novels. He wanted to be different than the peers of his time. He did not want to merge with the shapeless mass of average authors. Farrell wanted to write about something, yet at the same time, he was not interested in portraying the actual history; he did not want

to write about the great flanking manoeuvres or important mercantile treaties. In his words, he wanted to portray what no one else tried to capture, the trivial, or even meaningless circumstances, the everyday banalities, the sweat, irking eyes and blisters that accompany these events. *Troubles* were not meant as a deep analysis on the Irish struggle for independence, similarly as *The Siege of Krishnapur* was not meant as an actual portrayal of the Sepoy Rebellion in India, they were written as stories of ordinary people on the background of history. Thus characters from Farrell's historical novels are not the great world-historical individuals of the Lukács' literary theory, they are undergoing history instead of creating it. But it does not mean that these characters are marginal in any sense, they protrude above others as much, or maybe even more, as if they were historical individuals. The fact that he decided not to burden his characters with a "historical responsibility" allowed Farrell to focus more on their individuality or uniqueness. In this relation, Farrell's characters share certain distinct similarities with Sir Walter Scott's mediocre heroes.

The characters in these novels often display strong human qualities – e.g. practical intelligence, moral fortitude, decency and even the capability for self-sacrifice, through which they often gain the readers' sympathies. Probably the most typical of Farrell's characters is Major Brendan Archer, an honest man with a strong sense for justice, yet at the same time a man lost in the world, going through a series of failed love affairs and embarrassing situations. The other typical characters may include The Collector and his considerations about human progress, arts and sciences, or Fleury with his romantic fantasizing about heroism, his courting to Louisa Dunstaple, or his relatively comical experiences during the siege.

In terms of literary style Farrell was an excellent storyteller with an impeccable, if sometimes slightly morbid or absurd, sense of humour. Farrell usually based the point of his stories on one particular scene. As example of this, it's possible to use the scene with the two native men drawing up water from the well in *The Siege of Krishnapur*. Or it revolved around one particular character and his or her specific oddities. Farrell usually focused on one specific thing, the slightest of details, and made the most of it. In this sense, Farrell's writings are full of absurd and bizarre scenes, or scenes that have almost anecdotic character. It is an integral part of Farrell's work, however, that these bizarre scenes and anecdotic insertions are not in any case used only to entertain the

reader, but on the contrary, they are supposed to point towards the more serious issues presented in his novels. By using the comical element these important moral issues have an even greater impact on the reader. Thus it is possible to say, that in his novels, Farrell managed to combine the almost incompatible. He combined a realistic writing technique and the strong sense for morale together with nonsense, bizarreness and absurd exaggeration. It is this crossover of serious and absurd, the fact that as an author, Farrell never did try to force the reader into any direct moral judgements, and the focus on the everyday banalities of brilliantly depicted characters, that bestow on Farrell's works, their depth and feeling of timelessness.

To conclude, James Gordon Farrell had to come a long way from his first novels until he reached the peek of his literary career during the writing of his Empire Trilogy. Due to his unique writing style, Farrell was undoubtedly one of the more prominent British authors of the 1960's and 70's, yet unfortunately, he never became the subject of as much interest from the academic critique as some of the other contemporary authors. And it is a shame that after his tragic death in 1979 an interest in his works quite significantly subsided.

Resumé

Co je vlastně historie? Jedná se o pestrou koláž jedinečných, neopakovatelných, osobních zážitků každého jednotlivce nebo ji naopak tvoří prostý souhrn dat, letopočtů a jiných obecných historických faktů? Lze ji vůbec objektivně popsat nebo definovat? Může být naše vnímání historie nějakým způsobem ovlivněno? Tyto otázky tvoří podklad pro teoretickou část této práce.

Teoretická část, a to na základě prací profesora Aluna Munslowa nebo Richarda Slotkina, posléze dochází k závěru, že historie je objektivně nepopsatelná. Podle jejich tvrzení se současné, postmoderní vnímání historie odchýlilo od tradičního, osvícenského konceptu, že historická fakta jsou nezpochybnitelná a jasně a objektivně popsatelná, a spíše než samotným zachycením se tak zabývá otázkou interpretace těchto faktů. Postmoderní koncept historie od sebe jasně rozlišuje minulost a historii jako takovou. Dalo by se říci, že minulost tvoří jednotlivé historické události, ergo - něco se někde stalo během určité doby, kdežto historie je uměle vytvořená. Historie není pravdivým zachycením těchto událostí, není přesným vyobrazením minulosti, ale spíše její interpretací z pohledu přítomnosti. Dle této teorie se historie nikdy nemůže vymanit vlivu svého „autorství", protože samotná interpretace historických faktů znamená, do určité míry, jejich vědomé přetváření, respektive reorganizování, a ve výsledku se tak může, jak úmyslně, tak neúmyslně, vzdálit skutečnosti.

Na tuto myšlenku navazuje analytická část práce a postupně předkládá teorie Jeana Baudrillarda, Guye Deborda a Michela Foucaulta. I když se všechny tyto teorie zabývají spíše sociálně-politickými otázkami a řeší například uspořádání a fungování současné společnosti a politického systému, přesto je možné aplikovat některé jejich poznatky na Farrellova literární díla. Baudrillardova teorie se zabývá převážně kritikou konzumní společnosti a pracuje s předpokladem, že různé předměty mají odlišnou, ať už funkční, ekonomickou nebo symbolickou hodnotu. V přeneseném smyslu je možné tento koncept odlišných hodnot aplikovat i na tzv. „osobní historii" jednotlivce, protože jednotlivé prožitky, či různé události mohou mít pro každého jinou váhu. To, co je důležité pro jednoho, nemusí pro druhého znamenat vůbec nic. Avšak s jedinečností osobního poznání také souvisí jeho značné nedostatky. Při poznávání světa kolem sebe je jedinec odkázán pouze na svoje smysly, na to, co vidí, slyší, cítí, může ochutnat atd.,

a v určitou chvíli tak dokáže zachytit a analyzovat pouze značně omezenou část skutečnosti. Pokud je na jednom místě, neví, co se děje na místě druhém. Dále také, jednotlivé osobní prožitky jsou nepřenositelné z jednoho jedince na druhého. Jedinec sice může do detailu popsat to, co prožil, ale nikdy se tento popis nevyrovná tomu, jako kdyby si danou věc prožil druhý jedinec sám. Jako příklad lze použít scénu z úvodu románu *Nepokoje*. Před svým příjezdem si Major Archer, na základě četných dopisů od své snoubenky Angely, vytvořil vcelku detailní představu hotelu Majestát a života v Irsku, aby však posléze zjistil, že realita vypadá naprosto odlišně. Scéna, kdy Major pozoruje Vítěznou přehlídku v Dublinu z okna hotelového pokoje spolu s otravnou rodinou O'Neillových naopak ukazuje, jak různí lidé mohou vnímat jednu a tutéž událost odlišným způsobem. Major vnímal přehlídku jinak než voják pochodující v zástupu stejně tak, jako ji vnímal jinak člověk jásající v davu dole na ulici. Žádný z těchto osobních prožitků nelze považovat za „špatný", všechny tvoří součást dané události. Ovšem, pokud se jednotlivé prožitky všech účastníků historické nebo jakékoliv jiné události od sebe navzájem liší, jak je tedy možné vytvořit nějaký objektivní, ucelený obraz této události, jinými slovy „veřejnou historii"?

K této otázce se částečně váže Foucaultova teorie. Foucault se v ní zabývá ideou systému a jeho mocí nad jedincem. I když o sobě člověk uvažuje jako o nezávislé, samostatně myslící a uvažující bytosti, od první chvíle, kdy přijde na svět, se stává součástí společnosti, součástí systému. Nelze tomu žádným způsobem předejít nebo se tomu vyhnout, protože než jedinec dospěje do fáze, kdy si je schopen uvědomit svoji individualitu a svoje zařazení ve společnosti, už dávno je systémem ovlivněn. Pro tuto teorii je také důležitá autorita. Foucault předkládá koncept tzv. „disciplinární společnosti", jejíž fungování je založeno na iluzi konstantního dozoru ze strany autority a podvědomého strachu z trestu, pokud jedinec poruší pravidla daná autoritou. Strukturu disciplinární společnosti Foucault přirovnává k panoptikonu. Panoptikon bylo vězení kruhového půdorysu, v jehož středu byla umístěna věž s dozorcem. Cely byly úmyslně umístěny tak, aby dozorce mohl pozorovat vězně, ale vězni nikdy nemohli pozorovat dozorce. Aplikováno na společnost, systém a jeho jednotlivé složky, ať už legislativní, exekutivní nebo justiční, representují autoritu, které se jedinec podřizuje. Jako příklad lze použít scénu z románu *Obléhání Krišnapuru*, kdy se dva doktoři hádají o léčbě cholery. I když byl doktor McNab schopen předložit celou řadu logických argumentů,

které podpořily jeho tvrzení, a fakticky tak vyvrátil metody doktora Dunstaplea, většina obyvatel kantonu dala za pravdu právě doktoru Dunstapleovi jen proto, že byl členem Královské lékařské komory. V tomto případě nešlo ani tak o to, kdo z doktorů měl pravdu, pochopení dvou diametrálně odlišných metod léčby cholery a jejich důsledků pro pacienta bylo nepochybně nad rozumové schopnosti většiny místních residentů, ale spíše o fakt, že Královská lékařská komora byla v románu spojována s určitou prestiží a jako součást systému tak měla i určitou autoritu. A právě na základě tohoto dojmu určité prestiže a autority má obecně většina obyvatel už podvědomě tendenci věřit těmto „oficiálním" informacím předloženým např. určitým vědeckým institutem stejně tak, jako by většina obyvatel podvědomě sundala nohu z plynového pedálu, pokud by zahlédla policistu stojícího u silnice.

Guy Debord nahlíží na danou problematiku z lehce odlišného úhlu. Ve své práci *Společnost spektáklu* se zabývá vlivem masmédií na veřejné mínění. Podle Deborda současná, postmoderní společnost dávno ztratila schopnost kritického myšlení a na svět kolem sebe pohlíží pouze přes jakýsi zprostředkovaný filtr. Vzniká tak paradox, kdy v dnešní době má skoro každý jedinec ve společnosti prakticky neomezený přístup k informacím, přesto se však nikdo nepokouší předložené informace zpochybnit, případně ověřit z dalších zdrojů a stává se pouze pasivním konzumentem toho, co mu „spektákl" naservíruje. V Debordově teorii spektákl představuje jakýsi dominantní model, není pouze uměle vytvořeným zpodobněním světa kolem nás, krom obrazu samotného totiž předkládá i to, jak na daný obraz máme nahlížet, co je dobré, špatné, přípustné, módní atd. V širším smyslu lze tedy spektákl považovat za součást Foucaultova systému, protože představuje pouze další nástroj, který je schopen ovlivnit jak názor jednotlivce, tak celé společnosti. V návaznosti na postmoderní pojetí historie tak může systém spolu se spektáklem ovlivněním současných postojů a názorů určit jak, máme na určitá historická fakta a události pohlížet, případně ovlivnit, jak současné události budou zachyceny a zapsány do historie. Jako příklad lze použít četné výstřižky z dobových periodik v románu *Nepokoje*. Ve většině případů se novinové články, pokud jsou použity v beletrii, považují za určitý zdroj faktů. Farrell se ve svém díle ovšem od této všeobecné tendence odchýlil a záměrně použil spíše bulvární novinové zprávy, na kterých lze nepřímo, pokud jsou dány do kontrastu s některými událostmi z románu, pozorovat jejich absurdní zkreslenost a zaujatost. Bohužel, Major Archer, i když přímo

prožívá některé události irských nepokojů, například je očitým svědkem vraždy starce v Dublinu příslušníky Sinn Feinu, těmto bulvárním článkům věří a svůj názor na situaci v Irsku si vytváří částečně podle nich.

Každá z postav Farrelových románů je svým způsobem produktem určitého společenského prostředí. Většina hlavních postav má jasně vyhraněný názor na určitou situaci, který jasně reflektuje např.: její společenské postavení nebo prostředí, ve kterém vyrůstala. Jako nejlepší příklady lze použít postavy Sáry Devlinové, zatvrzelé irské katoličky, a Edwarda Spencera, majitele hotelu Majestát a fanatického zastánce irského unionismu z románu *Nepokoje*. Dalším příkladem by mohla být postava Správce, pana Hopkinse, z románu *Obléhání Krišnapuru*, která oproti dvěma předchozím naopak ukazuje, že tyto často jednostranné názory a předsudky nejsou neměnné. Správce přijel do Indie jako nadšený zastánce britské koloniální správy a vědeckého a společenského pokroku, který s sebou podle něho do země přinesla. Avšak průběh obléhání postupně veškeré jeho ideje rozbil.

Další důležitou součástí teoretické části práce je Lukácsova teorie týkající se vzniku historického románu a jeho vymezení jako samostatného literárního žánru. Lukács považuje historický román za specifický produkt Velké francouzské revoluce a následných sociálně-politických změn probíhajících v období po napoleonský válkách. Jednak v době před revolucí nastal určitý obrat k historii, kdy jednotlivé historické události byly použity k propagandistickým účelům, případně posloužily jako nástroj k probuzení národního cítění, a za druhé, masové zapojení civilního obyvatelstva do válečného úsilí a možnost podílet se na chodu státu i pro nižší a střední vrstvy společnosti způsobily, že poprvé v historii si většinová populace uvědomila, že historie není pevně daná, že není pouze v moci panovníka nebo církve, ale že může být i určitým způsobem přímo ovlivněna. Tato změna v uvažování a zvýšený zájem o historii samotnou se následně promítly i do umění, tedy i do literatury.

Za první historický román považuje Lukács román *Ivanhoe* od Sira Waltera Scotta z roku 1814. Předcházející texty, přestože byly zasazeny do určitého historického období, podle Lukácse nelze považovat za historické romány, protože jim chybělo několik zásadních prvků. Samotné zasazení do historie nestačí. Cílem historického románu podle Lukácse není předložit nějaký všeobjímající obraz určité historické epochy, naopak, historický román má být ve svém zaměření co nejkonkrétnější. Jako

příklad Lukács uvádí dílo Lva Nikolajeviče Tolstého, který, i když se ve svém románu zaměřil pouze na určitou část a příběhy několika málo konkrétních postav, dokázal vcelku přesně vykreslit celkový obraz napoleonských válek a atmosféru Ruska tehdejší doby. Samotné postavy a to, jak je dokáže autor zasadit do dobového kontextu, jsou jedním z klíčových bodů Lukácsovy teorie. Lukács tak částečně navazuje na Hegelovu filozofii a pracuje s konceptem tzv. „světově-historického" jedince. V Lukácsově pojetí se může jednat jak o skutečnou historickou postavu, tak o postavu zcela smyšlenou, ovšem jejím nejvýraznějším znakem musí být to, že morálně i v jiných ohledech výrazně převyšuje postavy ostatní.

Farrell v mládí četl jak Scottovu prózu, tak Lukácsovu práci, proto můžeme v jeho dílech najít některé společné prvky. Ovšem je také nutno podotknout, že navzdory tomu, že jsou jeho díla takto často označována, Farrell nikdy nechtěl psát klasické historické romány. Jako autor chtěl především psát o „něčem". Chtěl se tak odlišit od šedého průměru tehdejších britských autorů píšících nudné, často až mechanicky psané romány z provinčního prostředí s nulovou vypovídající hodnotou. Zároveň se ale vyhýbal literárním experimentům některých svých současníků. Ve vlastních dílech chtěl zaznamenat to, co se nikdo běžně zaznamenat nepokouší. Farrella nikdy nezajímaly velkolepé historické události, spíše se zaměřil na každodenní banality lidského života, protože, dle jeho názoru, se historická událost nesestává z podpisů smluv nebo vyhraných bitev, ale z puchýřů na nohou a kouře, který člověka štípe do očí. Farrell tyto významné události svým způsobem demystifikuje a často je popisuje z neobvyklé perspektivy.

Během psaní románů *Nepokoje* a *Obléhání Krišnapuru* Farrell prostudoval množství dobových podkladů, ovšem historické reálie používá pouze k dotvoření dobové atmosféry, k vytvoření jakéhosi pomyslného jeviště plného nejrůznějších detailů, které mu dodávají pocit autentičnosti a uvěřitelnosti. Farrellovy postavy v žádném případě nejsou prezentovány jako veliké historické osobnosti, naopak, místo aby historii samy vytvářely, tak se ji podrobují. Jedná se o příběhy obyčejných lidí polapených ve víru určité historické události, lidí nechápajících podstatu ani příčinu této události, pouze se snažících s touto situací nějakým způsobem vypořádat. Zároveň však tento fakt, že se nejedná o veliké historické osobnosti, neubírá postavám na jejich důležitosti, případně plastičnosti. Žádná z hlavních Farrellových postav není úplně

černobílá, každá má svým způsobem vcelku osobitý charakter. Většinou se jedná o inteligentní jedince, se silným smyslem pro morálku a spravedlnost. Asi nejtypičtějším příkladem je postava Majora Brendana Archera, slušného člověka se silnými morálními zásadami, ovšem zároveň i o člověka lehce zmateného, ztraceného ve světě, který se nechává volně unášet bludištěm různých trapných, svízelných, občas až tragikomických životních situací. Dalším příkladem může být postava Správce, pana Hopkinse, který se de facto stal duší celé Krišnapurské enklávy. Právě díky jemu většina místních obyvatel přežila. Sám bohužel ale během obléhání přišel prakticky o všechno, jak o svojí sbírku umění a různých vynálezů, které si přivezl z Velké výstavy v Londýně, tak o veškeré svoje iluze týkající se vědy, umění a lidského pokroku.

Farrell byl znamenitý vypravěč, v malém dvoupokojovém bytě v Londýně s oblibou častoval své přátele příběhy, které léta piloval k naprosté dokonalosti. Pointu těchto příběhů často založil na nadsázce, případně na karikaturním zkreslení vlastností určitého člověka. Část tohoto vypravěčského umění poté dokázal přenést i do svých literárních děl. Měl jedinečný smysl pro humor a cit pro nonsens a absurdno. Mnohé scény Farrellových románů jsou tak sledem různých bizarních situací, které mají skoro až anekdotický, případně groteskní charakter. Ovšem jejich cílem není pobavit čtenáře, naopak, často spíše poukazují na některé vážnější, převážně společenské, problémy vyobrazené v románech. Román *Nepokoje* nikdy nebyl prezentován jako detailní rozbor irského boje za nezávislost, stejně tak *Obléhání Krišnapuru* není detailní analýzou povstání z roku 1857. Na to jsou příběhy příliš úzce a jednostranně zaměřeny, ovšem tato kombinace absurdní nadsázky a realistického vyobrazení závažných společenských problémů spolu s faktem, že se Farrell jako autor zaměřil spíše na příběhy obyčejných lidí, i s jejich chybami a omyly, je to, co jeho dílům propůjčuje jedinečnou hloubku a určitou nadčasovost.

James Gordon Farrell byl nepochybně jedním z významnějších představitelů britské prózy 60. a 70. let 20. století. Jeho pozdější romány byly oceněny řadou prestižních literárních cen. Bohužel, v roce 1979 Farrell ve věku 44 let tragicky utonul během rybolovu a zájem o jeho díla rychle opadl. Vcelku neprávem tak zůstal ve stínu svých současníků a jeho dílům se nikdy nedostalo takové pozornosti jako například románům Johna Fowlese..

Bibliography:

Primary sources:

FARRELL, James Gordon. *Nepokoje*. Translation and epilogue by Martin Hilský. 1st Ed. Prague : Odeon, 1989, 427 p. ISBN 80-207-0001-3.

FARRELL, James Gordon. *Obléhání Krišnapuru*. Translation by Jan Starý. Epilogue by Martin Hilský. 1st Ed. Prague : Odeon, 1990, 359 p. ISBN 80-207-0160-5.

FARRELL, James Gordon. *The Hill Station and an Indian Diary*. Ed. SPURLING, John. Paperback edition. London : Phoenix, 1993, 254p. ISBN 978-1-8579-9086-7.

FARRELL, James Gordon. *The Siege of Krishnapur.* Paperback edition. London : Phoenix, 1993a, 314p. ISBN 978-1-8579-9491-9.

FARRELL, James Gordon. *Troubles.* Paperback edition. London : Phoenix, 1993b, 454p. ISBN 978-1-8579-9018-8.

Secondary sources:

BAUDRILLARD, Jean. *For a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign*. St. Louis : Telos Press Ltd., 1981, ISBN: 0-914386-24-7.

BERGONZI, Bernard. "Fictions of History". In: *The Contemporary English Novel*. Ed. BRADBURY, Malcolm., PALMER, David. London : Edward Arnold (Publishers) Ltd. 1979, 211p. ISBN 0 7131 6220 1.

BRADBURY, Malcolm., PALMER, David. *The Contemporary English Novel*. London : Edward Arnold (Publishers) Ltd. 1979, 211p. ISBN 0 7131 6220 1.

CRANE, Ralph J. *J.G. Farrell: The Critical Grip*. Dublin : Four Courts Press Ltd, 1999, 208p. ISBN 1-85182-421-9.

DEAN, Malcolm. "A Personal Memoir". In: FARRELL, James Gordon. *The Hill Station and an Indian Diary*. Ed. SPURLING, John. Paperback edition. London : Phoenix, 1993, 254p. ISBN 978-1-8579-9086-7.

DEBORD, Guy. *The Society of the Spectacle*. Michigan : Black & Red, 2000, 132p. ISBN-13: 978-0934868075.

DRABBLE, Margaret. "Things Fall Apart". In: FARRELL, James Gordon. *The Hill Station and an Indian Diary*. Ed. SPURLING, John. Paperback edition. London : Phoenix, 1993, 254p. ISBN 978-1-8579-9086-7.

ELLIS, Juniper. "The Ends of Empire in J.G. Farrell's The Siege of Krishnapur". In: *J.G. Farrell: The Critical Grip*. Ed. CRANE, Ralph J. Dublin : Four Courts Press Ltd, 1999, 208p. ISBN 1-85182-421-9.

FERNS, Chris. "Walter Scott, J.G. Farrell and the Dialogics of Historical Fiction". In: *J.G. Farrell: The Critical Grip*. Ed. CRANE, Ralph J. Dublin : Four Courts Press Ltd, 1999, 208p. ISBN 1-85182-421-9.

FOUCAULT, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison.* 2nd Ed. New York : Vintage Books Inc. , 1995, 352p. ISBN 978-0679752554.

FOUCAULT, Michel. *The Order of Things – An Archaeology of Human Sciences.* 2nd Ed. Oxford : Taylor & Francis Group Ltd., 2001, ISBN 978-0415267366.

GROOT, Jerome De. *The Historical Novel*. 1st Ed. Oxon : Routledge, 2010, 197p. ISBN 978-0-415-42662-6.

HILSKÝ, Martin. “Farrellova angloirská groteska”. In: FARRELL, James Gordon. *Nepokoje*. Translation and epilogue by Martin Hilský. 1st Ed. Prague : Odeon, 1989, 427 p. ISBN 80-207-0001-3.

HILSKÝ, Martin. “Farrellova černá fraška na viktoriánské téma”. In: FARRELL, James Gordon. *Obléhání Krišnapuru*. Translation by Jan Starý. Epilogue by Martin Hilský. 1st Ed. Prague : Odeon, 1990, 359 p. ISBN 80-207-0160-5.

HILSKÝ, Martin. *Současný britský román.* Jinočany : H & H, 1992, 191p. ISBN 80-85467-00-3.

"History". *Cambridge Dictionaries Online*. Cambridge University Press, 2011. available at WWW: <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/british/history_1?q=history> [quoted 2012-02-28].

"History". *Encyclopædia Britannica Online*. Encyclopædia Britannica Inc., 2012. available at WWW: <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/267505/history> [quoted 2012-02-28].

"Historiography". *Encyclopædia Britannica Online*. Encyclopædia Britannica Inc., 2012. available at WWW: <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/267436/historiography> [quoted 2012-02-28].

LUKÁCS, Georg. *The Historical Novel*. Translation by H. Mitchell. The Merlin Press Ltd., 1989, 364p. ISBN 978-0850363784.

MUNSLOW, Alun. What History Is. *History in Focus*. Issue 2: What is History? (October 2001). available at WWW: <http://www.history.ac.uk/ihr/Focus/Whatishistory/munslow6.html> [quoted 2012-02-28].

SLOTKIN, Richard. Fiction for the Purposes of History. *Rethinking History*. Vol. 9, No. 2/3, (June/September 2005), p. 221-236. ISSN: 1470-1154. available at WWW: <http://www.timeandspace.lviv.ua/files/session/slotkin%5B1%5D_259.pdf> [quoted 2012-02-28].

TAMPLIN, Ronald. "*Troubles* and the Irish Tradition". In: *J.G. Farrell: The Critical Grip*. Ed. CRANE, Ralph J. Dublin : Four Courts Press Ltd, 1999, 208p. ISBN 1-85182-421-9.