I. General Introduction

This present research attempts to explore the unexplored effects of British colonialism in the nineteenth century Australia presenting the noble views of Peter Carey through the unnamed narrator, great -grandson of Oscar to narrate the stories of different fictional and historical characters and the events in the novel. This narration and his rewriting and reinterpreting of history projects him as a postmodern metafictional historiographer.

Australian author, Peter Carey, born in the small town of Bacchus Marsh, Victoria on 7 May 1943 won more than dozen awards for his short stories, novels and film adaptations. Carey's most critically acclaimed novel *Oscar and Lucinda* (1988) won both the Booker Prize and the Franklin Awards in 1988. The novel has a sense of historical allegory and for the first time, Peter Carey focuses on the colonial period of Australian history. During the Victorian era, the colonies were a liminal presence that haunted the periphery of imperial awareness. As Carey develops the relationship between the story's two main characters - - Rev. Oscar Hopkins and Lucinda Leplastrier, he creates an unexplored view of the nineteenth century Australia.

Carey found work in Melbourne as an advertising copywriter after graduating from Monasch University in 1961. He developed close contact with writers such as Barry Oakley and Morris Lurie who provided him an inspiration to start writing fiction. According to Oakley, Carey's ability was obvious from the beginning but Carey himself has no idea of the magnitude of his own talent. Carey lived in London for a short span of time in the late 1960s, and then he returned to Australia in 1973. He married theater director Alison Summers in 1985. Carey made his mark on the Australian literary scene with a series of short stories that blended fantasy and dark

humor, which have become trademark of modern Australian fiction. Highly acclaimed collection of short fictions, *The Fat Man in History* (1974), moves through macabre fantasy world that reduces reality to the level of absurdity.

Carey's second collection of stories *War Crimes* (1979), solidified his reputation as a remarkable fabulist author. His first award winning novel *Bliss* (1981), is the story of an advertising man Harry Joe's three drastically opposing experiences with death and resurrection. The paradoxical nature of merging of lies with truths, fantasy with reality, is strongly reflected in his novel, *Illywhacker* (1985). He published his sixth novel, *Jack Maggs* (1997), a story based on the character magwitch in Charles Dicken's *Great Expectation* (1998). In the *True History of the Kelly Gang* (2001). Carey revisits the legend of the Australian outlaw Ned Kelly who has been labeled as a crook and murderer in the official history and represents him as a good person forced by circumstances into a criminal life. In other words, he is portrayed as a kind-hearted man destined to be a criminal. The book won the Booker prize in 2001for the second time.

He has also written children's books such as *The Big Bazooeley (1995),*a non-fiction book, and *30 Days In Sydney A Wildly Distorted Account (2001)*. The story centered around a literary hoax which gripped Australia in the 1940s is reflected in *My life as a Fake (2003*), *Wrong About Japan* published in 2005 is a memoir of the Author's journey through Japanese culture and heritage. *Theft (2006)* is the latest novel of Carey so far.

Carey was part of a generation of Australian writers who moved away from realism towards international models; by his own account, he was first influenced by William Faulkner. Hybrid mixing of fable, irony, satire and fantasy in his novels can now be seen as akin to post-colonial novelists such as G.G. Marquez, Salman Rushdie

and Michael Ondaatje. Australian identity and historical context play a part in several of his literary works like *Oscar and Lucinda*. Peter Carey considers himself an atheist. Its impact is noticeable in *Oscar and Lucinda.*. Carey's story telling created a world that dismantled a reader is assumption about time, reality, history and characters. Carey mixes freely the historical and fictional characters and narrates the stories of different sectors, places, and castes and time of the nineteenth century Australia in his novel *Oscar and Lucinda* to show postmodernist pastiches and parodies on it and project him, the unnamed narrator, as a metafiction historiographer.

Prestigious Booker Prize winning novel *Oscar and Lucinda* (1988), is set in England and Australia in the nineteenth century concerning the issues of unexplored effects of British colonialism upon setteler whites and aborigines by merging the historical characters with fictional characters without nostalgic tones mixing postmodernist tastes and scattering the elements of historiographic metafiction.

It is a contemporary novel that addresses contemporary Australian preoccupations by transforming the Victorian novel in other ways in *Oscar and Lucinda.* For instance, he plays with the Victorian intertext by transforming the famous Victorian author, Marian Evans or George Eliot, into a character in his novel. Evans was famous for flaunting the social mores that imprisoned Victorian women. It seems completely harmless to call *Oscar and Lucinda* a historical novel set in nineteenth century when hero worshiping was dominant. This hero worshiping expressed itself in popular poetry, like the following stanza from E. Sesca Sewin's poem "Australian Heroes":

> Tell no tale why every desert
> On the board Australian plain
> Speaks aloud of calm endurance

Shown in the bitterness and pain

Speaks a loud of men who tendered

Up their spirits to their god,

With the scorching sand around them,

Ne’er before by white man trod. (qtd. in Rutherford 16)

During this period, Australian was suffering from lack of national heroes but this gap in national mythology was filled by the explorer, Oscar was a hero of that time who came to Australia carrying the mission to civilize and develop the nation with the longing of transporting a glass church across the desert. Moving from the initial first person narrative into the third person omniscient narrative point of view he has insight into thoughts, feeling, and motives of his main characters, none of whom he has ever met. It draws attention to his functionality and highlights the fact that he is a construct, like the past he is constructing.

Oscar Hopkins is a eccentric misfit from his early years growing up in suffocating household in the nineteenth century west with his strict Pentecostal father Theophilus. Receiving what he perceives to be a sign from God, Oscar flees his home, to be taken in by the local Anglican priest, the Rev. Hugh Stratton. Enveloped in religions favour the young boy decides to train for life in the Church of England, to the dismay of his father and his congregation.

On the other side of the world, a kindred spirit also bucks against society's mores, Lucinda Leplastrier does not fit the model of an educated, middle class young Australian lady. Ostracized for their individualistic traits Oscar and Lucinda meet through their passion for gambling, on a ship bound for Australia. A strange yet close relationship rows between these odd and enduring characters.

Lucinda has a dream of building a glass cathedral to send to her ex-lover, the Rev. Dennis Haslet in his isolated native village. To prove his love for her, Oscar offers to take it. However, unable to resists a wager, Lucinda bets her fortune that he will not succeed.

Oscar's way to Australia is full of coincidences, distancing, ignorance, accidents and an amounting to blindness and it achieves nothing except his own destruction and a large amount of suffering to others. Oscar is seen in relation to two different social systems in Australia, the aboriginal and the settler society with whom he interacts in different ways. Lucinda, like her mother is an ardent feminist, convinced that the liberation of women would come through the building of factories.

When Oscar meets Lucinda, for the first time he feels cherished by a woman, deeply in love with her Oscar, wants to make her happy by building a glass Church to be transported overland to a distance settlement. Ironically, their innocent but loving relationship becomes a scandal; the overland trip with glass church is soiled by cruelty and murder; and after being seduced at journey's end by the great-grandmother of the narrator, the disillusioned Oscar welcomes death.

Thus, Peter Carey in *Oscar and Lucinda* demonstrates the effects of British colonialism to settlers and aborigines in Victorian era in Australia, narrating the stories of the period mixing the fictive and historical events and characters of the contemporary period by presenting an unnamed narrator, great grandson of Oscar as a metafictional historiographer.

Many critics and reviewers have analyzed this fiction from multiple perspectives since its publication in 1988. Brown Ruth examines this novel as an exploration of "the literal and metaphorical church" (114). There is a need for a "move away from the Church and literature of English". According to him, the novel

portrays denial of gospel stories and legitimacy of aboriginal stories. He further opines, "There is much in the novel to support the view that English religion and literature are inappropriate in Australia. Often, Christianity seems to be totally out of place. In Sydney, the stories of gospel lay across the harsh landscape like sheets of newspaper on the polished floor. Aboriginal stories are granted legitimacy [. . .]" (114).

Branali Tahabildar compares this novel with Gramham Swift's novel *Waterland* and reads it as, "Glass and Water: Love and Sexuality". "Peter Carey and Gramham Swift use imagery of glass and water to illustrate human sexuality and love relationships. In *Waterland,* scenes of swimming and water immersion serve to unveil picks sexuality and rawness of his character" (27). Tahabildar further argues, "Whereas Swift uses water imagery, Carey uses glass imagery to specifically reveal the nature of love between *Oscar and Lucinda* [. . .]" (28).

Kristen Holst Peterseh analyzes *Oscar and Lucinda* as “representative of Church and Industry" (111). In the imperial enterprise is almost ludicrous because of their marginalized position in settler society. Oscar is a pawn in bishop dancer's power game, and Lucinda is a woman on her own conducting herself according to the feminist ethos of her own. Admirable through that ethos is, it is derived from and directed as British society, not New South Wales, whereas Lucinda's mother knows, "They hate women like us with a passion you would not believe [. . .]" (114). She has educated her daughter into being a "[. . .] proud square peg" (114), and as a result of this Lucinda suffers agonies from what she calls me voodoo, "[. . .] of men in a group [. . .] men on a street corner or in a hall" (146). Both she and Oscar are obviously victims themselves, but from the point of view of the aborigines they

appear as representatives of church and industry with all the forces of destruction, which those institutions wrought upon them.

Carey says, "I had a vision of a church on a barge gong up the Bellinger river and the Christian stories moving through a landscape of aboriginal stories. In the end none of these books are totally about these things, but that is how they began" (Interview: Weekend Australia 8). The church of his original vision turned into a glass church and this brings Lucinda into picture. She is heir to her mother's fascination with factories, based on the conviction that industrialization "[. . .] would provide her sex with the economic basis of their freedom" (86). So, the glass church combines two driving forces behind the empire: Christianity and the manufacturing industry, one providing the moral excuse, the other the superior technology and wealth to conquer the world.

K. H. Peterse again judges the novel as a "gambling on reality"(112). According to him, Oscar's mother hopes and wishes that Oscar be a 'missionary' and a "pioneer Anglican" while traveling through Australia but Oscar's way to Australia is full of coincidences, misunderstanding, ignorance, accidents and innocence amounting to blindness, and it achieves, nothing except his own destruction and large amount of suffering to others, particularly the aborigines (112).

Turner Grame analyses this novel as a means of "nationalizing the author." (116). According to him, "The history of media construction of Peter Carey as a national celebrity, who writes novel for a living, raises questions about the process of 'nationalization' writers may undergo as they are admitted to the Australian literary canon" (92).

None of the critics cited above writes on Carey's portrayal of the narrator as a metafictional historiographer. Hence, this present researcher will study the

significance of the portrayal of the narrator as a postmodern metafictional historiographer in Carey's *Oscar and Lucinda.*

Peter Carey's *Oscar and Lucinda* makes use of traditional devices of Victorian historical fiction. It combines fact and fiction, historical (real) characters and events and fictional (unreal) ones. In accordance with the changed focus mentioned in the opening paragraph the historical characters and events are of a civil nature. The novel gives detailed descriptions of a wide range of social milieux including low life; it concerns itself with property relations and there is an attempt to create an illusion of reality by the use of a narrator. In realist fiction of the nineteenth century this careful managing of the text served to underscore its intended objectivity. The appearance of Marin Evans as a character in the novel is a reminder of this literary tradition, which the novel sets out to challenge.

The novel narrates the nineteenth century colonial history in a typical postmodern way. Inhabiting the genre it tries to deconstruct the nineteenth century historical novel, it undermines it basic assumptions from within. History is viewed not as a fixed and given senses of events and motives, but as a text itself which treated as subject to the whims and needs of historians as the literary' text is to those of the writers. Consequently, the past is an ideological construct and as such it is also unstable and liable to change in accordance with the needs of the time. In this regard, the narrator opines, *Oscar and Lucinda* "I learned long ago to distrust local history" (2).

In postmodern fictional writing, we can see the roothlessness and search for identity that is highly dominant on Carey's *Oscar and Lucinda* Peter Barry remarks:

> In Victorian novels the orphans symbolizes roothlessness and a search for identity at a time when society was undergoing found changes. The

> father figure represents the law and reality. If he is absent or lacking then the orphans have difficult fitting in and has to find his own values. Lucinda loses first her father and then her mother; Oscar loses his mother and then chooses to leave his oppressive father; and Carey's working title for the novel was orphans (qtd. in Jack 29).

The unnamed narrator narrates the unexplored and hidden (hi-) stories of the colonial nineteenth century Australia. The narrator of *Oscar and Lucinda* sets out to rewrite his family history because he is unsatisfied with the oppressive version. The narrator's aim is to set the record straight, apparently not so much on his detail of local history but principally as concerns with his own family history.

Carey does not think that there should be order of the events coherently and a set of fixed, objective facts. For Carey history is heterogeneous, multiple and subjective phenomenon like fiction that is decorated- constructed with the noble imagination of historians and their interpretation. *Oscar and Lucinda* implies such above-mentioned facts.

The terms fiction and history are traditionally perceived as separate and individual concepts. In ancient Greece, Aristotle distinguished between the functions of fiction and history by declaring that the latter is concerned with universal truths while the former deals with particular facts, and this can be argued to constitute a common understanding of the difference between fiction and history. However the relationship between fiction and history has been subject to debate in the sphere of literary criticism in recent years. Historiographic metafiction is concerned with blurring the demarcations between history and fiction.

Historiographic metafiction described as fiction that shares the characteristics associated with metafiction in general and takes history or part of history, as it creates

its fictional universe, archived historical figures or events. The genre questions the separability of history and literature, arguing that the two modes of discourse have a lot in common and thereby it redefines the relationship between fictional writing and history. One of the issues treated in historiography metafiction is history's claim to absolute truth; it sometimes challenges the truth of historical records by deliberately altering the particulars of known historical details.

Hayden White in “The Historical Text as Literary Artifact" asserts that [t]he postmodern is informed by a programmatic, if ironic, commitment to the return to narrative as one of its enabling presuppositions” (394-96). White further argues that all historical writing, as narrative, depends on a "non-negotiable item", the form of the narrative itself, and further, that the stories of history are understandable by virtue of their reliance on fictive forms (395). In Metahistory, White documents in detail how such formal determination affected the writing of history in the nineteenth century and concludes the present essay with his observation that "history as a discipline is in bad shape today because it has lost sight of its origins in the literary imagination"(13). From a different angle, the work of Dominick LaCapra has acted to de-naturalize notions of historical documents as representations of the past and of the way such archival traces of historical events are used within historiography and fictive representations.

In the succeeding chapter the researcher is going to develop the methodology related to historiographic metafiction in Carey’s *Oscar and Lucinda* Where the ideas of Hayden White, Linda Hutcheon and Dominick LaCapra will be presented.

II. Postmodern Historiographic Metafiction

The word 'postmodern', inchoate and susceptible to several meanings, is too flexible that it has generated much controversy and even hostility as a mode of enquiry has been questioned. But it is no doubt greatly influenced historiography during the past two and half decades and its impact on history-writing, a much debated issue among historians. There is not definite point of time when it began but the agreed assumption is that it started after second world war – the fifties – fetching multiple meanings, issues, ideas, analyses, perspectives and soon in painting, sculpture, history and fiction and so on.

J.F. Lyotard believes that postmodern artists and writers do not follow the pre-established rules rather they work without rules in order to formulate the rules of what will have been done. He thinks that it is not their business to supply reality but to invent illusions. He, in his essay, "What Is Postmodernism?" states:

> A postmodern artist or writer is in the position of a philosopher: the text cannot be judged according to a determined judgment, by applying familiar categories to the text or to the work [. . .] Hence, the fact that work and text have the characters of an event: hence also, they always come to late for their author [. . .] their realization always begins too soon. Postmodern would have to be understood according to the paradox of the future anterior. (71-82)

Here, Lyotard insists on experimental aspect in postmodern text.

Linda Hutcheon in "Beginning to Theorize Postmodernism" forwards her opinions. According to her, postmodernism is full of contradictions:

> Postmodernism is usually accompanied by a grand flourish of negativized rhetoric, we hear of discontinuity, disruption, dislocation,

> decentering, impermanency and anti-tantalization [. . .], the very concepts, it challenges, literature, painting, sculpture, philosophy, linguistic of historiography and so on. (343-45)

Linda Hutcheon's view displays a particular hostility to the seventeenth and eighteenth century enlightenment and scientific method, and forms of rationality derived from postmodern thinking.

It is a complete rejection of metanarratives, the presupposition that human history follows a particular line of development. In other words, it can be said that history has no pattern and can be interpreted from multiple perspectives. The notion of truth has no relevance and is at best only relative. By focusing on the narrative, the postmodernists regard words as having no fixed meaning.

E.P. Thompson insists that postmodern historiography is not merely textual, but wholly textual; though within that rubric there is a range of nuisances. While interpreting the texts the postmodernists assume that the creators of the sources provide them with the intention of canceling as much as revealing and more emphatically, they can use the texts anyway they like.

Before entering the major tools of this research, the researcher wants to introduce the term historiography. Historiography, the term, refers to the art of writing history. If we want to search the root of historiography, we have to go with Herodotus who introduced ancient historiography. After him, Aristotle introduced it and later Hegel and Ranke wrote histiogrpahy in their time. Michel Foucault and Greenblatt mentioned it on their works. Now, in postmodern era, Hayden White, Linda Hutcheon and LaCapra discuss and introduce historiography in metafiction mixing, representing and interpreting the postmodern pastiches and Parodies on it.

Historiographic metafiction shares the characteristics associated with metafiction in general and takes history, or part of history, as its topic and creates its fictional universe around historical figures and events. The genre represents not just a world of fiction, however self-consciously presented as a constructed one, but also a world of public experiences. It questions the separability of fiction and historiography, but does not in anyway purport to be in possession of the final answer to the debate about the relationship between them. Its aim is to foreground the discussion and to draw attention to the matter of whose truth is told, as historiographic metafiction presents the view that there are only truths in the plurals and never one Truth with capital 'T'.

Historiographic metaficiton, like much contemporary theory of history, does not fall into either 'presentism' or nostalgic in its relation to the past it presents. What it does is it de-naturalizes that temporal relationship. In both historiographic theory and postmodern fiction, there is an intense self-reflexivity (both theoretical and textual) about the act of narrating the certain events of the past, about the conjunction of present action and the past absent object of that agency. In both historical and literary postmodern representation, the doubleness remains: there is no sense of either historian or novelist reducing the strange past to very similar present. The narrating 'historian' of Salman Rushdie's *Shame* finds that he has trouble in keeping his present knowledge of events from contaminating his presentation of the past. George Lukacs does not demand correctness of individual facts as a condition defining the historical faithfulness of situation. In his opinion, historical data traditionally enter nineteenth century historical fiction in order to reinforce the text’s claim to verifiability to a persuasive rendering into fact of its events. Being self-conscious about his position

merely as a fictional invention of its author: The metafictional historiographer as a narrator of Rushdie's *Shame* announces:

> The country in this story is not Pakistan, or not quite. There are two countries, real and fictional, occupying the same space. My story, my fictional country exists, like myself, at a slight angle to reality. I have found this off centering to be necessary: but its value is, of course, open to debate. My view is that I am not writing only about Pakistan. (Rushdie 29)

The open mixing of the fictive with historical in the narrator's story telling is made into part of the very narrative.It is clear that he is trying to present the unpresentable.

About the act of narrative representation in both writing and photography undoes the mimetic assumptionsof transparency that underpins the realist project. Photogrpahy and fiction, in this study, are unavoidably connected to mass-media representations today and, even in their high-art manifestations, they tend to acknowledge this inevitable implication. This is most obvious in the appropriation of film and images in postmodern photography, but a similar process occurs in the use, for example, of detective-story structures in 'serious' fiction like.*The Name of the Rose* or *Hawksmoor*. Lennard Davis suggests that the question of narrative representation was already problematized in the earliest examples of the novel as a genre:

> After all, the novel, as the first wave in the sweep of mass media and the entertainment industry, stands as an example of how large, controlled, cultural forms come to be used by large numbers of people who wishes or were taught to have a different relation to reality than those who proceeded them. As the first powerful, broad, and hegemonic literary form, the novel served to blur, in a way never

> before experienced, the distinction between illusion and reality, between fact and fiction, between symbol and what is represented. (qut. In Linda Hutcheon, *poetics40*)

Postmodern historiographic metafiction simply does all of this overtly, asking us to question how we represent --how we construct-- our view of reality and of ourselves. Along with the photographic practice of Martha Rosler, Hans Haacke, and Silvia Kolbowski, as we see, these novels ask us to acknowledge that representation has a politics.

To get more clear idea about the genre, historiographic metaficiton, this research tries to analyse and differentiate the old historicism and New Historicism and their impact in postmodern historiographic metafiction.

The old historicism explains literary works in terms of the 'influence' of history upon them, both in the form of historical events (wars, social upheavals and other extra-textual factors) and in the form of cultural traditions sometimes referred to as 'the history of ideas.' A old historicist reading of a work written in the United States in 1799 looks to the author's political learning (was her father a federalist?)(or historical events to clarify what to the present day seems obscure to readers without a historical knowledge of the period).

Hegel believes that history is like a running river so there is no fixed point of truth and a particular thought is not correct forever and even but the thought can be correct where we stand and in relation to a certain historical context. He thinks that the only fixed-point philosophy can hold on to be history itself. Jostein Gaarder in *Sophie's World* captures the statements of Hegel where he states:

> History is in a constant state of change, so how can it be a fixed point? [. . .] And the history of thought – or of reason – is like this river. The

> thoughts that are washed along with the current of past tradition, as well as the material conditions prevailing at the time [. . .]but something can be right or wrong in relation to certain historical context. (361-63)

Here, Hegel presents his view that reading history is based on historical events and contexts. For old historicist, the truth is objective that gained by an author taking the basis of historical contexts and events. History, they agree, has always been a political affair; their aim is to fairly 'represent' the experiences of all, however approximately. Yet, many old historicists do not go far enough, in the new historical view, to rid themselves to a historical habits – for examples, the notion that the authors genius is what created the work, even if the author was himself affected by historical events in his/her life.

New Historicism, in general , concerns with the text's position in relation to ideological, social and political contexts, but the main interest in the new historicist way of thinking is its assertion that history and literature can not be separated; that a text must be seen as an event in the history of its time and that history is textual. New Historicism is taken as a reaction against New Criticism, which regards a text as an autonomous aesthetic entity on the grounds that literary criticism should not be affected by circumstances outside the text, but focus on the text itself. The invention of the concept new historicism is attributed to the American scholar Stephen Greenblatt, who first employed it in the introduction to a collection of essays, "The forms of power and the power of forms in the Renaissance" in 1982. Greenblatt sees it as an array of reading practices. New historicism is, in the words of Louis A. Montrose, who is one of the most acclaimed New historicist critics, defines new historicism as concerns with, " the historicity of text and textuality of history".

New historicism developed in the 1980s taking the base on the premise that a literary work should be considered as a product of the time, place and circumstances of its composition rather than as an isolated creation. It aims to understand the work through its historical context and to understand cultural and intellectual history through literature that documents the new discipline of the history of ideas.

Michel Foucault bases his approach both on his theory of the limits of collective cultural knowledge and on his techniques of examining a broad array of documents in order to understand the episteme of a particular time. New Historicist scholars begin their analysis of literary texts by attempting to look at other texts – both literary and non-literary -- to which a literate public has access at the time of writing and what the author of the original text himself might have read. A major focus of those, new historicist critics led by Moskowitz and Stephen Orgel have been on understanding Shakespeare less an autonomous great author in the modern sense than as a clue to the conjunction of the world of Renaissance Theater. Like Marxism, New Historicism also does something to postmodernism, however new historicists tend to exhibit less skepticism than postmodernists, and show more willingness to perform the traditional tasks of literary criticism, i.e. explaining the text in its context, and trying to show what it meant to its readers. We find the Focualdian basis in new historicism frequently. So, the new historicists seek to find an example of power is a means through which the marginalized are controlled. Foucault's concept of power is neither reductive nor synonymous with domination. Rather he understands power as continually articulated on knowledge and knowledge on power. Nevertheless, his works in the 1970s on prison have been influential on the new historicists.

D.G.Myers, believes that there is not only the influence of Foucault to new historicist, Montrose, Raymond and Eagleton have also contributed a lot to historicism. Myers opines:

> [. . .] Although the influence of such philosophers as French structuralists' Marxists, Louis Althusser, Raymond Williams and Terry Eagelton were essential in shaping the theory of New Historicism, the work of Foucault also appears influential. Although some critics believe that these former philosophers have made an impact on New Historicism. [. . .] Foucauldian notion of the episteme amount to very little more than the same practice under a new and improved label. (Mayers 2-3)

Thus, this present research approaches to the point that the old historicist's reading and writing on historical fiction based on the basis of objective truth and order of historical events centering the subject matter about political affairs and author's objective view on it ignoring the subjective truth and other socio, political and economics aspects.

Then New Historicists came and began studying and writing fiction differently, focusing on cultural and intellectual position of author and historical context. They think that every text studies through the historical context and cultural circumstances that is why every text is a product of time, place and circumstances. New historicists have been influenced by the concept of Foucault and work of Stephen Greenblatt in 1980s. But historigraphic metafiction studies the history by sharing the characteristics of metafiction in general and taking history as its topic and creates its fictional universe around historical figures or events. The genre questions the separability of fiction and history presenting the view that there are only truths in

plural, never singular truth, and welcoming the public experiences. The act of narrating in the present the events of the past is the not issue of historiographic metafiction and this research, on Peter Carey's *Oscar and Lucinda* by taking the bold and noble ideas of Hayden White, Linda Hutcheon and Dominick LaCapra are described in the succeeding part of this chapter. following paragraphs respectively as tools of this present research.

Hayden White (1928) is a historian in the literary criticism; most famous among his works is *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (1973). White rejects the post Collingwoodian philosophy of history by brushing away previous distinctions and debates, and by rejecting the notion of causality in history. He proposes a return to the historical text, which, he thinks, has been abandoned in favour of the study of other works in the philosophy of history. He asks that historians became.linguistic skepticists and that they question their use of language which is the most controversial is his defense of the idea that, "[. . .] the techniques or strategies that [Historians and imaginative writers] use in the composition of their discourses can be shown to be substantially the same, however different they appear on a purely surface, or dictional level [. . .]" (*Tropics of Discourse 121).*

In Metahi*story*, White extends the use of tropes form linguistic usage--figures of style -- to general styles of discourse, underlying every historian's writing of history. He believes histories to be determined by tropes, in as much as the historiography of every period is defined by a specific trope. For white, metaphor is the most useful trope, and historical explanation "can be judged solely in terms of the richness of the metaphors which govern its sequence of articulation" (*Tropics of Discourse* 46). He uses the work of historians and philosophers in the nineteenthe

century specifically, that of G.W F. Hegel, Leopold Von Ranke, Karl Marx, Friedrich Nietzsche and Benedetto Croce as embodiments of particular historiographical tropes and political aims.

White does not see tropes as incompatible with the historian's freedom in his actual writing of history. He justifies the position among other ways on the basis of the historical unfolding of tropes (from metaphor to metonymy, synecdoche, and finally irony); he places himself wither the ironic historiographic tradition, one that allows certain elements of the absurd and of contradiction. These ideas can be seen in light of White's support of the idea of narrative as an essential constituent of historical experience and method. He writes in *The Content of the Form* (1987) that "A true narrative account[. . .] is less a product of the historian's poetic talents, as the narrative account of imaginary events is conceived to be, than it is a necessary result of proper application of historical "method" (27). Referring to Paul Ricoeur, by whom he was strongly influenced, White writes: "Plot is not a structural component of fictional or mythical stories alone, it is crucial to the historical representations of events as well" (51).

White describes metahistory as a critical enterprise where the historian addresses reflective questions about the writing of history itself. He argues that all historical writing, as narrative, depends on a "non-negotiable item", the form of the narrative itself, and, further, that the stories of history are understandable by virtue of their reliance on fictive forms. From the materials the simple chronicle, as a series of events, as set facts, the historian provides explanations only by providing formal coherence: the story, that is to say, is never simple there in the facts but must be created. Such presumably elementary matters as what events will be considered as causes and which as effects defend precisely on how the vents are employed, just as

the mode in which the resulting history will be understood. White opines about the biasness of historian and lack of objective history:

> Yet, it is difficult to get an objective history of a scholarly discipline, because if the historian is himself a practitioner of it, he is likely to be a devotee of one or another of its sets and hence biased [. . .]. What are the possible forms of historical representations and what are their bases? What authority can historical accounts claim as contributions to a secured knowledge of reality in general and to the human sciences in particular? (*The Historical Text* 395-96)

White forwards his view about history and fiction that histories are not only about events but also about possible sets of relationship those events which demonstrates figures. These sets of relationships are not, however, immanent in the events themselves: they exist only in the mind of the historian reflecting on them. Here they are present as the modes of relationship conceptualized in the myth, table and folklore, scientific knowledge, religion, and literary art of the historian's own culture.

Hayden White stresses the use of tropes, relationships of events and sets, historical representation and stories of history in fictive forms in writing and reading hsitroiographic metaficiton is major concern of postmodern historiography.

Hutcheon argues that historiographic metafiction is the pastime of the past time. In her book, *A Poetics of Postmodernism* she talks about postmodern novel that rejects projecting of present ideas onto the past suggesting a difference between events and facts which are shared by many historians or historical critics on the postmodern novel:

> Historiographic metafiction is one kind of postmodern novel which rejects projecting present beliefs and standards onto the past and

> asserts the specificity and particularity of the individual past event. It also suggests a distinction between 'events' and 'facts' that is one shared by many historians. Since the documents became signs of events, which the historian transmutes into facts, as in historigraphic metafiction, the lesson here is that the past once existed, but that our historical knowledge of it is semiotically transmitted. Finally, historigraphic metafiction often points to the fact by using the paratextual conventions of historiography to both inscribe and undermine the authority and objectivity of historical sources and explanations. (122-23)

Hutcheon's arguments in both the poetics of postmodernism and the politics of postmodernism are often developed in direct response to Jameson, who unlike Hutcheon fovours modernism over postmodernism; as a result her discussion at times sounds like a polemic against modernism.

For Hutcheon, postmodernism remains historical and political precisely through its parodic historical reference; though such parodic reference, "postmodernist forms want to work toward a public discourse that would eschew modernist aestheticism and hermeticism and its attendant political self marginalization" (*Poetics* 23). Her claims make her more postmodernist. She talks about political issues in historical novel where we can find postmodern glimpse everywhere. She implies the parodixcal and historical forms in postmodern fiction. She further argues, "That the term postmodernism in fiction be reserved to describe the more paradoxical and historically complex form which she calls "historiographic metafiction' (40). The terms "postmodernist fiction" and "histioriographic metafiction" therefore exist in a relationship of identity and describe the same set of

objects: historiographic metafiction is postmodern fiction: all postmodern fiction; most of the postmodern fictions are historiographic metafictions. Her view captures a great deal of narrative. She adds that historiographic metafiction blends the self-reflexivity of metafiction with an ironized sense of history; this mix foregrounds the distinction "between brute events of the past and the historical facts we construct out of them" (*Poetics* 57). In doing so, such fiction draws historical representation.

Hutcheon asserts that historiographc metafiction foregrounds the discursively constructed nature of reality "by stressing the contexts in which the fiction is being produced – by both writer and reader" (*Poetics* 40). She thinks that the dialogue of past and present, of old and new gives formal expression to a belief in change within continuity. For Hutcheon postmodern architecture and literature are very close to give the meaning of postmodernity:

> But in doubly parodic, double coding (that is, as parodic of both modernism and something else). Postmodernist architecture also allows for that which was rejected as uncontrollable and deceitfully by both modernism's Gesamtkinstler and "life condition" that is, ambiguity and irony. (30)

For Linda Hutcheon, postmodernism cannot be used, as synonym for the contemporary and it does not really describe an international cultural phenomenon, for it is primarily European and American. She wants to call postmodernism is fundamentally contradictory, resolutely historical and inescapably political. Its contradictions are those of late capitalist society but, whatever the cause, these contradictions are manifest in the important postmodern concept of the ‘presence of the past’. For Hutcheon, all forms of contemporary art and thought are examples of postmodernist contradiction. She (like most writers on the subject) prefers the genre

of novel, and one form in particular, a form that she wants to label ‘historiographic metafiction’.

Hutcheon takes parody as perfect postmodern form and opines that most of postmodernist texts are also specifically parodic in their intertextual relation to the traditions and conventions of the genres involved. When T.S.Eliot recalls Dante and Virgil in *The Waste Land*, one senses a kind of wishful call to continuity beneath the fragmented echoing. In some senses, parody is a perfect postmodernist form, for it paradoxically both incorporates and challenges that which it parodies. She says that in the past history how often been used in criticism of the novel as a kind of model of the realistic pole of representation. Postmodernist fiction problematizes this model to querry the relation of both histories to reality and reality to language. In Lionel Grossman's terms:

> Modern history and modern literature [I would say postmodern in both cases] have both rejected the ideal of representation that dominated them for so long. Both now conceive of their work as exploration, testing, creation of new meanings, rather than as disclosure or revelation of meanings already in some sense there, but not immediately perceptible. (qtd.in Lind Hutcheon *Poetics* 256)

Hutcheon takes Brain McHale and his book *Postmodernist Fiction* who states that modernist and postmodernist fiction show an affinity for cinematic models, and certainly the work of Manuel Puig or Salman Rushdie supports such a claim but historiographic metafiction obsesses with the question of how we can come to know the past, shows an attraction to photographic models- and to photographs either as physically present or as the narrativized trappings of the historical archive.

In raising the issue of photographic representation, postmodern fiction often points metaphorically to the related issue of narrative representation, its powers and its limitations. To support her opinions she presents the narrator in John Berger's novel G. who tries to describe an actual historical and political event, but ends up in despair:"Write anything. Truth or untruth, it is unimportant. Speak but speak with tenderness, for that is all that you can do that may help a little. Build a barricade of words, no matter what they mean" (qtd. *in Politics* 45).

She writes that in historiogrpahic metaficiotn, Roa Bastos's *I The Supreme* is the typical example. The novel distrusts history's ability to convey truth: the word of power, of authority, words above words is transformed into clever words, lying words. She thinks that historians like novelists are interested not in recounting the facts, but in recounting that they are recounting them. She thinks that the power of literary representation is as provisional as that of historiography. Readers not know whether the fables are true stories or pretended truths. In this regard Rao Bastos says:

> The reader will already have noted that, unlike ordinary texts, this one was read first and written later. Instead of saying and writing something new, it merely faithfully copies what has already been said and composed by others [. . .]. [T] he re-scriptor declares, in the words of a contemporary author, that the history contained in these notes is reduced to the fact that the story that should have been told in then has not been told. As a consequence, the characters and facts that figure in them have earned, through the fatality of the written language, the right

> of a factious and autonomous existence in the service of the no less fictious and autonomous reader. (435)

The novel *I The Superme* is about history writing and oral tradition of story telling society. It thematizes the postmodern concern with the radically interminate and unstable nature of textuality and subjectivity. The entire novel is full of remarks about representation in the narratives of both fiction and history.

It is obvious that narrative has become a human made structure, not as natural or given where it is in historical or fictional representation. The view of narrative that so much current theory challenges is not new, but it has been given a new designation, it is considered as a mode of totalizing representation. The function of the term totalizing is to point to the process by which writers of history, fiction, or theory render their materials coherent, continuous, unified but always with an eye to the control and mastery of those materials. The term has been used to characterize everything from liberal humanist ideals to the aims of historiography. As Dominick LaCapra has pointed out:

> Dream of a 'total history' corroborating the historian's own desire of mastery of a documentary repertoire and furnishing the reader with a vicarious sense of – or perhaps a project for control in a world out of joint has a course been a lodestar of historiography form Hegel to the Annales School. (qtd. in History and Criticism 25)

Relationship between past and present is dominant in postmodern fiction. Historians are aware that they establish a relationship between the past and write and the present in which they write. The past appears as confused, plural and unstructured as the present does as it was lived.

Postmodern fiction, for Hutcheon, stresses on the tensions created by the realization that we can only know the past through our present. It emphasizes the actual events of the past and historian's act of processing them into facts. Historians never seize the event directly and entirely, only incompletely and laterally through a document that is through texts like this. History does not so much say what the past was rather it says, what it is possible to know. Historians are readers of fragmentary documents and like readers of fiction; they fill in the gaps and create ordering structures. She says that what historiographic metaficiton suggests is a recognition of a central responsibility of the historian and the novelist alike i.e. their responsibility as makers of meaning though representation.

Hutcheon introduces and uses parody in her writing which is called ironic quotation, pastiche, appropriation and intertextuality that is usually considered central to postmodernism, both by its detractors and its defenders. Parody also contests our humanist assumption about artistic originality and uniqueness and our capitalist notions of ownership and property. Postmodern parody does not disregard the context of the past representations it cites, but uses irony to acknowledge the fact that we are inevitably separated from that past today-by time and by the subsequent history of those representations.

E. Doctorow's *Ragtime* is a good example of postmodern ironic reworking of the same historical material in his historiogrpahic metaficiton. Postmodern parody is a kind of contesting revision of rereading of the past that both confirms and subverts the power of the representations of history. This paradoxical conviction of the remoteness of the past and the need to deal with it in the present has been called the allegorical impulse of postmodernism. Peter Ackroyd's *Chatterrton* offers a good example of a postmodern novel whose form and content de-naturalize representation in both visual

and verbal media in such a way as to illustrate well the deconstructive potential of parody i.e. its politics. *Chatterton* is a novel about history and representation and about parody and plagiarism.

While discussing the parody and its politics, it is not only this kind of visual art that should be considered, Latin American fiction underlines the intrinsically political character of parody and it challenges the conventional and the authoritative. The ‘politics of representation’ and the ‘representation of politics’ frequently go hand in hand in parodic postmodern historiographic metaficiotn. Parody becomes a way of ironically ‘revisiting the past’ of both art and history in a novel like Salman Rushdie’s *Midnight's Children* with its double parodic intertexts. *Midnight's Children* translates all the German social, cultural and historical details of Gunter Grass's novel, *The Tin Drum*, into Indian terms.

Hutcheon presents William Siska's article, "Metacinema: A Modern Necessity" to show the impact of historiogrpahic fiction in the postmndoern cinema forwarding the term "metacinema", a new kind of ‘self-reflexivity’ that challenges the traditional Hollywood variety of movies about movie-making that retain the orthodox realist notion of the transparency of narrative structures and representations, “The word "irony" does not now mean only what it meant in earlier centuries, it does not mean in one country all it may mean in another nor in the street what it may mean in the study, nor to one school what it may mean to another” (*Irony's Edge* 9).

This extract points out the inherent politics and historical context in historographic metafiction, which is written in ironic mode. Irony has been used to reinforce rather than to question established attitudes, as the history on satire illustrates so well. The irony functions tactically in the service of wide range of political positions. It happens in the space of between the said and the unsaid, Burke

states, "Ironic meaning is inclusive and relational: the said and the unsaid coexist for the interpreter, and each has meaning in relation to the other because they literally interact" (*Irony' Edge* 12). It means that to create the real meaning of irony there should be relation of said and unsaid. Irony happens in multiple things like class, race, ethnicity, gender and sexual preference and so are nationality, neighborhood, profession, religion and all the other micro-political complexities of our lives to which we may not even be able to give labels. Unlike metaphor and metonymy, irony has an edge that cuts the political situations and historical context in metafiction like Doctrow's *Ragtime* and Peter Carey's *Oscar and Lucinda*. Irony becomes political only when it consumes even the origin authority of the ironist.

Hutcheon's use of irony is to look at what might be called the 'scene' of irony: i.e. to treat it not as an isolated trope to analyze by formalist means but as a political issue. To get clear idea about the novel, *Oscar and Lucinda* that carries the effects of colonial Australia, the notions of Simon Duking and Hutcheon on postcolonialism will be beneficial that the researcher is going to discuss.

For Simon, postcolonialism is a need in nations or groups, which have been victims of imperialism like the aborigine, Britishers on many fields in Peter Carey's novel *Oscar and Lucinda* victimize the Australians including he female protagonist Lucinda who is a white settler. Simon opines that the postcolonial desire is the desire of decolorized communities for identity. In both literature and politics the postcolonial drive towards identity centers around language, partly because in postmodernism identity is barely available elsewhere. For the postcolonial to speak or write in the imperial tongues is to call forth a problem of identity to be thrown into parody, mimicry, and ambivalence. The link between post colonialism and language has a history. Rushdie makes dialogue between the post colonized and the post colonizer

takes place in a language which is not quite translated English by answering the postcolonized challenge in terms of the ‘different’ which we can see in his novel *Shame*.

Huthceon argues about postmodernism and postcolonialism and a difference postcolonial art and criticism share with various forms of feminism. It is true that postcolonial literature is also inevitably implicated what Helen Tiffin calls it, "Informed by the imperial vision": (*The Postcolonial* 130). In this regard, Hutcheon remarks:

> The Indian writer, the Jamaican, the Nigerian, the Canadian and the Australian, each one knows what is like to be a peripheral man whose hawl dissipates unheard. He knows what it is to suffer absolute emotional and intellectual devaluation, to die unfulfilled and still isolated form the World’s center. (“Circling the down spout of Empire” 133)

This is not the same as equating the white Canadian experience of colonialism with that of Africans and Indians.

She discuses of irony as a discursive strategy of postmodernism and postcolonialism suggesting irony as a trope of doubleness. She disagrees with Simon Duking's view about postcolonialism as she says, "The need in nations or groups which have been victims of imperialism", presenting the arguments that most postcolonial critics oppose the notion of Simon, arguing that the post-colonial has at in disposal various ways of subverting form within the dominant culture – such as irony, allegory, and self-reflexivity that it shares with the complicitious critique of postmodernism, even if its politics differs in important ways.

Peter Carey's *Oscar and Lucinda* has apparent features of postmodern Historiographic metafiction. White's tropes, Hutcheon's parody and irony are applicable to the novel that proves the novel as a good example of meatifaciotnal historiography and the unnamed narrator, great-grandson of nine tenth century Anglican priest Oscar, a postmodern historiographer who narrates the events and stories mixing the historical facts and fictive colours to explore the bad impacts on white settlers, and aborigines of Australia during British colonization period.

III. Portrayal of the Narrator as a Postmodern Metafictional Historiographer in Peter Carey's *Oscar and Lucinda*

In *Oscar and Lucinda*, Peter Carey focuses on the colonial period of Australian history. The action takes place in Australia and England using the first person unnamed narrator, the great grandson of Victorian priests Oscar mostly during the 1860--Victorian era. Certain narrative techniques such as realistic mode were dominant in that era. During the Victorian era , the colony was a liminal presence that haunted the periphery of imperial awareness: a place where criminals were punished or where progressives went to try out their new ideas far from mother country. In *Oscar and Lucinda*, Carey chooses both to recreate the period and to inhabit the canonical genre that characterized it. He adopts the classical postcolonial strategy which consists in 'writing back' to the centre not incidentally, 'back' in the sense of "against the assumption of the centre to be a prior claim to legitimacy and power" (*Ashcroft, Griffiths, Tiffin* 244-45).

Carey not only limits himself to attacking English imperialist discourse, he deconstructs three myths put forward by official Australian history: that of Australia the ‘lucky country’, that of the saintly missionary come to ’save' the 'heathern blacks' and that of the heroic explorer who 'opened up' the country for settlement and civilization. Peter Carey writes back to imperial English discourse expecting to encounter subversion of the historical balance of power between periphery and center and a corresponding subversion of the implicit conventions of the canonical genre. Carey tells the story in different order by twisting the story that Lucinda is not the grand mother of unnamed narrator, which is a precious postmodern style of writing novel by playing with readers’ expectations. The Victorian intertext leads us to reflect on literal and literary hermeneutic practices, literal interpretation being likened to

religious fundamentalism and games of chance. Carey lures the readers into playing a different kind of game in order to provoke awareness of the distress of the subject who is marginalized by imperialist discourse.

The narrator of *Oscar and Lucinda* sets out to rewrite his family history because he is unsatisfied with the oppressive version of history:

> These bishops were, for the most part, bishops of Grafton. Once there was [. . .] She would not tell the bishops that may great-grand father dog-collar was an act of rebellion. They would look at a Victorian clergyman. They would see the ramrod back, the tight lips, the pinched nose, the long stretched neck and never once, you can set, guess that this was once, you can set, guess that this was caused by Oscar Hopkins holding his breathing trying to stay still for two minutes [. . .]. (1)

The narrator makes it clear that his mother imposed on the family during his childhood. He recalls the mother version how Oscar transported a church to Bellinger. He describes the Church Gleniffer and forwards his father's view about church and mother that his father did not like church very much and his mother's habit. He writes, "My father didn't get drunk, but once, after drinking two beer, he told me that my mother walked around the perimeter of St. John's like a dog pissing around a fence" (3). The father of the narrator goes to St. John's for preying but he gets inside him something bad something traumatic feeling that he spoke out, "Oh, Christ, he said Jesus, Joseph and fucking Mary" (5). That made narrator's mother upset. As Somiinick states about repressed and suppressed feeling of the people that results negative impact that we can see in narrator's father who is the representative of that past which Carey picks in his novel.

Act of narrating the events of the past in the present form is a root issue of this postmodern genre, historiogrpahic metafiction. Carey presents the narrator as a character of the past story that says, “I would not have been born. There would be no story to tell" (6). He drops the fictive elements that the narrator is known that he is telling the story and a character of the novel. If all these situations weren't there, the novelist would not invent the narrator and tell the story. With these fictive elements he puts forward the historical character, father of Oscar, "Theophilus Hopkins was a moderately famous man. You can look him up in the 1860s *Britannica.* There are three full columns about his corals and his corallines, his anemones and starfish" (6). Carey mixes the fictional and historical material together that proves the novel Oscar and Lucinda a nice historiogrpahic metafiction.

Carey presents together both women; one fictional character, Lucinda and the other historical character George Elliot and makes them interact:

> And it was this, this turbulent, often angry sense of her own power that was most responsible for her being lonely in London. Even George Eliot, no matter what her fiction might suggest, was used to young ladies who lowered their eyes in difference to her own. Lucinda didn't do so [. . .] that made her seem so alien. And when she did, at last, lower her eyes, her lids were heavy and sensuous. (202)

This is a subversion of the image of the canonical Victorian writer. The contemporary Australian reader feels doubly smug: about her own politically correct attitude on the issue of women's rights and about the implicit moral superiority of the Australian heroin over the British Icon. But the smugness is punctured alter in the narrative when Carey's subversion spills out of the classical postcolonial bounds and challenges conventional reading practices by using the postmodern practices in his novel.

Thus, Carey uses the double code that on the one hand, he interacts or makes when interact between fictional and historical character, which is possible only in metafiction, and on the other hand, he challenges the conventional reading of novel by subverting the classical canon.

Peter Carey borrows several elements from the Victorian novel, including a thematic preoccupation with Orphans inheritance gambling but he makes these themes undergo a shift in meaning. Jach Anthoni supports the ideas of Carey and style and adds something, "In Victorian novels the orphans symbolize rootlessnes and search for identity of a time when society was undergoing profound changes. The father figure represents the law and reality. If he is absent or lacking then the orphan has difficulty fitting in and has to found his own values" (29). Introducing Lucinda and Oscar as well as Miriam who have lost their parents the narrator narrates:

> Our history is a history of orphans, or so my mother liked to say. She used the word in a sense both literal and sentimental. She didn't mean it in the sense that it is true for the nation as a whole, but only as it applied to the three corners of the family history, to Oscar, to Lucinda, to Miriam Chadwick, who lost her mother when the Grafton was wrecked crossing the bar at Bellingen Heads. (395)

By giving the chapter's title 'Orphans', Carey supplies Hutcheon's irony to indicate that the history of Australia is history of orphans that is why all the white settlers are orphans who lost or left their parents and guardians in Britain. Presenting three major characters of novel: Oscar, Lucinda and Miriam as orphans who lost their parents and they are being rootless and searching identity for their better future. Carey speaks through the voice of narrator who wants to rewrite the family history because of official version was oppressive and suppressive version. The narrator's rewriting of

the history symbolizes the act of revisiting the political history of past and fetching some unexplored, unpresentable issues of colonial Australia.

Tropes are applied in *Oscar and Lucinda* with Australian similes. Carey uses t Hayden White's tropes and his own country's similes to make the novel more powerful, strong and postmodern. He uses – black umbrellas hang from a stand "like flying foxes" (194), Oscar dances, "A brolga" (377), and he also uses Australian terms like "chooks" (272) instead of 'chickens' and makes reference to the bicentennial celebrations in Sydney at the end of the 1980s through a mentioning of "tall-masted ships" (295) at anchor in Sydney Harbor. These references underline the common experience of the narrator and the implied reader, thereby establishing an implicit bond between the writer and reader to suggest that his story is a quintessentially Australian story, which corresponds postcolonial approach.

The novel lifts issue of second world colonialism. *Oscar and Lucinda* is a contemporary novel that addresses contemporary Australian preoccupations. This perspective is regularly underlined and anachronism and geographical references that are displaced from the English center to the Australian periphery. For example, the narrator compares Theophilus Hopkins description of Devon as "almost tropical" (26) to an Australian "referring to a certain part of Melbourne at the Paris end of Collins Street" (26). Writing of the novel disagrees with Anglo- centric view, 'When I visit Demon I see nothing tropical. I am surprised, rather, that so small a country can contain so vast and indifferent sky. Demon seems cruel and cold [. . .] on the moor and think of ignorance and poverty, and cold, always the cold" (28). The otherness here is not a characteristic of ex-colony but of colonizing England itself.

The confrontation between imperial (British) and settler (white Australian) society is more complex and allows for greater subtlety. 'Oscar and Lucinda's double

roles as destroyers and victims area an indicate of this fact. Despite the ultimate outcome, there are different attitudes to the aborigines, and these do matter. Lucinda is actually aware of the Aboriginal presence and suffers from sense of guilt.

Peter Carey criticizes the misbehavior and crudity as well as hypocrisy but the targets of the criticism are seen as typical Victorian features: rigid sexual morality, religious hypocrisy, smugness prudery, intolerance, a high pressure to conform. We weep for and rage against the treatment metted out to Oscar and Lucinda. In fact, the novel includes most of the features of history and textuality opposing oral to written formulations but does so by inhabiting the absences or the oppositional positions in the imperial textual records. History is also made from the edge of society. It is not only a planned transfer of mid-Victorian society's vision of itself. It is not difficult to locate the gasp, coincidence, misunderstanding and accidents, which propel the story forward. The religious spectrum of mid-Victorian society is carefully outlined from the evangelical movements of the Rechabites and Plymouth Brethren, through the high, broad, and low factions of the Church of England to Puseyism and Anglo Catholicism. The exploitation and mismanagement of the church are the main butts of the satire of the novel. Oscar is carefully situated in this spectrum moving from the extreme fringe of the plymouth Brethren into the church of England without shedding his extreme fundamentalist beliefs.

It quickly becomes obvious of that postmodern coincidence; Carey uses postmodern devices as long as they are useful to his purpose, which is a revaluation of aspects of the history of Australia settlement. Carey projects attention and resists the political and cultural situation. He does it some mainly by remaining or recreating a version of Australia that compels our attention, forces us to accede to a recognition that the center of literature is language and language dwells in the world at large.

Carey, in effect, dismantles the center/periphery opposition of imperial culture. He, establishes the groundwork for a new sense of Australian identity, and at a time assets that Australia may be establishing it self politically as a republic.

Carey's postcolonial and postmodern sense of newness and of beginnings account for his penchant for apocalyptic endings. The novel *Oscar and Lucinda* ends with astonishing images of catastrophe: a glass Church breaking up and sinking into a bay, a series of dynamite expositions touching off underground petrol tanks. As a novelist of eschatology, Carey is prophesying an end, which is a beginning. The lyricism of his prose, the mad enchantment of his characterizations, the fierceness of his will to create express the recovery of an ancient artistic purpose: shaping role of the nationalist writer. Insofar as Australia is a relatively new country, positioned culturally and politically in a gap between British heritage and American hegemony, there remains the possibility of a writer, or group of writers, effecting a change or crystallization in the consciousness of the Australians. In Carey's work disjunctiveness of postmodernism coincides with his sense of the historical displacement of a colonialism, the continuing influence of the past-the postcolonial condition which is transformed into a vision of the future --Australia as the postmodern society. Thus, in his work the postmodern is the postcolonial and 'Australian literature' comes to occupy a space of its own.

The self constructs in past as a fictional story of *Oscar and Lucinda*. Describing now anger dominated Lucinda's mother's life after the death of her husband, the narrator proceeds to explain that Lucinda.

> [. . .] didn't know her mother well. This was not what she imagined. All her life she dusted and polished the fiction she had made as a child: that they were 'intimates' like sisters. In her memory there was always

> laughing and hair brushing, and tickling and cudding [. . .]. All these things really happened, but if they were remembered so vividly it was because anxiety and bad temper had been far more common. (73)

Lucinda fabricates a close, loving relationship with her mother and though this construction is not representative of the truth, it provides her more comfort than the reality of the relationship. Lucinda remembers only the pleasant memories with her mother and assembles them into a cohesive narrative. Attributing this ordering to her memory, the narrator implies that the mind naturally creates this fiction as a coping mechanism. Explicating his belief in the constructed past, Carey, in an interview, asserts that human beings absolutely invent themselves.

The novelist consciously plays with the reader to exemplify the human desire to believe in stories that Graham Swift's hero Crick discusses in *Waterland*, the novels, *Waterland* and *Oscar and Lucinda* have very similar features. Beginning the story by calling Oscar his "great-grandfather" (`1), the narrator implies that he exists because Oscar had sexual intercourse with someone, (We believe that Oscar had intercourse with Lucinda in the beginning but not), thereby producing the grandparents. here the narrator as the a postmodern metafictional histiographer defer the expection of readers Naming the novel *Oscar and Lucinda* and dedicating the plot equally to Oscar’s and Lucinda’s development, Carey leads the reader to believe that Oscar and Lucinda end up having a sexual relationship. Furthermore, Carey's narrator prefaces Oscar's and Lucinda's first encounter by telling the reader, "In order to that I exist, two gamblers, one obsessive, the other compulsive, must meet" (187). Although this statement implies that Oscar and Lucinda have sex, the text never explicitly asserts this relationship, the reader chooses to make this connection because the

reader wants to believe the story. Carey knows the readers desire to believe and plays on their desire as a self- reflective narrator.

The narrator introduces Miriam earlier in the novel but does not call her his "great-grandmother" (422) until Oscar and Miriam meet. Entitling the next chapter, which begins after Oscar and Miriam have sex, "Oscar and Miriam" (422), Carey plays on then novel's title *Oscar and Lucinda* that originally led the reader to believe in their future sexual relationship. Carey constructs his novel so that the reader becomes a living example of the human desire to believe and find meaning in stories.

Carey introduces and involves science and technology, which is the most important innovation of this era taking and talking in foundation from nineteenth century knitting it with women's liberation and freedom of choice. He presents Elizabeth Leplastrier, mother of Lucinda whose impacts we can see on her, as a pillar of revolt against traditional values and norms. She challenges the ancient concept of people and demonstrates her choice of freedom on industries, which is a bold feature of metafictional historiography. The narrator states:

> She didn't care for farming. Farming was her husband's concern. He was a soil scientist but secretly romantic. It was he who had such dreams of country life and she who was careful not to pry into the wells from which these desires sprang lest she find [. . .] she had seen industrialization as the great hope for women. The very factories, which the aesthetes and romantics so abhorred would, one day soon, provide her sex with the economic basis of their freedom. (83)

Lucinda inherits her mother's qualities that shape her longing to buy factory of glass and wants to make glass church, a symbol of liberation and bring it to out of her town to another countryside.

Carey presents her as a bold woman who want to change the society and show the effort of women on the one hand, and he on the other hand, he introduces socio-economic condition of Australia, and the country is getting developed with new innovations of industrialization of the nation. Carey explores the new but hidden progression of the nation by revisiting the past, rewriting new history and introducing the interest of women in Australia in the field of industry which were unexplored during writing the Australian official history neglecting such issues, Carey puts forward all these issues.

The narrator presents Oscar as a creative character who wants to strongly condemn the uncreative work thinking that life should be passed at, slow and meaningless manner. Oscar revolts against tyranny of his father who wants to make him pure Anglican by pouring the false statements. Theophilus was warned not to test the pudding but Oscar tests it that made his father angry: "Theophilus acted as if his son were poisoned. He bought him to the scullery and made him drink salt water[. . .] Oscar gagged and struggled. His father's eyes were wild" (11). Oscar's struggle does not work, he compels to drink salt water until he vomits, then only his father throws the remained of pudding into the fire:

> Oscar had never been hit before. He could not bear it.
>
> His father made speech. Oscar didn't believe it.
>
> His father said the pudding was the fruit of Satan.
>
> But Oscar had tasted the pudding. It did not taste like the fruit of Satan. (12)

Carey's treatment of the false instruction that makes Oscar revolutionary. Oscar believes those things, which are scientifically proved. He begins to doubt everything after the taste of pudding which was called a fruit of Satan but it was not so. After

having it, his father made him fool by forcing him to drink salt water until he vomited that reflects the falsity of Anglican religion.

The narrator presents the parodic scene by describing the way of Oscar praying.

> The boy was standing at a kink in the path at the top of the combe with two spilling, brimming buckets hanging from the ends of his long pale wrist. He was praying that his papa wouldn't die [. . .]. He had a pain pushing down his thigh, in his calf too. It pulsed in his left buttock and left testicle. (20-21)

By exaggerating of the writing style of writer and his mocking to Anglican Church and the Oscar, Carey drops irony to the religion and nineteenth century priest's way of teaching.

By taking the reference of Aborigines and Christianity, Carey places injustice against Aborigines in Christian context of guilt and vengeance. Elizabeth, Lucinda's mother, fearing that has been implicated in "something terribly wrong" (89) and Lucinda wants to rid of "the great guilty weight of her inheritance" (457), fortune acquired from the blood of the blacks'. Postmodernist uncertainties do not operate within the novel where aborigines are concerned. There is no space for other, equally valid ways of telling the story of their death and dispossession. Oscar tells the explorer Jeffries who kills aborigines who get in his way, that if that were his country, he would be feared to see his coming and pray to god to forgive him.

Oscar's vengeance is recounted in biblical terms: "He prayed: Oh God, give me the means to smite the enemy:" (487), and, an axe being to hand, he uses it. Percy Smith, a gentle, kind Christian who begins the assault with a tomahawk, is confident that in the circumstances god will forgive their violence. "We have killed an evil man

[. . .]It has done me a power of good, I can't tell you" (494). The narrator here wants to clarify that for Christian it allows anyone who doesn't follow the same religion or they neglect the behaviour of them that is a false and cruel act of colonizers. Not only Percy Smith but also Oscar himself killed the aborigines. The aboriginal woman whom the cedor cutters abducted and raped.

These all events and incidents prove that there was extremely double exploitation upon aborigines, both white settlers and Britishers during the period of colonization of Australian. Britishers but situation of Kumbaingiri, Black aborigines and Australian exploited the white settlers, tribes was worse:

> The old blacks' camp consisted of seven weather board huts, built in a row. They were constructed after the style of the so-called 'shelter sheds' which are still the feature of school playgrounds around Australia. They were black places, each with a single 'room', a single door, three steps, one window. In these huts the surviving members of the Kumbaingiri tribe, lived and died. (474)

Carey has portrayed such a picture of the colonial Australia. He reconstructs the history of Australia and miserable condition of Australian aborigines. The novel concerns the British colonization of Australia and destruction of the aborigines. Oscar's way to Australia is full of coincidences, misunderstandings, ignorance, accidents and an innocence amounting to blindness, and it achieved nothing except his own destruction and a large amount of suffering to others, particularly the aborigines.

Postmodern historiographic strategies are dominant in Carey's fiction *Oscar and Lucinda* that makes it as an account of historiographic metaficiton. In portraying characters in crisis over their belief system, Peter Carey, like Graham Swift's

Waterland and A.S. Byatt's *Possessions*, treats the Victorian past. Although, he becomes an Anglican minister, he is a compulsive gambler, which further complicates his faith. In referring to the past, the novel has a particular way of treating metanarrative, varying from the traditional to the aggressively postmodern. In the novel, Carey's narrative strategy casts an illuminating light onto crises of knowledge, Victorian and postmodern alike.

Throughout *Oscar and Lucinda*, Oscar is driven to the point of near paralysis by his conflicting views about religion. His hopscotch – like board with various symbols, "a structure for divining the true will of God" (31), dictates that he must live in an Anglican household, creating a foreseeable rift with his father, a minister of plymouth Brethren. As Oscar sees it, God continues to step in and determine his fate in the form of other equally random means of assertion. One flip of a coin tells him to go to New South Wales" and other to take a job "at Lucinda's glasswork" (338). Yet he feels the presence of God so strongly in his life:

> Our whole faith is a wager, miss Leplast rier. We bet-it is all in Pascal and very wise it is too [. . .]. We bet there a God we bet our life on it. We calculate the odds, the return, that we shall sit with the saints in paradise. Our anxiety about our bet will make us before dawn in a cold sweet we are out of bed and on our knees, even in the midst of winter. And God sees us, and sees us suffer. (262)

Oscar consciously commits sinful acts: he gambles obsessively and has pre-marital sex. Understandably, Oscar's inability to stop gambling is the source of much anxiety and neurosis throughout the novel, for both himself and his friends.

For anonymous narrator, God and the past seem to serve the same purpose; that is, Oscar's crisis is only crucial in its role in the narrator's lineage. Carey goes on

describing other necessary aspects of Oscar and Lucinda's meeting.' The carrying of a prayer book, the propulsion of the compulsive from a doorway, and the ventilation system of a ship-elements which, like the novel's title, are meant to mislead the reader into thinking that Oscar and Lucinda are the narrator's grandparents. Cary's *coup ade theater* (French phrase) is that the narrator's grandmother is not in fact Lucinda, but Miriam,l who is introduced in the novel's penultimate moments. Oscar loves Lucinda as he announces: "I love Lucinda Leplastrier" (508), but copulates with Miriam:

> It had been three in the morning. He had come out to draw more water and had found her there, in her Chinese gown. His Penis was a hard rod against the softness of her stomach. He felt Satan take his soul like an overripe peach with a yielding stalk. He kissed her dear, soft lips. He nuzzled her long white neck. He touched and broke away, touched and broke away, moaned and begged his God's forgiveness while the clock in the kitchen struck the hour. (136)

He does all these thing first and begs for God's forgiveness, sometimes he thinks that "there is no God" (438), shortly before he disappears into the water forever in attempting to float downriver the glass church he and Lucinda have built.

Lucinda has a profound impact on Oscar's life, and his interaction with her did ensure that the narrator would meet Miriam. This fact leads us to realize that so virtually all of his encounters with everyone he ever met brought about the future in which his great-grandson would be telling his story. In portraying Lucinda, who is not the narrator's grandmother, as a primary component of the narrator's genealogy, Carey shows the irony of construction of history as the product of seemingly corresponding causes and effects. His novel shows that even those events we cannot label as important from a historical vantage – point have major impact. *Oscar and Lucinda,*

thus challenges the convention of taking history as the product of seemingly cut-and-dried causes and effects and history as the collection of objective facts.

Carey questions the idea of a supposedly neutral historical perspective. While the narrator consciously spins a tale that makes us think Lucinda is his great-grandmother, he also drops hints throughout the novel that she is not, such as his early mention of Miriam. By the time Miriam's status as great-grandmother is made clear, we realize how we have distorted the past in order to secure the stability of what we misidentify as future truths. In so doing, we come to grips with our tendency – our needs even to shape history into an essentially unrejectable narrative for the purpose of supporting our present condition.

History as metanarative is challenged by the very story that the narrator tells. The nameless descendent of Oscar recounts the life and times of his ancestors and though they were documented knowledge, yet his story is constituted by events and emotions of whose occurrence he could never possibly know. The novel, then, is essentially fabricated entirely of the what – if, calling attention to the construction of the narrator as an informed source. J.F. Lyotard, in *The Postmodern Condition,* observes that challenges the legitimacy of historical narrative begs the questions, "How do you prove the truth" or, more generally, 'who decides the conditions of the truth?" (29). This project mirrors that of *Oscar and Lucinda*, which itself demands with us, how do you know if what I'm saying could or could not have happened?' Carey presents history as a construct and questions the reliability of the historian as well, further distinguishing his narrative strategy as postmodern.

Carey, about the end of the novel, presents the male protagonist of the novel who is going to drawn into the deep blue ocean with glass church, consciously reflecting his sinful acts that makes him uneasy while dying, the narrator describes the

sinful acts Oscar has committed and demonstrates the condition of Oscar that how he is praying with god:

> He begged God forgive him for the murder of the blacks which he, through his vanity, had brought about.
>
> He begged God forgive him for the death of Stratton.
>
> He begged God forgive him for the murder of Mr. Jeffris.
>
> He begged God forgive him for the seduction of Mrs. Chadwick.
>
> He begged God forgive him his complacey, his pride, his willful ignorance. But even as he prayed he felt himself polluted almost beyond redemption. (518)

The narrator narrates the pathetic condition of Oscar. With Oscar, Carey plays and presents the postmodern pastiches in his novel. Oscar is interpreting his all past activities and begging forgiveness from God. Oscar describes all the past events consciously in the novel. This act of interpreting the events consciously makes the novel postmodern historiography.

Carey, in the novel, mixes interwar historical characters with fictional ones, further problematizing the opposition between the real historical and fictional. The narrator tells us, "you can look up [Theophilus Hopkins, Oscar's father] in the 1860s *Britannica*" (6). Lucinda's mother "is that person Carlyle refers to in his correspondence as the factory" (83). Carey goes beyond a mere one –sentence mention to a non-fictional character in his discussion of George Eliot, whom Lucinda thinks "is a snob" (202-5). He tells us that she does not approve of Lucinda's backside. Nothing Carey has written about Eliot or Carlyle contradicts any historical record, thus we are left with the question of how to determine 'which version of history is to be regarded as the official account? The present research answers;

narrating in the present events of the past, it is all subjective. Any and all histories are possible.

IV. Conclusion

The objective of this research is to portray the unnamed narrator, great-grandson of nineteenth century Anglican priest Oscar, as a postmodern metafictional historiographer who narrates the events and (his)tories of Victorian era mixing the historical facts and coincidences with fictive colours during the period of British colonization in Australia.

Peter Carey makes the narrator narrate the stories and histories of colonial Australia picking a male protagonist of England Oscar and female protagonist of Australia, Lucinda who meet at harbor, bet, fall in love and destroy themselves physically and mentally by reflecting the situations of white settlers and aborigines in Australia and missionaries of England in the most acclaimed novel *Oscar and Lucinda* (1988). Oscar's way of Australia is a full of misunderstandings, ignorance, accidents, distancing and an amount of blindness who achieves nothing except his own destruction and a large amount of suffering to others especially aborigines of Australia.

Past events are captured in histories, which are based on facts. If they are not interpreted, there is problem of their existence so the historians interpret the past events polishing with fictive colours by using their imagination to create metafictional historiography. Interaction between fictional characters, Oscar and Lucinda with historical characters like George Eliot, Carlyle and Theophilus Hopkins is possible only in historiograhic metafiction like *Oscar and Lucinda*.

The narrator of the novel is completely dissatisfied with his/her mother's oppressive version of family history which makes him rewrite the family history and at the same time national history with new and noble ideas of his imagination fetching some historical facts of the past events to give strange and mostly actual taste of the

history to the present readers. While narrating (his)tories the narrator uses irony and parody to make the novel live and present the documents which are unpresentable. The narrator attempts his best to interpret the history of Australia by revisiting the past events of the histories.

The act of narrating the events of past in present is a sole issue of histriographic metafiction that we find in the present novel *Oscar and Lucinda* (like *Ragtime* and *Shame*). The narrator consciously narrates the stories. He thinks that he is just telling the sorties and histories of past events adding some colourful materials. The narrator wants to the unsaid. While talking about the nature of metafiction, it requires self-reflexive narrative representation.

Thus, Carey believes that interpretation of the events saves and shapes the history. Answering the question about truth, he opines that it is in plural forms; there are 'truths' not only 'Truth'. Narrative representation, self-reflexive narration, parody, and interpretation of the past events in present are dominant features of postmodern fiction which are found in Peter Carey's prestigious Booker prize wining nove*l Oscar and Lucinda*, So, this present research comes to conclusion that the novel *Oscar and Lucinda* is a good example of postmodern metafictional historiography and the unnamed narrator of the novel who consciously reflects the situation of colonial Austria, self and narrates the stories of the Victorian people postmodern metafictional historiographer.

Works Cited

Ackroyd, Peter. *Chatterton*. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1987.

Ashcroft, Bill. Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. Eds. *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Postcolonial Literature*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 202.

Carey, Peter. *Bliss*. London; Picador, 1981.

- - -. *Illywhacker*. St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1985.

- - - .*Oscar and Lucinda*. London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1988.

Collingwood, R.G. *The Idea of History*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946.

Doctorow, E.L. *Ragtime*. New York: Random House, 1975.

Foucault, Michael. *The History of Sexuality.: An Introduction* ,Trans. Robert Hurley Vol.1. New York: Vintage,1980.

Gaarder, Jostein. *Sophie's World*. New York: Berkley Books, 1996.

Gosse, Edmund. *Father and Son.* London: Penguin Books, 1986.

Graeme, Turner. "Nationalizing the Author." *Australian Literary Studies* 16.2 (1991): 91-96.

Hutcheon, Linda. “Circling the Dawbspout of Empire”. *The Postcolonial StudiesReader*. Eds.Bill Ashorft,Gareth Griffiths, and HelenTiffin. London and New York: Routledge, 1995.

- - - . *Irony's Edge*. London: Routledge, 1994.

- - - . *The Poetics of Postmodernism*. New York: Routledge, 1988.

- - - . *The Politics of Postmodernism*. New York: Routledge, 1994.

Jach, Antoni. "An Interview with Peter Carey" *Mattoid* 31.2 (1988): 24-36.

LaCapra, Dorminick. *History and Criticism.* New York: Cornell University Pres, 1985.

- - - . *History in Transit: Experience, Identity, Critical Theory.* Cornell University Press, 2004.

- - -. *Rethinking Intellectual History: Texts, Context, Language,* Ithaca. New York: Cornell University Press, 1983.

Lukacs, George. *The Historical Novel.* Trans. Hannah and Stanley Mitchell, London: Merlin, 1962.

Lyotard, T.F. "From Answering the Question: What is Postmodernism?" *The Postmodern Condition.* Trans. R. Durand, Manchester University Press,(1984) 71-82.

- - - . *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge.* Trans. Geoff Bennington and Brain Massumi, University of Minnesota Press, 1984.

McHale Brain. *Postmodernist Fiction.* London and New York: Methuen, 1987.

Myers, S.G. *The New Historicism in Literary Study* 27 April 2006,1989.

Peterse, K.H. “Gambling on Reality”. *Australian Literary Studies* 15 (1991): 107-16.

- - - . Interview with Peter Carey. *Morning Hobart*, 19 March 1998.

Roa, Bastos, Augusto. *I The Supreme.* Trans. New York: Aventura, 1986.

Rushdie, Salman. *Midnight's Children.* London: Picador, 1981.

- - - . *Shame.* London: Picador, 1983.

Ruth, Brown. "English Heritage and Australian Culture." *Australian Literary Society* 17.2 (Oct. 95): 113-14.

Said, Edward. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Knopf, 1993.

Siska, William. "Metacinema: A Modern Necessity." *Literature/Film Quarterly* 7.1 (2001): 285-9.

Swift, Graham. *Waterland.* London: Heinemann, 1983.

Tahbildar, Bernali. "Glass and Water: Love and Sexuality in Oscar and Lucinda and Waterland." *English* 97.2 (1997): 27.

Wachtel, Eleanor. “We Can Really Make Ourselves Up: An Interview with Peter Carey.” *Australian and New Zealand Studies in Canada* 9 (1993): 103-5.

Hayden, White. “The Historical Text as Literary Artifact.” Eds. Hazard Adam. *Critical Theory Since 1965*. Florida: University Press of Florida, 1986.

- - - . *Tropics of Discourse: Essay in Cultural Criticism.* Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978.

- - - . *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth Century Europe.* Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1993.

- - - . *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation.* Baltimore: John Hopkins University Pres, 1973.