Fictions of Empire and the Making of Imperialist Mentalities: Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Criticism as a Paradigm for Intercultural Studies

Vera Nünning & Ansgar Nünning

> More than any other, the Age of Empire cries out for demystification, just because we - and that includes the historians - are no longer in it, but do not know how much of it is still in us.
> (E. J. Hobsbawm)
>
> For fictions have their own logic and their own dialectic of growth or decline.
> (Edward Said)

1. Introduction: on the continuity of the imperial past in the present

The Age of Empire lies in the past, but its ambivalent heritage is still very much with us. The British Empire, like the colonial empires of the other European powers, came to an end when independence was granted to previously colonised countries. But colonialism and imperialism have left behind many social and political problems, and many of the values, preconceptions, and cultural stereotypes associated with the imperial world-view have been bequeathed to us. The reasons for this are not hard to determine. A plethora of books dealing with the British imperial experience as well as television, films, and the resources of other media heavily contributed to preserving the glories of the imperial past in Britain's cultural memory and to constructing highly standardized images by means of which the British Empire continues to be viewed. Moreover, a host of novels, plays, and poems[1], many of which reflect a persistent imperial world-view, testify both to the fascination that the British Empire still has for authors and to the great importance that the imperial heritage continues to have for the way Britain sees itself. It is largely due to culture that the perceptual and ideological fictions that form the conceptual matrix of imperialism live on as an integral part of what has been called 'collective memory and cultural identity'.[2] Referring to popular boys' adventure stories, Susan Bassnett recently pointed out that "the values of those stories, however we may wish to repudiate them on the grounds of racism, sexism and xenophobia generally, are encoded into our thought patterns".[3] This has, of course, nothing to do with a peoples' genes, but is the result of the discursive practices of cultural transmission.

One way of approaching the demystification of the Age of Empire is to take a revisionist look at the role that literary fictions have played in nurturing "the sentiment, rationale, and above all the imagination of empire" and in helping to create "imperialism's consolidating vision".[4] The essays in this issue try to explore the relationship between literature and the complex process that Mangan has felicitously called "making imperial mentalities".[5] The contributors look at the works of such authors as Tennyson, Rider Haggard, Kipling, Conrad, and Forster as examples of colonial discourse so as to shed light on the making of imperialist mentalities.

Since the articles are concerned with different works of fiction or poetry and with particular myths and metaphors of British imperialism, this introduction will attempt to outline the approach that informs and unites the different contributions, pursuing the goals of providing a general overview of the topic, exploring the connection between literature and imperialism, and giving a short overview of the essays. Section 2 will provide a brief discussion of post-colonial criticism and its impact on revisionist accounts of colonial discourse. Section 3 will be devoted to a preliminary explanation of the meanings of the term 'fictions of empire', i.e. of the ambiguous subtitle of this volume. Section 4 will then mainly deal with the relationship between culture and imperialism, and the creative role that works of fiction can play in the construction of the ideological fictions of imperialism. Section 5 discusses six of the main functions that both literary and conceptual fictions can fulfill with regard to the making of imperialist mentalities. A short overview of the essays in the volume will be given in section 6, and section 7 will conclude the introduction by offering some suggestions for dealing with the topic of fictions of empire in the upper grades of secondary schools.

2. What is Intercultural Studies? A revisionist look at colonial discourse from the point of view of post-colonial criticism

The above epigraphs, taken from E.J. Hobsbawm's all-encompassing study *The Age of Empire* and from Edward Said's seminal work *Orientalism*, reflect some of the issues that are of crucial importance for anyone trying to come to grips with the Age of Empire and the logic of the fictions which provided the ideological backbone of British imperialism. If one agrees with Hobsbawm and Said that "the Age of Empire cries out for demystification" and that "fictions have their own logic and their own dialectic of growth or decline"[6], one is faced with the question of how such a revisionist project of exploring and demystifying the fictions of British imperialism is to be undertaken.

The title of this introduction indicates the approach that the contributors to this volume have adopted in order to suggest possible answers to the question. The articles not only provide a reassessment, from the point of view of

post-colonial criticism, of some of the most influential literary fictions that deal with the British Empire, but they also try to illuminate the role these works have played in the making of imperialist mentalities. They try to show how novels, poetry, and a wide range of other genres came to the service of creating Victorian England's imperialist view of the world. The essays thus attempt to demystify what Andrea White has poignantly called "the energizing myth of English imperialism", which, she argues, was "the culture's dominant fiction".[7] By focussing on the relationship between culture and imperialism, they also chart the dialectic of growth and decline that the fictions of empire have had since the heyday of British imperialism in the late nineteenth century.

Rather than attempting to contribute to the ongoing theoretical discussions about those recent developments in the humanities that have come to be subsumed under the label of 'cultural studies', the essays will try to illustrate how one can actually 'do' intercultural studies. Taking the British Empire and the fictions that are associated with it as their historical and literary paradigm, the contributors offer concrete and practical answers to the question raised on the title page of the *Times Literary Supplement* of May 27,1994: "What is Cultural Studies?" This headline testifies to the popularity that the approaches subsumed under the label of cultural studies currently enjoy, but the fact that it is couched in the form of a question draws attention to the many theoretical and methodological problems of cultural studies which have yet to be resolved.

We will suggest an approach to doing intercultural studies within a multi- or cross-disciplinary framework.[8] In doing this, we will take up a suggestion made by Lynn Hunt in her introduction to a collection of articles on *The New Cultural History*. Hunt argues that "the more cultural historical studies become and the more historical cultural studies become, the better for both".[9] Similarly, it can be argued that what is needed for coming to grips with the complex relationship between literary fictions on the one hand and the making of imperial mentalities, the invention of traditions, and the constitution of a nation's cultural heritage on the other is a cross-disciplinary approach to cultural studies. Proceeding from the epistemological premises of radical constructivism, such an approach incorporates the anti-mimetic view of the relationship between literary texts and their extra-literary contexts, something which poststructuralism and the New Historicism have both argued for. Such a view rests on the assumption that, instead of conceiving of culture and imperialism as two distinct entities, it is more profitable to explore the ways in which literature as well as other media and the imperial project mutually influenced and reinforced one another. Moreover, the approach adopted is cross-disciplinary in orientation in that it draws on both the theoretical framework of the history of mentalities and the insights of post-colonial criticism.

One of the main goals of the volume is to explore those peculiarities of colonial discourse that are characteristic of British imperialism. Following Michael Titzmann, the term 'discourse' can be defined as a system of thought, feeling, and argument that is characterized by three features: a specific topic or subject-matter, regularities of speech, and interdiscursive relations to other discourses.[10] Colonial discourse can thus be defined as the set of codes, stereotypes, and vocabulary employed whenever the relationship between a colonial power and its colonies is written or spoken about.[11] An analysis of colonial discourse must therefore look at "the variety of textual forms in which the West produced and codified knowledge about non-metropolitan areas and cultures, especially those under colonial control".[12] Since any attempt at drawing up an encompassing and systematic inventory of the features of colonial discourse would be doomed to failure, this volume focusses on some of its most important features and on literary manifestations of the imperial idea.

As anyone familiar with current developments in literary theory will know, the approach outlined would be inconceivable without the insights provided by post-colonial criticism.[13] This takes in a number of theoretical and critical approaches used to explore both the complex relationship between culture and colonialism and imperialism's ambivalent heritage. They focus either on the cultural products of the former colonies of the European empires or on the problems inherent in imperialist views and representations of the colonies and their relationship to their mother countries. Both varieties of post-colonial criticism offer revisionist counter-narratives to the tradition of European imperial narratives. The roots of post-colonial criticism, or colonial discourse theory and analysis, as it is sometimes called, go back to the important work of Frantz Fanon and to Michel Foucault's work on the history of systems of thought, which has drawn attention to the fact that knowledge and power are articulated in discursive practices. Among the leading practitioners and theorists of post-colonial criticism at present are such well-known scholars as Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak and Homi K. Bhabha, but Edward Said is often regarded as its founding-father: "It is perhaps no exaggeration to say that Edward Said's *Orientalism*, published in 1978, single-handedly inaugurates a new area of academic inquiry: colonial discourse, also referred to as colonial discourse theory or colonial discourse analysis."[14] In this seminal study, which established a revisionist way of looking at the roots of imperialism in European culture and which has become one of the canonical texts of both post-colonial criticism and cultural studies, Said gives an overview of European representations of and attitudes towards the Middle East. Fie tries to reconstruct how a particular mind-set shaped not only Western conceptions of the Orient but also a tradition of academic study of the Orient. Adopting the approach inaugurated by Said and taken up by other practitioners of post-colonial criticism, the essays in this issue take a revisionist look at colonial dis-

course in order to explore the role that fictions of empire have played in the making of imperialist mentalities.

3. The fictions of empire and the empires of fiction

The subtitle of this volume is *Fictions of Empire*, and one might begin by explaining what that phrase can mean. According to one of the standard works on the subject, "Empire is a relationship, formal or informal, in which one state controls the effective political sovereignty of another political society".[15] Although the meaning of the word 'empire' is as clear as its reference, in the present context, to Britain's overseas colonies or 'possessions', as they were often called, the British Empire's "diverse character" needs to be stressed. The empire was, as John M. MacKenzie has emphasized, "at least four separate entities. It was the territories of settlement [...]. It was India [...]. It was a string of islands and staging posts, a combination of seventeenth-century sugar colonies and the spoils of wars with European rivals, China and other non-European cultures. And finally, Empire was the 'dependent' territories acquired largely in the last decades of the nineteenth century".[16]

In contrast to the word 'empire', 'fiction' is an ambiguous term which can easily generate confusion. As the *Oxford English Dictionary* shows, the word 'fiction' has quite different meanings. On the one hand, the word can designate "[t]hat which, or something that, is imaginatively invented" or, more specifically, w[t]he species of literature which is concerned with the narration of imaginary events and the portraiture of imaginary characters", viz. "[a] work of fiction; a novel or tale".[17] On the other hand, 'fiction' refers to any "supposition known to be at variance with fact, but conventionally accepted for some reason of practical convenience, conformity with traditional usage, decorum, or the like".[18] In this latter sense, fictions are used in Law, for instance, with the fiction that a corporation is a person separate from its members being a case in point. Such legal fictions are theoretical constructs or rules that assume something as true that is clearly false or at variance with fact.

The subtitle of the volume is deliberately ambiguous in that it self-consciously alludes to the double meaning of 'fiction': "the meaning of 'fiction' as literary, nonreferential narrative and its meaning (often [...] in its plural form) as theoretical construct".[19] This double meaning is essential for the questions that the articles try to answer in that they are concerned with the interplay between works of fiction that deal with the British Empire and those theoretical and ideological constructs which constituted the imperial idea.

First, then, the phrase 'fictions of empire' simply refers to those literary narratives that focus on the British Empire. Nineteenth-century travel writing, the

adventure fiction of such authors as Frederick Marryat, Robert Ballantyne, G.A. Henty and H. Rider Haggard, Kipling's stories and poems, and Conrad's novels constructed not only the imperial subject, but also immensely popular and influential fictional models of imperialism and of the empire.[20] The articles in this volume are concerned with a number of such particularly literary fictions that deal with the experience of the empire. But such a limited definition does not adequately account for the complexity of the issues involved in the relationship between culture and imperialism. In a broader sense, the subtitle of this volume refers to the diversity of theoretical and ideological constructs which the colonial discourse projected. These constructs can be called fictions because they were clearly at variance with fact.

Such conceptual and ideological fictions can be defined as recurring images of the empire, of the imperialist, of what he regarded as his mission, and of the colonized, the 'Other'. Such fictions consist of predispositions, biases, values, and epistemological habits which provide both agreed-upon codes of understanding and cultural traditions of looking at the world. In their entirety these fictions constitute that culturally sanctioned system of ideas, beliefs, presuppositions, and convictions which constitutes imperialist mentalities. Such ideological fictions are closely connected with literary fictions because they find their most succinct expression in conventional plotlines, myths, and metaphors that support and legitimize the imperial project.

It is this second meaning of fiction that Said has in mind when he calls Orientalism a "system of ideological fictions" and when he equates that phrase with such terms as "a body of ideas, beliefs, clichés, or learning", "systems of thought", "discourses of power", and with Blake's famous "mind-forg'd manacles".[21] Moreover, since the "scope of Orientalism exactly matched the scope of empire"[22], most of what Said says about those Western conceptions of the Orient he calls Orientalism is equally relevant for understanding the structure and functions of the ideological fictions of empire this volume is concerned with. Just as "the Orient is an idea that has a history and a tradition of thought, imagery, and vocabulary that have given it reality and presence in and for the West"[23], the empire can also be profitably understood as a set of ingrained and largely unconscious beliefs, ideas, feelings, and values.

What the present volume, then, mainly attempts to explore is not the colonial and foreign policy of England that created the actual British Empire, but manifestations of the imperial idea, "the rise and growth of an Imperialist spirit in England"[24], as reflected in or constructed by contemporary literature. As John MacKenzie has convincingly demonstrated in his seminal work *Propaganda and Empire*, in the late nineteenth century an ideological cluster of ideas known as the 'New Imperialism' took shape and forged new links between imperialism and patriotism. It was compounded of Social Darwinism,

militarism, and Christianity, and it fostered and led to the propagation of the belief that Empire was an adventure and an ennobling responsibility. Moreover, MacKenzie argues that there was an extraordinary continuity in this system of ideas from late Victorian times until well into the twentieth century and that it was of central importance to British self-perception and pride.

What MacKenzie's work and that of other scholars on popular imperialism has also shown is that the ideological fictions that constituted the New Imperialism were not just reflected in or produced by the canonical works of 'high culture'. On the contrary, from the late nineteenth century to the second world war, nationalist and imperialist ideas were conveyed through various popular genres and media, e.g. boys' stories and other fiction for young people, the music hall, popular art, school books, postcards, packaging, cinema, exhibitions, parades, and a broad range of other genres and media.[25] In other words, the empires of fiction are not the only fictions of empire that one should take into consideration if one wants to come to grips with the questions of what made up the imperial idea and of how it manifested itself.[26]

What the essays in this issue are mainly concerned with is not the geographical or political extensions of the real British Empire but the relationship between literature and the mental realm that was discursively constructed and called 'the Empire' or the 'imperial idea', an empire 'of the mind' or of the imagination. They look at imperialism as a cultural or mental phenomenon, as a habit of mind or a structure of ideas and attitudes. Focussing on the images of the British Empire as they manifested themselves in textual representations, the articles try to throw light on both the ways in which the imperial idea was given literary form and on the question of how the British Empire was perceived, experienced, and understood by its contemporaries.

Instead of assuming that imperialism was merely reflected in literary works, the contributors argue that narrative fictions, patriotic poetry, boys' stories, history books, travellers' tales, and a host of overtly propagandistic genres played an active and constitutive role in creating the imperial idea and in making imperialist mentalities. Moreover, they maintain that literary as well as nonliterary fictions of empire have not only given the British Empire and the imperial idea reality and presence but that they have also secured the empire a lasting and significant place in England's cultural memory. The ideologial fictions of empire which such genres helped to create served as a filter through which the imperial experience came into the British public consciousness.

What are the most important ideological fictions that constituted the conceptual backbone of imperialism and that determined contemporary perceptions of the Empire? One of the dominating fictions of British imperialism was the ingrained belief in English superiority and the concomitant conviction that

the native peoples in the various colonies were in need of elevation and civilization. Said even goes so far as to locate "the essence of Orientalism" in "the ineradicable distinction between Western superiority and Oriental inferiority", which was itself based on the "binary typology of advanced and backward (or subject) races".[27] Because of what Said has called "the structures of attitude and reference" that constituted the imperial world-view, this fiction went hand in hand with another assumption fostered by Social Darwinism, viz. the ingrained belief "that subject races should be ruled, that they *are* subject races, that one race deserves and has consistently earned the right to be considered the race whose main mission is to expand beyond its own domain".[28]

Moreover, Said has drawn attention to two other important conceptual fictions of empire or features that are characteristic of imperialism as a mode of thought and a set of attitudes: "stereotypes about 'the African' [or Indian or Irish or Jamaican or Chinese] mind" and "the notions about bringing civilization to primitive or barbaric peoples".[29] The colonized peoples were not only habitually regarded as inferior, but they were turned into undifferentiated types, the ingrained stereotypes about the Oriental or the African.

These processes of dividing up the world into 'them' and 'us', of fostering a sense of one's own superiority that was based on the principle of inequality, and of creating cultural stereotypes in turn brought forth and legitimized the notion of 'the White Man's Burden'. According to this fiction, it was the White Man's job, duty, or even mission to act as a bearer of moral and intellectual values, to bring humanity and civilization to primitive peoples, and to impose their benefits on a world of savagery. The deep-seated belief in European superiority over Oriental backwardness finds its most succinct expression in Kipling's idea of 'the White Man', whose (self-imposed) burden of fulfilling his civilizing mission was regarded as his unalterable destiny. What the ideological fiction of being a White Man entailed, is succinctly as well as critically summed up by Said:

> Behind the White Man's mask of amiable leadership there is always the express willingness to use force, to kill and be killed. What dignifies his mission is some sense of intellectual dedication; he is a White Man, but not for mere profit, since his 'chosen star' presumably sits far above earthly gain. [...] Being a White Man [...] meant specific judgments, evaluations, gestures. It was a form of authority before which nonwhites, and even whites themselves, were expected to bend.[30]

Another important ideological fiction of British imperialism was "the ideology of empire as family"[31], which was vividly expressed in the form of conceptual metaphors. The recurrent use of the family metaphor assigned the

colonies the role of children dependent on the tutelage of the mother country. The widespread dissemination of this particular trope justifies calling the image of the British Empire as a world-wide family one of the metaphors that popular imperialism lived by.[32] Closely related to these ideological and metaphorical fictions was another recurrent feature of what Said has aptly called "the imperial lingua franca", namely the tendency to delineate the relationship between Britain and its colonies "in terms of possession, in terms of a large geographical space wholly owned by an efficient colonial master".[33]

As even a brief glance at a random selection of texts concerned with the British Empire will illustrate, talking about the relationship between Britain and its colonies in terms of possession often went hand in hand with another feature of colonial and imperialist discourse, viz. with denigrating or even erasing the native population of the countries that were colonized. What is implied in such a phrase as "many blank spaces on the earth"[34], which fascinate Conrad's Marlow, for instance, is that there are whole regions waiting desperately for the colonialist or imperialist to populate them: "Colonialism conceptually depopulated countries either by acknowledging the native but relegating him or her to the category of the subhuman, or simply by looking through the native and denying his/her existence."[35]

In addition to these fictions and rhetorical figures that one encounters in colonial discourse, there are a number of other more specific fictions of empire. In his thorough monograph *The Language of Empire*, R.H. MacDonald has provided an overview of some of the most influential myths and metaphors of popular imperialism. One of the main fictions imperialism lived by manifested itself in a "poetics of war" and in the "public school code of 'playing the game'". Both are based on the "metaphor of war as sport - and its corollary, sport as war", which encouraged people "to behave as though the battle-field was an extension of the playing field, requiring the same attitudes and spirit".[36] The vocabulary of war provided imperialism with a set of metaphors, of which "the trope of war-as-a-lesson" is another famous, or rather infamous, example. It also supplied the imperial project with stereotyped plots: "The framing narrative of imperialism, the ur-plot, was that of conquest: first came the traders and missionaries; the 'natives' resisted or 'rebelled'; then came the army to conquer and pacify."[37] Although the above brief overview of some of the main ideological fictions of popular imperialism is anything but complete, it may serve to convince the sceptic that there is more to the phrase 'fictions of empire' than meets the eye or than anyone thinking only in terms of narrative fiction may have anticipated.

4. Culture and imperialism: literature, the cultural construction of reality, and the making of imperialist mentalities

Making a distinction between the literary fictions that deal with the British Empire and the conceptual and ideological fictions of popular imperialism, of course, raises the question of how the relationship between literature and imperialism can be conceptualized. Despite the fact that in *Orientalism* Said suggested that an essay on culture and imperialism should be written, this suggestion was not taken up until he himself published a systematic study of that particular topic, namely his *Culture and Imperialism*, which appeared in 1993. In this important work, Said provides a methodological framework for applying the well-known epigraph of E.M. Forster's novel *Howard's End* – "Only Connect" - to the realms of culture and imperialism. The articles in the present volume follow the path laid out by Said in that they, too, consider literary fictions of empire within the context in which they were written and read, in order to "to show the involvements of culture with expanding empires, to make observations about art that preserve its unique endowments and at the same time map its affiliations".[38] Looking at the connections between fiction and the pursuit of imperial aims is, of course, something that has often been done before. Yet the question of how culture participates in imperialism has traditionally been posed only in a mimetic framework.

What has been less explored is the extent to which literature may have played a constitutive rather than a reflective role in colonial and imperialist discourse. The articles in this volume question the traditional assumption that the relationship between fiction and reality is based on mimesis. They argue that it is more rewarding to conceptualize fiction as an active force in its own right leading to the actual generation of ways of thinking and of attitudes and, thus, of something that stands behind historical developments.[39] Rather than being merely a passive vehicle that reproduced the imperial ideology of their time, narrative fictions need to be conceptualized as a productive medium that can play a creative role in the production of the ideological fictions that provide the conceptual framework of imperialism.

The articles argue that the imperial idea and the fictions it projected did not merely copy features of the 'objective' historical reality, but constructed an imperial ideology consisting of stereotypes, beliefs, feelings, and values. Although it would be wrong as well as patently absurd to argue that the British Empire was just an idea with no corresponding reality, it would be equally erroneous to assume that ideological fictions in any way represented real phenomena. Studies dealing with popular imperialism ought to take to heart what Peter Burke has called the "philosophical foundation of the new history", viz. "the idea that reality is socially or culturally constituted".[40] Such a view of the 'social construction of reality', to borrow Berger and Luck-

mann's well-known formula, has important and far-reaching consequences for the conceptualisation of the relationship between the language of popular imperialism and the reality of the British Empire: "Words did not just reflect social and political reality; they were instruments for transforming reality."[41] One needs to emphasize that the discursive practices of imperialism did not reflect objectively preexisting properties. On the contrary, the conceptual and ideological fictions of empire constituted the very reality they purported merely to reflect. Creating their own reality, they not only assigned roles to the colonizer and the colonized, but they also gave meaning to the imperialist project. What Said says about academic texts is therefore also true for most of the nonfictional and fictional works that deal with the British Empire: "Most important, such texts can *create* not only knowledge but also the very reality they appear to describe."[42]

On the basis of such a constructivist view of the relationship between colonial discourse and reality it can be argued that the forms of thought and sets of values that we have called conceptual 'fictions of empire' belong to those objects that "are made by the mind, and that these objects, while appearing to exist objectively, have only a fictional reality".[43] Moreover, colonial discourse is highly self-referential in that what it considers to be a fact does not reflect historical reality, but the preconceptions, values, and perceptions of the colonialist who produces the discourse in the first place. Just like Orientalism, the colonial discourse which projected such ideological fictions as those outlined above "responded more to the culture that produced it than to its putative object, which was also produced by the West": "it ascribes reality and reference to objects (other words) of its own making".[44] Such a constructivist conceptualisation of the relationship between culture and imperialism is indebted to the insights of a number of fairly recent approaches, especially to the New Historicism.[45] The New Historicism conceives of works of literature not as mirrors of reality, but as "historical and cognitive events in their own right"[46], "as texts which are involved in the actual production of history":[47]

> If texts exist in what - to be deliberately unfashionable - one could call a dialectical relationship with their social and historical context - produced by, but also productive of, particular forms of knowledge, ideologies, power relations, institutions and practices - then an analysis of the texts of imperialism has a particular urgency, given their implication in far-reaching, and continuing, systems of domination and economic exploitation.[48]

If one adopts such a view of the dialectical relationship between culture and imperialism, it becomes clear that fictional narratives or poetical works that deal with the British Empire need not necessarily just reflect imperialist issues and preconceptions. Instead of merely reproducing the imperial ideology of their time, literary fictions concerned with the empire can just as well

contest, criticize, or deconstruct the ideological and racist premises on which imperialism rested. Joseph Conrad's and E.M. Forster's ambivalent fictions of empire are a case in point, whereas Rider Haggard's and G.A. Henty's works, for instance, show very little (if any) critical distance from the imperial project.

It is therefore not the question of correspondence, or the lack thereof, between the literary and ideological fictions of empire on the one hand and the 'real' British Empire on the other that is at issue, but the nature and internal consistency of that system of thought, feeling, and perception that constitutes the imperial idea and frame of mind. The disparity between texts or discourses and reality is the rule rather than the exception so far as colonial and imperialist discourse is concerned.[49] The significance of literary fictions of empire to an analysis of imperialist discourse is thus not in the historical accuracy of the accounts they give of colonialism, but in the light they throw on both the system of thought, attitudes, and values that informs imperialism and on the way fictions construct the past and shape cultural memory. Said has argued that such cultural forms as the novel "were immensely important in the formation of imperial attitudes, references, and experiences".[50] If the empire was viewed in a framework constructed largely out of literary and ideological fictions, then a revisionist analysis of the fictions, myths, and metaphors of British Imperialism is a good place to start in attempting to demystify the Age of Empire.

Anyone trying to connect literary fictions with the imperial process of which they were a part is, of course, faced with the difficult problem of how one can determine the imperialist, racist, or ideological bias of a given work. Since novels or poems do not generally do the critic the favour of making any direct statements for or against imperialism (or feminism, or anything else, for that matter), the critic has to expose them to detailed textual analysis. The things to look for, according to Said, "are style, figures of speech, setting, narrative devices, historical and social circumstances, *not* the correctness of the representation nor its fidelity to some great original".[51] If one substitutes the word 'empire' for 'Orient' in the following quote, one gets more than just an inkling of how to come to terms with the way in which the ideological fictions of imperialism implied or created in literary fictions that deal with the British Empire can be ascertained:

> Everyone who writes about the Orient must locate himself vis-à-vis the Orient; translated into his text, this location includes the kind of narrative voice he adopts, the type of structure he builds, the kinds of images, themes, motifs that circulate in his text - all of which add up to deliberate ways of addressing the reader, containing the Orient, and finally, representing it or speaking in its behalf.[52]

This means that an analysis of narrative structure, plot, point of view, narration, focalization and characterization is a prerequisite for determining the role that novels dealing with the empire may have played in the making of imperialist mentalities. Similarly, since poems restructure the empire through their use of metaphors, rhetorical tropes, and rhythms, it is these textual devices that provide insights into the complex relationship between culture and imperialism, between literary fictions of empire and the ideological fictions they project.

5. Making imperialist mentalities, inventing cultural traditions, legitimizing imperialism, and other functions of fictions of empire

The remarkable discrepancy between the often harsh and ignoble historical reality of the British Empire and the euphemistic myths and metaphors projected by colonial discourse raises the question of why the British were so prone to constructing complacent and self-congratulatory fictions of empire. At least part of the answer can be sought in the fact that the word 'empire' was generally regarded as an inappropriate term for designating the relationship between a mother country and her colonies. The same holds true of the word 'imperialism', which had a very bad press, as Laura Chrisman and Patrick Williams have recently pointed out: "In Britain, the term imperialism had never been a popular one - quite the reverse in fact, since it carried connotations of over-weening ambition and self-aggrandisement, the very antitheses of Britishness."[53] The connotations of the words empire and imperialism constituted a threat to the notion of Englishness, i.e. to those traditions that were regarded as specifically English.[54] Important though this insight into the unpopularity of the words empire and imperialism in Britain is, it hardly suffices to answer the question of what functions the conceptual and ideological fictions of empire outlined above may have fulfilled.

In the first place, by reducing both the complexity and the strangeness of the empire's diverse character such fictions imposed form upon an untidy reality and served as models for thought. They turned vast geographical areas into manageable entities, transformed complex series of diffuse events into simple imperialist myths, and made soldiers into heroes. Despite their inevitably reductive character, such conceptual fictions can fulfill heuristic or cognitive functions in that "they represent or stand for a very large entity, otherwise impossibly diffuse, which they enable one to grasp or see".[55] In their capacity as mental models, fictions of empire served as means for explaining complex historical processes and constellations. They helped to make sense of the imperial experience and "familiarised the public with the bearings of the question[s]"[56] that were raised by the debates and the agitation about the British Empire.

Secondly, the literary and conceptual fictions fulfilled normative functions because they authorized ideologically charged views of the relationship between the mother country and her colonies. Popularizing imperialist attitudes and norms, the myths and metaphors of popular imperialism established a configuration of values that was conducive to maintaining an imperial world view. Although colonial discourse purported merely to describe the empire and the relationship between the colonizer and the colonized, what it actually did was assign roles to them. Imposing not only structure but also transformations and corrections upon raw reality, the ideological fictions of popular imperialism shaped both the prevailing view of the relationship between the mother country and her colonies and the perception of the encounter between the colonizer and the colonized. By translating the foreignness of the imperial experience into a highly stylized language, literary as well as conceptual fictions of empire served to create habits of thought, feeling, and perception conducive to advancing the imperial project. More specifically, popular fictions helped to transform the public perception of the military which came to be viewed in a completely different light as a result of successful campaigns in the colonies.[57]

Thirdly, by establishing oppositions between 'us' and 'them', between self and other, fictions of empire served as an important means of maintaining an advantageous British self-image and of constructing Britain's national identity. The fiction of the White Man's burden, for instance, supported, or even created, a pronounced sense of self-regard as a nation of great power destined to wield its civilizing influence over 'an empire on which the sun never set' (as the famous formula had it). Colonial discourse and the fictions of empire it projected are closely bound up with the development of Britain's cultural identity, because a people's collective identity, just like personal identity, is neither natural nor stable, but discursively constructed: "In an important sense, we are dealing with the formation of cultural identities understood not as essentializations [...] but as contrapuntal ensembles, for it is the case that no identity can ever exist by itself and without an array of opposites, negatives, oppositions".[58] Emphasizing one's own superiority, enhancing Britain's self-pride in its achievements, or denigrating stereotyped Orientals or Africans was thus not an end in itself, but part of that complex political and cultural process that Linda Colley has aptly called 'Forging the Nation'.[59] In this respect, as in so many others, the so-called 'Indian Mutiny' was one of the most significant ideological and moral turning-points because this key event of imperial history transformed both the reputation of the army and the conception Britain had of itself, of its national characteristics, and of its role in the world.[60]

Fourth, many of the literary as well as of the conceptual fictions of empire constructed and propagated a patriotic view of imperial history and trans-

mitted it from one generation to the next. Thus they played a significant part in the shaping of cultural memory that has been called the 'invention of tradition'.[61] Popular history, historical novels, and the official historiography of empire created what MacDonald - using Tennyson's phrase - has called "the Island Story", which had "very little to do with fact, but a great deal to do with metaphorical or imaginative reality [...]. Like all good stories, it had a plot, with a beginning and an ending, and in between, a series of crises".[62] It was in the framework of these patriotic myths of imperialism that officers acquired the aura of heroes and that these British heroes won each battle against native villains. The history of imperialism was thereby reduced to a series of memorable and heroic moments, each of which was endowed with patriotic meaning. MacDonald has called these mythologized events which made the 'Island Story' accessible and by which the imperial past has largely been remembered "Deeds of Glory", which "provided a pattern-book of heroism" and which were modelled on "an aristocratic sense of chivalry".[63] For obvious reasons, representations of such deeds of glory are of great interest to the cultural historian interested in the set of values underlying imperialism: "A hero is a product of his society, the culture gives the hero's life its particular meaning. The culture, ultimately, produces heroes who reflect its values".[64] The growth of legends about the exemplary lives and heroic deeds of such eminent Victorians as Lord Nelson and the Duke of Wellington, the two English champions of the Napoleonic wars, of General Charles Gordon, the epitome of the soldier as Christian martyr and gentleman, or of Sir Henry Havelock, who died a heroic death as a Christian soldier when he tried to relieve the besieged in Lucknow, provides typical examples of the role fictions of empire played in the construction of national identity and the shaping of cultural memory.

Fifth, fictions of empire fulfilled a legitimizing function because they provided rationalizations and justifications of imperialism. They legitimized colonial conquest and imperial rule by dignifying them with a high-minded mission which putatively aimed at conferring moral, religious, and material benefits onto the colonies. According to Said, the "important thing was to dignify simple conquest with an idea, to turn the appetite for more geographical space into a theory about the special relationship between geography on the one hand and civilized or uncivilized peoples on the other".[65] The ideological fictions that imperialism lived by served as means of retrospective and prospective justification, because they legitimized imperial rule in advance as well as after the fact.

Last but certainly not least, fictions of empire served as subtle means of propaganda and as ideological handmaidens of imperialism, because they glorified the imperial project, disseminated highly advantageous myths and metaphors of popular imperialism, and created a cult of exemplary heroes. The overtly

propagandistic function that literary fictions played in the making of imperial mentalities is particularly obvious in Victorian popular literature. The popular fictions of prolific writers like G.A. Henty, Robert M. Ballantyne, Frederick Marry at, Cutcliffe Hyne and Edgar Wallace "became handbooks for the imperial programme".[66]

Literary fictions of empire, in particular, could fulfill such normative, legitimizing, and propagandistic functions because they shaped habits of thought, feeling, and perception. Their plots, myths, and metaphors played an important part in making imperialist mentalities because they organised "the metaphorical realities of empire" and "conditioned the way in which those who used them thought of the world".[67] The limited imagery, rhetoric, and vocabulary of popular imperialism provided conceptual and normative frameworks which functioned as more or less distorting lenses through which the empire was experienced.

6. Essays in this Issue

The articles that follow will explore the relationship between literature and the growth and decline of the imperial idea. The essays try to illuminate both the roles particular literary fictions of empire have played in the making of imperialist mentalities and the cognitive, ideological, and moral patterns by which the imperial world view was structured. Although the main focus lies on texts that appeared during the phase of late Victorian imperialism, the diachronic range of the contributions extends from the mid-Victorian period to the present. Most of the articles deal with novels and other narrative fictions, but other genres - e.g. travel literature, poetry, and history books - are also taken into consideration. In geographic terms, the articles range from English texts concerned with the colonial experience in India and Africa over South African literature to Indian-English novels and Chinese Canadian literature. Although the methods adopted by the contributors are diverse, they all focus on individual works and on the connections between literary fictions and the values, modes of thinking, and sentiments these texts reflect, criticize, or deconstruct, in order to throw light on the role literature played in the making of imperialist mentalities.

Adopting a historiographical approach, John MacKenzie surveys the development of scholarship in the area of popular imperialism and shows how fruitful the use of a wide range of non-official sources like school textbooks, juvenile and 'pulp' literature, music hall songs, advertising and other media of popular entertainment can be for promoting a more thorough understanding of British attitudes about the empire, particularly of ideas prevalent among the general population. In his broad overview of the complex relationship between imperialism and popular culture, MacKenzie shows that popular

manifestations of the imperial idea often conveyed a similar set of ideas to those represented in the canonical literary works of authors like Rider Haggard or Kipling. In addition to discussing important recent approaches and their results MacKenzie indicates new directions for research that have opened up. The fairly extensive bibliography with which his article is supplemented is intended to give readers an ample guide to relevant books and articles on a quickly expanding and fascinating area.

The majority of the other articles focus on literary fictions dealing with the British Empire that appeared during the colonial or imperialist phase in the late nineteenth century, which was characterized by the acquisition of territories, mainly in Africa, by the European powers. British attitudes towards the empire and indigenous cultures were characterized by a number of conceptual fictions, three of which are analyzed in the articles by Vera Nünning, Bernhard Reitz, and Ansgar Nünning. In her article on the British reactions to the threat of losing the 'Jewel in the Crown', the Indian possessions, Vera Nünning shows how non-fictional texts - mainly diaries, letters, biographies, and history books - had their part in turning a real historical event into a powerful imperial myth. She argues that it was this process of mythologizing of imperial history, rather than the historical facts, which shaped cultural memory. Concentrating on a key event that took place during the Indian Rebellion in 1857, i.e. what has come to be known as 'the siege of Lucknow5, the article investigates how the cruel, desparate, and inefficient acts of English soldiers and civilians were painted in heroic colours in a wide range of popular fictions and that such depictions were taken for historical 'fact5up to the 1950s, serving to justify British rule in India and elsewhere.

Exploring how a particular genre helped to shape imperialist mentalities, Bernhard Reitz concentrates on the role which popular adventure novels in general and the image of the Christian gentleman in particular played in the construction of imperial fictions. After delineating the Christian, moralistic, and nationalistic legitimation of the British Empire which was current in the second half of the nineteenth century, Reitz shows that Rider Haggard's *quest romances* moulded an imperial mentality by redefining and propagating imperial values while, at the same time, idealizing Englishness and constructing an idealized British past.

Focussing on metaphorical constructions of empire, Ansgar Nünning examines the structural properties and functions of the metaphor of the British Empire as a family in the poetry of Tennyson and Kipling. He argues that this rhetorical figure, which was used in a wide range of fictional and nonfictional genres, was no mere poetical embellishment, but a conceptual metaphor which affected the ways in which people perceived and thought about the Empire. The metaphorical uses of kinship terms provided a way of seeing one

domain, namely the relationship between England (as the mother country) and her colonies, in terms of another conceptual domain, viz. our knowledge of kinship and family life.[68] Such kinship metaphors turned political conflicts into family squabbles, because they allowed people to endow the British Empire with the moral, emotional, and normative values of the family.

Whereas the texts dealt with in the essays already mentioned advanced a very favourable view of the British Empire, the two following articles delineate the gradual development of a more critical stance to British rule. Erhard Reckwitz provides an overview of three literary genres important for the thematization of colonial ideals in South African English literature. After explaining his theoretical framework by defining the terms discourse and colonial discourse with reference to current post-colonial theories, Reckwitz discusses the impact of the adventure novel, the "colonial pastoral", and the farm novel. Although the last genre was the most suitable mode for justifying the expropriation of land, Reckwitz shows that it also provided the germ of a strong counter-discourse which was critical of colonial exploitation and subjugation. Marion Gymnich discusses the construction and deconstruction of imperialist modes of thought in Rudyard Kipling's *Kim*, Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*, and E.M. Forster's *A Passage to India*. She shows that, in contrast to Victorian adventure fictions and to Kipling's *Kim*, the novels of Forster and, to an even greater degree, of Conrad imply an ambivalent view of the British domination of indigenous peoples. Since *A Passage to India* and *Heart of Darkness* do not merely reproduce the imperial ideology of their time, but question and criticize many of its assumptions, Conrad and Forster mark the transition from the imperial enthusiasm of the late nineteenth century, epitomized in Charles Dilke's vision of a 'Greater Britain', to the growing disillusion with the imperial project and the turning back to 'Little England', which came to be characteristic of the twentieth century.

The last two articles deal with different historical experiences of anti-colonial resistance to empire. They explore texts that belong to the post-colonial period and that reflect changed political and cultural realities. In these texts indigenous norms and values have come to dominate over British imperial ideals. Davids' investigation of the 'Amazing Mix', which characterizes the mixture of 'eastern' and 'western' concepts and values in Indian-English literature, discusses the various ways in which Indian conceptions of religion, politics, and everyday life are juxtaposed against English systems of thought. Looking at novels and short stories written in the twentieth century, Davids presents a spectrum of texts, ranging from the assertion of 'purely Indian' concepts to that 'amazing mix' in which cultural contradictions come together in complex mixtures. That the empire is indeed writing back, is demonstrated by Ronald Hatch, who looks at the literature Chinese writers have produced in Canada. Dealing with a former white settler colony with a

history of both French and English colonialism, he examines the difficulties of overcoming the highly ambivalent heritage of empire and of finding an original voice. Whereas the other articles looked at the interaction between the native inhabitants of Africa or India and British rulers, Hatch discusses the impact of the racism of white settlers in Canada on Chinese immigrants, who came in great numbers from the middle of the nineteenth century onwards, but only found their own voice in the 1970s.

What Indian-English literature has in common with other post-colonial literatures is "that they emerged in their present form out of the experience of colonization and asserted themselves by foregrounding the tension with the imperial power, and by emphasizing their differences from the assumptions of the imperial centre".[69] What gives Davids' article a certain paradigmatic quality is that it explores the ways in which the ideological fictions of empire and the world-view they propagated have come to be deconstructed in post-colonial literatures everywhere. Moreover, many of the subversive strategies employed in the novels that Davids discusses can be related to those "two principles [...] which are central to all post-colonial writing: first, there is a repetition of the general idea of the interdependence of language and identity - you are the way you speak. [...] second, there is the more distinctive act of the post-colonial text, which is to inscribe difference and absence as a corollary of that identity".[70]

7. Some notes on teaching fictions of empire

Although the essays in this issue do not directly address the question of the possibilities of teaching fictions of empire, there can be little doubt that the subject of literary responses to the British Empire can be profitably dealt with in an intercultural framework in the upper grades of secondary schools. Despite the fact that intercultural approaches in foreign language teaching have recently been the subject of considerable debate, there is still a lack of practical suggestions for illustrating how such approaches could be applied in specific courses.[71] It is beyond the scope of this introduction to delineate a course calendar for an *Unterrichtsreihe* on the topic of 'fictions of empire' or to make detailed didactic suggestions, but a few concluding remarks about the selection of suitable texts may at least facilitate the preparation for those interested in teaching a course on this subject.

Teachers trying to select suitable texts will find two anthologies very helpful for providing literary glimpses of the British Empire and other textual material pertinent specifically to the relationship between Britain and India, viz. F. Jarmann's, G.H. Rammer's, and D. Whybra's *Empire and After. Literary Glimpses of the British Empire* (Hannover, 1986) and R. Musman's *Britain and India - the love and the hate* (Paderborn, 1978). In addition to these useful

collections and to the fictions analysed in the present issue, there are a number of other literary texts dealing with the British Empire that are eminently teachable. Two obvious cases in point are Ruth Prawer Jhabvala's novel *Heat and Dust* (1975) and Paul Scott's *Staying On* (1977), both of which were awarded the Booker Prize for fiction. Both of these novels are set in India and deal with the enormous changes in the relationship between England and India after the achievement of Indian independence in 1947. Moreover, there are many other relevant and teachable novels[72], and some are even readily available in inexpensive editions specifically designed for teaching purposes and supplemented with useful explanatory notes, coursework assignments and additional information on the author and the historical background.[73]

The list of books that may be taken into consideration as set texts in a course on the fictions of empire is, of course, anything but exhausted by these works or by the texts analysed by the essays in this issue. The growing awareness that "the Empire had not been built by choirboys"[74], already latently present in Conrad's fiction, has led to a wide range of post-colonial novels that provide revisionist accounts of the imperial experience. The works of authors from the former colonies, e.g. Chinua Achebe's, Peter Carey's, Nadine Gordimer's, Janet Frame's, Doris Lessing's, Timothy Mo's, V.S. Naipaul's, Ben Okri's, Caryl Phillips', Ngugi wa Thiong'o's, and, of course, Salman Rushdie's[75], to name but a few, come readily to mind as possible texts that might supplement (or even replace) the rather short list of somewhat outdated English classics that have been used in foreign language teaching in German schools for years. Moreover, well-known British writers like J.G. Ballard, William Boyd, J.G. Farrell, Paul Scott, Barry Unsworth, and many others have also provided revisionist fictional explorations of Britain's imperial past, most of which are anything but glorifications of the Empire. James Gordon Farrell, for instance, an author who won considerable acclaim in Britain during the seventies and who was awarded the prestigious Booker Prize for his novel *The Siege of Krishnapur* (1973), thematizes, satirizes, and debunks a wide range of clichés about imperialism in his historical novels by providing miniature versions of key episodes involved in the decline of the British Empire. In his novels such literary devices as the time-structure, the semantization of place and of material possessions, the use of illness and disease as recurring metaphors, and the inversion of roles, attitudes, and beliefs under- mine the ideological justification of the British mission.[76] Like many of the works of the post-colonial literatures, Farrell's novels lay bare the values and unspoken assumptions that stand behind the British Empire.

In addition, anyone interested in teaching a course on the impact of literary fictions on the growth and decline of popular imperialism will find in the following essays suggestions for doing intercultural studies and food for thought about the question of why it is worthwhile to encourage students to explore

the relationship between the imperial past and the present. By discussing and deconstructing the central ideological fictions of imperialism that are inscribed in many literary (as well as nonliterary!) works, the articles demonstrate that not only "the *guild* of Orientalists" but high and popular culture as well "has a specific history of complicity with imperial power, which it would be Panglossian to call irrelevant".[77] Moreover, only if we understand the logic and structure of what we have called conceptual and ideological fictions of empire will we be able to recognize "where and how our view of things is inflected (or infected) by colonialism and its constituent elements of racism, over-categorization, and deferral to the centre".[78] A great deal of the value and relevance of a course on such an unusual topic as 'fictions of empire' lies in this continuity between the past and the present: "Mentalities created by yesterday's certainties survive more frequently than some would like to believe. These mentalities still extensively influence those of today. The effort to collate and interpret such mentalities created in the past may well constitute in the present and the future, therefore, a moral prophylactic."[79] Anyone interested in these complex processes would therefore be well advised to heed the implied warning with which Said concludes his *Orientalism*: "systems of thought like Orientalism, discourses of power, ideological fictions - mind-forg'd manacles - are all too easily made, applied, and guarded".[80] If the discourse of popular imperialism cries out for demystification, then teaching a course on fictions of empire is surely as good a place to start as any.

Notes

* We should like to thank Jon Erickson for reading and commenting on an earlier draft of this article and for suggesting valuable improvements.

1 Cf. B. von Lutz: „Die Auseinandersetzung mit dem Britischen Empire in der zeitgenössischen englischen Lyrik". *Arbeiten aus Anglistik und Amerikanistik* 10,1-2, 1985, 109-121. - B. von Lutz: „Das Britische Empire in ausgewählten englischen Dramen der Gegenwart: Kritik und Nostalgie". *Literatur in Wissenschaft und Unterricht* 17,1, 1984, 21-35.

2 For these key concepts of cultural studies see J. Assmann: „Kollektives Gedächtnis und kulturelle Identität". - In J. Assmann, T. Hölscher (Eds.): *Kultur und Gedächtnis*. Frankfurt, 1988, pp. 9-19.

3 S. Bassnett: "Teaching British Cultural Studies: Reflections on the Why and the How". *Journal for the Study of British Cultures* 1,1, 1994, 63-74, here p. 71.

4 E. Said: *Culture and Imperialism*. London, 1993, pp. 12, 288.

5 Cf. J.A. Mangan: "Making Imperial Mentalities". - In J.A. Mangan (Ed.): *Making Imperial Mentalities. Socialisation and British Imperialism*. Manchester, New York, 1990, pp. 1-22.

6 Cf. E.J. Hobsbawm: *The Age of Empire 1875-1914*. London, 1989, p. 5. - E. Said: *Orientalism. Western Conceptions of the Orient*. Harmondsworth, 1995 [[1]1978], pp. 62, 328.

7 A. White: *Joseph Conrad and the Adventure Tradition. Constructing and Deconstructing the Imperial Subject*. Cambridge, 1993, p. 6.
8 For a theoretical and terminological outline of an interdisciplinary approach to cultural studies, see A. Nünning: „Literatur, Mentalitäten und kulturelles Gedächtnis: Grundriß, Leitbegriffe und Perspektiven einer anglistischen Kulturwissenschaft". - In A. Nünning (Ed.): *Literaturwissenschaftliche Theorien, Modelle, Methoden: Eine Einführung*. Trier, 1995, pp. 173-197.
9 L. Hunt: "Introduction: History, Culture, Text". - In L. Hunt (Ed.): *The New Cultural History*. Berkeley, 1989, pp. 1-22, here p. 22.
10 Cf. M. Titzmann: „Skizze einer integrativen Literaturgeschichte und ihres Ortes in einer Systematik der Literaturwissenschaft". - In M. Titzmann (Ed.): *Modelle des literarischen Strukturwandels*. Tübingen, 1991, pp. 395-438, here p. 406: „erstens durch einen Redegegenstand, zweitens durch Regularitäten der Rede, drittens durch interdiskursive Relationen zu anderen Diskursen".
11 Cf. the definition that E. Said: Orientalism, p. 71, gives of "Orientalist discourse".
12 L. Chrisman, P. Williams: "Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory: An Introduction". - In L. Chrisman, P. Williams (Eds.): *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory*. New York, London, 1993, pp. 1-20, here p. 5.
13 For a concise and illuminating introduction to the theoretical assumptions of this approach, see E. Kreutzer: „Theoretische Grundlagen postkolonialer Literaturkritik". - In A. Nünning (Ed.): *Literaturwissenschaftliche Theorien, Modelle, Methoden*, pp. 199-213. - The following definition is indebted to J. Hart, T. Goldie: "Post-colonial theory". - In I. R. Makaryk (Ed.): *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory. Approaches, Scholars, Terms*. Toronto, 1993, pp. 155-158.
14 L. Chrisman, P. Williams: "Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory", p. 5.
15 M.W. Doyle: *Empires*. Ithaca, 1986, p. 45.
16 J. MacKenzie: "Introduction". - In J. MacKenzie: *Propaganda and Empire. The Manipulation of British Public Opinion, 1880-1960*. Manchester, 1984, pp. 1-14, here p. 1.
17 *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. "fiction".
18 Ibid.
19 D. Cohn: "Optics and Power in the Novel". *New Literary History* 26, 1995, 3-20, here 18.
20 Cf. A. White: *Joseph Conrad and the Adventure Tradition*. - Z.T. Sullivan: *Narratives of Empire. The Fictions of Rudyard Kipling*. Cambridge, 1993.
21 E. Said: *Orientalism*, pp. 321,205, 328. - Cf. also the use of the phrase "nationalist fiction" in E. Said: *Culture and Imperialism*, p. 20.
22 E. Said: *Orientalism*, p. 104.
23 Ibid., p. 5.
24 C.A. Bodelsen: *Studies in Mid-Victorian Imperialism*. London, 1960 [[1]1924], p. 7.
25 Cf. J.M. MacKenzie: *Propaganda and Empire*. - J.M. MacKenzie (Ed.): *Imperialism and Popular Culture*. Manchester, 1986.
26 The conceptual framework underlying this chiasm, which is more than a mere play on words, is indebted to M. Fludernik: *The Fictions of Language and the Languages of Fiction*. London, 1993, a wide-ranging narratological monograph, which also emphasizes pluralism, "the multiplicity of languages among different speakers" and the diversity of fictions "which language as a system projects in the course of narrative signification" (p. 2).
27 E. Said: *Orientalism*, pp. 42, 206.

28 E. Said: *Culture and Imperialism*, p. 62. - For the key phrase "structures of attitude and reference", cf. ibid., pp. 61ff., 73, 89, 114, 134, 157 and passim.
29 E. Said: *Culture and Imperialism*, p. xi.
30 E. Said: *Orientalism*, p. 226f.
31 Z.T. Sullivan: *Narratives of Empire*, p. 105.
32 This phrase is, of course, an allusion to an influential book on the theory of metaphor, viz. to G. Lakoff, M. Johnson: *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago, 1980.
33 E. Said: *Orientalism*, p. 213.
34 J. Conrad: *Heart of Darkness* [[1]1899]. - In *Youth and two Other Stories*. New York, 1924, p. 52.
35 C. Tiffin, A. Lawson: "Introduction: The textuality of Empire". - In C. Tiffin, A. Lawson (Eds.): *De-Scribing Empire. Post-Colonialism and Textuality*. London, New York, 1994, pp. 1-11, here p. 5.
36 R. H. MacDonald: *The Language of Empire: Myths and Metaphors of Popular Imperialism, 1880-1918*. Manchester, 1994, pp. 19, 20.
37 Ibid., pp. 27, 26.
38 E. Said: *Culture and Imperialism*, p. 5.
39 For a conceptual framework for literary history based on an alliance between narratology and the New Historicism, see A. Nünning: „Narrative Form und fiktionale Wirklichkeitskonstruktion aus der Sicht des New Historicism und der Narrativik. Grundzüge und Perspektiven einer kulturwissenschaftlichen Erforschung des englischen Romans im 18. Jahrhundert". *Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik* 40,3, 1992, 197-213.
40 P. Burke: "Overture: the New History, its Past and its Future". - In P. Burke (Ed.): *New Perspectives on Historical Writing*. Oxford, 1991, pp. 1-23, here p. 3.
41 L. Hunt: "Introduction: History, Culture, Text", p. 17.
42 E. Said: *Orientalism*, p. 94.
43 Ibid., p. 54.
44 Ibid., pp. 22, 321. - The authors of one of the canonical texts of post-colonial criticism, B. Ashcroft, G. Griffiths, H. Tiffin: *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures*. London, New York, 1989, p. 59, make basically the same point when they warn against what they call the "danger in 'transcultural dialogues'", viz. "that a new set of presuppositions, resulting from the interchange of cultures, is taken as the cultural reality of the Other. The described culture is therefore very much a product of the particular ethnographic encounter - the text creates the reality of the Other in the guise of describing it".
45 For an informative and lucid overview of the basic tenets of this approach, see A. Simonis: "*New Historicism* und *Poetics of Culture: Renaissance Studies* und Shakespeare in neuem Licht". - In A. Nünning (Ed.): Literaturwissenschaftliche Theorien, Modelle, Methoden, pp. 153-172.
46 F.S. Schwarzbach: "London and Literature in the Eighteenth Century". *Eighteenth-Century Life* 7, 1982, 100-112, here 112.
47 T. Healy, J. Sawday (Eds.): *Literature and the English Civil War*. Cambridge, 1990, p. 2.
48 L. Chrisman, P. Williams: "Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory", p. 4.
49 E. Said: *Orientalism*, p. 71, has poignantly argued why it was futile to "look for correspondence between the language used to depict the Orient and the Orient itself": "not so much because the language is inaccurate but because it is not even trying to be accurate".

50 E. Said: *Culture and Imperialism*, p. xii.
51 E. Said: *Orientalism*, p. 21.
52 Ibid., p. 20.
53 L. Chrisman, P. Williams: "Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory", p. 1. - For a thorough investigation, see R. Koebner, H.D. Schmidt: *Imperialism: The Story and Significance of a Political Word, 1840-1960*. Cambridge, 1964.
54 Cf. the articles in *Anglistik und Englischunterricht* 46/47: *Englishness*, 1992.
55 E. Said: *Orientalism*, p. 66.
56 J. A. Froude: *Oceana, or England and her Colonies*. London, 1886, S. 390.
57 Cf. I. MacKenzie (Ed.): *Popular Imperialism and the Military, 1850-1950*. Manchester, 1992.
58 E. Said: *Culture and Imperialism*, p. 60.
59 L. Colley: *Britons. Forging the Nation 1707-1837*. New Haven, 1992.
60 Cf. V. Nünning: „'Daß Jeder seine Pflicht thue'. Die Bedeutung der Indian Mutiny für das nationale britische Selbstverständnis". *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 78, 1996 [forthcoming].
61 For the notion of Englishness as a set of 'invented traditions' see E. Hobsbawm, T. Ranger (Eds.): *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge, 1983, p. 1 and passim. - Cf. also J. A. Mangan: "'The Grit of our Forefathers: Invented Traditions, Propaganda and Imperialism". - In J.M. MacKenzie (Ed.): *Imperialism and Popular Culture*, pp. 113-129.
62 R.H. MacDonald: *The Language of Empire*, p. 51.
63 Ibid., pp. 81, 90.
64 Ibid., p. 82. - For the following, cf. ibid., pp. 83-111.
65 E. Said: *Orientalism*, p. 216.
66 R.H. MacDonald: *The Language of Empire*, p. 205, who focusses on "two of the most successful adventure writers of the high imperial age, Cutcliffe Hyne and Edgar Wallace" (ibid.). - On the significance of Henty's historical romances as imperialist propaganda, cf. V. Nünning: „Viktorianische Populärliteratur als imperialistische Propaganda: G.A. Hentys historischer Roman *In Times of Peril*". *Literatur in Wissenschaft und Unterricht* 28,3, 1995 5, 189-201.
67 R.H. MacDonald: *The Language of Empire*, p. 233.
68 For a general analysis of metaphorical uses of kinship terms, cf. M. Turner: *Death is the Mother of Beauty. Mind, Metaphor, Criticism*. Chicago, 1987, pp. 15-77.
69 B. Ashcroft, G. Griffiths, H. Tiffin: *The Empire Writes Back*, p. 2.
70 Ibid., p. 54.
71 For further information, see A. Nünning: „Das British Empire in der englischsprachigen Literatur. Theoretische Grundgedanken und praktische Hinweise zur Durchführung einer interkulturell orientierten Unterrichtsreihe". *Die Neueren Sprachen* 92,6, 1993, 567-586. - The article provides a theoretical outline of the possible goals of teaching literature in an intercultural framework as well as didactic suggestions for teaching a course on literary responses to the British Empire, for selecting suitable texts, and for applying new methodological approaches to literary works.
72 Cf. William Boyd's *A Good Man in Africa* (1981) and *An Ice-Cream War* (1982), J.G. Farrell's *Troubles* (1970) and *The Siege of Krishnapur* (1973), and Caryl Phillips' *Cambridge* (1991) and *Crossing the River* (1993),
73 Cf. N. Gordimer: *July's People*. J. Sidney (Ed.). Harlow, München, 1991 [London, [1]1981]. – R.P. Jhabvala: *Heat and Dust*. B. Bleiman (Ed.). Harlow, München,

1989 [London, [1]1975]. - P. Scott: *Staying On*. R. Samson (Ed.). Harlow, München, 1991 [London, [1]1977].

74 1The phrase is a quote from P. Carey: *Oscar and Lucinda*. London, 1988, p. 475. - On Carey's revisionist fictional account of the colonial period in Australian history, see A. Nünning: „'The Empire had not been built by choirboys': Zur revisionistischen Darstellung australischer Kolonialgeschichte in Peter Careys *Oscar and Lucinda*'. *Literatur in Wissenschaft und Unterricht* 27,3, 1994, 171-187.

75 For an excellent short survey, see E. Kreutzer: "Commonwealth-Literatur". - In H. U. Seeber (Ed.): *Englische Literaturgeschichte*. Stuttgart, 1991, pp. 394-438.

76 Cf. A. Nünning: „'Make miniatures of the once-monstrous theme...'. Formen und Funktionen der Auseinandersetzung mit dem Niedergang des Britischen Empire in J.G. Farrells Romanwerk". *Arbeiten aus Anglistik und Amerikanistik* 18,2, 1993, 159-179.

77 E. Said: *Orientalism*, p. 342.

78 C. Tiffin, A. Lawson: "Introduction", p. 9.

79 J. A. Mangan: "Making Imperial Mentalities", p. 20.

80 E. Said: *Orientalism*, p. 328.