

A TRUE SURVEY ON 'ARTHUR & GEORGE' BY JULIAN BARNES FROM HISTORIOGRAPHIC METAFICTIONAL THEORIES BY LINDA HUTCHEON

Shalizeh Hajian

(Corresponding Author)

: MA, Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Foreign languages, Central Tehran Branch of Islamic Azad

University, Tehran, Iran

Tel: +98-912-6025045

E-mail: shlzhhajian@yahoo.com

Jalal Sokhanvar

PhD, Professor, Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Foreign languages, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran

Tina Takapouie

PhD, Assistant Professor, Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Foreign languages, Central Tehran Branch of Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

ABSTRACT

This investigation analyzes Julian Barnes' 'Arthur & George' under the light of historiographic metafictional theories by Linda Hutcheon. Since the most important parts of the historiographic metafictional process also are noticeable essentials in Julian Barnes' works, the ambivalence and indeterminacy of history were investigated in this study. The concepts of real and unreal truth, with their own historical contextualities and inter-contextualities in the literary approach, are paralleled to scrutinize the objective and subjective facts. Reality and imagery in the novel confront each other and, ever so often, they extend beyond each other in a way that their borders cannot be set with certainty. Thus, the researcher tries to display the precise and appropriate state line between them in their objective and subjective situation as plainly as possible. The researcher acknowledges that the two objective and subjective worlds should arrive together in a parallel method and carry the real truth, which has been exposed between the real and invented or fictional situations. The essay seeks the structure of authenticity and factual information all the way through the play of imagination, and it attempts to illustrate the line between realism and thoughts.

Keywords: discourse, discursive formation, historiography, metafiction

1. Introduction

'Arthur & George,' published in 2006, is another volume based on history. It is about detective novelist Arthur Conan Doyle's role in getting a judgment reversed in a shameful case of miscarriage of justice. A Parsee solicitor from Birmingham, George Edalji, is convicted of mutilating farm animals, a crime he did not commit. Finally, the detective, Arthur Conan Doyle, was able to save his old friend, George Edalji, from the prison. In Doyle's autobiography and related texts, Barnes discovered that Doyle, who was married, fell in love with a younger woman. The purpose of the study was to investigate the novel 'Arthur & George' by Julian Barnes under the light of the historiographic metafictional approach with regard to Linda Hutcheon's parodic, historical, fictional theories. Since Barnes mirrors known facts, through this process the researcher looks for truth and tries to show the line between reality and imagination.

2. Discussion

2.1. Real and imaginary beginnings and endings

Julian Barnes' novel, 'Arthur & George,' is a masterful grouping of truthful and imagined elements. Despite the fact that most incidents in the novel are not based on certainty, the key character in the novel, George Edalji, is judged to be based on an actual, historical character. With the set up of the novel, readers concentrate on the open judgment of George Edalji, who has, in fact, been accused of "Wyrley Great Outrages" and the mutilation of animals and is now judged by the British judicial government and is, at the present time, accused of crimes he has committed against his country. George Edalji does not take on a submissive or defensive stand and attempts to make the point that whether one is the accused or the accuser is just determined by fate; he becomes quite indifferent and silent in his manner. He has to tell the truth: "I am the way, the truth, and the life" (Barnes, 2006). George Edalji heard it from his father repeatedly; in other words, he has to tell the truth as he goes through life. Indeed, this is not the Bible's speech; however, he has to know it through his life.

The first section of the novel looks at the opposition of Arthur Conan Doyle's and George Edalji's lives through which the reader must relate the different parts of the puzzle in the place, time, and character process, i.e., from their childhood to their present occupations. However, in the fictional world of Julian Barnes, their lives cannot find pure historical reality. The novel's narrativity goes back and forth between two periods because Arthur Conan Doyle was born in 1859 and is 18 years older than George Edalji, and this change is formed by using the past for Arthur Conan Doyle and the present for George Edalji.

It is because both of them live in two different worlds. George Edalji, as a realistic man, does not believe in the Bible's stories; however, he loves the church where he prays for his sick sister. In fact, the church gives him much pleasure and peace even though he is not religious. He wants to find the pure truth through laws and rules and through the use of his own wisdom. Nevertheless, Arthur Conan Doyle uses his high sense of spirituality and imagination to imagine the fictionalized entities and find the pure truth in the epic heroic stories.

As Hutcheon proclaims: when critics, such as Eagleton, Jameson, and Newman, attack post-modernism for being what they see as a historical entity and what is being referred to as "post-modern" suddenly becomes unclear and indefinite, for surely "historiographic metafiction, like postmodernist architecture and painting, is overtly and resolutely historical-though, admittedly, in an ironic and problematic way that acknowledges that history is not the transparent record of any sure "truth."'" (Hutcheon, 1988). In the meantime, the disorder and discursivity of the real and artificial incidents automatically invoke such kinds of disinterestedness, distrust, and de-arrangement in the reader's mind. The reader might wonder how he can attach and relate the real incidents to each other. However, at the end, if the reader becomes aware of the reality, he can realize who the real character is and what the main characteristic of the novel is.

The judicial system tries to represent George Edalji as a repugnant character to people, while the researcher maintains that the police give him an artificial identity. Definitely, there are different opponents and adherents of different races in each government in which uprisings occur. Each one tries to overpower the opponents to achieve victory, so they have contests in order to go against the others' ideologies, when Arthur Conan Doyle, as the great detective Sherlock Holmes, did his best to save his old friend George Edalji. The British judicial system denies the truth, while incessantly trying to impose its own ideas on George Edalji.

In the second part of the novel, "Beginnings with an Ending," the persecution of George Edalji starts in 1903 and leads to his imprisonment for three years. Arthur Conan Doyle's private and occupational life simultaneously lasted from 1887 to 1906. George Edalji's sections are told in the present; however, since he is arrested, the fiction's narration changes to past times. The other issue that is important is that the first and the last sections try to show the platonic relationship between Arthur Conan Doyle and Jean that began in 1897 and lasted until Touie, his wife, died in 1906. However, this new section of Arthur Conan Doyle's life belongs to the last section of this part, which relates to the year 1897. Arthur Conan Doyle's narrative permanently changes to the present when his beloved appears, and it shows the coming of a new section in Arthur Conan Doyle's life, and it is a period in which the present time is significant to him. The reader moves from 1906 to the year 1897, and the change and the chronological chaos can be seen in relation to George Edalji's real situation.

As Kristeva says: "by examining the ambivalence of the spectacle (realist representation) and of lived experience (rhetoric), one might perceive the line where the rupture (or junction) between them takes place" (Kristeva, 1966). So, one might ask what the function and the result of this new system are. And how can the reader possibly relate the real sections historically and chronologically?

George Edalji is known indirectly as a criminal, but, an unknown person in the story has gone towards the horses on a dark night and suddenly disappears. If the reader reads the story properly, finally he notices that the unknown man could not have been Arthur Conan Doyle or George Edalji. Thus, it is possible that there is a third person who is a stranger and did this job. This section shows the reader that such an occurrence suggests one thing that can provide Arthur Conan Doyle and George Edalji with a sort of encounter or confrontation. The separation of their lives occurs in 1903 in a fictional and metaphorical situation, while, historically, the confluence of their lives occurs in 1906, at the end of the second part and the beginning of the third part.

Hutcheon acknowledges: "Historio-graphic meta-fiction is particularly doubled, like this, in its inscribing of both historical and literary inter-texts. Its specific and general recollections of the forms and contents of history writing work to familiarize the unfamiliar through (very familiar) narrative structures as White has argued (White, 1973), but its meta-fictional self-reflexivity works to render problematic any such familiarization. And the reason for the sameness is that both real and imagined worlds come to us through their accounts of them, that is, through their traces, their texts" (Hutcheon, 1988).

The whole novel is not a satire; it is an awful and painful reality. In the post-modern countries, this bitter, harsh reality occurs. Besides, there is an irony that occurs in some parts of the novel that belongs to George Edalji's characteristic. However, as it was said, his destiny is shown in the end.

2.2. Guilt against innocence: one person's reality is another person's untruth

The media, the words, and different viewpoints are always contrary to realities; they permanently exaggerate any issues politically, threaten people, astonish them, and inter-weave any kinds of problem in order to hide the main reality and its entity. In fact, this is the duty of fiction or imagination, i.e., to cover the facts in order to show itself as an exaggeratedly main truth. This is the art of imagination or hyperbole that poses the process of realities, i.e., realities that are detached from their main core in a parodied model. This art of fiction changes realities in order to confuse the reader's mind to solve the problem; therefore, this is the British judicial system's method of fictionalizing in order to defeat George Edalji's case. In fact, the system tries to make the reader accept the reality that it has built, not what George Edalji sees and perceives objectively. Hutcheon adds and implies: "such fiction corroborates the views of philosophers of history such as La Capra who argues: "the past arrives in the form of texts and textualized remainders-memories, reports, published writings, archives, monuments, and so forth" (La Capra, 1985) and that these texts interact with one another in complex ways" (Hutcheon, 1988). But if the truth is not justified objectively to the reader, it will not become clear-cut enough.

Moreover, reality is neither absolutely objective nor is it completely subjective, but, in the earthly world, everyone can really perceive the objective truth even if there is a truth that is beyond the mundane truth and reality. In other words, no one can ignore the essence and existence of the pure reality, even in this world. The researcher expresses that people must not ignore the two worlds; they are both important, because there is a pure reality within them. Throughout the novel, the accuracy and correctness of the truths in the political, historical, and cultural contexts always change and sway. There are also different narrators who narrate particular sections. These techniques disorganize meaning and coherence in the discursive chaotic process of the story.

The researcher intends to show that a text never separates historical events that contain the context. There are sometimes flashbacks throughout the novel in which the different incidents are referred to; in other words, the omniscient often returns and refers to real events in the past. However, there are one or two narrators who interpret and narrate the particular parts; for example, Arthur Conan Doyle and George Edalji interpret different sections both in the past and the present in historical and fictional modes. Here Hutcheon states: "The formal linking of history and fiction through the common denominators of inter-textuality and narrativity is usually offered not as a reduction, as a shrinking of the scope and value of fiction, but rather as an expansion of these. Or, if it is seen as a limitation-restricted to the always already narrated-this tends to be made into the primary value, as it is in Lyotard's pagan vision, wherein no one ever manages to be the first to narrate anything, to be the origin of even her or his own narrative (Lyotard, 1971). Lyotard deliberately sets up this "limitation" as the opposite of what he calls the capitalist position of the writer as original creator, proprietor, and entrepreneur of her or his story" (Hutcheon, 1991).

2.3. Intertextuality: multiple truths under construction

In this section, the focus is on the real characters of the novel. In the third section "Endings with a Beginning," Arthur Conan Doyle has deeply engaged with George Edalji's case, since 1906 to his time of freedom, i.e., 1907. This chapter shows a circulation or change, and the end of the chapter may be the beginning of a new chapter that happens again in Arthur Conan Doyle's and George Edalji's lives. The content of the chapter shows George Edalji's absolute freedom and the beginning of their separation. This is the author who attracts the reader's attention towards the relationship between the two characters. In the last chapter of the novel "The Beginning," George Edalji and Arthur Conan Doyle meet each other for the second time, and George Edalji delicately criticizes the method of investigation that Arthur Conan Doyle

uses. He tells Arthur Conan Doyle he still uses the past tense based on whatever George Edalji has done in past times. Indeed, the writer himself shows the confrontation to the reader in order to say their relationship has been more influential. Later on, the story goes forward towards the present time. For example, what Arthur Conan Doyle saw was the first effect when he could walk, look, take the handle, and close the door. A child for the first time saw a mummified corpse as a white waxen thing in the room. This did not have a bad effect on him and he did not fear it. Thus, “a thing behind” was a central issue for him. He thought of the door, the room, the light, the bed, and what was on the bed: “a white, waxen thing” (Barnes, 2006). Epic heroic poems made him use his imaginary and spiritual mind that his mother told: “And then the knight was held over the pit of writhing snakes, which hissed and spat as their twining lengths ensnared the whitening bones of their previous victims...”, ‘And then the black-hearted villain, with a hideous oath, drew a secret dagger from his boot and advanced towards the defenseless...’, ‘And then the maiden took a pain from her hair and the golden tresses fell from the window, down, down, caressing the castle walls until they almost reached the verdant grass on which he stood...’ (Barnes, 2006). Indeed, they go beyond the truth to get the pure meta-characteristics to show an infinite viewpoint to the reader.

The novel looks at racism and is rebuilt and introduced as a powerful work by the author. Even the narrator directly appears in the story. This is interesting for anyone who follows literary and romantic fiction in which the writer emerges as one of the characters. First, the reader does not know the real identities of the characters; however, gradually, as time passes and by reading, he may discover the secret entity. In Julian Barnes’ opinion, the mechanisms of Arthur Conan Doyle’s investigations, legal processes and claims are not exactly what they seem to be. Julian Barnes holds the reader at the edge of indeterminacy so the reader would not find the truth readily. Therefore, the reader’s conception fluctuates because of his knowledge. Since realities are interpreted and then translated, Julian Barnes also concludes that nothing can be certain for the reader’s understanding, and, probably, a shock even may appear in the end. Hutcheon says: “the double contextualizability of inter-texts forces us not only to double our vision, but to look beyond the centers to the margins, the edges, the ex-centric” (Hutcheon, 1992). Arthur Conan Doyle and George Edalji are both victims of the system, even though they come from different races. For example, George Edalji is the son of a vicar who was born in India and married a Scottish woman and lived in a poor rural situation.

According to Angel, he believes: “in the sensational case known as “The Great Wyrley Outrages”, George Edalji was sentenced to seven years in prison. He was released after three years, but it was only through Arthur Conan Doyle's public intervention that he was fully rehabilitated” (Angel, 2005). The miscarriage of justice is an important point in the story that finishes with Arthur Conan Doyle’s intervention as a vigilant detective. Indeed, Arthur Conan Doyle and George Edalji helped each other return to their previous lives. These two characters are called “unofficial Englishmen,” which suggests their hybridity and eccentricity. As Arthur Conan Doyle tells: “You and I, George, you and I, we are ... un-official Englishmen” (Barnes, 2006). George Edalji’s father is a black Indian Third World person and Arthur Conan Doyle’s father is a stranger as is George Edalji’s, but not of the Third World. However, both come from cultures that have been in the colonial grounds. This is done by the author to engage the reader in the deep process of the story. Indeed, George Edalji behaves himself with an emotional and realistic manner in prison and does not fight anyone. These behaviors and cases help him to be freed early. In fact, the main question is who finally committed “Wyrley Great Outrages” (Barnes, 2006). This does not belong to George Edalji at all. He is unjustifiably in prison. McHale believes: the concept of “the dark area of history is problematic; in other words, it is impossible to prove the authenticity of historical events which the writers refer to in order to separate historical fact from fictional invention” (McHale, 1979). In fact, in history-writing such as conducting research, the writer should know what he should write; however, the most important thing the writer should know is what he should not write.

Angel thinks that people sympathize with George Edalji's destiny, while they do not perceive Arthur Conan Doyle's situation. Also, the female characters do not support their protagonists. Arthur Conan Doyle's understanding of the opposite sex is woeful. Angel maintains: "women are never to be entirely trusted—not the best of them" (Angel, 2005). But, the researcher maintains that people do understand both Arthur Conan Doyle's and George Edalji's situations; also, the researcher thinks Arthur Conan Doyle is really interested in promoting his profits and those of George Edalji. First, he is an old friend of George Edalji. Second, Arthur Conan Doyle has accepted the case to help his friend's interests willingly as he had done in previous cases through which Arthur Conan Doyle, as a successful novelist and detective, could win the case. Therefore, there is no force on him to re-inspect the criminal case. Conversely, his love passion is platonic, and it has a faithful and an honest entity.

It is not true that his love is an imaginative and temporary one, because it is very deep and real without including a sexual relationship. The ring can be a symbol of what binds Jean to Arthur Conan Doyle. It is real that this woman appears in Arthur Conan Doyle's life. It is true that Arthur Conan Doyle is a spiritual man who uses his imagination in his daily affairs, but it should not be said that the existence of this woman has only a speculative and subjective aspect. She is real and her existence is very important in Arthur Conan Doyle's life. He says: "Jean, my darling, do you think there was ever such a love story as ours since the world began?" (Barnes, 2006). Indeed, their deep feelings for each other gave Arthur Conan Doyle strong motivation. He could either be back to his normal life or save his friend with more energy. She brought him a sort of self-esteem and reliance by which he could help George Edalji's case. Arthur Conan Doyle shouted: "I am Arthur Conan Doyle and I am proud to love this woman, Jean Leckie" (Barnes, 2006).

Through the novel, the reader notices that Arthur Conan Doyle's wife is sick and cannot be close to her husband. He is worried because he cannot do anything for her; however, he loves her and sympathizes with her. He cried and told: "my wife passed away after a long illness ... I was unable to settle to work until the Edalji case came to turn my energies into an entirely unexpected channel" (Barnes, 2006). Indeed, he cannot deny his beloved's strong support and sympathy. He is quite sure that God's help and Jean's kindnesses help him to succeed. During the lifetime, Arthur Conan Doyle's wife says to him: "I do not need assurance I am certain of your love" (Barnes, 2006). In fact, there have been powerful and victorious women throughout history who worked and defended their principles and their country like the protagonists and support them spiritually and mentally. They make the protagonists calm and confident in order to overcome their problems. Such things happen in the story, and they attract the reader's attention. Therefore, there should not be any problems even though it includes real incidents and occurrences. Arthur Conan Doyle believes: "My beloved Jean Leckie is such an angel" (Barnes, 2006).

When George Edalji was in prison, he was given "typical Oriental" as a new name, because he was not from the original race in England. In fact, he was a black, Third-World man who has been oppressed brutally. As George Edalji states: "I am not a typical solicitor. I am a typical Oriental, whatever that means. Whatever I am, I am typical" (Barnes, 2006). His attorney says to him: "at least they do not call you a sly" (Barnes, 2006). George Edalji did not accept this comment because he thought this was not related to his being arrested and that the racism had been solved; however, since this matter was important and the authorities could not give him another name, he was such a useless and hybrid person to them. The authorities showed their avarice, cruelty, and violence to him in order to suppress him and deny him of his rights. Since George Edalji has respected the British laws, rules, and judicial system, since he believed in English justice, he thought he could be free; however, they had no mercy and did not free him. This indicates that poor George Edalji is unlucky, but he actually is a man who is optimistic about his future and believed that his manners could help him to be exonerated as soon as possible. But the reality was different, and he did not understand his family's background, race, nation, or originality. Arthur Conan Doyle says to

the court: "It may surprise you to know that George Edalji specifically rejects racial prejudice as the basis of his misfortune" (Barnes, 2006). The time, place, and arrangement of the process do not correspond with theories told in the court of justice. George Edalji is questioned many times even though he tells the truth every time. He was not beside the horses in the farmland on that night; he was at home doing his work and investigating his business. There is no paradox in George Edalji's speeches; however, he was arrested even though he was innocent and honest. George Edalji asks: "Sir Arthur, may I ask ... to put it simply ... you think me innocent?" (Barnes, 2006).

Moreover, these two characters learned that they must function elaborately in life. Some readers cannot perceive the characters' ideas and situations because of the fictional framework of the novel. They have kinds of dualities. Thus, the characters' dualities or the text's dualities bring pure indeterminacies that cause the reader not to reach a firm result due to the change of time and place. Therefore, this novel has an orderly disorder that returns its relationship to its irrelevancy. According to Waugh, "If the discipline of history has lost its privileged status as the purveyor of truth, then so much the better, according to this kind of modern historio-graphic theory: the loss of the illusion of transparency in historical writing is a step toward intellectual self-awareness that is matched by meta-fiction's challenges to the presumed transparency of the language of realist texts" (Waugh, 1984). Upon first examination, the text may seem to be a type of chaos or discursivity, but the researcher believes that it is better for the reader to have some endurance and patience up to the end in order to finally understand the fiction's theme and process.

Ludovic maintains: "Julian Barnes gives such dexterities to Arthur Conan Doyle that the bigoted Sherlockians cannot accept, because they believe such a man can be literary" (Ludovic, 2005). Arthur Conan Doyle acts like a professional detective who has a real entity and uses his imagination and creation to discover the fact and manage the criminals. Sherlock Holmes's stories are successful in that the readers are led to study people like a book. Ludovic acknowledges: "Sir Arthur had been too influenced by his own creation. Holmes performed his brilliant acts of deduction and then handed villains over to the authorities with their unambiguous guilt written all over them" (Ludovic, 2005). Ludovic also believes: "Arthur, as a novelist, can be a successful man with a high imagination, but as an experienced detective, he cannot investigate the problems well, especially George's case" (Ludovic, 2005). As a young detective, he has to go forward towards improvement in his judicial and criminal cases. It is better for him to experience different and difficult cases to get at the highest climax of his position. Ludovic says that Julian Barnes, the writer of this novel, has exaggerated Arthur Conan Doyle's characteristics and designed him to change into a surreal or supernatural character. However, it is not true. He is more similar to a normal and usual person with a little high intelligence and emotion. The researcher rejects the above-mentioned comments and claims if Arthur Conan Doyle were not intelligent enough and did not have enough experience, he would not have accepted the case. If another person did this, why is he at the center of attention in the fiction? The researcher believes that Arthur Conan Doyle's experience and skill are not related to his age. Therefore, every case he has accepted, he could victoriously have accomplished. Nevertheless, the researcher claims that Arthur Conan Doyle is an experienced detective and that Julian Barnes has not exaggerated his nature; even though some events, incidents, and happenings have been used that have imaginary and fictional aspects. The reader and writer can logically conclude that Arthur Conan Doyle is a real character who can overcome all the problems well in order to win his victory. After three years of his attempts, he could free George Edalji from prison. Arthur Conan Doyle said: "It is pure speculation about George's case" (Barnes, 2006). He is a real detective with a real entity who could defend George Edalji's rights to reach the affirmative result. He believes: "Edalji is of the professional class" (Barnes, 2006).

2.4. *The ultimate, yet ambiguous truth*

Ludovic explains that Sherlock Holmes is considered as a limited person in different cases. As Dr. Watson, his cooperator told that, in some cases, Arthur Conan Doyle's ignorance was significant and his understanding of the opposite sex was amazing. The researcher acknowledges that Arthur Conan Doyle and Sherlock Holmes have self-esteem. It is true that anyone may change a little in some circumstances; however, through the fiction and on the basis of reality, Arthur Conan Doyle or Sherlock Holmes could not have worked as experienced and smart detectives if they were ignorant or lacked adequate knowledge.

Ludovic states: "Sherlock Holmes or the same Arthur Conan Doyle is interested in intellectual and aesthetical art and pleasure as they can solve difficult and complicated crimes" (Ludovic, 2005). Sherlock Holmes says: "My mind is like a race engine, it is chopped into pieces, because it is not connected with the work has been built" (Barnes, 2006). Moreover, he believes that Holmes is primarily a mechanical man who cannot use his psychoanalytical depth. It is because his mind may not process the psychoanalysis because his imagination is too limited.

The researcher, however, claims that Arthur Conan Doyle and Sherlock Holmes consider intellectual and aesthetic art and pleasure by using their vast imagination. Arthur Conan Doyle feels: "Fearless to the strong; humble to the weak, chivalry towards women, of high and low degree" (Barnes, 2006). Indeed, they help Arthur Conan Doyle solve all the unknown, indeterminate riddles. While Sherlock Holmes's feats are at the center of attention, no one sees Arthur Conan Doyle's attempts, skills, bravery, and disposition. "The spirits of the dead do not trouble me." And "Indeed, I welcome them" (Barnes, 2006). This real work has been arranged by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle and Sherlock Holmes' character and thoughts all stand for the real Arthur Conan Doyle. He shouted to his colleagues: "Sherlock Holmes baffled! Scotland Yard solves mystery" (Barnes, 2006). Thus, people never forget their warriors or champions, especially a champion who lives in the real world.

History and fiction come together in their formal formations. This fiction studies the problematic situations that can be a result of linguistic misunderstandings that appear throughout the text. This is the common ground of the text in which fictional and historical structures are arranged fixedly in a synchronic complex. Thus, history and literature are the same. As Said has been arguing recently: "There is a relationship of mutual interdependence between the histories of the dominators and the dominated." (Said, 1983). Arthur Conan Doyle could appear as the first novelist detective who created stories through a horrible and criminal genre. He did not let the reader solve the riddle completely; in fact, he was born to realize the details of horror during the Edwardian periods. He has often been introduced as a "scientific detective," because, in a literary framework and context, he is known as "an expressed scientific professional detective" in order to be seen as a literary political characterization. He could clear his infamous background by the use of documented and stable records.

Narrating the details that have appeared in documents and records makes it hard to present a portrait of the entire historical past, but the researcher cannot accept the details in order to justify the cause and effect of the details in a unified logical interpretation. Past texts are related to the literary mode. Byatt believes: "the formal heresy in British fiction is involved in its compasses which has no parallel." (Byatt, 1995). If the present time is the logical consequence of past times, it will be possible to have a correct perception of the situation of the present epoch on the basis of the past.

3. Conclusion

This is a literary essay that transforms many realities and sentences that should show the truth. In other words, the novel configures them in an aesthetic, fictional aspect. Throughout the novel, the reader can observe ambivalent and dual dimensions of the events and the individualities. In the end, reality and fiction are separated from each other, and both the reader and researcher can realize the truth. The reliable records or data are inadequate; therefore, it is the art of imagination that poses the process of realities that are detached from their main core in a parodied model. Essentially, it seems that there are several types of personal likes and dislikes in the reader's thoughts and in the writer's translation, which is somewhat fathomable. In writing history, the writer should understand what he should write. Of course, of utmost importance is the fact that the writer should know what he should not write. The problem is he must be vigilantly careful about the reader's judgments through the reading of the works that are considered to be the great, postmodern literary feats. Since objectivity and subjectivity are not necessarily untrue or mendacious, they are defined as the pure realities that are supplementary, both on the materialistic and the spiritualistic levels.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Julian Barnes for his help and kindness whose effective and essential information made this research possible.

References

1. Angel, G. Q. (2005). Remaking history Painstaking detective work weighs down a tale of Arthur Conan Doyle's role in a real life case: [SURVEYS EDITION]. Section: FT WEEKEND MAGAZINE-Books. Publication title: Financial Times. London (UK): Jul. 30, 32. Source type: Newspaper. <http://WWW.ProQuest.umi.com>
2. Barnes, J. (2006). Arthur & George. London: Picador. <http://WWW.proquest.com>.
3. Byatt, A. S. (1995). A New Body of Writing: Darwin and Recent British Fiction. New Writing 4: An Anthology. Eds. Antonia Susan Byatt and Alan Hollinghurst. London: Vintage 439-448. <http://WWW.JSTOR.org>.
4. Hutcheon, L. (1988). A Poetics of Post-modernism: History, Theory, and Fiction. NY: Routledge. <http://WWW.jstor.org>.
5. Hutcheon, L. (1988). A Theory of Parody: The Teachings of Twentieth Century Art Forms. London and NY: Methuen. <http://WWW.jstor.org>.
6. Hutcheon, L. (1988). Narcissistic Narrative: The Metafictional Paradox. NY: Routledge. <http://WWW.jstor.org>.
7. Hutcheon, L. (1991). Discourse, Power, Ideology: Humanism and Post-modernism. London. <http://WWW.JSTOR.org>.
8. Hutcheon, L. (1992). Historio-graphic Meta-fiction: Self-reflexive, Parody, Inter-textuality. London. <http://WWW.jstor.org>.
9. Kristeva, J. (1966). Word, Dialogue and Novel. <http://WWW.ProQuest.mht.Co.uk>.
10. La Capra, D. (1985). History and Criticism. Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press. <http://WWW.jstor.org>.
11. Ludovic, H. T. (2005). Man of mystery Sherlock Holmes is emotionally limited and full of Victorian Prejudice. [SURVEYS EDITION], Section: FT WEEKEND MAGAZINE-Books. Publication title: Financial Times. London (UK): Nov. 26, Pg. 34, Source type: Newspaper. <http://WWW.ProQuest.umi.com>.
12. Lyotard, J. F. (1971). Meta-narratives or the System of Thought of 20th Century and Sublimity. <http://WWW.Jstor.org>.
13. McHale, B. (1979). Modernist Reading: Post-modern Text: The Case of Gravity's Rainbow. Poetics Today 1, nos. 1-2, 85-110. <http://WWW.JSTOR.org>.
14. Said, E. (1983). The World, the Text, and the Critic. Cambridge: HU Press. <http://WWW.proquest.mht.com>.
15. Waugh, P. (1984). Meta-fiction: The Theory and Practice of Self-conscious Fiction. London: Methuen. <http://WWW.proquest.mht.co.uk>.
16. White, H. (1973). Meta-history: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth Century Europe. Baltimore, Md, and London. <http://www.proquest.umi.com>.