Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro

Centro de Educação e Humanidades

Instituto de Letras

Gabriela Romana Viveiros

Tipperary, by Frank Delaney: a reading of the rewriting of history in Ireland

Rio de Janeiro

2011

Gabriela Romana Viveiros

Tipperary, by Frank Delaney: a reading of the rewriting of history in Ireland

Dissertação apresentada, como requisito parcial para obtenção do título de Mestre, ao Programa de Pós-Graduação em Letras, da Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro. Área de concentração: Literaturas de Língua Inglesa.

Orientadora: Prof.ª Dra. Ana Lucia de Souza Henriques

Rio de Janeiro

2011

CATALOGAÇÃO NA FONTE
UERJ/REDE SIRIUS/CEHB

D337 Viveiros, Gabriela Romana
Tipperary, by Frank Delaney: a reading of the rewriting of history in Ireland / Gabriela Romana Viveiros. - 2011.
79 f.

Orientadora: Ana Lucia de Souza Henriques.
Dissertação (mestrado) – Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Instituto de Letras.

1. Delaney, Frank, 1942- - Crítica e interpretação – Teses. 2. Delaney, Frank, 1942-. Tipperary – Teses. 3. Ficção irlandesa – História e crítica – Teses. 4. Memória na literatura – Teses. 5. Literatura e história – Irlanda – Teses. I. Henriques, Ana Lucia de Souza. II. Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro. Instituto de Letras. III. Título.

CDU 820(417)-95

_____ _____

Assinatura Data

Gabriela Romana Viveiros

Tipperary, by Frank Delaney: a reading of the rewriting of history in Ireland

Dissertação apresentada, como requisito parcial para obtenção do título de Mestre, ao Programa de Pós-Graduação em Letras, da Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro. Área de concentração: Literaturas de Língua Inglesa.

Aprovada em 25 de março de 2011.

Banca Examinadora:

_____

Profª. Dra. Ana Lucia de Souza Henriques (Orientadora)
Instituto de Letras da UERJ

_____

Profª. Dra. Henriqueta do Couto Prado Valladares
Instituto de Letras da UERJ

_____

Profª. Drª. Elisa Lima Abrantes
Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro

Rio de Janeiro

2011

DEDICATION

To my parents, Vera and Williams, who have taught me that when you chose to invest in studying and learning, you are truly investing in a freer and more fruitful life.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First I would like to thank my adviser Ana Lucia Henriques for her everlasting patience, support and guidance. Had she not motivated and encouraged me, this work would certainly not have been done.

It is my pleasure to thank all the teachers that I have had in this post graduation course in UERJ for all the wonderful classes.

I wish to thank specially my classmates, for all moments they have helped me throughout the course and for the fruitful exchange of ideas.

I am grateful to the board for being here today and for having the chance to dedicate their time to the reading of this work.

I would like to show my gratitude to all of my friends and also my boyfriend, Renan, for their affection and company in the moments that I just thought I would not make it.

I am thankful to my entire family, my aunts, uncles, and cousins who were also so glad to ask me about my work and would always listen to me even though, at times, they had no idea of what I was talking about! Surely, I would like to thank my wonderful sisters Renata and Ana Beatriz for being who they are, for being part of my life and contributing to who I have become.

Finally and most importantly, I wish to thank my parents, Vera and Williams. They have taught me everything I know and they have always loved me no matter what. When my whole world is falling apart and whenever I feel lost, they are the only ones I can think of and find my way back.

“There is no present or future, only the past, happening over and over again, now”

Eugene O’Neill

RESUMO

VIVEIROS, Gabriela Romana. *Tipperary, by Frank Delaney: a reading of the rewriting of history of Ireland.* 2011. 79f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Literaturas de Língua Inglesa) – Instituto de Letras, Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, 2011.

O objetivo da presente pesquisa é o de discutir a reescrita da história da Irlanda, mais especificamente aspectos relacionados à construção da identidade nacional e de marcas da tradição, a partir da leitura do romance *Tipperary,* de Frank Delaney. Publicada em 2007, essa obra aborda de forma singular as querelas sobre identidade nacional, nacionalismo, passado, memória, e seus personagens principais e a trama estão significativamente ligados ao contexto político-social da história da Irlanda. Nessa reconstrução da história, o passado é revisitado através de diferentes pontos de vista. Nossa atenção estará voltada para a seleção de elementos/momentos da história do país que ganham foco na narrativa, e as possíveis repercussões deste processo. Além disso, nos concentraremos na questão das tênues fronteiras entre história e ficção, ou seja, as fronteiras pouco delimitadas entre o discurso histórico e o discurso ficcional. Na escrita da história em *Tipperary*, Delaney aborda questões relativas a mitos, lendas e tradições como importantes fatores de identidade nacional em uma Irlanda que emerge como uma nação independente. No romance em questão, podemos observar como história e memória se unem na jornada do protagonista, em sua empreitada de narrar a 'história' de sua vida e de seu país.

Palavras-chave: Ficção irlandesa. Memória. Reescrita da história.

ABSTRACT

The goal of this present work is to discuss the rewriting of the history of Ireland, more specifically aspects related to the construction of national identity and marks derived by tradition from the reading of the novel *Tipperary*, by Frank Delaney. Published in 2007, the author works with the quarrels of national identity, nationalism, past, memory in a singular way, and its central characters and plot are significantly connected to the history and the political and social context of Ireland. In this process of reconstructing history, the past is revisited through different points of view. We will focus our attention in moments/elements in the history of this country that are highlighted in the narrative, and the possible repercussions of this procedure. Besides, we will concentrate in the issue of the possible boundaries between history and fiction, that is, boundaries that are not very clear between the historical discourse and the fictional discourse.The writing of history in *Tipperary*, Delaney addressed matters related to myths, legends and traditions that are important factors of national identity in the context of Ireland emerging as an independent nation. In this novel, we observe how history and memory come together in the journey of the protagonist in his enterprise to rewrite the 'history' of his life and country.

Key-words: Irish fiction. Memory. Rewriting of history.

SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

Frank Delaney is a productive Irish writer whose latest works especially maintain, in different ways, a deep connection with Ireland, its people and the history of the country.

In a recent interview (Cf. p. 47), the author claimed to have written the novels *Ireland* (2006), *Tipperary* (2007) and *Shannon* (2010) as an enterprise to retell the history of Ireland through fictional work. His idea was that he could get a different perspective of the historical events from the view of fictional characters he had created. When he chose to grasp this diverse view of history by his characters' actions, he wanted to get a more dynamic portrait of facts, and maybe discover something else about his country.

The novels were written in a sequence and each of them pretty much picks up from where the other has stopped regarding the timeline of history. Thus, their characters and plot are completely diverse. Nonetheless, all of them carry in their narratives elements in common such as revisiting and dealing with the past. In the author's notes to *Shannon*, Delaney states that "much of our power comes from the past" (2010, p. 1).

The selected novel for this work is *Tipperary*, and even though it was a decision made since the beginning of this project, it unfolded to me into a great surprise. My graduation is in philosophy, and during the course I researched and produced works related to political philosophy, and all aspects concerning nationalism, nations and national identity have always interested me. When I applied for the Masters course, I knew I wanted to develop some work in which I could use my background knowledge and take the study of nationalism to a higher level. Later, after a lot of exchange of ideas with classmates, professors, I concluded that working with Irish fiction would make it possible for me to expand my studies as I wanted.

At first, two novels were selected for the comparative analysis. However, with the progress of the research, I realized, with the help of my supervisor, that the rich dialogue the novel *Tipperary* establishes with the history, legends and myths of Ireland could be taken as the main topic to be discussed in the present dissertation. In this novel Delaney addresses the issues of national identity, nationalism, past, memory in a unique way. Charles O'Brien, main narrator, is an Irish man who feels motivated to write the history of his life and the history of Ireland from his memory. Charles´s profession/occupation as a traveling healer, who goes around the country treating sick people from all sorts of social classes, gives him the opportunity, to absorb knowledge about his nation from different points of view.

As a narrator, Charles observes that the unrest that prevails in his country in his time matches the one going on in his heart. When he commences writing his narrative, it has already been a long time since he first met and fell in love at first sight with a woman named April Burke, who refuses him. In spite of the time, Charles would never forget April. In his obsession for her, he writes the history of a country which is now fighting for its independence.

At the same time, there is a second narrator, a History and Literature teacher named Michael Nugent, who is living those present days (as related to the date the novel was published). He found Charles's account and also some letters and diaries that were together with the story in a chest. Nugent becomes interested in this material and decided to dedicate his time to the reading of it. As he realizes they all belong to the same narrative, related to the same characters, he decides to put the story in order by organizing its parts. It is relevant to notice that Nugent, as a narrator, compares and contrasts historical facts in Charles´s narrative with official history based on his knowledge acquired through experience or his studies. Soon, he becomes a second voice in the novel. Delaney alternates Nugent's and Charles's writings. In that way, we have Charles's writing, then a division, and right after that Nugent's comments on that part of Charles´s story he (Nugent) had just presented to reader. In this interesting style, it seems as if we are reading Charles´s story at the same time Nugent does. We read what Charles had to say, and then it is as if we 'take a break' and start reasoning about what had been told to us with Nugent, who sometimes appears to be as surprised or confused as we are with the new pieces of information found in letters and diaries, such as those by Charles´s mother.

Nugent's comments vary along the novel. At times he wishes to clarify or expand on some fact Charles had exposed, others he discusses critically what had been said, and sometimes he may wonder curiously about why some things have happened in Charles's story. And as the reader that he is, he creates hypotheses and speculates about what happened and what may happen in the story.

Delaney's choice to include such a peculiar second narrator is intriguing. Perhaps, the author aimed at showing two reconstructions of the history of Ireland in the same novel. First, we have Charles, who is writing in his own way, from his point of view, facts he witnesses or recollects. Also, he is being motivated by the troubles of his heart; then he will include, exclude or highlight what he believes to be important. Charles is not afraid of admitting to the reader he is not a reliable 'historian'. On the other hand, we have Nugent, who has an academic historical background, and possesses the 'advantage' of knowing what will happen

next in history, since he is ahead in time, whereas Charles is living what he is writing about. Soon, we realize that both narratives, Charles's and Nugent's, complement each other, forming a big quilt in this reconstruction of the history of Ireland. The other elements, such as the letters and the diaries written by Charles's mother, Amelia, and April are also incorporated by Nugent, who is responsible for sewing all these parts together.

The first chapter of this study will be divided into three subsections in which we will layout important ideas for the analysis of the novel itself. The starting point of this chapter is the matter of the fictional and historical discourses and the boundaries between them. We will base this research on the reading of authors such as François Dosse, Lená Medeiros de Menezes, Hayden White and Jacques Le Goff, by comparing and contrasting their ideas on the issue. The need to rewrite history and revisit the past is an evident factor in the chosen novel, thus we believe it to be important to start by addressing these subjects firstly.

By studying ideas about the historical discourse, we inevitably have to consider a deeper look on the concept of memory. It is worth to emphasize that the novel we are working on in this research is based on memory. When Charles O'Brien decides to begin his writing, he does so by recollecting moments of his life and events that he has witnessed since his childhood. Therefore, he relies entirely on his memory to construct his narrative. On this close exam of memory, we will count on the readings of the same authors we have listed before in this introduction and also Maurice Halbwachs.

In *Tipperary*, the history of Ireland is evoked in many moments in the narrative. For this reason, we agree it is relevant for the readers to have a brief view of the history of Ireland, so that they can have a better comprehension of the rewriting of Irish history in the novel. To reach our goal, we will provide a panorama of the history of this country supported by the reading of historical reference texts. Our panorama will cover the events from pre-Christian Ireland to a little after the establishment of the Republic of Ireland.

Lastly, closing chapter one, we will explore the issue of nationalism. As Charles O'Brien sets his goal, the rewriting of an Irish national identity also takes place. Before focusing on how this rewriting occurs on the novel, we will provide an outline on the concepts of nationalism and national identity. We will consider the studies of Stuart Hall, Eric Hobsbawm, Stuart Woolf, Ernest Renan, Johann G. Herder, Benedict Anderson and other authors whose impressions on those themes provide substantial complement to this study.

In the second chapter, our focus will concentrate on the author Frank Delaney in a first moment. As we have said in the beginning of this introduction, Delaney is a writer whose work is deeply concerned with Ireland. Therefore, we will present some words about his life,

his literary career, and the works he has written. Then, in a second moment, we find it relevant to include a more detailed summary on the novel *Tipperary*.

Chapter three is dedicated to the analysis of the novel. *Tipperary* is a very rich narrative, and the author raises many interesting points to be discussed about history. Surely, lot of essays could have been written on this novel by selecting different aspects in it. However, for this study we will select two aspects that are considerably highlighted in the novel. The first one is the presence, throughout the novel, of points related to the land issue in Ireland. As a consequence of the XVI century evictions, part of the process of English colonization, thousands of native people were uprooted, and this event created a deep mark on Irish people's identity. It will be our goal in this part to examine this matter further, by comparing it with references about this event on the novel.

Another aspect is the appearance of conspicuous literary and political figures throughout the novel. Not only are they mentioned, but they also take part in the narrative, interacting with Charles, they have a voice in this fictional narrative. The discussion of the rewriting of history in the novel, mixing historical and fictional characters, will be the objective of the second part of chapter three.

1. TIPPERARY AND THE WRITING OF IRISH HISTORY

1.1 Historical and fictional discourses: possible boundaries

> Customarily, history is written by the victors; in Ireland the vanquished wrote it too and wrote it more powerfully. That is why I say, 'Be careful about my country and how we tell our history.' (…)
>
> All who write history have reasons for doing so, and there is nothing so dangerous as a history written for a reason of the heart. The deeper the reason, the more unreliable the history; that is why I say, 'Be careful about me.'(DELANEY, 2007, p. 4)

Frank Delaney, the author of the epigraph that opens this chapter, states in the author's notes to the novel *Tipperary* that "in Ireland everything is personal, especially the past" (2007, p. 1). The issue of the influence of a country's history, its legends, myths, heroes, and especially how it is remembered and told is, as we believe, particularly meaningful for the study and investigation of nationalism and national identity. As aforementioned in the introduction, this chapter aims to discuss ideas of how history and memory can be understood, and the borderlines between the process of writing history and the process of writing fiction.

History as it is traditionally presented to us in the form of a narrative in school books gives the idea of being an accurate collection of facts, which is said to be based on documents and evidence we cannot change or question. As it seems, there is no place for imagination, fantasy or any kind of previous selection. The facts are told as they occurred at a specific time in the past, and we must trust that narrative. On the other hand, a fictional story is one we are not supposed to believe in. In most cases, its content is not 'true'. Although it may be possible to find references of real data, it is not what is normally expected from a fictional text. However, by reading the quotation above from *Tipperary*, we cannot help but to wonder about the boundaries between fiction and history as we believe we may know them. It's also possible to put in question how much of imagination and creation there might be in the historical discourse; and how much of accuracy and factuality there may also be in fictional narratives.

The quest for the truth was the impulse that brought history to the surface since its first records in ancient Greece. In agreement with Marcel Detienne in *Os Mestres da Verdade na Grécia Arcaica* (1988), we may understand the concept of truth in two levels: in the one hand as something that is in accordance with some logical principles, and on the other hand in accordance with what is real. In this way, therefore, connected to the ideas of demonstration,

experimentation and verification (1988, p. 13). The historian François Dosse tells us in *A História* (2003) that history came through from a slow emergence and successive ruptures with the literary genre, as a result of the search for the truth. The historian was born in the figure of Herodotus, who established in his work the importance of objectivity and distance from the issue that is narrated in contrast to the narratives of Homer, in which timeless myths and tales of muses and heroes are replaced by narratives that are related to a certain point in time and the participation of men is enhanced in order to promote source of heritage for the future generations. Many poets such as Homer and Hesiod are some of the main sources of information connected to Greek myths, although they are not believed to be the real authors of the myths, but writers who could register poetically legends and tales from different traditions and communities that have once lived in the Greek territory.

In ancient Greece, the Greek city, the *polis*, was the center of political consciousness and source of citizen identity, where the historical genre finds its place. It was only after a profound process of secularization in the Greek society that philosophy and other social sciences could emerge, since men started to reflect critically about the environment around them. The mythical thought consisted in the way in which people used to explain the essential reality of their lives, the origin of the world and people, natural processes and basic values. The myth does not justify or fundaments itself, therefore, there is no room for correction or criticism. It works with the idea that the Gods, the spirits and destiny govern men and society. Dissatisfaction and unrest with the mythological explanation of men's presence on Earth led to a rupture that brought objectivity, detachment from myths and legends and the arising of the philosophical-scientific thinking, all crucial for the establishment of the truth. It is very important to point out, however, that this rupture with the mythical thought did not occur immediately and completely at first. Notwithstanding, myths do not disappear for good, they are still present in traditions, superstitions and fantasies, surviving, though progressively changing their function in society. It is also decisive to mention that the process of transformation and transition in the Greek society was very long. After a period of shifts including the invasion of the Greek territory by other Asian tribes and also the appearance of the first city-states, people have their active participation and involvement in the issues of the community amplified. As a consequence, pagan religion slowly fades as the new order is based more and more on economical and commercial activities and demands a social organization that is rested on intense political activity and more concerned with a concrete reality.

As a consequence of many transmutations, Herodotus himself was banned by his pupil, Thucydides, who accused the master of being too close to the myth and tending to create information in order to fill in gaps in documents. After that, Thucydides developed a number of methodological rules so that the truth would not be forsaken in the narrative, and one of these rules eliminates the narrator, so that facts could speak for themselves. Dosse considers this procedure problematic and observes that the historian that consecrates the present as immutable truth and excludes his predecessors, such as Homer and Herodotus, invalidates at the same time a prior point of view and source, depriving future generations of ancient facts. In the XV and XVI centuries, the Renaissance revised and accentuated the rupture between literature and emerging history.

As related to the XVIII century, Lená Medeiros de Menezes reminds us in *História e Realidade: Uma relação de múltiplas possibilidades* (2002) that the views changed, and the Enlightenment History was necessarily a narrative. In this matter, Hayden White, in *As Ficções da Representação Factual* (2001), adds that historians recognized that they shared the same literary techniques as used in any fictional story in the representation of real events in the discourse of history. Therefore, historians usually made use of methods and artifices also common to fictional narratives. Moreover, history and fiction shared the same scope: both aimed to provide an image of ‘reality’ to the reader. A novelist presented a fictional story in which the characters might not have existed in real life; however, this professional had to do it in a way that his readers would see the story as believable, as plausible. In order to reach this goal, whether it be a fairy tale or a more realistic work, the writer had to abide to rules of coherence and cohesion, so that the story made sense to people who would read it. A historian would probably go through the same process when producing a text. Additionally, the issues at that time laid much more on the contrast between ‘false’ and ‘true’, rather than the emphasis on ‘fact’ and ‘imagination’. Imagination was needed as historians sought to produce the most adequate representation of that ‘truth’ they wanted to write about. This information reinforces the idea that historians employed techniques common in fiction and poetry when composing their texts. As we take these ideas into consideration, we may start to see some common points between history and fiction, in their core.

In the beginning of the XIX century, historians commenced to identify ‘truth’ with the concept of ‘fact’, and oppose them – truth and fact – to ‘fiction’. As a consequence, history was also opposed to fiction, both represent different things. Fiction aspired to express the possible or imaginary, whereas history corresponded to the ‘real’. With this antagonism,

fiction became a sort of obstacle for the full understanding and comprehension of reality. White, also a historian and literary critic, goes on exploring this issue. He singles out how important it was for historians of the time to be careful and prevent their discourses from not being near the fictional at any point. History was to be taken care of as a very precise discourse, a form of science. François Dosse contributes to this discussion explaining that in the XIX century a process of 'professionalization' of History took place. The genre would then possess proper method and follow certain rules. Historians that applied those methods considered themselves as pure scientists, and announced a radical rupture with literature. A 'good' historian in accordance to those convictions had to keep subjectivity apart and submit the texts he produced to rigid scientific criteria.

Jacques Le Goff in *História e Memória* (2003) criticizes Hayden White for formulating a very simplistic conception of the historian's work as being simultaneously poetic, scientific and philosophical. Le Goff confirmed that, in the XVIII century, philosophy, literature and history were close, but history works hard in order to, towards the end of the XIX century, become more technical, specific, and scientific and at the same time less philosophical and literary. Although the author admits that history could partially reach this goal, he states that the historical work is not a work of art, since the historical discourse has its specificity. The historian does not have as much freedom as a novelist does. Nonetheless, Le Goff is not entirely positivistic and says that imagination is represented in the historical discourse. He distinguishes two types of imagination that a historian may resort to: the one responsible for breathing life into what is dead in documents, which is part of the historian's work so as to explain and demonstrate men's actions. Most importantly for the author, the historian should call upon another form of imagination that is the scientific imagination, which is expressed through the ability of abstraction. Le Goff notes that this information does not discriminate historians from other men of science; they should work on their documents with the same imagination as a mathematician in his calculus or a chemist in his experiments.

Paul Veyne states in *Apenas uma narrativa verídica* (1978) that History is memory's daughter (1978, p. 19), and Dosse (2000, p. 270) explores the relationship between memory and history and highlights the fact that memory was, especially from the XVI to the XVIII centuries, connected to history in a process of recuperation around a national scheme. Since the XVI century, the context of construction of the Monarchical State very much influenced historical production. Collective memory is then based upon the political will, on those active politically engaged men. Dosse exemplifies this idea by confirming that in France historical

knowledge was in service of the monarchy, and the political power wanted the historian to glorify the monarch. When the French Supremacy was threatened in the XVIII century, for instance, historians would evoke the great ancestors, royal chronicles and national myths in a way to legitimize the present through the past.

Hence, memory is one of the key concepts in the studies of the historical narrative, and it has also received contributions from many scholars. Remembering and forgetting, conscious and unconscious manipulations of memory based on interest, desires, censorship and other aspects are primary for the understanding of individual memory as well as collective memory. Jacques Le Goff points out how the oblivions and silences of history reveal the mechanisms of manipulation of collective memory.

In pre-writing societies, there were sorts of “memory-men”, as Le Goff defines them, that were mainly historians of the local government or court. Those elder men or priests were responsible for keeping and transmitting orally the “society memory”, legends and origin myths not word by word precisely, but through songs, for example, which allowed memory to have more freedom and creativity instead of only being repeated and memorized (idem, p. 245). However, writing came as an advance to memory. Through a written record it was possible then to celebrate a memorable event or monument. Moreover, the possibility of having storage of information let people communicate data through time and space, providing to men a system of marking, recollection and recording.

In the middle ages, the Christian faith as the prevailing religion and ideology provoked some changes in the concept of memory. The development of the memory of the dead, especially of the saints, and the role of memory in oral and written education are some traces of the main characteristics of the changes in memory in the middle ages. Le Goff states that Christianity and Judaism are highly connected to history since they are “religions of remembrance”, what may be seen in many aspects: the divine acts of salvation that shape the contents of the faith and of the object of worship are all in the past, and also an essential religious duty is the need to remember. Christian education consists of the memory of the history of Jesus Christ transmitted by the apostles, the constant celebration and recollection of his messages and of important moments such as Christmas and Easter.

The employment of written register, thus, was vital to keep the memory of events and things, relying in the belief that information, when written down, could last forever. The press, the development of dictionaries and encyclopedias promoted a great enlargement of collective memory. While people could resort to a memory that was getting richer and more

improved as time passed, the memory of the dead seemed to be growing apart from these improvements. Its return was evident right after the French Revolution, not only in France, but in many European countries. Cemeteries, new types of monuments and funeral rituals appear. Romanticism highlights this connection of the cemetery, of the dead to memory (idem, p. 456). The revolutionaries wanted to celebrate the memorable dates, the nationalists saw memory as an instrument of the government. Later, the celebration needed new elements in order to gain more support, such as medals, coins, souvenirs and other symbols of the nation. In France, for example, the Revolution created National Archives so that all people could have access to documents of national memory. Also, museums, libraries, and any kind of institution that could promote means of contact with the knowledge of the memory of the nation flourished.

The contrasts between history and memory were also studied by sociologist Maurice Halbwachs in *Memória Coletiva* (2006). He introduced the idea that history was in the realm of the critical, the conceptual, and the problematic while memory was concrete and vivid. History, being only theoretical, talked of changes that were limited by the clock and the calendar, submitted to a temporality. Memory was connected to the human, to life and continuous as a river that flows, possessing no limits, cuts or lines of separation, in constant evolution opened to dialectics of memory and forgetfulness. A person would then take part in two types of memory, the collective and the individual one. Nonetheless, the individual memory is not completely closed and isolated. A person usually needs, in order to recollect one's own past, to resort to other people's memories, to try to see oneself through different points of reference that were determined by society. Halbwachs does not let us forget that individual memory works over language and ideas that were not invented by the individual, but borrowed from one's environment. However, our personal memories do not get mixed with the ones from other people; since one can basically recall what he/she thought, felt, saw, did during a specific period of time. As a consequence, personal memories are limited in time constraints. Collective memory has a similar process, but its limits are not the same. During the course of somebody's life, the national group this person belongs to goes through a number of events, but this person obviously does not take part in all of them. All that he/she can learn about these events do not come from memory, but from books, newspapers or maybe talking to someone who has witnessed such event. Each person carries a baggage of historical memories, that can be increased as we read and study, but it is important to highlight that these memories are not all personal, but borrowed.

As related to national thought, the events that are carried and recollected throughout time leave a deep mark, not only because several institutions were modified by them, but mainly because the tradition concerning such event remains alive in every person, political or religious group, class or family that has participated in it.

The notion of memory Halbwachs is working on, that could be distinguished from an internal, personal one, could be known as somewhat social memory. Developing the concepts associated to each memory, he goes further and refers to them as an autobiographical memory and historical memory. The autobiographical one would count on the historical for contributions since the history of a person's life is inserted in a bigger whole which is history in general. Naturally, historical memory would be more extended in comparison to the first one, and, as the author says, would represent to us the past in a schematic and summarized form, whereas the memories we have from our personal lives are presented as a more fluid and deep framework (idem, p. 73). Although some may consider memory more of an individual skill – we are able to evoke the moments in the past that we have been part of, the author reaffirms his theory stating that our memories are reintegrated in a larger scope, in relation to groups we belong to.

Studying the inner workings of individual and historical memories, Halbwachs considered a child and how he/she was able to attribute values or/and importance to what he/she witnessed in society. He noticed that a young infant would find it difficult to realize the historical or even sociological relevance of what is occurring; notwithstanding, the child would be able to keep memories of images, perceptions of what he/she sees. In order to reach what the author refers to as *historical reality* through image, the child would need to move to the 'outside' his/her personal sphere, that is, transfer her/himself to the point of view of the group. This way, the infant would be able to comprehend the reason why a specific date, event was important to his/her group because he/she would join the circle of common national passions and interests. This is possible by the process of connecting to the historical memory. It is by the agency of the historical memory that one can relate one's personal life to external facts, and these facts can leave their marks and impressions.

As the child Halbwachs was referring to previously is now becoming concerned with the meaning of the images that he/she sees or has seen, we could say that that child is now thinking in common with others. This person's thought would be divided into a flow of personal impressions and the many streams of collective thought. Since the child is not only closed internally, his/her thoughts can now share different and new perspectives, ideas, but at

the same time, not having to lose touch with his/her own ideals and memories. The issues of the nation and of the group now are also relevant to his/her personal life. Moreover, Dosse (2000) reminds us that Psychoanalysis also suggests interesting views of the working of memory with the knowledge of the unconscious and of memory wounds; traumas and memories too painful to be brought back.

For Halbwachs, the past has left in society today many traces, some visible, some others noticed in places and also among people, in the way they act or think, as they were unconsciously imprinted and conserved. He directs out attention to the fact that modern customs and traditions lay on more ancient layers that emerge in more than one place (2006, p. 87). History, the author goes on, works as a collection of facts that have held a serious place in human memory. And the only way the author sees so as to preserve that memory is through words, a narrative, aiming to create a bridge between past and present, in order to reconstruct the continuity that was once interrupted.

Yet, collective memory can be distinguished from history. The former is a stream of continuous consciousness, alive in the thoughts of a group; there are no clear or regular boundaries. History is located outside the groups, and needs to establish divisions along the flow of facts, so as to base the schematic structure it requires. Furthermore, collective memory and history differ in the aspect that collective memory can be plural and diverse, and history, in spite of the differences among the history of different countries, is only one process.

Resuming to our discussion on Dosse's ideas (2000), the author affirms that the dialogue between the living and the dead is a complex one and memory is of a fragmented and plural essence. He believes history eliminates the obscure and complex inner workings of memory, setting a path to a better understanding of processes of transformation and past disruptions. Hayden White does not seem to rely on history to do such job, as he finds historians of the XIX century, as well of contemporary ones, victims of the illusion that it is possible to describe facts neutrally, disregarding their interpretation and analysis. Lená Medeiros de Menezes sees that historians are aware that they cannot reconstruct the past or narrate exactly what once happened; but they are at the same time sure that the past can be represented by a particular point of view and from a place, based on different approaches of research, from documents, or analysis of characters and plots and even representations forged in other temporalities. This exercise of finding a new approach is what Peter Burke calls in *A Escrita da História* (1992) 'densification of the narrative'. Burke considers narratives mediation between structure and the facts. By the process of 'densification', it would be

possible to create narratives able to encompass not only a sequence of events and the conscious intentions of the actors of such events but also the structures, that he understands as being, for instance, institutions and ways of thinking, in order to verify whether these structures work in a way to accelerate or obstruct those events. To achieve such aim, Burke provides some solutions such as the focus on micro-narratives, narratives in which chronological time is inverted and also narratives which present events by different points of view. Nevertheless, Burke agrees that history today is fragmented and there are multiple subdivisions, what he believes to be an inevitable process.

Historians are, besides dedicated to their work, also people who belong to a certain social class and that have thoughts and beliefs. Therefore, White is possibly right when he states that they may suffer from an illusion when they believe to be completely impartial. In the novel *Tipperary*, the main character, an Irish man called Charles O'Brien, informs the reader that his writing is about the story of his life and his country, events he has taken part in, witnessed or heard from other people. Certainly, O'Brien is not an official historian in the book, only an enthusiastic story teller. He describes, for example, with colorful details the War of Independence, an important event in Irish history, at which he was present. Notwithstanding, in the epigraph selected to open this chapter, we may observe hints of what type of story teller O'Brien is. He warns his readers to be careful about him. He may be advising them not to trust him fully or not to take the events told as completely impersonal. O'Brien, the "historian", informs us that he is a person deeply involved with retelling and researching the past of his country in his own way, constructing a narrative of his own. By being open-hearted to his readers about what prompts him to write, O'Brien honestly reports what may happen in the writing process of many historiographies: different priorities and points of view, as well as a partial selection of facts, highlighting some and ignoring others.

1.2 **A panorama on the history of Ireland**

A nation marked by dramatic events, Ireland possesses a fascinating history, a fertile soil for the study and investigation of nationalism and national identity. Having in mind that the objective of this study is to address and explore the issue of the Irish national identity, aiming to observe how traditions and traces, that are considered peculiarly Irish, contribute to rewriting the history of the country by Frank Delaney in the novel *Tipperary* (2007). Therefore, this present chapter aims at presenting some points about the history of Ireland, since the knowledge of these historical facts is crucially important for the understanding of the rewriting of Irish history and identity in the work under consideration.

In Tipperary, we are able to observe the way in which history, myths, legends and memory come together in the challenge to reconstruct the 'history' of his life and country.

Little is known about pre-Christian Ireland. In accordance with Máire and Conor Cruise O'Brien in *Ireland, a concise history* (1999), what is known is that the earlier Irish ancestors were basically agricultural and lived an intense conservative country life. Fortunately, this very fact helped the establishment of high Neolithic culture later on. Since pre-Christian times, the land has been essential for the Irish. It is believed that around 600 BC the first small groups of Celtic speaking people appeared in Irish soil. The Celts have Austrian roots, and information that is known about their religion, customs and practices significantly reinforce the sense of Irish common culture, and greatly corresponds to the body of Irish tradition (idem, p. 15). The Celts also play important role in Irish mythology, and features from their culture are deeply encapsulated in Irish history and literature. In this century, high kingdoms started to emerge. Within the kingdoms, high culture flourished with the presence of aristocracy and learned people. However, by the VII century, the idea of a single king claiming the entire island had come to seem a possible ambition. And the allegation to high kingship became accessible starting in the territory of Tara, linked with the Niall Noígíallach, a High King. Noígíallach laid the basis for this dynasty's hegemony and his descendents could claim large territories. This caused many powerful kingdoms and peoples to disappear, what facilitated pirate and Viking raids in the IX and X centuries.

According to religious accounts, the arrival of St. Patrick in 432 AD was a considerable event in Irish historiography. Although there were already Christians living in the island, St. Patrick worked to convert Ireland to Christianity. He preserved Irish social patterns and introduced the Roman alphabet.

The XII century was marked by the arrival of the Normans. At that time, Ireland was still divided in various kingdoms. Kings fought each other for the supremacy of the whole island. Among these disputes, Diarmait, the King of Leinster, was banished over sea by the high king of Connacht. Diarmait, then, obtained permission from English King Henry II to recruit Norman knights to regain his kingdom. A century had passed since the Battle of Hastings, when William the Conqueror had launched the Norman invasion of England. Now, it was time they take over Ireland. Diarmait succeeded in restoring his power, and later on, he named his son-in-law, a Norman, heir of his kingdom. This fact did not please King Henry II, who had already thought about conquering Ireland and feared the establishment of the Normans in Ireland before he could conquer it. With the authorization of Pope Adrian IV, Henry II went to Ireland in 1171 becoming the first English king to set foot on the island. He assigned Irish territories to be taken care of by his younger son, John. When he became King John, the lordship of Ireland fell directly under the English Crown.

Initially, the Normans controlled a great part of the island. They went deep into the country, settling and fortifying. The lord of Ireland, King John, helped consolidate the Norman controlled areas, while at the same time ensuring that many of these lords swore fealty to him. Nevertheless, the policy for many English who had kingdoms in Ireland was to weaken the power of Norman lords. The so-called Hiberno-Norman – Normans who settled in Ireland – suffered a series of attacks and ceased to spread their settlement and power. For this reason, the next years were paved with conflicts which caused a great deal of destruction, especially around Dublin. In this deranged situation, many Irish lords were able to regain large amounts of land their families had lost since the conquest.

Around the year of 1348, the Black Death stroke Ireland. English and Normans, who lived mainly in towns and villages, were severely hit, much harder than the native Irish, settled in dispersed rural areas. This case promoted the re-emergence of Gaelic Irish language and customs. The English responsible for controlling the territory shrunk back to fortified areas around Dublin and had little authority beyond this range. By the end of the XV century, English authority in Ireland had mostly disappeared, also due to the War of the Roses and the Hundred Years War, which meant that no English king up to Henry VII could give his individual attention to Ireland, even for a possible re-conquest during this period. Nonetheless, within the period from 1485 to 1487, the War of the Roses came to an end with the victory of Henry VII and the establishment of the House of Tudor (1485 – 1509). King Henry VII resolved to re-conquer Ireland and bring it under Crown control. Then, he upgraded Ireland from Lordship to full Kingdom, and also proclaimed himself King of

Ireland. After meeting with the Parliament, it was necessary to start a process of claiming control of the territory. Yet, the re-conquest was only completed during the reigns of Elizabeth I and James I, after extremely violent conflicts. Although the English, with some help from the Scots, were able, this time, to bring real and centralized control to the island, they could not convert the Irish into the protestant religion.

From the mid XVI century to the XVII century, the English and later British policy of colonization was a process called Plantations, a method of settlement, well understood as confiscation of land. Scottish and English Protestants were sent as colonists. The intention was that those people would then form the ruling class of future British administration in Ireland. The new landlords had to build fortified houses and buildings in their new land and keep men armed for security. In any other aspect, they had permission to use the land in any way they intended to, and were instructed to hire as workers only those who were English, Scottish and even Irish, but not the catholic ones. As a consequence, the native Irish grew intensely discontented. Unfortunately for them, the higher the number of upset natives, higher was the number of Scots and English coming to Ireland. The Lord Deputy, Grey of Wilton, was sent by Queen Elizabeth as her representative in Ireland, together with his secretary, the poet Edmund Spenser. Lord Grey was cruel, ruthless against the Irish rebels, and urged for a reformation, by the sword, if necessary. His secretary Edmund Spenser was supportive, but knew the human cost of such a war. After the crushing of a rebellion, Spenser wrote:

> Out of every corner of the woods and glens they came creeping forth upon their hands, for their legs would not bear them; they looked like anatomies of death; they spoke like ghosts crying out of their graves; they did eat the dead carrions, happy where they could find them; yea and one another soon after, insomuch as the very carcasses they spared not to scrape out of their graves (apud. O'BRIEN, 1999, p. 53-54)

Máire and Conor Cruise O'Brien affirm that the conquest of Ireland provided the psychological basis for the colonization of a great part of the world. Still, the Dead of the Irish, those hungry, oppressed, uprooted ghosts hover the land, belonging not only in the past, yet so relevant in the present. Queen Elizabeth, ruling an insecure throne, needed a different strategy in order to prevent Ireland from becoming an opening for enemies of the Crown. Pacification in Ireland was a requirement of national survival for England. However, pacification asked for the destruction of the Gaelic order, whose forms of liberty were, in the

English point of view, anarchical. An everlasting pattern had now established itself: Catholic Ireland under the subjugation of Protestant England. Soon, the population was divided into Catholics and Protestants. Although the original plan of the Settlements was to eliminate the hostile native population, the new undertakers responsible for the plantations, in practice, ended up accepting Irish tenants because they were cheaper workforce. The ground was laid for religious animosity juxtaposing a bitter and enduring dispute over land.

The XVII century was the bloodiest in Irish history. With the Stuarts on the throne, by 1641, a new generation of Irish was burning from dissatisfaction. Since England was ongoing a period of internal unrest, the rebels saw this as an opportunity to attack the English, or better saying, English settlements in Ireland. Two periods of civil wars caused huge life loss. Irish Catholics would not settle for being just tolerated, they wanted the Catholic faith established and the right of owning land, in this way, several rebellions broke out. In 1649, the Civil War in England came to an end with the execution of King Charles I. Oliver Cromwell, a strict English Puritan military and political leader, took over as the first Lord Protector of the Commonwealth of England. He felt deeply shocked when hearing about the atrocities committed against Protestants in Ireland, and decided it was time to suppress Ireland once and for all. As George Macaulay Trevelyan in *History of England* states about this matter,

> The first step in the reconstitution of the British Empire by the Republican Government was the subjugation of Ireland. It was rendered easier for Cromwell and his army because the Protestants over there, whatever their political allegiance, tended to rally round him as the champion of their race and creed, while the Irish resistance became racial and Catholic instead of Royalist. (1939, p. 421-422)

Hence, in the process of re-conquering Ireland, Cromwell understood he was truly justified in treating the Irish rebels in the most brutal way. The Irish settlement was by far the most destructive part of his work in the British islands. His project completed the transference of land from Irish to English proprietors and, according to Trevelyan, its object was threefold: to pay off in Irish land the soldiers who had fought and the capitalists who had provided the money for the conquest; secondly, to guarantee total control of Ireland and protect Great Britain against rebellions; and lastly, to exterminate Catholicism. By the end of the conquest movement, up to one third of Irish pre-war population was either killed or in exile. In the course of time, religion was the tie that brought the native Irish together and resisting. Since the native nobility had been destroyed by the English, the persecuted priests were the only

leaders to the people. The Cromwellian settlement only enhanced and contributed to the fact that Ireland for centuries was the most priest-led population in Europe.

Ireland became the main battlefield since King James II, a Catholic Stuart, was involved in conflicts between Catholics and Protestants. With his overthrown at the end of the Glorious Revolution (1688), the British Crown under the reign now of King William III, set a series of anti-Catholics statutes: the Penal Laws. According to these laws, as stated by O'Brien:

> Irish Catholics could not sit in parliament, or vote in parliamentary elections; they were excluded from the bar, the bench, the university, the navy, and all public bodies; they were forbidden to possess arms, or a horse worth more than five pounds. No Catholic could keep a school, or send his children to be educated abroad. The ownership of land was a subject of a whole complex branch of the penal code, as a result of which almost all the remaining land still owned by Catholics passed into Protestant hands. (1999, p. 77)

As it may be seem, the Penal Laws aimed in keeping the Catholic population in permanent state of inferiority. However, despite the harshness of the Penal Laws, the situation of the Catholic population throughout the first half of the XVIII century was less heavy than in the previous centuries. The native Gaelic culture has been virtually destroyed during the reign of Elizabeth I and Cromwell desolated the country, confiscating most of the land. Nonetheless, Gaelic literature managed to flourish in the XVIII and XIX centuries. The language, its literary production and oral traditions kept alive the sense of identity of the suppressed people and fortified the tendency to reject an alien government and social system, a fact that was revolutionarily potent in itself. Still, the Penal Laws caused great impact in the country. A. J. Barker in *Irlanda Sangrenta* (1979) points out that, after the oppression against the minorities in Hitler's time, people may see those Penal Laws as a mere historical fact. On the contrary, Irish people perceive what happened in the same way as the Jewish see the persecutions suffered by their people from Hitler. The wounds caused by this event of the Penal Laws have not completely healed, according to the author, and the Irish have not totally forgotten about them.

In reality, the main barriers in Ireland were not only those connected to religion. The Protestants who lived in Ireland were themselves torn between the Protestant Church of Ireland, the official one and other dissidents, such as Presbyterians. These dissidents had

supported King William III during the Glorious Revolution, yet, they were not in a privileged position, since they were also denied many civil rights. In spite of the fact that their situation was much better than the Catholics, only the rich landowners who belonged to the Official Church had the right to hold seats in the Irish Parliament. At the same time, the landowners were also resentful as the Irish Parliament was under the control of the British Parliament, they had no autonomy, and could only create or edit laws after previous authorization from England. Such laws limited them all: Catholics, Protestants, Presbyterian trade folks and the landowner elite.

In this sense, English legislation and governmental practice, which operated against Irish interests, resulted in the growth of a sense of Irish nationality. Furthermore, for some settlers, at times, the sense of being Irish differed from that of being British[1], overshadowing, as a consequence, the senses of being Protestant in opposition to being Catholic. In the end, the English legislation helped establish this sense of a separate nationality. The basic ambivalence in Ireland, between Protestant and Catholic, started to seem blurred for the Irish Protestants, as they too felt the damages of the Penal Laws, and had the impression that they were more and more seen as distant, strange and remote to the English, causing great resentment against England. A political alliance, then, followed, of Protestants and Catholics, in a patriot cause. Catholic 'defenderism' was a solution for Protestant economic ascendancy.

In the south of Ireland, the conditions of the peasantry were shameful. Many Presbyterians migrated to America, in search of hope. By the end of the XVIII century, 250.000 Presbyterians had crossed the Atlantic and many of them took part in the American War of Independence. The Declaration of Independence itself was written by an Irish, and at least ten of the American Presidents were Irish descendants. The impact of the American War of Independence and the French Revolution transformed the situation in Ireland. The movement of the United Irishmen sought to make Ireland a republic on French principles, and to break the connection with England. These facts culminated in the Irish Rebellion of 1798. An agreement was found in the Act of Union in 1800, with the hopes of peace and Catholic emancipation, which did not happen. Protestants began to realize that their dependence on England was the best guarantee for their lives and liberty against the revengeful Catholic rebels. In no time the words Protestants and Unionist were to become mere synonyms. Whereas the Catholics, whose leaders had originally favored the union with Great Britain, felt

[1] It is worth noting that, in reality, in spite of the presence of Scottish settlers, the Irish expressed biggest resentment in relation to the English. Although Scots had relevant participation in the conquest of Ireland, - James I was Scottish – the English supremacy has always prevailed. It is important to highlight that in the history of Scotland and Wales as well, it is possible to observe episodes that were marked by the English oppression.

betrayed when the emancipation promised did not follow. Protestants had become again to be viewed as the English presence in Ireland. The memory of intervening years still had its potency. Catholic emancipation seemed to be the cure for Ireland's social and economic distress.

In the period of 1845 to 1852, a major tragedy fell upon Ireland. The Irish Famine was a milestone in modern Irish history. It dramatically changed Irish economic and social structures and, needless to say, this critical shift left a lasting perception on the minds of the Irish people. In *This Great Calamity, The Irish Famine 1845 -1852* (1995), Christine Kinealy points to the fact that Ireland was an agricultural country in its majority. However, the image of Ireland as a poor, backward, potato-based country only partially represents its pre-Famine economy. The author argues that the country's agriculture was quite diverse, and its fruits were almost all commercialized. Indeed, the potato held a very significant role in the Irish diet. They were easy to cultivate and cook, and were consumed from the richest to the poorest. The fact that potatoes were widely partaken within Ireland allowed other products produced there to be exported in a higher portion; and England was Ireland's single largest supplier.

The crisis started in 1845, when blights in potato crops were first identified, caused by a fungus. In 1848, thus, Ireland was practically devastated and the failure of the potato crop happened again in consecutive years. Millions of people emigrated, mainly to the United States, and more than a million died. The country population was about half of what it had been before the Famine. Moreover, they were struggling against hunger, diseases and poverty.

Kinealy reminds us that the English government, the most powerful nation at that time, and Irish landlords kept on importing goods and profiting from Ireland, while the Irish population perished. The response of the English government and landlords alike was inadequate and did not bring solutions to the problem. International aid was provided, mainly from the United States, but it was insufficient to help the whole population and make up for all the food exported. These years of suffering, misruling and incompetent feedback from England and Irish landlords only helped feeding the bitterness between Ireland and England, as the Irish laid much of the blame for what had happened on the former. The result, according to the author, was a large-scale emigration that took the tragedy of the Famine beyond the shores of Ireland to an international stage (idem, p. 342).

Deep social and linguistic changes followed the Famine. Before those years, Ireland was to a great part Gaelic Irish-speaking, mainly among poor families, which maintained the

language alive until mid XIX century. Gradually, Gaelic started to disappear in the process of British colonization, and English had been the official language since 1801. As an outcome of Famine, most poor people had either died or emigrated, and soon English was spoken everywhere. In spite of that, by the turn of the XIX century, perhaps as a way of fighting the horrific situation of the country and a deep frustration, many Catholic writers and poets begun writing about the glories of ancient Ireland, revisiting ghosts and traditions, towards a reconnection with the land and the country, as if they were looking in the past for a cure for the present. The *Irish Literary Society* and the *Gaelic League* were created respectively in 1892 and 1893 both intending to rescue and preserve the Gaelic as the official national language. The members saw the Gaelic culture as fundamental for Irish identity, and wanted to redeem its supremacy by reaching back to the past and in its native culture.

In the late XIX century, legislations split up large states and gradually gave rural landholders' and tenants' ownership of the lands. The Land Act in 1881 conceded many principles which the tenants had long been demanding; such was fair rents and security against eviction. This Act transformed the conditions of land holding in Ireland and cracked the entire basis of the Cromwellian settlement, once landlords' authority became conditional and open to question. This was an attempt to solve the enduring land issue in Ireland, and it indeed proved to be quite effective. Still, the divisions were clear in Ireland. The majority Catholic, nationalist and agrarian, and, on the other side, there were the Unionist, Protestant and industrialized. Catholics believed they would remain economically and politically second class citizens without self government. Soon, there were agitations in order to grant the Home Rule to Ireland. After political turmoil, the UK Parliament finally passed third Home Rule act to establish self-government for Ireland. Nevertheless, the civil war that Ireland was involved in towards Home Rule was postponed by the outbreak of the First World War. In order to ensure implementation of Home Rule after the war, several nationalists supported Britain and allied against the Central Powers. The core of Irish volunteers was against this decision, but majority left for war. In 1916, the leaders of the Irish Republican Brotherhood thought they would not profit if they waited for the war to end and set a date for the Rising for Easter Sunday.

The Rising took place in around Dublin, although it was planned to be nationwide. The rebels proclaimed the Republic, after seizing many public buildings and the General Post Office. The British forces were taken by surprise, and suffered heavy causalities. Eamon De Valera assumed as the first president.

As it follows, the Rising had a sequel. About after a week of fighting, the rebels surrendered. Fifteen of the leaders were executed and several arrested, destroying the political base of the Irish parliament. The horror caused by the number of executions caused a deep adverse reaction from the American government. American reaction became a matter of concern to the British government especially due to America's entry in the war. Then, the British government felt pressured to compromise, and started by, at Christmas that year, releasing some imprisoned rebels, including De Valera. Even so, British government was not prepared to make concessions greater than those already established by the Home Rule act. Also, there was the issue of the remaining six counties in the North of Ireland of Protestant majority, Unionists, which opposed to the Republic. Two and half years of guerrilla war succeed, led by the Irish Republican Army. In 1920, separate parliaments were established for Northern Ireland and Southern Ireland, but truce only came one year after with the Anglo-Irish Treaty, when it was agreed that Northern Ireland could opt union with the UK, which promptly did so. Both parliaments formalized the Treaty in 1922 ensuring the independence of the twenty-six counties of the Irish Free State. However, many members of the IRA regarded the Treaty a deception to the Republic, since the whole island was not united, and decided to carry on the fight to the bitter end, initiating the Irish Civil War at that very same year.

The Irish Civil War was bloody and lasted for one year. Despite the bitterness and the disillusion caused by the confront, there was also a sense of common pride. The conflict between basically the anti-Treaty nationalists, the ones who wanted to fight on until an Irish Republic was achieved, and the Pro-Treaty nationalists, who accepted the Free State as a first step towards full independence and unity prevailed during the combat. Until today, division among nationalists still taints Irish politics, especially between the two leading parties, Fianna Fáil, founded by De Valera, and Fine Gael. In 1949, the state was formally declared a republic and left the British Commonwealth, being now Ireland and no longer Southern Ireland.

Challenges, tough, seem never to cease, and Ireland still proves to be a country of political stir and moved by deep influence of religion. Yet, it also certifies to be a state of passion and personality, full of contrasts, inspiring myths that base its identity, colors and inner strength.

1.3 **A few remarks on National Identity**

> As a 'nation' (which we now increasingly called ourselves), we revisited our glorious past of myth and Wonder; we reminded ourselves of our ancient poets and our many Gods and out brilliant artistic virtues. (…) we must observe what had happened – because in the workings of the past lay the clues to the future. (…) and we would soon again become brilliant. (DELANEY, 2007, p. 205)

In June 2009, around 110 Romanian gypsies were attacked in Belfast, in North Ireland, by thugs who used bricks and bottles in order to drive them away from their homes. A group of about 20 families, including children, had to leave their homes and shelter in a community center. Frightened and disappointed, the families of gypsies are making their way back to their homeland. Since Romania joined the EU in 2007 there has been an increase in migration, according to newspapers. Also, there has been a rise of anti-immigrant sentiment across Europe according to the BBC news[2]. Another newspaper, the British *The Guardian*[3], singles out an interesting piece of information: accompanying the wave of racial tensions in Europe, British Far-Right picked up seats in many countries in elections for the European Parliament. The British national party, which proposes a 'voluntary repatriation of immigrants' increased its share of the vote and won its first two European seats. Meanwhile, in the wake of the Belfast attacks, a number of Romanians wrote to newspapers disassociating themselves from the Romanian gypsies: 'They don't have the Romanian Soul' an anonymous Romanian posted.

The incident briefly described above, in accordance with the point of view of newspapers found that mentioned this piece of news, draws our attention to important issues that are concealed in it. Conforming to Anthony McGrew, in *A Global Society?* (1996), globalization brings into question the foundational concepts of society and the nation-state, setting premises concerning the future of the nation-state and the nature of the modern political community. Globalization would, then, reconstruct the world as 'one place' refocusing the sociological project away from the notion of 'society' and the nation-state towards the emerging 'world society'. However, when we witness episodes like the Belfast attacks and many others across the globe, one cannot help but to think if we really do live in a

[2] Source: BBC News http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/8114234.stm on Tuesday, 23 June 2009

[3] Source: The British Guardian http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/jun/21/race-northern-ireland-romanian-gypsies on Sunday 21 June 2009

global society under these standards and also if globalization is really bringing the reality of a society with no boundaries. Moreover, we could reckon whether the concepts of nation and nationalism are indeed losing their strengths in face of these changes in modern society. As this point is highlighted in many passages of the novel *Tipperary* as well, it seems relevant to revise the conceptions of nation and nationalism and national identity, their roots, how they work and the impact they cause on people and how they contribute in shaping one's identity.

Bill Ashcroft, in *Post-Colonial Studies: the Key Concepts* (2000), emphasize that global capitalism requires that the individual be free to act in an economic realm that crosses and abolishes boundaries and identities. The tensions between the impulses of a united 'world society', increasing rapidly as modern communications make global contact a daily reality, and the conflicts of nationalism and differences among nations are amongst the most important and yet unresolved forces in the modern world.

As we can see, nationalism is still a powerful phenomenon and there is still a lot of room for discussion. From time to time we are faced with headlines such as those reported above, which makes us wonder about the subject. In contrast with globalization and its impulse of unity, the passport, for example, became a fundamental legal document that states not only who a person is but where this person is from, attaching the individual to the nation state. Thus, it would be impossible to be a 'stateless' person. Montserrat Guibernau in *Nacionalismos: o estado nacional e o nacionalismo no século XX* (1997), reflects upon nationalism in Europe in the XX century, the contrasts between Western and Eastern Europe, and the role nationalism plays in those countries. The author singles out the integrating force of the European Union in contrast with the excluded minorities that exist in European nation states. The author ponders whether the union would stimulate these minorities become stronger and develop their identities in face of a giant or if the birth of a European identity would erode differences and particularities.

In Ireland, nationalism is still an issue, and it is not solved. Many contemporary authors discuss it through fiction, and the novel that is the object of this study, *Tipperary*, is not an exception. Frank Delaney defines, in the author's notes, his book being "a passionate romance within an epic struggle for nationhood" (p. 1) in which the narrators and characters are somehow involved in the upheavals of their country, Ireland.

Eric Hobsbawm in *Nações e Nacionalismos desde 1780: programa, mito e realidade* (1990), argues that the concept of nation as we know today, as a social entity is connected to a certain form of modern territory, the nation state. Despite the fact that nations have not been responsible for developing the states and nationalism, there is no sense, for the author, to

discuss nation and nationality outside the relationship to the idea of nation state. Therefore, the author highlights that nations are cultural constructs, a myth. Nationalism, he sees, transforms nations, shapes them, and invents them. He holds that nationalism comes before nations. Nations, then, do not form the state and nationalisms, but the opposite.

Stuart Woolf in the introduction to *Nationalism in Europe, 1815 to the present: a reader* (1996) claims that there are three elements that have become inextricably overlapped in our understanding of the nation state: the nation, as a collective identity; the state as an expression of political independence; and the territory as a geographical area with frontiers demarcating the necessary coincidence between nation and state. However, nationalism, in its identification of a people with the territorial nation state, is a historically modern phenomenon, usually accepted as related to the French Revolution. Before the French Revolution, the King represented the personification of the nation. After this rupture, the nation, which was once personified in the body of the King, became something 'invisible', spiritual, to be divided to each of its members. Hobsbawm (1990) contributes saying that the equation "nation = state = people"[4], especially sovereign people, linked nation to the concept of territory, as the structure and definition of states were now essentially territorial. The idea that the nation dwells in each one of the members, and it is no longer represented by only one individual, feeds patriotic feelings and sense of responsibility towards that territory and ideology, for example, fighting at war for the sake of the nation.

In *O que é uma nação?* (1997), Ernest Renan defends the conception that the common interest among men is a powerful and important bond, but insufficient when it comes to forming a nation. The nation is a soul, a spirit. This soul is constituted by a rich legacy of memories, and the desire to live together and cherish that heritage. Yet, it is not an easy process; the nation is the result of hard work, sacrifices and devotion. The heritage, the ancestors, they are important as motivation and guidance as they are responsible for who we are now. The idea of nation and nationalism lays in the glorious past, heroic men who have made great things and that instigates people to move forward and continue doing great deeds. Therefore, the nation is a major solidarity, built on the feelings people get from sacrifices they have made, and the ones they are to make in the future. The clear desire to be together and share life in common is, ergo, the essence of the nation.

[4] We can reckon that this equation proposed by Hobsbawm could mean that the concept of nation would be equivalent to the idea of the state, which refers to the land, the territory. Also, these two elements would also correspond to people, as the group of citizens who would compose the nation. This equation aims at showing that by linking the citizens and the conception of the nation to the land (state) we could see as a possible consequence how nation is closely connected with territoriality.

Renan takes into account many aspects that are raised when nationalism is in discussion, such as religion, geography, language and race. He argues that those ideals are not crucial for his concept of nation by giving examples of nations in which ethnic diversity in the constitution of its people and in the present is a reality. In relation to languages, he claims languages to be historical constructs, not something present in the blood of the speakers, so it is not possible to chain a person to a language. For example, in Switzerland, three or four languages are spoken and official. As for religion, it is an individual choice, and it is in the realm of the intimacy, and the author excludes it from being able to traces limits in nations. Lastly, he admits that geography does play an important role in the division of the nations. Nonetheless, the land without people is soulless. The people are the ones who breathe life into the land by working, planting and connecting with it. Conclusively, men are not slaves to race, language, religion or a place. A huge group of men, with health spirits and warm hearts are the moral consciousness of a nation (1997, p. 43).

In contrast with the beliefs exposed by Renan, Johann Herder thought the nation as a natural entity, an inheritance that one received when born in a certain place. The ideas exposed by José Luís Jobim and Ana Lúcia de Souza Henriques in A *literatura e a identidade nacional lingüística: José de Alencar e Walter Scott* (1996) help us to understand that, according to Herder, the individual would, then, at birth, receive the soul and spirit of the nation it is born into. The cultural bonds that unite the people in the nation are pure energy, coming from inside, they are shared by all and these feelings constitute the collective essence of people throughout time. The people symbolize a sole spirit, unalterable. Herder discusses the idea of nationalism as being something culturally organic, inherited as energy by the people that are born into a land, and the emotions and sense they take out of it develop into a collective soul common to all.

Benedict Anderson, in *Imagined Communities* (1983), seeks to explain the attachment people feel for their nations. It is useful to remind ourselves that nations inspire a profound sentiment, linked with devotion, patriotism. He states that nationalism thinks in terms of historical destinies, while racism dreams of eternal contaminations, transmitted from the origins of time through an endless sequence of loathsome copulations: outside history. The ambitions of racism actually have their origin in ideologies of class, rather than in those of nation: above all in claims to divinity among rules and to ‘blue’ or ‘white’ blood and ‘breeding’ among aristocracies (1983, p. 149).

Anderson defines ‘official nationalism’ as typically a response on the part of threatened dynastic and aristocratic groups, upper classes, to popular colloquial nationalism.

Colonial racism was a major element in that conception of ‘Empire’ which attempted to bind dynastic legitimacy and national community. It did so by generalizing a principle of innate superiority on which its own domestic position was based to the greatness of the overseas possessions conveying the idea that, for instance, English lords were naturally superior to other Englishmen and also subjective natives. In this context, nationhood and nationalism failed to represent the diversity of the actual national community for which they proposed to speak, and in practice represented and consolidated the interests of dominant power groups. However, he argues that what he calls ‘the last wave’ of nationalism had its origins in colonial territories, as a response to new-style global imperialism. According to Ashcroft (2002, p. 154) Anti-colonial movements employed the idea of a pre-colonial past to assemble their opposition through a sense of difference, but they employed this past not to reconstruct the pre-colonial social state but to generate support for the construction of post-colonial nation-states based upon the European nationality model. Whether in Europe or in post-colonial countries, nationalism is a present potency. Movements for independence show that. Many post-colonial countries have their political history marked with struggle, and even once they become independent their bonds of economic dependence with the Empire are still apparent, and perhaps the fact that many base the construction of their nation-sates in the modern European model means that this model is not suitable or sufficient to support their inner conflicts.

Furthermore, Benedict Anderson (1983) argues that nations are imagined communities. Nation, nationalism and nationality are cultural artifacts: in order to understand them, it’s necessary to consider how they have come into historical being, how their meanings have changed over time and why they command such profound emotional legitimacy. He defines the nation as an imagined political community; that is imagined both inherently limited and sovereign. They are limited because even the largest nations have finite boundaries, beyond which lie other nations. They are sovereign because the concept of nation was born in an age in which Enlightenment and Revolution were destroying the legitimacy of divinely hierarchical dynastic realm. Nations dreamed of being free. The emblem of this freedom was the sovereign state. Anderson believes nations are imagined because the members of such communities will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, hear them, yet, in the minds of each lives the image of their communion. He notes that a nation imagines itself this way because, regardless of inequalities and exploitation that may prevail in some nations, it is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship. It is this

fraternity that makes it possible for so many people to kill or be willing to die for such imaginings.

Notwithstanding, communities should not be distinguished or pointed out by their falsity or even genuineness, but by how they are imagined. And this is exactly the point where the difference lies between nations; how they are imagined; what elements are deployed to construct our common-sense views of national belonging or identity. Stuart Hall (1996) adds to this concept that national cultures are discourses, composed of symbols and representations; they are like narratives that have a way of constructing meanings that influences and organizes both our actions and our conceptions of ourselves. National cultures contribute in shaping our identities by producing meanings about the nation with which we can identify. In *The Question of Cultural Identity* (1996), Hall raises the query of how the narratives of national cultures are told. He selects and develops five elements which he finds essential. First, he points to the existence of what he calls the narrative of the nation, which are national stories, legends, literatures and so on that are told and retold. They are crucial since they provide a set of images, scenarios, historical events, national symbols, and rituals which stand for, or represent, the shared experiences, sorrows and triumphs and disasters which give meaning to the nation. At this point, we can make a connection with the concept of an imaged community presented by Anderson because the population of one nation, as members of such imagined community, can see themselves sharing this same narrative. It gives significance and importance to their existence, connects their everyday lives with a national destiny, even though they do not know they are co-citizens. They are joined by the past and the future of their nations. The past, the dead and the history of one's nation create marks that are constantly present, contaminating and influencing one's being.

In a second place, Hall signals the emphasis on the ideas of origins, continuity, tradition and timelessness. National identities are portrayed as primordial, in the very nature of things. They may be in a sort of state of somnolence, but they are always ready to be awoken. The essentials of national character remain unchanged through all the fluctuations of history. It is there from birth, eternal. Therefore, roots, origins and so on are marked to remain unchanged, untouched throughout time. In view of this point, there is a connection with the third element that Hall chooses to single out. A third discursive strategy is related to traditions. Hall develops the concept in accordance with what the historians Erik Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger call the invention of tradition. In *The invention of tradition* (1984) they sustain the idea that traditions that are believed to be long dated are often recent and sometimes invented. They recall to a set of practices that aim to infuse certain values and

norms of behavior by repetition; and this reoccurrence of actions will result in the continuity of a historical past.

In terms of narratives that endorse the historical past of a nation, myths and legends are foremost examples. In the fourth element conceived by Hall, he discusses what he calls the foundational myth, which talks about the origin of the nation, the people and their character. These narratives date so long in time that they are lost in the mists, in the limits between the 'not' real and the 'mythic' time. These 'myths' provide a narrative in terms of which an alternative history or counter-narrative can be constructed. Following this line of thought, in the fifth and last point, we see that national identities are often symbolically based on the idea of what Hall defines a pure, original people, or 'folk', that is alongside with the thoughts of Herder. However, by checking the realities of the development of the nation, it is rarely this primordial folk the ones who exercised power. This discourse ends up building identities that are ambiguously placed between past and future, and sometimes national cultures are tempted to turn back, to retreat to that lost time when the nation was 'grand', and to restore past identities. Yet, often this nostalgia, this return to the past hides a struggle to mobilize 'the people' to purify their ranks, to expel 'the others' who threaten their identity, and to strengthen loins for a new journey forwards.

Kenneth Thompson, in *Religion, Values and Ideology* (1996) brings up interesting questions. He wonders about the importance of a shared culture aiming at binding people together in society today. The author seems uncertain about the fact that society needs people to share certain values and beliefs in order to engage in social cooperation, in the sense that the absence of this cooperation would hinder society's existence. Additionally, he questions whether culture truly affects how people perceive their interests and their sense of themselves as individuals, having an identity derived from membership of some larger community or grouping. As it was developed before, Stuart Hall (1996) discusses how relevant this shared culture, these common beliefs and values, the national cultures, are. This feeling that one is sharing cultural references with others, that one belongs somewhere is one of the primal sources of cultural identity. People often define themselves as Irish or Brazilian. Although, as Hall also calls our attention to, these national identities are not imprinted in our genes, we do think of them as part of our essential natures. Underlining the power of nationalism, Ernest Gellner stresses in *Nations and Nationalism* that 'a man must have a nationality as he must have a nose and two ears' (1983, p. 6). Without a sense of national identification, Gellner concludes, a man would experience a profound sensation of subjective loss.

Understanding nationalism, its core, how and why it moves people that much, Benedict Anderson traces the roots of nationalism. He reckons that nationalism should not be comprehended by aligning it with political ideologies, but with the large cultural systems that preceded it. Two relevant cultural systems are: the religious community and the dynastic realm. The decline of these two cultural systems contributed to the rise of nationalism and to the possibility of the beginning of the process of imagining a nation.

Kenneth Thompson notes that the influence of the thoughts generated by the Enlightenment challenged the dominance of religion in the realm of ideas, including social and political thought, and then later the French Revolution seemed to give the fatal blow to traditional institutions that embodied those ideas. He leaves an intriguing question: 'What would take the place of these ties?' (1996, p. 398). Anderson contributes with the idea that religious communities were linked to the use of sacred language and written script. Sacred languages were the media through which the great global communities of the past were imagined. These sacred languages created truths that paved concepts of how men saw life and thus their ideas about admission to membership. The idea was that a particular script-language offered privileged access to ontological truth, since this language was an inseparable part of that truth.

The dynastic realm is associated with the belief that kingship is in the center and legitimacy derives from divinity. People are subjects, subordinates, not citizens. Thus, it is the view that society was naturally organized around and under high centers – monarchs who were people apart from human beings and who ruled by some form of divine dispensation. Considering the decline of the dynastic realm and the loosening of religious ties, in a process of secularization, in modern societies, the set was ready for the rise of nationalism. The nation emerges as the ultimate ideological community for most people, and one with the strongest imagined sense of timelessness and naturalness.

Émile Durkheim in *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life* (1961) utters that, especially after the French Revolution, under what he calls the influence of the general enthusiasm, things that were previously regarded as temporal and profane were turned by collective opinion into sacred things. These sacred elements in society, according to the sociology, were: Reason, Liberty and Fatherland. The representations that these ideologies provide emanate from a kind of transcendent source: they excel the individual interests; they have an 'aura of disinterestedness' as the ties that Anderson says that binds people to the nation as an imagined community does. Perhaps the ties Thompson was inquiring about. Nationalism was finding its way into the hearts of the people.

According to Benedict Anderson (1983), the conception of temporality also plays in important role in understanding the roots of nationalism and the origins of the nation as an imagined community. Before the decline of sacred communities, the divine sphere and history were undistinguishable, the origins of the world and men were essentially the same. The change in the manner of apprehending the world and time was fundamental in the sense that made it possible to 'think' the nation. The notion of simultaneity was the key to promote the origins of the imagining of a community. By admitting the idea of an homogeneous, empty time, as Anderson asserts, the 'meanwhile', we can think that people, the members of a community, can be passing each other on the street, without ever becoming acquainted, and still be connected. Likewise, the appearance of the novel and the newspaper in the XVIII century provided technical means for representing the kind of imagined community that the nation is. Through the reading of a novel, it is possible to observe that people that do not know each other – but are still connected in the same plot – are doing different activities. This idea grows in the mind of readers, omniscient readers that watch the characters of the story acting all at once.

In conformance with Anderson (1983) the thought of a sociological organism moving across homogeneous time is a definite equivalent of the idea of the nation, which is also conceived as a solid community moving steadily across history. A Brazilian may never know the names of the millions of his fellow-citizens; and may have also no idea of what they are doing, what they are planning to do. However, he has complete confidence in their steady, anonymous, simultaneous activity.

As aforementioned, language also takes part in making communities imaginable. The deterioration of Latin – language connected with ecclesiastic knowledge – contributed to the growth and emergence of other languages. The interaction between technologies of communications, such as: print, human linguistic diversity, and also a system of production and productive relations, related to the origins of capitalism, marked the genesis of nationalism. They laid the basis for the rise of national consciousness. By creating fields of communication and exchange, speakers of a variety of "Frenches" and "Englishes" who might have found difficult or even impossible to understand one another became capable or understanding one another via paper. In this process, they gradually became aware of the hundreds of people that spoke and/or wrote the same language, so they felt as if they belonged to the same group. These fellow-readers formed the embryo of the nationally imagined community.

Through the analysis of a genealogy of the nation, of this imagined community, it is possible to understand its influence and force on people. Nationalism and the cultural representations that nations provide are sources of meanings, focus of identification. Hall (1996) questions the unity of this national culture. He reminds us that nations refer to both the modern nation-state and something related to family, domicile, and condition of belonging. National identities, therefore, aimed to bring these two parts together – the membership of the political nation-state and identification with the national culture. Hence, national cultures seek to unify the members of a community into one cultural identity, to represent them as belonging to the same national family. Yet, with this unity, differences such as gender, class, race and others could be canceled or subsumed, since most meanings and values from national cultures have powerful masculine and hegemonic associations. Withal, as proposed by Hall, among other theorists, we should think of national cultures as constituting a discursive device which represents difference as unity or identity. They are cross-cut by deep internal divisions and differences, and 'unified' only through the exercise of different forms of cultural power (1996, p. 617). National identities are not free from the play of power, distinctions, internal conflicts, contradictions, and they do not include all other forms of difference into themselves. Perhaps national identities are still a complex subject. They may not take the form that is considered more inclusive because they are constructs, conceived by people that are trying to express themselves somehow and might be themselves uncertain of their own identities.

Stuart Woolf comments that the success of nationalism in establishing national identity onto multiple pre-existing individual and collective identities owned much to its capacity to relate its image of the nation to elements locally recognizable by people and groups. National history has always worked, in the image created by the author, as a large suitcase, able to accommodate and revive memories of a distant and mythicized past (1996, p. 30).

The author adds that national identities depend on the exclusion as much as on inclusion. He chooses as examples to address this issue the foreigner, whose expulsion is determinant in concretizing national independence; and also ethnic minorities, whose existence threatens national unity. Both examples show functional complements of the symbolic and material mechanisms of forging national cohesion, present in most historical processes of nation-building. However, the definitions of who should be included or excluded are fundamentally arbitrary, depending on the very myths that ground nationalist ideology. Lastly, the author agrees that the strength of nationalism, to the present day, lies in its capacity to identify with, incorporate and mobilize support for a wide range of ideological positions.

Over the centuries, societies have undergone so many changes, and the way people think and see themselves and the world, and therefore the nation, has alternated a lot, too. Nonetheless, we could agree that the concept of the land continues to be irrevocably a fundamental part of one person, and this idea becomes very clear as we read the novel *Tipperary*, especially when the character Michael Nugent comments:

> Under the old systems of kinships, most people had an opportunity at least to wring a living from the earth. Ancient Ireland was a network of small farms. When the planters came in, and farms were confiscated and merged into huge estates, the land hunger only went underground. It never disappeared. (DELANEY, 2007, p. 111).

Despite all the incongruities of nationalism, it plays an important role on people's lives. It is a concept that deserves attention and examination. It is still a song in the hearts of many individuals.

2 FRANK DELANEY AND HIS NOVEL *TIPPERARY*

2.1 The author and his work

The Irish author Frank Delaney was born in Tipperary in 1942. He has a very active literary career and has published more than 21 books. Also, he has worked as a judge for many literary prizes including the Booker Prize. However, Delaney worked in TV and radio for many years. In 1970, he began working as a newsreader for the Irish state radio and television network RTE. In the mid 1970's, he joined the Northern Ireland region of the BBC in Belfast as their current affairs man in Dublin and covered an intense period of violence known as the Irish *Troubles*. After 5 years of reporting on the violence, he moved to London to work in Arts broadcasting. In 1978, he created the award-winning weekly show *Bookshelf*, which covered books, writers and the business of publishing. Over the next five and a half years, he interviewed over 3000 authors including Anthony Burgess, Margaret Atwood, Christopher Isherwood and Stephen King. Afterward, he created and presented *Word of Mouth*, the BBC's award winning show about language, as well as a variety of radio and television documentaries. Moreover, he presented *The Book Show* on the Sky News satellite channel for many years. His writing career started in 1981 when his first book, *James Joyce's Odyssey*, was published to critical acclaim and became a best-seller in the UK and Ireland. In 1986, he wrote and presented the six-part documentary series *The Celts* for the BBC and its best-selling companion book. Besides having also edited many compilations of essays and poetry, Delaney has written books of non-fiction, novels and a number of short stories[5].

In an interview[6], Delaney talked about the three novels he has written around the history of Ireland. He calls these three novels an enterprise of retelling the history of Ireland through fiction, deeply exploring native Ireland's history in the twentieth century, dealing with one decade at a time. The author chose this strategy since he believes one can interrogate things in fiction, whereas we are not encouraged to question facts. He points out the history is in the heart, and he is more interested in the *mood* of the country rather than the facts he can get from history. Therefore, he figured that if he created characters, he would then be able to look at history through the character and his or her actions. In this process, he hoped to find out something, some knowledge from his country he had not got before, from history books.

---

[5] Source: Delaney's official site http://www.frankdelaney.com/

[6] Source: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aIFPGsgTJQM. In this link there is a video of Frank Delaney's speech at the NYS Writers Institute in 2009.

In the first novel, named *Ireland*, published in 2006, he gives an overview of the history of Ireland since the Ice Age until the XIX century. In this novel, an itinerant storyteller, the last of a fabled breed, arrives unannounced and mysteriously at a house in the Irish countryside. By the fire, he begins to tell the story of this extraordinary island. One of his listeners, a nine-year-old boy, grows so interested by the storytelling that, when the old man leaves, he dedicates his life to finding him again. It is a search that reveals both passions and mysteries, in the boy's life as well as the old man's. In addition, a document is quoted from throughout the book - the Storyteller's own chronicle. Together they comprise the narrative of a people, the history of a nation, the telling of Ireland in all its drama, intrigue and heroism, its philosophy, its spirit, its national ego. Along the great search, we meet kings and monks, god-heroes and great works of art, shrewd Norman raiders and envoys from Rome, leaders, lovers and poets. Each illuminates the magic of Ireland, the troubling power of England and the eternal connection to the raw earth. Delaney, in the author's notes to *Ireland*, enhances the notion that imagination and emotion play their parts in every history and therefore, to understand the Irish, mere facts can never be enough; this is a country that reprocesses itself through the mills of its imagination.

In *Shannon* (2010), Delaney starts from the point where Tipperary (2007) ended, after the end of the War of Independence. Robert Shannon is a young American hero of the Great War, a marine chaplain, who was present at the frightful Battle of Belleau Wood, and still suffers from shell shock. He lands in Ireland in the summer of 1922, as his mentor hopes that a journey Robert had always wanted to make – to find his family roots – will restore his equilibrium and his vocation. Interestingly, along the banks of the river that bears his family name, a chain of support has been put into place – to guide him, nurture him, and protect him. However, there is one more thing: on his return from the war, Robert Shannon witnessed serious corruption in the Archdiocese of Boston. Consequently, he has also been sent to Ireland to secure his silence permanently. Suddenly, Robert is invited to face the dangers of a torn nation and is pursued by the venom of true evil. Meanwhile, Ireland's myths and people, its beliefs and traditions, its humor and wit, unfold in his path.

Delaney's most recent novel *The Matchmaker of Kenmare* (2011) is a sequel of *Venetia Kelly's Travelling Show* (2010). In *Venetia Kelly's,* Delaney tells us the story of 18-year-old Ben McCarthy, who leaves home in search for his father. His odyssey is set in Ireland in the politically tumultuous 1930's. In the sequel *The Matchmaker of Kenmare,* the scenery is neutral World War II Ireland. The matchmaker Kate Begley comes into Ben

McCarthy's life and as the story goes they are both sent to war to secret assignments, facing the questioning of remaining neutral in the face of overwhelming evil.

As we can see, Delaney has much to say and continues to publish constantly and advertize his country and its people. It seems that he is not done with his rewriting on the history of Ireland through fiction.

2.2 **Summary on the novel *Tipperary***

The novel *Tipperary* is the result of a man's endeavor to rewrite and retell the history of his country based on his feelings, experiences and perceptions. By the time the main character, an Irish called Charles O'Brien, and narrator of most part of the book decides to write down his memories, he is completely involved in the political agitations in Ireland. It is the moment when rebels are getting together and fighting for independence of the country. Additionally, he has to cope with personal turmoil: he is deeply in love with a woman who does not love him back, and he tries to deal with this pain by working hard and gradually getting more and more involved in political issues regarding Ireland, which also shares his passion.

Nevertheless, O'Brien is not the sole narrator in the account of his life. Throughout the novel, we read critical 'commentaries' on the writings of O'Brien through notes presented since the very beginning of the book. Towards the middle of the book, a second contemporary narrator reveals himself. His name is Michael Nugent, he's a History and English Literature teacher and besides the notes he writes, he also compiled letters, newspaper reports and O'Brien's mother's journal. Nugent argues having bought a chest which carried O'Brien's journal, and while reading it, he became completely involved and fascinated by the story, and kept on researching about it deeper and deeper, until he was completely taken over by it, even though he could not understand the reasons for being so drawn to it.

O'Brien opens his memories with a vivid event from his childhood. It is his intention to discuss in this first moment an important issue in Ireland that is the struggle over land. As we have seen before in the chapter concerning the History of Ireland, native Irish have suffered with land confiscation in many periods along history. For many years, Britain's idea of dominating Ireland was over seizing land from the native Irish and giving them to English or Scottish landlords. Nine-year-old O'Brien recalls the day he visited the Treeces, a rich family who lived nearby. They lived in a big farm and their ancestors had been given the land for helping Oliver Cromwell, who undertook most of Irish land in the 1650's. That day, O'Brien and his father witnessed Mr. Treece violently evicting a poor family of tenants, mother, father and young children that apparently lived in his property, from their home in order to use the land to breed sheep. Weeping, the father was able to say:

> Take a good look at this man on the horse. (…) He's our landlord, George Treece. He's evicting us. He's evicting us because he wants the land for grazing, because he thinks sheep and cattle more valuable than people. He's evicting people whose family has lived in these fields for more than fifteen hundred years. (DELANEY, 2007, p. 11)

After these words, Mr. Treece had his men demolish the family's little cottage. On their way home, Charles and his father were able to observe a startling scene: in the deep forest, thousands of homeless, poor people observe the eviction. Watching in silence, as if they had grown from the ground, they resembled phantoms. Charles describes them:

> Under these branches, in the shadowy tree-line beside this destroyed household, local people had begun to materialize, like ghosts out of the darkness. They never quite stepped into the sunlight but I somehow knew that they had been there all along, watching. Men and women, both young and ancient, (…) all dressed in the uniform of shabbiness of the people who lived in the cottages, all gaunt with the same undernourishment (…) gazing calmly but intently at the eviction. (idem, p. 13)

O'Brien's father became evidently affected by what he had seen. And young O'Brien tried to understand what had happened, and as both were riding back home, they were able to see shapes of people in the woods, hiding behind trees, shapes of shabby undernourished people of all ages, poor people that were now homeless in their own country. By dinner time that day, his father told O'Brien: "Please write down what you saw. It will last longer if you do it. These things will need to be known one day." (idem, p. 14).

Even though O'Brien decides to start his memories with the story of the Treece eviction, we could say that the true starting point of this narrative is when the character is forty years old and meets the woman who will motivate him to write this account in the first place: April Burke, whom he met in 1900, when she was just 18 years old. After having finished a seven-year training to be a healer, O'Brien started traveling around Europe helping and curing people. In the year he met Burke, he was summoned by a good friend who asked him to go to Paris in order to help a person in need, a request which he promptly attended. The sick person was no one other than the writer Oscar Wilde. At that time, the writer had already left prison and was poor and terribly ill living in a hotel room in Paris, where O'Brien met April. She was one of the people in the room assisting to Wilde, and she had been brought so as to distract and make company to him. During long conversations with the young lady, Wilde started to speculate whether April, who had Irish descending, had any family

connections with the real owners of Tipperary Castle, a majestic building which had not been claimed for years.

Soon after O'Brien's arrival in Paris and the beginning of the treatment, Wilde died. O'Brien tried to get closer to April Burke, but still, after so many attempts, she fiercely rejected him. Not long after that, O'Brien gets to know April's father and, consumed with the idea that Tipperary castle belonged to his beloved's father, he told Mr. Burke the whole story and tried to convince him to pursue the case. Finally, in 1904, April decided to go to Ireland to hire lawyers and carry out the lawsuit on the ownership of the castle. Alongside, agitations in Ireland became vivid. The whole country burned with a nationalistic flame and the talk of Home Rule was a constant debate.

Along the negotiations on the Tipperary castle case, April's father died, and in 1907, April, the only heir, receives the keys to the castle. April requests O'Brien's help on the evaluation of the condition and renovation of the estate, working as a caretaker. The local population did not seem to accept the idea that an English woman would come to revoke a land and a castle that was so symbolic to them. Some months after winning the claim to the castle, April married Stephen Somerville, a young lawyer who had assisted her in her case, and who was clearly only interested in her money and inheritance. Needless to say, this fact broke Charles's heart to pieces. Nevertheless, he never ceased to help April with the castle. April's ownership of Tipperary castle was questioned by the local people, who somehow refused to believe she was really related to the real owners of the place, and they resented the fact that an English woman would come all the way from London to take over a property they had already regarded as their own. Because of that, there were negative reactions to her presence and the work on the castle. One day, due to his involvement in the reconstruction, Charles was brutally attacked and shot on evening in the entrance of the castle. The young man who found and helped him, Joseph Patrick Harney, becomes a significant figure in this story. He did what he could to make sure O'Brien would be cured and never left his side after that.

While O'Brien was recovering, April coldly fires him from the job of caretaking, which he loved, and that caused him a great deal of pain. When recovered, he tried, with Harney's help, to possibly find the people who shot him. Meanwhile, he continues to be harassed by people who believe that the castle should be given back to the people of Tipperary, from whom it had been taken by Plantations in 1587.

After trials, the estate is officially awarded to April in 1911, and the general reaction was that:

> The Anglo-Irish welcomed somebody who had married one of their own: now those who wanted to stay on in their estates felt strengthened. Moderate Irish people felt perhaps that some kind of ancestral justice had been done to the name of Burke but also felt a little cheated at the entry of a Somerville – a protestant. And republicans, dreaming of independence and the recovery of ancestral lands, fumed at the loss of thousands of rich acres. (DELANEY, 2007, p. 248)

In 1914, the Great First World War began and Home Rule did not come true at that time. Disappointed after his brother's death, O'Brien tried to enlist, and then to emigrate to the United States. None of these things happen since April's husband, Somerville, dies at war and, left alone, she asks for O'Brien's help again, now to rebuild the house.

In 1916, the Easter Rising began in confusion. The rebels saw an opportunity since England was weakened and distracted by the war, and although there was disorder and disagreement among the activists, the attack happened anyway, ending in tragedy. O'Brien realized Harney was missing and after investigating found out he was a volunteer for the Irish Republican Army. In the middle of turmoil, he went to Dublin to fetch his friend. Despite his efforts, Harney ended up arrested at the end of the rising. Having no one else to reach out for help, O'Brien decides to go back to Tipperary to find the castle destroyed by an attack with fire.

At last, Harney came back home, but did not let the fight behind. Later on in the story, O'Brien and April became acquainted with some of the most prominent names of the fight for Irish independence, such as Michael Collins, De Valera and Dermot Noonan. As the fight grew more and more intense, O'Brien's life became increasingly involved in it. Soon, Michael Collins himself requested help and Tipperary castle served as shelter for many of Collins's men on the run. April, being English and rich, worked as a perfect undercover and they weren't caught. O'Brien saw his peaceful Tipperary absorbed in violence and disorder each day. Lastly, truce was called in 1921. Also, truce came to O'Brien's life: after more than twenty years, he eventually married April.

At the same time in the narrative, another dilemma is evolving. Michael Nugent, as he puts the pieces of this story together, finds out more information which he can cross to his own life and the life of those he thought were his parents. He stumbles across some incoherencies in his own story, and his studies and the dissection he makes of O'Brien's tale leads him to the truth about his origin: he is, indeed, April and Charles O'Brien's only son. They had a baby, but interestingly this fact was not reported in any diary. The baby was only

three-months old when, in 1925, there was a thunderstorm and the house caught on fire. O'Brien and his wife could not save their lives, but the baby, Michael, was saved, and given to the Nugents, a couple who couldn't have children of their own. The solution to this enigma was given by Harney, who had himself arranged for the baby to be adopted, but left him a letter so as to make sure he would one day know his 'true' history.

3 MEMORY AND THE REWRITING OF THE HISTORY OF IRELAND IN DELANEY'S *TIPPERARY*

Dealing with the past quite often represents a conflict. As we observed in chapter one of this work, we have to rely on memory and history when we want to find out more about what has happened in the past, but the relationship between memory and history is not always easy and clear.

As related to this subject, Beatriz Sarlo writes about the past and the role played by memory in *Tempo passado: cultura da memória e guinada subjetiva* (2007) and she believes that even though people are capable of psychologically repressing ancient happenings, the past remains, either farther or closer, lurking the present as a memory that comes in the moment when we least expect or as a shadow, a dark cloud that prowls around, representing something that one does not want or cannot remember. Sarlo also adds that being willing not to remember something is like not realizing things around us, such as smells or tastes. Memory, as a smell, comes to you even when it is not summoned, and it does not allow being relocated, just the opposite: it compels people to start searching for something, for when it comes, memory is never complete. Memory is powerful and uncontrollable, so one cannot give up on that search. In a way, Sarlo concludes that the past *is present;* the right time for the memory is the present.

Memory is indeed supreme; however Sarlo admits that it is possible not to deal with the past. An estate, a government can prohibit its citizens to mention the past and sustain this, but this situation would be only figurative since the past cannot be totally eliminated. Additionally, in what the author calls '"normal" subjective and political conditions the past always finds its way to the present.

Sarlo believes that, in the last few decades, the past is on the one hand weakened by a postmodern society in which everything is so fast and inconsistent, but yet these decades were also marked by the appearance of many museums, rescuing the past through the concept of the *vintage*, the rebirth of the historical novel and of best sellers and films that revisit the past from the histories of ancient empires, such as the Greek one, to the histories of private life.

As an example, in *Memorial da Grande Fome* (1994), Terry Eagleton tells us the story of a museum that was created to keep traces and objects related to the Great Famine, Ireland's most devastating catastrophe. Many still maintain the memories of cruel images of hundreds of starving people, the bodies defeated by diseases, thousands of hungry families emigrating,

mainly to the United States, yet some would barely arrive at their destiny: many succumbed during the trip and emerged dead in the New World. However, no one seems to have been able to find the right words to talk about this event. It remains a taboo. It is intriguing for Eagleton how a museum can be built based on the unspoken.

Eagleton states that this disaster was a mark in Modern Ireland, an abyss in which one quarter of the population of Ireland disappeared and the Irish nation was shattered all over the world with massive emigrations.

It would be appropriate to wonder if it is better to forget, if historical amnesia is the best way to handle the future and move on. This museum dates around the years of 1994 and 1995, and in the year of 1995, the Great Famine completed mere 150 years. Maybe, we could argue whether this museum does represent an obsession the Irish have about their past. Moreover, we could perhaps associate that construction as a way to understand the unspoken, the shadows of their history so that the Irish would be able to behold a clearer path to the future.

As mentioned before, in *Tipperary*, Frank Delaney chooses to rewrite the history of Ireland through memory, the memory of an ordinary Irish citizen that had many recollections to share, who had met many important characters in the history of Ireland, and had travelled, around his country, visiting places and talking to its people, absorbing their wisdom. In the narrative, two men rewrite history by telling their story and the story of the ones among them, and the product is an amazing quilt of remembrances. In each of the three novels that represent Delaney's enterprise of reconstructing the history of Ireland through fiction, the author writes about three men's life journey, which is somehow connected to facts in the history of Ireland. Each of these men has a story to tell, in their own way, and by their own reasons. By creating such characters, Delaney decided to give voice to these common people of Ireland, as he sees them, who have so much to say about the history of their country.

Beatriz Sarlo observes that throughout decades many historians and sociologists have located their focus on witchcraft or madness for example looking for details and traces of the exceptions, those subjectivities who would oppose to normalization in order to understand mechanisms of society since they present resistance to means of power and impositions. Sarlo cites Michel de Certeau as an example of a scholar that became interested in studying about 'normal' subjects, people who were also protagonists of exceptions and transgressions. These subjects are people who are able of changing without hassle the life condition they are in, adding that: "In the field of these subjects, there are elements of rebellion and elements of

preservation of identity, two traces that the 'politics of identity' value as self-constituents."[7] (apud. SARLO, 2007, p. 16). The production of historiographies of the daily life is a consequence of this endeavor in the study of those subjects. The past is involved as historians are in search of details, originalities, curiosities that can be no longer found in the present. The material can be found in what Sarlo calls 'discourses of memory' such as diaries, letters, pieces of advice, prayers, and lyrics. In *Tipperary*, the success of the narrative would not have been achieved without the contribution of the letters written from April Burke and Charles's mother, Amelia, and also Amelia's diary. Through these parallel writings we have a chance to get a different perspective of these women, who are crucial for the story, and find out what was on their minds about the other people in the story and what they were thinking about the events in the narrative. April is the woman Charles loves, and this love has motivated him to write an account about his life and his country. Had we only had Charles's words about her, we would probably only be able to see a cold and cunning person, who fiercely rejects a loving man over and over. Furthermore, without Amelia's journal entries and letters we could see a controlling and jealous mother, and not perhaps a mother who is deeply concerned with her absent-minded and immature son, and just does not want his heart to get broken. Therefore, oral history and testimonies have restored trust in a first person that narrates his life so as to preserve memory or amend a wounded identity (idem, p. 19).

Beatriz Sarlo is an Argentinean literary critic and the book we have been citing here was written regarding memory in relation to mainly military dictatorships in Argentina as well as in other countries in South America. She states that, in such cases, memory and testimony have made it possible to condemn the terrorism of the Estate and worked as a tool for the reconstruction of the past and social communities that have been destroyed by the violence of the Estate. She cites Ireland as an example of a country whose relationship with remembering functions in a diverse way as the cases she is studying in her work, in which the excess of memory may conduct to war, as she mentions 'national war memories'.

Almost 90 years after the independence of Ireland and the separation of the country into Northern Ireland and Southern, the issue of nationalism is still not solved and there is room for conflict and sorrow. Thus, many contemporary Irish novels deal with political and historical matters, and *Tipperary* is an example of such novels.

[7] My translation from the original in Portuguese: "No campo desses sujeitos há princípios de rebeldia e princípios de conservação da identidade, dois traços que as 'políticas de identidade' valorizam como auto-constituintes."

3.1 **British oppression and the XVI century evictions in *Tipperary*: the thirst for land**

The marks that the evictions, as part of the English colonization process in the XVI century, have created in the Irish people are evidently highlighted in *Tipperary*. British presence was still made evident for many years of interference in Ireland, but those decades from the Tudor plantations to the years of Cromwell's leadership of the Commonwealth of England were truly harsh in terms of British oppression. The importance of these historical facts in the novel are very clear as the author debates the consequences of this brutality and the issue of land.

In the author's note to *Tipperary*, Frank Delaney writes:

> Colonization is one of the world's oldest stories – history, as the saying goes, is geography. Thus, the freedom struggles of countries trying to overthrow their invaders have given us some of our most dramatic legends and our most enduring myths. (2007, p. 1)

'History is geography' whether a pertinent idea or not, seems to be really important for Charles O'Brien, who comes up with the plan to rewrite the history of Ireland. As he decides to start writing, Charles is himself undergoing a personal drama, which prompts him to write. Besides that fact, his testimony is impressive, Charles shares with us memories of Ireland's most crucial historical period, and he was completely involved in it. Since the country was the scene of unrest and conflict, Charles's feelings apparently matched that turbulent atmosphere, so he writes with all his excitement and emotion. His account comes straight from his heart, but as he argues "isn't memory at least unreliable? And often a downright liar? Maybe." (idem, p. 3). And acting as a sort of a spokesperson for his fellow citizens, he adds:

> We Irish prefer embroideries to plain cloth. (…) We have too much to remember. (…) Listen to our tunes, observe a Celtic scroll: we always decorate our essence. This is not a matter of behavior; it is our national character. (idem, p. 3)

Charles commences his writing with a piercing memory that, in his words, 'blazes with fire at the core of Ireland's history': the struggle over land. It is interesting that Charles would choose to start his story with such memory and, towards the end of the novel, he is absorbed in depicting the War of Independence, a moment in which Ireland would be able to

regain its power and territory, and the land issue could have a solution. As for Charles's choice, he justifies the selection of this moment in Ireland's history since: "My wooing began in passion, was defined by violence, and ended up circumscribed by land." (idem, p. 17).

As we have seen in the second chapter of this work, Charles describes the event of the eviction of a family in the Treeces' property (Cf. p.50 - 51). Afterwards, while he and his father were heading home, they were shocked to see a number of people living in poor conditions in the woods. Those lifeless shapes in the forest show us a glimpse of the millions of evicted families. Living in poor conditions, they had lost their home and their land, their sense of reality and identity. Uprooted, what kind of citizens would they be now? The evictions changed a lot the scenery and landscape of the country and also its people. The cottages disappeared, and many people roamed the streets without work or home. Those who stayed turned into spooky forms wondering around, in some kind of miserable existence. Many left the country as emigrants, other were deported as slaves. This moment surely would not be forgotten, and that memory would endure for many generations.

In spite of the fact that a panorama on the history of Ireland has been already outlined in this work in chapter one, we would like at this point to resume to some aspects in the history of Ireland referring to the process of English colonization in Ireland and the evictions, in order to revisit this point in a more detailed way.

Before the beginning of the English colonization process, Ireland was divided into several small kingdoms whose leaders were subjugated to five High Kings, and therefore, there was not a central government or a sense of unity in all the country. Around the year of 1155, the Pope Adrian IV had already issued a Papa Bull rendering the English King Henry II authority to invade Ireland as a means of controlling ecclesiastical corruption and abuses. In 1171 Henry II became the first English King to set foot in Ireland. With the absence of central power, resistance to the English presence was difficult; however Henry II's colonization of Ireland proved to be mostly peaceful.

After the end of the War of the Roses (1485), English rulers shifted their attention back to Ireland. King Henry VII and his successors tried to implement rules so as to control the country firmly, but it all generated constant conflicts with the native population.

In 1541, King Henry VIII was officially acclaimed King of England and Ireland. Therefore, Ireland was under total control of English government. Then, as Elisa Lima Abrantes affirms in *O passado que não passa: memória, história e exílio na ficção de Edna O'Brien* (2010), a fierce process of Anglicization took place and it was marked by deep cultural changes and a religious conflict, as Ireland was a Catholic country and England

Anglican (Protestant) ever since King Henry VIII broke relations with the Catholic Church implementing the Anglican Church.

In King Henry VIII rule of Ireland, he extended Royal protection to all of Ireland's elite; in return the whole country was expected to obey the law of the central government; and all Irish lords were to officially surrender their lands to the Crown. Overall, the intention was to assimilate the Gaelic and Gaelicized upper classes and develop loyalty on their part to the new crown. Ultimately, they would be granted English titles and for the first time be admitted to the Irish parliament.

In practice, most lords around Ireland accepted their new privileges. However, what created problems was the Tudors' increasing intervention upon their local autonomy by the development of a centralized state which brought the English system into direct conflict with the Gaelic Irish one.

As a consequence, one of the most important results of the colonization was the disarmament of the native Irish lordships and the establishment of central government control for the first time over the whole island; Irish culture, law and language were replaced; and many Irish lords lost their lands and hereditary authority.

The 'Tudor conquest' continued for sixty years, until 1603. The conquest was mainly complicated by the imposition of English law, language and culture, as well as by the extension of Anglicanism as an institutional religion. As the 16th century progressed, the religious question grew in significance.

Under Queens Mary I and Elizabeth I, the English in Ireland tried a number of solutions to pacify the country. Many policies failed, and this prompted England to find a solution that would take a longer time. An effective solution was the Plantations, in which areas of the country were to be settled with people from England, who would bring in English language and culture while remaining loyal to the crown. The intention was that they would constitute a new ruling class in Ireland.

King James I continued the process of subjugation of Ireland confiscating millions of acres from the Irish. The colonists were instructed they could do what they wanted with the land, but they were forbidden of employing Catholics in their lands. Little by little, along this process, the national Irish identity based on a Gaelic-Catholic culture was being smashed. During the XVII century, England was immersed in political chaos and undergoing civil war. That was a period in which religion oppression caused intense tensions in Ireland.

In 1649 the civil war in England came to an end with the decapitation of King Charles I and the ascendancy of Oliver Cromwell in command of England as Lord Protector of the

Commonwealth of England. Under Cromwell's leadership, Ireland underwent bloody times. Cromwell was extremely violent and cruel in the Irish colony and a large part of land was either destroyed or confiscated. Besides, thousands of Irish were killed.

Working for most of his adult life as a traveling healer, Charles was able to observe aspects close to Irish people's heart and of Ireland's history intimately and 'at first hand'. He was allowed from the poorest to the richest homes, and people often shared stories and confidences with him, which made him feel even more prepared to write to History of Ireland.

The expressive way Charles writes catches the attention of the second narrator in the novel. The historian Michael Nugent comments that Charles's tendency to manifest his thoughts colorfully and dramatically is particularly Irish. Nugent explains that the national inclination towards vivid self-expression comes from history. According to his opinion:

> From the late 1600's when the subjugation of the people began to intensify, the new dark ages shrouded native Irish expression. (…) As the original Irish landowners lost more and more their territory to the English, a new class emerged: the dispossessed. (idem, p. 42-43)

These people would be, according to Nugent's analysis, the progenitors of travelers of Charles's time, the ones that roam around sharing stories and memories.

Nugent argues that one further characteristic marks Charles as an Irishman: his response to land. He grew up, as he utters "in territories of conflict - in a beautiful land of old castles, woods, and rivers (…) where murder was often committed in the name of land."(idem, p. 45). Charles's relationship with the land, as if he sees something mystical in it is something that many other Irish men partake. In Nugent's words, "Charles O'Brien understood that and (…) saw the land, the clay, the dirt, the mud as a matter of the spirit." (idem, p. 42).

The Land League in the 1880's marked as a movement of tenants who fought for better conditions, fair rent and minimum protection from evictions. By that time, over ninety percent of Ireland's land was in the hands of English landlords, and the increase of the rent worked in the most arbitrary form, according to the landlord's wishes. Charles traveled along the country and talked to many native Irishmen who talked passionately about land and had high hopes in the movement. He had the pleasure of recording one of this men's testimony, as can be observed in:

> May I ask you, sir – What does that mean, that you love the land?" The man replied: "Land is an odd sort of thing – because it drags you in. (…) There's a field called Jimmy, because my great-great- grandfather Jimmy Lenihan, won it playing cards. (…) I'll tell you when I first noticed land – I noticed it on my hands and knees and I was only about eight years old. (…) Well, I thought, this is like a bit of magic. And I began to think, what else is like this? What else in the world is anything like this? And I couldn't think of anything. (idem, p. 106).

Another farmer, a man who according to Charles's accounts had set foot in Ireland back in 1692, was a giant man in Ulster, the largest Plantation in Ireland. If we interpret his words and Charles's description of him and of his property, we may conclude this man is descendent of a family of colonists right in the beginning of the process of land confiscation in Ireland. He was a Protestant ("We're hardy people, Protestants", he added) and his property was far richer as well as his attitude very diverse from the other farmer Charles referred to previously. In conversation with Charles, the farmer argued:

> You know, young O'Brien, this island has a lot of land agitation going on here. People are looking for what they're calling 'Land Reformation' (…) Well, I tell everyone – the land doesn't need any reforming, the land is fine. It's the people that needs the reforming. And I can tell you – I'll reform them, so I will, if they try and take any of my land away from me. King William gave my family this land, because the people who were on it were too dirty and too lazy to work it well. (idem, p. 111).

By reading the quotation above, we could say that Delaney has found a way to include in this narrative the point of view of the colonizer. The main protagonists are Irish, talk about and interact with Irish people. Therefore, Charles and Nugent provide us their Irish point of view. Delaney highlights in this passage the prejudice the colonizer kept towards the Irish citizens. The farmer in the passage above calls them 'dirty and lazy', which also means that he believes to be superior in relation to the local people and more deserving to possess land.

Again, the phrase 'History is geography' traces the roots of one of the most serious conflict Ireland has ever known: the land issue. Paying close attention to the narrative in the novel, we realize that the scarcity of the land is directly connected to the hunger for it. As the eviction process went on, and more and more people were sent out of their homes, this hunger only kept below the surface, it never disappeared. In some occasions in the history of Ireland, this desire came to surface again, joining patriotism, nationalism and the longing for land in one cause.

As the War of Independence came to an end, and the English troops finally departed, the country celebrated[8]. Alongside, Charles wondered if the troubles of his country and of his heart still suffering from a love that was not corresponded would ever find tranquility. A truly optimist, he hoped they would; and before he celebrated, he took his time and rode along the land, observing the animals, rocks, houses and trees of peaceful Tipperary.

[8] It is important to note that the English troops did leave Ireland but they remained in Northern Ireland.

3.2 **The rewriting of Ireland's history through some of its characters**

As Charles O'Brien narrates his story and awakens his memories, he does not forget to include the people he has met. Charles is an ordinary Irish citizen, and does not belong to a wealthy family; yet, in his journey over the country he manages to meet the most important Irish figures in history such as Oscar Wilde, George Bernard Shaw, James Joyce and others. Conspicuous literary and political Irish personalities are part of this story. Perhaps, Delaney's objective was to include these people who magnify the image of Ireland, since they are known all over the world for their actions and work. Charles emphasizes that his goal is to write the history of Ireland; however, not only historical facts are described. As the narrative develops, the presence of those men who have made and represented Ireland is marked as they have voice and interact with the fictional characters of the story. In *Tipperary*, history is not only being rewritten through facts, dates or revolutions, but also by the presence of historical characters and aspects of their private life.

In the short story *The Dead* (1907), Irish writer James Joyce reflects upon the presence of the past in the present. The story is part of the book *Dubliners* published in 1914, in which Joyce aimed to write a chapter of the moral history of his own country, and he chose Dublin for the scene.

In the story, Kate and Julia Morkan are two influential sisters that throw a dance holiday party every year. In the beginning of the story, the sisters along with their niece Mary Jane Morkan and housekeeper Lily anxiously await for the arrival of their favorite nephew, Gabriel, and his wife, Gretta.

The dance party goes on smoothly, like every year, and all the expected events fall into place. During the dance, Gabriel ends up paired up with Miss Ivors, a teacher and ardent supporter of Irish culture. The dance leads to discomfort as Miss Ivors confronts Gabriel by calling him a 'West Briton'[9] – a native Irishman or Irishwoman whose sympathies lie towards England – as he writes literary reviews for a conservative newspaper. She goes on defying him for his lack of interest in his own country, when he declines her invitation to pay a visit to the Aran Islands, where Irish is the main spoken language. She questions why he shows no interest in keeping in touch with his own country, people and language. Feeling the pressure on the insisting questions, Gabriel impulsively replies he is sick of his own country, an

[9] Source: http://www.thefreedictionary.com/West+Briton

answer he could not justify and just left him raged and made Miss Ivors become more certain he was a ‘West Briton’.

After the uncomfortable conversation, it is time for dinner, and Gabriel delivers a long speech thanking his aunts for their hospitality. He frowns upon the fact that in the present, hospitality does not get its right value. However, he stresses that people should not hold on to the past and the dead, and live the present to the fullest instead.

Nevertheless, the speech and other circumstances made Gretta remember the past and later she confesses to her husband that she had been thinking about an old lover who died tragically when she was a teenager waiting for her outside the house in the cold.

Mortified by his wife’s confession, Gabriel goes to bed and, as he finds it hard to sleep, he watches the snow outside falling on the graveyard where Gretta’s former lover rests, as well as all Ireland. Living a controlled and passionless life, Gabriel realizes that people who have left this world after living with great ardor lived more fully than himself.

The story shows many of the intersections that exist between life and death. The insipid, monotonous party that follows the same routine every year, and a love story full of emotion, that is back in the past, but never forgotten.

Joyce reminds us that these ghosts, the dead are always present and close to us; and in Ireland, evoking ghosts from the past is a strong matter. Gretta’s former lover, who is now dead, added to other elements that refer to the importance of tradition, represent, in the text, how the past suffocates the present. Gabriel feels controlled as he is too concerned with following rules and conventions that were pre established by his society, customs that come from the past. Towards the end of the short story, the dead from the title becomes stronger. This aspect could be a way the author chose to reveal the inability that Irish people have to free themselves from the weight that comes from the power of the past in the present. Gabriel and other characters in the story feel trapped as the dead, the past, exercise such a control on the living Irish.

In *Tipperary*, already an experienced traveling healer, Charles receives a letter by a friend who begs him to help a close friend that is much in need. He goes to Paris to find out that his patient is Oscar Wilde. Delaney’s Wilde is a man in great pain, but that did not lose his grace and politeness. He talks to Charles in the most natural and active way, interested in his routine and journey. He asks Charles questions about his life and mentions his children and how much he misses them. Charles is completely enchanted by this moment:

> Could it be that this remarkable man was to be my patient? His name aroused such passion – of opprobrium and support. He had written one of the most delightful plays in the world, *The Importance of Being Earnest*, which I myself had seen four times. On the heels of this and other great successes, he had then been tormented in three court trials. (DELANEY, 2007, p. 72).

Oscar Wilde (1854 - 1900) was born in Dublin and became one of the most popular playwrights in the early 1890's. His parents were successful intellectuals, and he was distinguished by his class and education, leaving Dublin to study at Oxford. Wilde is remembered by his brilliant work but also by the tragedy of his imprisonment. After some trials, he was convicted for gross indecency with other men and was sent to prison for two years. He was released in May 1897, and his last work, *The Ballad of Reading Gaol*, written during his exile in France, is a poem about the execution of a man who murdered his wife for her infidelity. His health had suffered during his imprisonment, and he died of meningitis in November 1900.

Michael Nugent, the second narrator that comments on Charles's writing throughout the novel, had only wonderful words to say in relation to Wilde. Nugent's admiration of the famous author is clear through his enthusiastic words. He defines him "the shooting star of his day, and he streaked across the sky from Ireland to England." (idem, p. 74). In his discourse, Nugent highlights Wilde's exceptional academic performance and his taste for art and aesthetics. In his words: "Oscar's brilliance flamed through nineteenth-century London. Those who saw him in action remarked upon the gold of his language, the silver of his tongue. He became a big man in every sense." (idem, p. 75). Nugent frowns upon the injustice committed against the author for being sent to prison and reckons that Charles did not described Wilde as he deserved: "His description of that first encounter may have been discreet as to the true appearance of Oscar Wilde." (idem, p. 76).

Nugent has Charles's memories at his hand, and as he puts this story together, he also adds his comments. It is possible to realize that at times, Charles and Nugent have different points of view. Charles seemed to be a great admirer of Wilde and know a lot about his work. However, the description he provided was not grand enough in Nugent's eyes, maybe simply because they express themselves differently. Also, Nugent might have felt that Wilde's description by Charles was overshadowed by April's, who caught more his attention. As Nugent makes remarks on Charles's writing, the two narratives complement each other, forming a great mosaic.

Charles enjoyed spending time with Wilde, and although he was doing his best, his patient was not getting better. Nevertheless, Wilde would represent the figure that would be the symbol of the biggest change of his life. It was in Wilde's chambers that Charles first saw young April Burke and fell in love with her. Likewise, April's life would change completely as well. Wilde fancied her immediately and he loved talking to her. One day, both talked about April's past and the fact she did not know much about her ancestors, Wilde started wondering about April's Irish ancestry, the mysterious fate of her grandparents, and by making connections he thought April could probably be the heir of a estate in Tipperary, a well-known castle in the county that had not been claimed for years.

Sadly, Wilde soon dies and all the discussion about Tipperary castle ceases. Charles tries hard to get closer to April, but she rejects him over and over. However, this story would not end at this point. It was just the beginning.

It is interesting to observe Delaney's choice to use Wilde in the beginning of this love story that is taken as Charles's guideline in the novel. Charles reached Paris, but he ended up having very little time to spend with Wilde as his disease was in an advanced stage, and he died shortly after. Yet, that little amount of time was enough to cause a revolution on Charles's and April's lives, and that moment would transform the path of their destinies. In his comments, Nugent points out that, since Wilde provoked a profound effect on those around him, his last days and last hours in company of those two were sufficient to alter the course of a lifetime. Perhaps this was Delaney's objective when summoning Wilde's name into the book. As a professional dramatist, in some hours Wilde could outline April's past and propose to her a new view on the history of her family that she had never considered before. April would not have a lot of faith on that outline at first, but little did she know it laid the clues to her future, to go back to Ireland in search of her roots and live a life differently than what she could have planned for herself.

Later in the story, Charles meets an important political activist, Charles Stewart Parnell (1846 - 1891) who was the founder and leader of the Irish Parliamentary Party. According to Elisa Lima Abrantes, in *O passado que não passa: memória, história e exílio na ficção de Edna O'Brien* (2010), in the second half of the XIX century, Irish leaderships resumed the fight in favor of autonomy in Ireland. He was one of the most important figures in the XIX century in Ireland. His political downfall was marked by a scandal involving Parnell and his mistress, Katherine O'Shea, a married woman. The Catholics of Ireland could not accept a man who consorted to illicitly with another man's wife and Parnell lost his party and his repute. Curiously, Charles O'Brien had a lot to do with this scandal.

When Charles was introduced to Parnell, he could not hide his excitement: “Charles Stewart Parnell – Father’s hero, Mother’s hero, Ireland’s hero.” (idem, p. 114). However, he seemed to be a little disappointed by Parnell’s attitude, as it can be observed in the quotations below:

> He seemed altogether more stern than I had thought. Yes, I had heard my father talk of his fiery speeches, (…) so greatly did the people love him. This man, though, seemed quite consumed with his own authority. (idem, p. 114).

> We talked of many things, but principally we listened to Mr. Parnell, and I could have listened to him all evening and all night and all next day. Still, I wondered that he had gained such fame for his filibustering ability in Parliament; he seemed to me a halting speaker, and of a reticent inclination. Yet, it must be reported that nobody had such capacity to stay so closely on the point of the argument. (idem, p. 116).

Similarly, Nugent exposes his thoughts on Parnell as passionate as he was about Wilde. He talked about how few people in the history of Ireland could ever portray as many heroic achievements and hold such a poignant stature as Parnell. Parnell political performance and influence in Nugent’s words seems to be really outstanding. Parnell had the political skills, the intelligence and esteem, but the scandal that followed was able to outshine this legend.

On the day Charles met Parnell, he had also been introduced to Kitty O’Shea, and although no comment had been made about her presence and what she was doing in the company of Parnell, in his mind, Charles mistook her for his wife. One evening, while he visited a cousin, he was talking about his experience of getting to know Parnell and let out that he had been delighted to meet his wife as well. The people in the room were surprised, for all of them knew Parnell was not married. Charles insisted and gave out her name. A young journalist who was in the room caught the words among Charles ignorance and innocence, and convinced him to write an article for a newspaper. Charles wrote a ‘bold’ article, going on details of how attentive and sweet Parnell was towards his ‘wife’. When he realized, he was the talk of the day. He had to flee London not to be attacked, and was only going to find out what he had really done and the outcomes of it when he reached Ireland. Ultimately, Kitty O’Shea got her divorce and married Parnell, and they went away to live quietly on the south coast of England.

Charles’s gullible personality allowed him to see things sometimes without some critical sense. Still, through honesty and open-heartedness he could observe nuances in

Parnell's personality that many of his passionate followers ever could. Maybe, Delaney's choice of having Charles as the person responsible of Parnell's downfall, by accident, accentuates his blunt and candid personality that does not take sides or make judgments.

The official discourse of history is being challenged here by Charles's relevant participation. As Delaney made his fictional character responsible for a real historical figure downfall, he is inviting us to take a closer and more private look into these historical characters' lives. In his writing, Charles expressed no problems at observing the way Parnell behaved to Kitty, he even admired the couple together. We all know from history the bad public reaction, the accusations and the consequence of that love affair to Parnell's political career. Yet, here, in this reconstruction of the fact, we observe it was nothing more than a misunderstanding, a mistake from an absent-minded man that should not have overshadowed Parnell's greatness as an activist. Nonetheless, the religious traditions of Irish people could not have let that affair been overlooked.

It was on one afternoon in 1914, when Charles was sitting in a café in Dublin, that he met a young man who started questioning him about why he was writing. This man introduced himself as James Joyce. Joyce talked about his literary plans with Charles and also borrowed some money. He had been observing his fellow-citizens in Dublin and indented to write a "memoiristic but brilliant satire on the human soul" (idem, p. 132). Joyce is curious about what Charles is writing about. Charles tells Joyce he is writing about a legend he had heard about the warrior Finn MacCool and his hunters. Joyce tells Charles to look for Yeats in order to share this legend, since he claims the writer to be very interested in mythologies.

Charles does come to Yeats, and tells him that Joyce had recommended him, Mr. Yeats talks about Joyce: "He's so sarcastic. You can't take seriously a word that he says. He's always sending people to call on me even though he knows how busy I am. (…) Did he try to borrow money off you? Don't give him a penny." (idem, p. 133).

James Joyce (1882 – 1941) was born in Dublin and shortly after finishing university left to Paris, as he chose to move away from an English-speaking environment. According to Andrew Sanders in *The short Oxford history of English literature* (1996), Joyce found the turn-of-the-century cultural atmosphere of Ireland stifling and the Irish nationalist movement an imposition on his intellectual freedom. Although from the age of 21on he had no longer lived in Ireland, Ireland and the Irish people remained the exclusive subject of his work. He is considered to be one of the most influential writers of all times and is known for perfecting the stream of consciousness technique, which allowed the reader to listen to the character's

innermost thoughts. Moreover, his works are filled with his comic spirit and humor, and we note a touch of his irreverent personality on Charles account and Yeats's later comment.

Yeats (1865 – 1939) was born in Dublin and began writing poems at a very early age. His early poetry is full of Celtic mysticism and romanticism. Several years before the independence of Ireland, a group of Irish intellectuals started a movement that came to be known as the Irish Renaissance. Its purpose was to support the political movement for the independence, the 'Home Rule', by reviving the native Irish language, Gaelic, and preserving Irish history and mythology from cultural dominance by English masters. A leading member of this movement was Yeats. Alongside with Lady Gregory (1852 – 1932), Edward Martyn (1859 – 1923) and John Millington Synge (1871 – 1909), he founded the Abbey Theater in Dublin in 1900, dedicating it to promoting talents of Irish dramatists. About this moment in Ireland's history, Charles adds from his memories:

> As the century wore on, Mr. Yeats and Lady Gregory began to make clear value of ancient Ireland's traditional legends and culture, and **literature became a symbol for national patriotism**. The Catholic Irish flocked to these renditions of their past. In their houses, I have heard them read aloud the mighty tales of Celtic gods and heroes. (idem, p. 188, grifo nosso)

From his middle-age until his death, Yeats continued to evolve in his poetry, relying strongly on symbolism. In his later life, he received many public honors: an appointment to the first senate of the newly independent Republic of Ireland and the 1923 Nobel Prize for literature.

The man that met Charles O'Brien that day, after the latter encounter with Joyce, was very serious at first, but then warm and friendly, as he asked questions about Charles's life and listened carefully as Charles talked about his adventures as well as, surely, April Burke. As we can realize, the legend worked just as an excuse so that they could meet, since they do not discuss it or anything related to it in their dialogue. Instead, Charles starts talking about April and Yeats ended up suggesting that, after having listened to the entire story, Charles should give his passion one more chance and look for the girl's father as a way to get closer to her again, a strategy which actually worked. One more time, Delaney chooses a very conspicuous Irish figure, a man of great importance for Irish literature, to come into Charles's way and change his life again. Things seemed to be a little paralyzed since Charles had left London, after the Parnell incident. He had written April several letters, but she never replied. Yeats idea would serve as a twist, defining a new direction to this story.

After meeting Yeats, Charles did pursue April's father and together they tried to put the story in order to see if the Burkes were really entitled to inherit Tipperary castle. They hoped to find clues of Mr. Burke's past, his parents, especially his mother, whose destiny was a mystery. She was an actress, so both decided to resort to the help of a very important person, Mr. George Bernard Shaw, since they were acquainted with the fact that he was known to love actresses.

Shaw (1856 - 1950) was born in Dublin in a lower middle class family. He moved to London as a young man, where besides working as a theater critic for London newspapers he wrote several plays. He also became an ardent advocate of socialism, preaching that a society based on the equal distribution of wealth was the only one capable of calling itself truly civilized. Shaw died at the advanced age of 94, remaining active until his very end. He was awarded both a Nobel Prize for Literature (1925) and an Oscar (1938), for his contributions to literature and for his work on the film Pygmalion (adapted from his play of the same name), respectively. Shaw wanted to refuse his Nobel Prize completely because he had no desire for public approbation, but eventually accepted it at his wife's demands: she considered it a tribute to Ireland.

Charles's meeting with Shaw was fast and unfortunately, he could not help him with information on the actress. However, Charles described it as if Mr. Burke and him had a very good time with the author, were well received and laughed a lot with the stories they shared. His appearance in the novel did not work to modify Charles's story, but Delaney certainly could not have forgotten to include such figure.

Nugent points out how Shaw, more than any of his fellow countrymen, understood these inclinations; he was self-made, clever and had a mind of his own. He knew how to attack England's stereotypes with humor, and created a formidable presence as a columnist and activist. Nugent comments on this encounter:

> His (Shaw's) presence in London typified a kind of long-standing phenomenon. The Irish in England have achieved roles that were never reciprocated. (…) no Englishmen got comparable status in Ireland. For obvious reasons. Whereas the sound of an English accent in an Irish ear long spoke of brutal colonization, the presence of a cultivated Irishman in London salved the conscience to some degree, as if to say, 'Look, we have been educating these savages.' Or, if entertaining, supported the stereotype: 'Oh, such charming rogues.' (idem, p. 140).

In his adventures, Charles met some of the most substantial Irish people in literature. By 1904, the situation in Ireland was growing tense, as many volunteers and activist from the south were continuously fighting for Ireland's autonomy. Meanwhile, Charles returns to Ireland from his London enterprise to convince April to pursue the ownership of Tipperary Castle and he is finally successful. Charles was the personification of excitement itself, as when he found out April was really going to come to Ireland in a few days – she had been exchanging letters with his mother, Amelia – and then would live very close to him. Thus, he could not think of anything else. Little did he know that, this moment on would mark his involvement in the conflicts of Ireland and he started meeting some of the most remarkable political leaders and activists of this meaningful time for Ireland. He could realize it himself as he noted that the whole country burned with nationalistic flame.

Charles immediately resumed to his work after coming back from London, and it was during these hours of laboring that he met men who planned a political revolution, and wished all the land matters to be ultimately solved and put behind, so that freedom and self-government could be determined. One example is when he meets Arthur Griffith in Dublin. Griffith (1872 - 1922) was the founder and leader of Sinn Féin. He served as a president of the revolutionary Irish Republic of 1919 - 1922 from January to August 1922 and was head of the Irish delegation at the negotiations in London that produced the Anglo-Irish Treaty of 1921.

Charles felt so delighted in meeting him that he wrote an article for a newspaper about him, in which he said:

> He seems to maintain a balance of fierce and wise, of astute and idealistic. Of his Irish patriotism, he has no doubt (…) He gave the name of his new political movement, Sinn Fein meaning 'We Ourselves', and he declared as its aim the restoration of Ireland as a separate condition of statehood under the British monarchy. (idem, p. 157)

Joseph Harney, the young man who finds Charles on the roadside after he has been shot, became Charles's best friend. His role on Charles's life became profound, and as Harney got more and more involved in the conflicts for Ireland's independence, Charles felt he had no choice but get involved too, somehow. When he discovers Harney had left to fight in the War of Independence, he does not think twice and leaves Tipperary to rescue his friend. He spent days trying to get closer to the place where the rebels were hiding; he finally gets there and was even able to see Éamon de Valera. De Valera (1882 – 1975) was one of the dominant political figures in 20th century Ireland, being a leader of Ireland's struggle for independence

from England. Despite the fact that they did not even exchange words, De Valera was identified by Charles, and his presence in the novel was marked in a moment in which he was in action for his cause and his beliefs.

A person that did make a significant appearance in the story was the activist Michael Collins. His passage owned him many lines and comments by both Charles and Nugent, who appointed him as 'the greatest hero of all time'. He visited Tipperary Castle and interacted with both Charles and Harney, and also April.

Michael Collins (1890 – 1922) was an Irish revolutionary leader, director of Intelligence for the IRA, and member of the Irish delegation during the Anglo-Irish Treaty negotiations. Throughout this time, at least as of 1919, he was also President of the Irish Republican Brotherhood. Collins was shot and killed in August 1922, during the Irish Civil War.

Collins in the novel came to the castle one day in December looking for Harney. Charles was alone there that day and did not recognize him, but could tell from the moment he saw him that he was a remarkable man, in his judgment. Collins asked to see the place, asked some questions and was playful and nice all the time. Although he could not stay for long, Charles was impressed by his personality and never forgot him.

Nugent states that Collins:

> became a walking legend, a living myth. (…) Collins turned Ireland – or, rather, the British authority in Ireland – inside out. (…) Perhaps his outstanding achievement was his capturing of men's loyalty. (…) Collins's men would have gone through fire for him. As they did, and all their lives – and I met them and spoke to them – they would say with quite pride, 'I was a Collins man myself.' (…) Collins called himself a soldier, not a politician.
>
> My parents often spoke of 'the day Michael Collins died.' Both had occasion to be out of the house, and traveling. My father got off a train in Limerick and saw people kneeling on the streets, weeping. Three counties away, in Kilkenny, different city, difference province, my mother saw the same. Each said afterward that they knew, without asking, what had happened. (idem, p. 319 - 321)

Capital punishment was abolished in the Republic of Ireland, and the last execution was in 1954. In English-occupied Ireland, however, it happened everywhere, for many reasons. The Justice system was corrupt and many trials were heavily manipulated. If a landlord was killed; as a result, many local men would be hanged. Every unfair trial created a new hero-martyr. The ballads and laments found a new base. And the stronger they became,

they served as ammunition against injustice, a way people found to express themselves and be heard. About this matter, Delaney, represented in the novel by Nugent, writes:

> In fact, they (ballads, laments, songs) became weaponry. And they helped to create **the new voice of the majority.** The purer literary impulses of the educated Anglo-Irish, such as Oscar Wilde, George Bernard Shaw, and William Butler Yeats, had already been resounding. Their unique tone brought the English language to bear on the Irish imagination. Now the Catholic martyrdom in miscarriages of the justice created a different Irish sound.
>
> In the fusion of the two traditions, the cool and educated Anglo-Irish styles and the raw, often ironic, morning ferocity of the ballad tradition, was born **a new Irish voice.**" (idem, p. 130, grifo nosso).

In the passage above, Delaney pays honors to some of the names he determined to include in the novel, those men whose powerful words helped reshape the sound of Ireland. He highlights their contribution to be part of a new Irish expression, and also somehow supporting his decision of including them in the narrative, giving them voice and action, portraying them as absolute accessible and human. The same could be said about the political figures inserted, often depicted as heroes of the nation, who were clearly cherished by their people and added their character and courage to their country's cause, strengthening the Irish expression with what they have achieved.

Charles O'Brien comments, in a passage:

> My fortune has been to live through such comprehensive times. As I witnessed the great will to recover the country's land for the Irish, I also observed another and separate movement of restoration: the recovery of the native soul. (idem, p. 131).

By the turn of the XX century, many Catholic writers and poets had begun writing about glories of ancient Ireland, revisiting their 'ghosts' and past, as a way of reconnecting with the land, the country. Through their work, the Celtic world came to the fore once again, over many passionate declamations in verse and prose. In all this process, great men rose, many writers who would gain fame and respect. Lastly, Charles affirms about having had the honor of meeting some of these men that: "Some of these literary figures planted themselves in my memory, not from works they had written but from force of presence." (idem, p. 131).

The historical characters were incorporated in the novel in different moments in Charles's adventure and they were all portrayed in reverence for their contribution to Irish history and image. They represent the Irish people, their strength and their potential.

The main historical facts addressed in the novel pretty much correspond to the official discourse of history in overall. However, fiction has a big participation in the particularities and details of the private life of the figures selected by Frank Delaney here. Had Parnell's affair really been revealed in that way described? Had Wilde really had an Irish doctor and the company of an English young lady called April in his last days of life? Official history does not tell us that, there are always gaps to be filled. As we have studied in chapter one, the historian aims at being impartial, but every narrative has a point of view. Besides, the material the historian uses to base his research on is also developed from a specific selection and point of view. Delaney seems to be interested in working with the aspects that have not been told by the official history of his country. In *Tipperary*, he creates characters that through their dynamics enable him to fill in the gaps, offering his readers a touching rewriting of the history of Ireland.

CONCLUSION

Frank Delaney's work, mainly his last published novels, shows a deep alignment with the history of Ireland. As we could see in this present study, not only *Tipperary* (2007) but the other novels mentioned all carry a duty to expose some moment of the history of this country. This is an author that, in the twenty first century, is actively and constantly revisiting the official historical records of this home land reinforcing the idea that the past bears an important influence on Irish people. In the author's notes for the novel *Shannon*, he adds: "We need the spirit of our past more than we need the facts; we need the pride more than we need the proof" (2010, p. 1).

Delaney really seems to be in an enterprise to revisit the history of Ireland. By inserting fictional characters and plot into official history, the author is providing us with a different approach to Ireland, a different way of understanding it, contributing, then, to the rewriting of the history of this country.

In this process, the limits between fiction and history become more flexible. In the first part of this research, it was our intention to focus on these boundaries, and see what different authors say about these discourses. Hayden White (2001) argues that the historical and the fictional discourses share strategies and that there is a lot of fiction and imagination in the historical discourse. Therefore, for the author, we cannot count on historians to be always reliable. Jacques Le Goff (2003) is an example of an author mentioned in the beginning of our study as one of the theorists that oppose to White. He claims that White has a very simplistic view of a historian's work, that even though the historical discourse may contain some elements of fiction, it is not possible to compare the serious work of a historian, who has its specificities, with the work of a novelist.

In this discussion on the borders between the discourses of history and fiction, it is interesting to point out that the man responsible for gathering all the information together in *Tipperary,* Michael Nugent, is a history teacher himself. Charles O'Brien, the protagonist and author of most of the material that Nugent collects, admits in the first lines of his memories to be an unreliable 'historian', to be moved by passion and, thus, to be totally partial. Nugent introduces himself as a history lover, whose attention was caught by Charles's abandoned writings and some letters and diary entries that came with it. Unable to let go of this material, Nugent kept on researching on the facts listed by Charles, commenting on them and sewing all the pieces together, until a change in his own personal history takes place. We reckon that Delaney's choice to have a history teacher as the person who is going to 'judge' all the

material written by Charles is not a coincidence. Nugent is an experienced teacher who has been teaching history for a long time. Even so, his history could be modified. In a way, the historian's views were complemented and rewritten by this alternative discourse of history provided by this stranger's memories. And the gaps in Nugent's life were also filled, as by analyzing Charles's writing he found out the truth about himself: Charles and his beloved April were indeed his biological parents. The whole concept he had on his 'history' was then shaken.

Charles O'Brien's accounts were based basically on his memory. Memory is a concept we also gave attention to in the first chapter of this study. Maurice Halbwachs (2006) argues that memory is an idea connected to the vivid; it is human and fluid, not constrained by limits of the clock. François Dosse (2000) adds that memory is of a fragmented and plural essence, and that the discourse of history comes to eliminate the obscure and complex inner work of memory. By the end of the first part of chapter one, we hope to have exposed some ideas on these possible borders of the historical and fictional discourses, and also discussed the concept of memory.

In the second part of chapter one, we believe to have presented a consistent panorama on the history of Ireland. Our goal was not only to situate our reader on the history of the country, as it is important for the understanding of the novel, but also to provide a reading on the facts that were highlighted on in the novel.

To close chapter one, we explored ideas on the issue of national identity. Benedict Anderson (1983) believes that the construction of the national was in fact a cultural artifact, as invented nations. Eric Hobsbawm (1990) complements this idea by stating that the conceptions related to nationalism are connected to the modern concept of the nation state, therefore the land, the territory, being nation cultural constructs.

Ernest Renan (1997) and Johann Herder (Cf. JOBIM&HENRIQUES, p. 67) contrast in their opinions on national identity. Renan views national identity as a bond, a common interest man of the same community share. Then, nation is a soul, a spirit that is experienced by all members of a society. On the other hand, Herder considers national identity as something innate, and nations are natural entities.

In spite of the different opinions, Delaney does seem to believe in the existence of a profound bond of people to their home lands as definite to their lives and personalities. As he states, one more time in the author's notes for *Shannon*:

> The more mobile we become, and the farther we travel from our point of origin, the more we seem to want to return. That is, if the Irish example can be judged; to have come from Ireland, no matter how long ago, is to be of Ireland, in some part, forever. (2010, p. 1)

In chapter two, our goal was to present a brief view on the author's life and works, and also to provide for the reader a brief summary of the novel *Tipperary*.

Lastly, in chapter three, we laid on a further analysis on the novel. We have already claimed that *Tipperary* is a rich novel in which many possibilities of study could take place. However, we chose to focus on two main aspects in the novel. Firstly, how the author deals with the piercing British oppression and the evictions in the XVI century in the story. Later, we chose to take a closer look on the inclusion of historical characters in the plot, mixed with fictional ones.

British colonization in Ireland proved to be filled with cruel episodes that created deep marks for the Irish. These moments of coercion are vividly present in Charles's earliest memories and are the first images he has to share with us in his writing. Traumas and marks generated by those events of brutality are intrinsically represented by characters in the novel. In his work as a traveling healer, Charles met victims of that time in history and talked to them. Delaney gave that oppressed people voice so that they could profess the injustice of the evictions and their love for the land. Throughout the story, Charles could also be a witness of movements in favor of land reforms and also be an active element in the ultimate struggle for independence.

In his adventurous life, Charles had the privilege to meet some of Ireland's most famous literary authors and political figures. The voice and face of Ireland were represented by those people who are well-known worldwide for their work. Charles encounters these people in many diverse moments of his own history and always finds a way to show how he felt honored by their presence. Delaney portrays these men with a lot of praise, highlighting their contribution to Irish history and to the image of Irish people as a whole, making sure they will never be forgotten.

In this last chapter, our purpose was to show how the aspects selected for this study were developed in the novel. We selected passages in the novel that illustrate those aspects in order to verify how Delaney proposes a rewriting of Irish history. In this author's work, history and fiction intertwine and depicts a different reading on the reality of facts proposed by the historical discourse.

REFERENCES

ABRANTES, Elisa Lima. *O passado que não passa*: memória, história e exílio na ficção de Edna O'Brien. Niterói: [s.n.], 2010.

ADAMS, Gerry. *Entrevista com Gerry Adams*: o combate pela cultura. In: BOURDIEU, Pierre (Ed.). *Liber 1*. Trad. Mary Amazonas Leite de Barros e Sérgio Miceli. São Paulo: Edusp, 1997.

ANDERSON, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism. London: Verso, 1983.

_____. "Memória e esquecimento". Trad. Maria Helena Rouanet. In: *Nacionalidade em questão*. Cadernos da Pós/Letras, Rio de Janeiro, n. 19, 1997.

ASHCROFT, Bill et al. *Post-Colonial Studies*: the Key Concepts. London: Routledge, 2000.

BARBOUR, Stephen; CARMICHAEL, Cathie. *Language and nationalism in Europe*. Oxford: OUP, 1999.

BARKER, A. J. *Irlanda sangrenta*. Trad. Edmond Jorge. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Renes, 1979.

BBC News. *Gypsies attacked in Belfast*. Available in: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/8114234.stm> 23/06/2009.

BHABHA, Homi K. (Org.). *Nation and Narration*. London: Routledge, 1991.

BOSI, Ecléa. *Memória e Sociedade*: lembranças de velhos. São Paulo: Edusp, 1987.

BRAUDEL, Fernand. *Reflexões sobre a história*. Trad. Eduardo Brandão. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1992.

BRENNAN, Timothy. "The national longing for form". In: BHABHA, Homi K. *Nation and Narration*. London: Routledge, 1994.

BURKE, Peter (Org.). *A escrita da história*: novas perspectivas. Trad. Magda Lopes. São Paulo: UNESP, 1992.

CARR, E. H. *O que é história?* Trad. Lúcia Maurício da Alvarenga. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 1996.

CHABOT, Jean-Luc. *O Nacionalismo*. Trad. Evaristo Santos. Porto: África-Lusófona RÉS-Editora, [s.d.]. (Coleção cultura geral).

DELANEY, Frank. *Tipperary*. New York: Random House, 2008.

_____. *Ireland*. London: Harper, 2006.

_____. *Shannon*. New York: Random House, 2010.

_____. *Venetia Kelly's Travelling Show*. New York: Random House, 2010.

_____. *The Matchmaker of Kenmare*. New York: Random House, 2011.

_____. *Interview with Frank Delaney*. Available in: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AQoIYR47JKY> 20/11/2010.

_____. *Frank Delaney talks about the novel Shannon*. Available in: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_DcgejOtscA> 20/11/2010.

_____. *Frank Delaney's speech at the NYS Writers Institute in 2009*. Available in <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aIFPGsgTJQM> 20/11/2010.

_____. *Frank Delaney: Stories Create Realities.* Available in: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hxxrjwPnOK8> 20/11/2010.

_____. *Frank Delaney's official website*. Available in: <http://www.frankdelaney.com/> 15/10/2010.

DETIENNE, Marcel . *Os Mestres da Verdade na Grécia Arcaica*. Trad. Andréa Daher. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Editor, 1988.

DOSSE, François. *A História*. Trad. Maria Elena Ortiz Assumpção. Bauru, SP: EDUSC, 2000.

DURKHEIM, Émile. *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*. New York: Free Press, 1961.

EAGLETON, Terry. *Memorial da Grande Fome*. In: BOURDIEU, Pierre (Ed.). *Liber 1*. Trad. Mary Amazonas Leite de Barros e Sérgio Miceli. São Paulo: Edusp, 1994.

ECO, Umberto. *Seis passeios pelos bosques da ficção*. Trad. Hildegard Feist. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2009.

GELLNER, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1983.

GUIBERNAU, Montserrat. *Nacionalismos*: o estado nacional e o nacionalismo no século XX. Trad. Mauro Gama & Cláudia Martinelli Gama. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Editor, 1997.

GREGORY, Lady; YEATS, William Butler. *Treasury of Irish Myth, Legend & Folklore*: Fairy and Folk Tales of the Irish Peasantry. New York: Gramercy, 1986.

HALBWACHS, Maurice. *A memória coletiva*. São Paulo: Centauro Editora, 2006.

HALL, Stuart. *The Question of Cultural Identity in HALL.* In: STUART et al. *Modernity:* an Introduction to Modern Societies. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1996.

HELD, David. "The Development of the Modern State". In: STUART et al. *Modernity:* an Introduction to Modern Societies. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1996.

HENRIQUES, Ana Lucia de Souza; JOBIM, José Luís. A literatura e a identidade nacional lingüística: José de Alencar e Walter Scott. *Cadernos Pedagógicos e Culturais*, v. 4, n. 2 e v. 5, n. 1/2, Niterói, 1996.

HOBSBAWM, Eric. *Nações e Nacionalismos desde 1780*. Trad. Maria Célia Paoli & Anna Maria Quirino. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 1990.

_____; RANGER, Terrence et al. *The invention of tradition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

JOYCE, James. *The Dead.* 1907. Available in: <http://www.online-literature.com/james_joyce/958/> 10/01/2011.

KINEALY, Christine. *This Great Calamity*: the Irish Famine 1845 – 52. Boulder, Colorado: Roberts Rinehart Publishers, 1995.

KORHONEN, Kuisma. “The Literature/History Debate & Narratives of the Fake: The Collected Objects, Personal Histories and Constructed Memory”. In: _____ (Ed). *Tropes for the Past:* Hayden White and the History Literature Debate. New York: Rodopi, 2006.

LE GOFF, Jacques. *História e Memória*. Trad. Irene Ferreira, Bernardo Leitão, Suzana Ferreira Borges. Campinas: UNICAMP, 2003.

MCGREW, Anthony. “A Global Society*?*” In: HALL, Stuart et al. *Modernity:* an Introduction to Modern Societies. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1996.

MENEZES, Lená Medeiros de. “História e Realidade: uma relação de múltiplas possibilidades”. In: HENRIQUES, Claudio Cezar; PEREIRA, Maria Teresa Gonçalves (Org.). *Língua e transdisciplinaridade*: rumos, conexões, sentidos. São Paulo: Contexto, 2002.

MURPHY, Maureen O’Rourke; MACKILLOP, James. *Irish Literature:* a reader. New York: Syracuse University Press, 1987.

O’BRIEN, Máire; CONOR, Cruise. *Ireland:* a concise history. New York: Thames and Hudson, 1999.

RENAN, Ernest. “O que é uma nação?”. Trad. Maria Helena Rouanet. In: Nacionalidade em questão. *Cadernos da Pós/Letras,* n. 19, Rio de Janeiro, 1997.

SANDERS, Andrew. *The Short Oxford History of English Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

SARLO, Beatriz. *Tempo Passado*: cultura da memória e guinada subjetiva. Trad. Rosa Freire d’Aguiar. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2007.

The British Guardian. Available in: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/jun/21/race-northern-ireland-romanian-gypsies> 21/06/2009.

THOMPSON, Kenneth. “Religion, Values, and Ideology”. In: HALL, Stuart et al. *Modernity*: an Introduction to Modern Societies. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1996.

TREVELYAN, George Macaulay. *History of England*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1939.

VEYNE, Paul. Apenas uma narrativa verídica. In: *Como se escreve a história e Foucault revoluciona a História*. Trad. Alda Baltar & Maria Auxiliadora Kneipp. Brasília: UnB, 1978.

WHITE, Hayden. As ficções da representação factual. In: *Trópicos do discurso*: ensaios sobre a crítica da cultura. São Paulo: EdUSP, 2001.

WOOLF, Stuart (Ed.). *Nationalism in Europe 1815 to the Present*: a reader. London: Routledged, 1996.