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Summary

The aim of the article is to present the image of the Other in the letters of Anthony Trollope – English writer, journalist and post office clerk as well as renowned inventor of the mailbox and reformer of the postal services. The quotation featured in the title refers to Trollope’s remark about the Egyptian politician Nubar Pasha, with whom Trollope negotiated the conditions concerning mail delivery. The first part of the paper will deal with this Postal Agreement, i.e. speed and costs of delivery and Trollope’s point of view (as an Englishman) on the matter. Cultural differences between ‘English’ and ‘Oriental’ will be highlighted as they appear in the correspondence. The article will provide insight on such issues as camel pace and the superiority of bags over paper boxes in mail delivery. A post-colonial interpretation of these issues will be presented.

The second part of the article will embrace Trollope’s views on different ‘Others’ – inhabitants of British colonies, Irishmen and Xhosa people. The analysis will include any derogatory and racist remarks that can be found in the correspondence. The third part of the article will be devoted to the image of the Other in Trollope’s Letters to the Examiner (concerning Ireland) and letters from South Africa. The differences in the image of the Other as they appear in private, official and literary correspondence will be presented. A post-colonial interpretation of the sources will be provided in the last part of the paper.

Key words: Trollope, correspondence, orientalism, racism, colonialism, Other, post.
Anthony Trollope – a man who loved letters

Anthony Trollope, English writer and journalist, gained recognition for two reasons – being the prolific author of fifty lengthy novels and being the inventor of the pillar mail box. Both his careers – literary and postal – were successful, though Trollope’s attitude to his postal work was ambiguous. On one hand he declared ‘love of letters’ which were carried by the post and anxiety ‘for their welfare’ as if they were his own (Trollope, 2008), on the other hand there is no doubt that his relationship with superiors and colleagues was rather troublesome. In his Autobiography Trollope admitted that they were ‘glad to be rid of’ him (Ibid.), when he eventually resigned after 33 years of work (and a without pension) (Ibid.). Though he dismissed the praise expressed by Sir John Tilly in reply to his letter of resignation as ‘official flummery’ (Ibid.), Trollope was ready to enumerate the matters of his concern in the Office:

That the public in little villages should be enabled to buy postage stamps; that they should have their letters delivered free and at an early hour; that pillar letter-boxes should be put up for them (of which accommodation in the streets and ways of England I was the originator, having, however, got authority for the erection of the first at St. Heliers in Jersey); that the letter-carriers and sorters should not be overworked; that they should be adequately paid, and have some hours to themselves, especially on Sundays; above all, that they should be made to earn their wages; and latterly that they should not be crushed by what I thought to be the damnable system of promotion by so-
called merit; these were the matters by which I was stirred to what the Secretary was pleased to call energetic performance of my duties. (Ibid.)

It can be assumed that, despite his irony, Trollope considered himself to be a good public servant and charitable surveyor. This opinion was not cherished by his colleagues and underlings, who thought his manners ‘aggressive and offhand.’ (Hennessy, 1971) Notorious for his short temper and bursts of anger he was said to excite enmity in his underlings and irritation in his colleagues. However, the same features combined with his diligence and energy seemed to make him an able supervisor, reformer and executor of the law.

**Image of an ‘Oriental’ – negotiations concerning the Postal Agreement of 1858**

Trollope’s superiors appreciated his efficiency and in January 1858 sent him on a new mission to Egypt. Trollope was supposed to arrange a new postal treaty, facilitating the movement of mail to and from India. (Terry et al., 1999) According to the former agreement the mail on route between Alexandria and Suez had been carried by camel; a new treaty was needed in order to authorize mail delivery via the new Cairo to Suez railway. (Hennessy, 1971) This route was the first modern transport connection between the Mediterranean and the Gulf of Suez.

One of the goals of Trollope’s mission was to make sure that mail would be carried through Egypt within 24 hours. However, this crucial point was met with opposition from the Egyptian official Nubar Bey, with whom Trollope negotiated the treaty. His letters along with a mention in his *Autobiography* describing the circumstances surrounding the negotiations provide us with valuable insight into Victorian prejudices.

In his *Autobiography* Trollope writes that he found Nubar Bey (who at the time the *Autobiography* was published became Nubar Pasha) ‘a most courteous gentleman, an Armenian.’ (Trollope, 2008) Negotiations took place at Trollope’s hotel, where Nubar Bey came on a daily basis bringing his servants, pipes and coffee. This is certainly an exotic setting and Trollope’s remarks on the occasion correspond to Joep Leerssen’s definition of exoticism as it is ‘the other culture appreciated exclusively in terms of its strangeness; it is reduced to the aspects wherein it differs from the domestic standard.’ (Beller, Leerssen, 2007) This is precisely the case with Trollope, as he remarks that he had never gone to Nubar.
Bey’s office ‘nor do I know that he had an office,’ at the same time admitting that he enjoyed Nubar Bey’s visits. (Trollope, 2008)

Trollope underlines the obstinacy with which both officials stuck to their points; i.e. Trollope insisted on 24 hour delivery, while Nubar Bey wanted 48 hour mail delivery. At this juncture the former recounts strange outburst of emotion on the part of Nubar Bey:

[… ] at last his oriental tranquillity seemed to desert him, and he took upon himself to assure me, with almost more than British energy, that, if I insisted on the quick transit, a terrible responsibility would rest on my own head. I made this mistake, he said, - that I supposed that a rate of travelling which would be easy and secure in England could be attained with safety in Egypt. (Ibid.)

Significant here are two opposing terms – ‘oriental tranquillity’ and ‘British energy.’ The ‘Orient’ is therefore associated with calmness and serenity. ‘Oriental’ means quiet, lenient and moderate. This stereotype assumes that the strength of an ‘Oriental’ lies in a specific vis inertiae. Describing Nubar Bey, who apparently overcomes this stereotype, Trollope in fact strengthens the stereotype because Nubar Bey’s behaviour is depicted as something unusual, abnormal, as an exception to eastern ways and manners. Nubar Bey does not have an office, he negotiates in the hotel, in a comfortable yet extraordinary manner.

The same term – ‘tranquillity’ appears in the official letter, which Trollope sent to Sir Rowland Hill on 23 February 1858: Trollope remarked that the Peninsular and Oriental Company is urging on Nubar Bey ‘what he calls tranquillity’ (Trollope, 1983) ‘Tranquillity’ in mail delivery – to be specific. The tone of this particular phrase heavily suggests that what ‘an Oriental’ understands as ‘tranquillity,’ a Westerner would name otherwise. How? The words ‘laziness’ or ‘inefficiency’ come to mind here, yet they remain unspoken. And according to Bern Thum the stereotypes of eastern ‘laziness’ confronted by a western work ethic as well as ‘inefficiency’ (confronted by organization) belong to ‘the mindset of orientalism.’ (Beller, Leerssen, 2007) As there are thirty years between the letter and the Autobiography, we might state that the stereotype of ‘tranquillity’ was well grounded in Trollope’s mind.

‘British energy’ or ‘British firmness,’ on the other hand, remain the features Trollope identifies himself with, mainly because it corresponds with his own forcefulness. Trollope, being a vigorous man, perceives ac-
tivity as a stereotypical British trait. It is worth noting that Trollope identifies himself as British, not English. This is also significant because according to Menno Spiering there are two main stereotypes concerning Englishmen – that of a ‘phlegmatic gentleman’ and that of ‘John Bull,’ essentially belonging to the middle class, stout, stubborn and choleric. (Ibid.) Anthony Trollope clearly identified himself with the second one – moreover he also contributed to the spread of this particular stereotype as an author of the novel *John Bull on the Guadalquivir*. Therefore, the negotiations between Trollope and Nubar Bey can be regarded as a battle between the auto-image of Trollope as a Brit and the hetero-image of Nubar Bey as an Oriental.

Nubar Bey’s obstinacy reached its climax, when he threatened Trollope that 24 hour mail delivery would cause ‘bloodshed’ and ‘loss of life.’ (Trollope, 2008) He also declared that he would resign from his office and ‘retire into obscurity.’ (Ibid.) Trollope repeats these words as proof of eastern ways, overreaction and exaggeration. In his letter to Frederic Hill he explicitly names Nubar Bey’s objections – ‘moonshine.’ (Trollope, 1983)

The credibility of the Egyptian official is repeatedly undermined in Trollope’s letters. Firstly, Trollope is convinced that Nubar Bey’s obstinacy in demanding 48 hour mail delivery is caused by the influence on the part of the Peninsular and Oriental Steamship Company. This British company opposed the notion of very quick transit as it did not suit them. Trollope thus describes the entire situation in the letter to Rowland Hill:

> While we wish celerity in the transit, they are urging on Nubar Bey, what he calls ‘tranquillity’ in the transit: that is, they are anxious to ensure the certain despatch of any merchandise they may have to carry, at the same pace and hours as the Mails. (Ibid.)

Moreover, Trollope discovered that Nubar Bey’s superior, the Viceroy of Egypt, Muhammad Sa’id Pasha, was heavily indebted to the Company’s agent, Mr Holton. It cannot be doubted that Nubar Bey tried to hide this knowledge from Trollope. Trollope denounces the vehement declarations of Nubar Bey as part of a bluff, writing:

> I often wondered who originated that frightful picture of blood and desolation. That it came from an English heart and an English hand I was always sure.’ (Trollope, 2008)
What Trollope misses to see and acknowledge is that Nubar Bey’s position – as a negotiator between two colonial powers – The General Post Office and the Peninsular and Oriental Steamship Company – was indeed very delicate.

On the contrary, Trollope prides himself on uncovering other of Nubar Bey’s deceptions when he writes to Frederic Hill about the supposed pace of the camels:

I made no mistake about the pace of the camels – I was informed by those of whom I enquired, our own agents & the agents of the Railway, that when laden they travelled 3 miles an hour. Mr Green may very probably be right in saying that they only go 2,5 miles- viz 20 miles in eight hours. He has however probably got his information from Nubar Bey, & Nubar Bey’s officers, when talking the matter over; and they would doubtless claim ample time. (Trollope, 1983)

Here Trollope elevates himself not only at the expense of Nubar Bey, but also at the expense of the Postal Agent and colleague Mr Green, who – unlike Trollope – seems to be easily deceived. And while Trollope never explicitly accuses Nubar Bey and his subordinates of falsehood, he implies they are not credible source of information. ‘Never trust a foreigner, check every detail yourself” remains the underlying thought behind Trollope’s words.

The same notion is expressed in another (private) letter to Frederic Hill from 1 July 1858. This time Trollope clearly states and confirms his prejudices on hearing that after his change of heart Nubar Bey declared that it was no problem to execute 24 hour mail delivery:

I believe that one should never give way in any thing to an Oriental. Nubar Bey, who now that the treaty is signed declares that there will be no difficulty in carrying it out, assured me at least a dozen times, that if the Viceroy insisted on his signing such an agreement he would at once abandon his office, seeing that the work to which he would be bound would be absolutely impracticable! (Ibid.)

There are several issues concerning Trollope’s words. Firstly, it can be assumed that he was deeply moved writing them as it is indicated by the exclamation mark. Secondly, while Trollope’s indignation can be understood, he clearly puts the blame on Nubar Bey’s cultural background and nationality. What Trollope tends to overlook is the simple fact that
given the situation (pressure from both the Postal Office and the P&O Company) every official in such a situation would behave like Nubar Bey. Every official, whether he/she were of European origin or not, could misinform or threaten to resign or respond in an emotional manner. This kind of behavior is nothing unusual, even nowadays. Finally, Trollope himself is quite emotional writing these words as it has been already mentioned. And yet he explicitly accuses Nubar Bey of overreaction as well as dishonesty or/and manipulation.

It is a pattern discernible in the entire correspondence concerning the Postal Agreement that particular accusations are rarely expressed in a direct manner. For instance, when considering the cost of the service Trollope writes that Nubar Bey demands £1200, commenting: ‘I do not know that it is necessary that I should make any observations on this point.’ (Ibid.) This is the ancient rhetorical device known as praeteritio or paralipsis, the declared will to pass over certain things in such an ironical manner that it paradoxically draws the reader’s or listener’s attention. Refraining from any comments, Trollope in fact implies that the costs of the service are high (too high) and that Nubar Bey as well as the Viceroy are grasping men.

In another letter to Frederic Hill dated on 14th February 1858 Trollope describes the conditions of mail delivery carried on camels. This occurred when the Post Office authorities tried to introduce the use of mail bags instead of boxes. Trollope opposes this solution for two reasons. Firstly, he fears that the contents might be damaged. Secondly, he thinks that there is a risk of thievery. He thus describes the situation:

Eighty or ninety camels are I am informed often used at the same time. And where so many Arabs are employed – one namely to each camel – it is impossible to answer for the conduct of them all. [The mail bags, he explains] can be ripped by any knife. (Ibid.)

This time Trollope’s point of view is clear – he considers Arabs as prone to stealing, even though he does not give any example of thievery. What is more, Trollope states that it is a Westerner’s – an Englishman’s responsibility to watch over the Arabs, as they themselves are both irresponsible and dishonest. And when a colonial official is unable to keep an eye on his local employees, he should do everything in his power to prevent the hypothetical plunder. Trollope is sure that this type of plunder may happen, and his conviction is based merely on prejudice
toward the Arabs. The letter invokes the image of the thievish Oriental with a knife – the representation of ‘Europe’s phobic fascination with an imagined Orient,’ (Beller, Leerssen, 2007) as Joep Leerssen phrased it. Trollope’s approach to Arabs remains a mixture of fairy-tale imagery and racial prejudices.

**Irishmen at the eve of the Famine Revolution**

It remains a paradox illustrating colonial inequality well that the best period of Trollope’s life coincided with Great Irish Famine. Gordon Bigelow in his essay ‘Trollope and Ireland’ writes that during the food crisis ‘Trollope seemed to take relatively little note of it; when he did come to write of it some years later, he tended to minimize its scale [...]’ (Dever, Niles, 2011) This is certainly true. In his letters Trollope, an English official in Ireland, remained totally oblivious of the misery, which surrounded him. There is only one letter dated in Spring 1848, dedicated to Ireland and Irishmen. Trollope writes to his mother, Frances, probably with the intention of calming her down. The letter in question is devoted to the forthcoming uprising – the Young Irelander Rebellion of 1848 also called the Famine Rebellion. Trollope himself wrote about it as a ‘revolt’ or ‘row’. He also belittled the situation: ‘[...] all I hear or see of Irish rows is in the columns of the *Times* newspaper...’ (Trollope, 1983)

The entire letter is devoted to the question of a possible uprising as well as the nature of Irishmen, yet there is not a single word about the causes of the revolt – not a single word about the famine. Oblivious to the real reason of people’s discontent, Trollope attributed it to the polarization of attitudes in Irish society as well as the ignorance of the populace. According to Trollope Irishmen lack basic knowledge. He wrote:

Here in Ireland the meaning of the word Communism – or even social revolution – is not understood. The people have not the remotest notion of attempting to improve their worldly condition by making the difference between the employer and the employed less marked. Revolution here means a row. Some like a row, having little or nothing to lose. These are revolutionists, a call for pikes. Others are anti-revolutionists, having something to lose and dreading a row. These condemn the pikes, and demand more soldiers and police. (Ibid.)

There are several issues concerning this fragment. Firstly, Trollope’s opinion of Irishmen is marked by his overwhelming sense of superiority. Irishmen are presented not only as uneducated but also ignorant of
rudimental knowledge on social issues. Trollope repeats this reproach in the last part of the letter, stating that there is ‘not enough intelligence in Ireland for any body of men at all to conceive the possibility of social improvement.’ (Ibid.) Trollope states that Irishmen do not understand the idea of the golden mean, being either rebellious or conformist. Secondly, Trollope accuses Irishmen of greed. According to him there are two classes in Ireland – the rebellious proletariat and opportunists who exploit it. Opportunists collaborate with English colonists, they demand more control over the working classes; they also want to introduce a police state. Both classes are responsible for the difficult situation in Ireland. What Trollope fails to acknowledge is the fact that it is British colonial power which is to blame in the first place. Cecil Woodham-Smith, the authority on the Great Famine, states clearly that the crisis was not caused by food shortages, but by the restrictive system of distribution. During the worst period of the food crisis, vast quantities of food were transported from Ireland to England ‘under armed guard from the most famine-stricken areas of the country with the approval of the government.’ (Woodham-Smith, 1991) Such a situation can be regarded as a glaring example of structural violence. Trollope, however, absolves the colonists of any responsibility.

In Letters to the Examiner, written in response to the government’s detractors, Trollope is even more critical of the Irishmen, as he writes: ‘Irishman ever lacks the ability, when he can master the will, to put his shoulder to the wheel [...]’. (Trollope, 1987) Moreover, on the whole, Trollope considers the situation to be exaggerated by the newspaper, politicians and people who, unlike him, are ignorant of Ireland. The most atrocious remark concerns the victims of the famine, who, according to Trollope, were ‘considerably few.’ (Trollope, 1987) These are words written at the time when about a million people died of starvation and another million was forced to emigrate. (Dever, Niles, 2011)

According to Trollope, Irishmen are prone to laziness as ‘the prospect of comparatively idle life is seductive’ to them.’ (Trollope, 1987) Therefore in his Examiner letters Trollope puts the blame almost entirely on indebted Irish landlords and indolent Irish tenants, who instead of working hard decide to give up their occupation and sublet their lands, as Trollope remarks, ‘at a great profit.’ (Ibid.) This is the same accusation of greed, which appears in the letter to his mother. As Mary Hamer writes, Trollope is ‘stalwart in his defence of government policy and of the relief programme.’ (Terry et al.,
1999) He certainly believed that Irishmen were unable to govern themselves. In his final letter on Ireland he states: ‘I find it impossible to believe that the Irish are gifted with those qualities which are required to support a stern struggle for constitutional liberty.’ (Trollope, 1987) According to Trollope Irishmen are at the same time ignorant and irresponsible. He also enriches this existing stereotype of the intellectually handicapped Irishman (Beller, Leerssen, 2007) with allegations of avarice. He not only repeats the old stereotype but also creates a new one. What’s even worse, Trollope writes as an authority on Ireland; therefore, he is personally responsible for spreading these stereotypes among Victorian society.

**On ‘Kaffirs’ – the image of blacks**

Of all Trollope’s letters only one can serve as an example of pure racism and prejudice, invoking the worst, most biased images of blacks as ‘savages’ and ‘barbarians.’ It is a letter to his son, Henry Merrivale Trollope, a letter send by Trollope on the verge of a conflict, which is now known as a The Cape Colony War or Xhosa War (1877). Trollope describes the meeting with Kaffir Chiefs (from Xhosa tribes). Though he uses the noun ‘kaffir,’ which nowadays is regarded as a racial slur, (Yerkes, 1989) it is not the term, which is the most offensive aspect of the letter. Trollope writes about Kaffir Chiefs thus:

This morning about 20 Kaffir Chiefs were brought into town to talk to me. They came with an interpreter [...] Only one Chief talked, and he declared that everything was as bad as it could be; That the Kaffirs were horribly ill treated by the English; - That they were made to wear breeches instead [of] red paint, which was very cruel; and that upon the whole the English had done a great deal more harm than good. (Trollope, 1983)

It is a good example of modern racism, which emerged in Victorian society as a response to Darwin’s works ‘suffused with a plethora of imperialist ethnographies.’ (Beller, Leerssen, 2007) The problems and complaints of autochthons are not only belittled, they are also ridiculed. Trollope seems to be amused by the claims of the blacks. He is mocking the people with the intention of proving to his son how baseless their complaints are. This is a ‘scientific’ racism, based on the racial and anthropological theories of the nineteenth century, which served to prove that ‘superior’ race has the ‘right’ and ‘duty’ to conquer the ‘inferior’ ones for their own good.
The second part of the description is even more racist, as Trollope writes about the Kaffir Chief:

He was a dirty half-drunken savage, who wore a sixpenny watch key by way of earring in his ear. He ended by begging tobacco, and God-blessing me for giving him half a crown. The other nineteen stood by silent, and went away when he went. (Trollope, 1983)

Modern English scholars writing about Trollope state that ‘he was no believer in racial equality’ (Terry et al., 1999) – that seems to be understatement. Trollope here introduces the most common, the most frequent hetero-image of ‘savage’ – uncivilized, deprived of knowledge, manners and even dignity, which sometimes occurs in the ‘noble savage’ stereotype of the epoch.

Trollope presents the black chief as a ‘barbarian’ (unable to speak a civilized language – i.e. English), a drunkard and a beggar. This is the stereotype created by European explorers and conquerors. Manfred Beller thus writes about the circumstances which surrounded the creation of this particular image:

They were strangers, spoke completely different languages, lived in many cases under more natural or primitive conditions, and reacted to the uncomprehending greed and violence of the invaders with hostility and cruelty on their part. (Beller, Leerssen, 2007)

Trollope’s chief seems to be a part of that tradition, though he is a harmless being. Yet it is also worth noting that he is the only man speaking (and the only black whom Trollope describes). Neither Trollope, nor we can know what the thoughts of the nineteen other chiefs were. It is not known whether these people really approved of the behavior of their representative. We do not know what the meaning of their silence was – was it approval or shame or quiet censure or anger. Trollope never bothers himself with a moment of consideration, dismissing any possibility of resistance on the part of chiefs, though this particular meeting took place in the year of the war.
Trollope and Orientalism

Edward Said once wrote that:

Orientalism can be discussed and analyzed as the corporate institution for dealing with the Orient – dealing with it by making statements about it, authorizing views of it, describing it, by teaching it, settling it, ruling over it: in short. Orientalism as a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient.’ (Said, 1979)

According to this conception, Westerners created the Orient for themselves, adjusting reality not only to their experience but also to their prejudices and imagination. That is essentially true – on analyzing Trollope’s correspondence we are able to perceive that he too, like many other Westerners, created the ‘Orient’ and ‘Orientals’ for himself. And images of the Orientals as they appear in Trollope’s letters do not differ from the mindset of Orientalism presented in Manfred Beller and Joep Leerssen’s ‘Imagology.’ ‘Inefficiency instead of organization,’ ‘laziness rather than work ethic,’ ‘ostentation instead of restraint’ (Beller, Leerssen, 2007) – these are the traditional dichotomies associated with East/West representation clearly discernible in Trollope’s letters concerning the Postal Agreement from 1858. Furthermore, even in official correspondence the ‘exotic’ picture of a ‘sneaky Arab with a knife’ appears – the image originated in Western reading (or mis-reading) of ‘Arabian Nights.’ The only difference is that in Trollope’s imagination Arabs don’t rip the throats of enemies but rather their mail bags.

Geoffrey Bennington writes in ‘Nation and Narration’ that the post is a pinnacle of politics, that this institution is indispensible to civilization and social life. He quotes Montesquieu’s lost Treatise on Duty: ‘it is the invention of the post which has produced politics.’ (Bhabha, 2008) In this aspect Trollope’s activity not only in Egypt but also in Ireland (and truly – wherever he was sent) can be seen as an extension of British colonial power – reforming the postal service, introducing new inventions, optimizing work. Trollope’s perspective is also a colonial perspective, though he desperately tries to present his experience as unique and his thoughts as original. His derogatory remarks on the Xhosa people are nothing but common. There is nothing exceptional about the base racism manifested in the infamous letter to his son. This letter merely proves, once more, how colonial officials perceived the autochthons.
Trollope not only created an Orient for himself – for himself he also created Ireland and Irishmen. This time, he was, unfortunately, quite original, because during the Famine many Englishmen criticized governmental policy and the incompetence of prime minister Lord John Russell. Unlike others, Trollope decided to defend Russell’s politics, for according to Hennessy – ‘as an official himself, he detested philanthropists who thought they knew better than the Government.’ (Hennessy, 1971) It is worth noting that he didn’t profit in any way from publishing *Letters to Examiner* – he was never paid for them and wrote them because of pure hatred for critics. He wrote from the position of an ‘expert’ on Ireland, believing in every word he had written. Unfortunately, he not only repeated all of the old prejudices concerning Irishmen and their supposed ‘ignorance’ and ‘rebellious nature,’ but also he introduced new hetero-image of Irishmen as grasping people, responsible for the suffering of their countrymen.

The image of the Other in Trollope’s letters is distorted. The Other appears as an Oriental gentleman (Nubar Bey) but also as an Arab with a knife, a ‘savage’ and fiery, immoderate Irishman. John Buzard in his essay ‘Trollope and travel’ notes that:

[…] for all the diligent finding of facts, nowhere in Trollope’s travel writing do we come across a substantial alteration of perspective; very nearly nowhere does prejudice falter; repeatedly we encounter expressions of bigotry and narrow-mindedness wholly conventional in Trollope’s culture. It is not too much to say that, in spite of all the places he visited and people he encountered, Trollope hardly ever changed his mind. (Dever, Niles, 2011)

In all his prejudices, in his imagination as well as in his experience Anthony Trollope remains the product and the child of his epoch.

**Conclusions**

1. On analyzing Trollope’s letters we perceive that he too, like others Westerners, created an ‘Orient’ for himself.
2. Images of the Orientals do not differ from the mindset of Orientalism presented in Beller and Leerssen’s ‘Imagology.’ ‘Inefficiency instead of organization,’ ‘laziness rather than work ethic,’ ‘ostentation instead of restraint’ – traditional dichotomies associated with East/West representation are discernible in Trollope’s letters.
3. Even in official correspondence the ‘exotic’ picture of ‘sneaky Arab with a knife,’ an image originated in Western reading (or mis-reading) of ‘Arabian Nights’ appears;

4. Though Trollope tries to present his experience as unique, there is nothing exceptional about the base racism manifested in the infamous letter to his son.

5. Trollope also creates for himself the image of Ireland and Irishmen, repeating old prejudices concerning supposed ‘ignorance’ and ‘rebellious nature’ and introducing a new hetero-image of Irishmen as grasping people, responsible for the suffering of their countrymen.

6. Trollope’s activity not only in Egypt but also in Ireland (and truly – wherever he was sent) can be seen as the extension of British colonial power – reforming the post, introducing new inventions, optimizing work, defending government.

References

1 Paralipsis, also paraleipsis – the suggestion, by deliberately concise treatment of a topic, that much of significance is being omitted. (Yerkes, 1989) also παράλειψις derived from παράλειπω ‘leave on one’s side’ (Jurewicz, 2001).

Literature

Beller, M. and Leerssen, J. (eds.). (2007). Imagology: The cultural construction and literary representation of national characters. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.

Bhabha, H. K. (2008). Nation and narration. London and New York: Routledge.

Dever, C. and Niles, L. (eds.). (2011). The Cambridge Companion to Anthony Trollope. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hennessy, J. P. (1971). Anthony Trollope. London: Jonathan Cape Thirty Bedford Square.

Jurewicz, O. (ed.). (2001). Słownik grecko-polski. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Szkołne PWN.

Terry, R. C. (ed.). (1999). Oxford Reader’s Companion to Trollope. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Trollope, A. to Mrs. Frances Trollope. Spring, 1858. The Letters of Anthony Trollope, John Hall, N. J. (ed.). Volume one: 1835-1870. (1983). Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Trollope, A. to Frederic Hill. February 14, 1858.
________________. February 23, 1858.
________________. June 19, 1858.
________________. July 1, 1858.
Trollope, A. to Henry Merivale Trollope. August 22, 1877.

Trollope, A. (1987). The Irish Famine: six letter to the Examiner: 1849/1850. London: Silverbridge Press.

_________. (2008). An Autobiography. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Said, E. W. (1979). Orientalism. New York: Vintage Books A Division of Random House.

Woodham-Smith, C. (1991). The Great Hunger: Ireland 1845–1849. London: Penguin.

Yerkes, D. (ed.). (1989). Webster’s Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary of the English Language. New York: Portland House.