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Summary

This dissertation examines James Joyce’s interrogation of nationalist historiography: his reading and interpretation of historical texts and events, predominately of Irish history, before and up to his lifetime that were inherently influenced by nationalism. My argument is that nationalism, which was prominent in late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century Irish sociopolitical discourse, is crucial in understanding Joyce’s engagement with history. I argue that Joyce was ultimately skeptical of nationalistic interpretations of history, considering them skewed, inaccurate, and deleterious to Ireland. Although he was critical of the various strains of nationalism during his lifetime, his writings demonstrate both a reprimand and an interpolation, both intentional and unwitting, of nationalist historiography. I analyze topics that I believe are either pivotal in understanding Joyce’s historiography or have been hitherto underdeveloped in Joycean scholarship.

The dissertation is divided into five sections: an introduction, three chapters, and a conclusion. The introduction provides an overview of the historiographical and theoretical methodologies I will use throughout the dissertation. After outlining the body of research done on historiography and nationalism in Joycean scholarship, I demonstrate my methodologies by discussing Joyce’s early engagement with controversial historical topics, including the Laudabiliter. I then discuss “the Citizen” of the “Cyclops” episode in Ulysses, who I argue exemplifies some of the worst aspects of Irish nationalism and will serve as a basis of comparison for the following sections. My analysis of the Citizen includes a discussion of his various influences, including Michael Cusack and David Patrick “D. P.” Moran, and the character’s egregious interpretation of Irish history.

The first chapter focuses on Joyce’s engagement with one of Ireland’s most controversial historical events: the 1798 Rebellion. Analyzing various historical texts and Joyce’s engagement with them, I argue that Joyce accentuates the legacy of the rebellion
throughout his work in order to underscore the follies of nationalist historiography and nationalism in general. The 1798 Rebellion is particularly relevant in that it was constantly evoked by Irish nationalists in the nineteenth century to further their sociopolitical agendas to various effects, most of which Joyce considered foolish and athwart to the real development of the Irish people.

The second chapter focuses on nationalist historiography in Ireland as compared to those of other nations. Using Arthur Griffith’s *The Resurrection of Hungary* (1904) as a basis of comparison, I explore the issues and contradictions of Irish nationalist historiography in an increasingly multicultural and globalized world. I examine the historiographical comparisons of Ireland and Hungary as well as ethnic groups such as the Huguenots and the Jews. I argue Joyce’s work demonstrates that nationalist historiography in Ireland faced a number of challenges from the ramifications of globalization, which itself was an outgrowth of imperialism. I also argue that the “Hungarian parallel” Griffith attempted to establish in *Resurrection* exhibits the pitfalls of comparative nationalist historiography as well as the wider dangers of nineteenth century nationalism throughout Europe.

The third chapter focuses on socialist nationalist historiography. I argue that this version of historiography, although imperfect and subject to the same limitations of other nationalist historiographies, bears the closest resemblance to Joyce’s own historiographical methodology. I briefly summarize the emergence of socialism in Ireland and its notable leaders such as James Connolly, Roger Casement, and Thomas Brady before analyzing their respective historical works as well as the ways in which socialist nationalist historiography was evident in Joyce’s treatment of specific historical topics such as the Brehons Laws, the Phoenix Park Murders (1882), and the Second Boer War (1899-1902).

The conclusion is a summary of my findings as well as a propositioning of various unresolved issues derived from my research.
Abbreviations and Notes on the Text


Passages from *Ulysses* are identified by the episode and line number. Passages from *Finnegans Wake* are identified by the page and line number. Passages from *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* are identified by the chapter and line number. Passages from the other texts above are identified by the page number. Only passages not preceded by a reference to the text are identified by an abbreviation.

Unless otherwise indicated, italics are from the original text and ellipses are not from the original text. I adhere to the formatting and citation style of the *MLA Handbook* (8th ed.).
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Introduction

The past is a foreign country: they do things differently there.

– L. P. Hartley, *The Go-Between* (11)

On April 10th, 1921, a young Irishman named Arthur Power approached James Joyce in the Bal Bullier, a dancehall in Paris. Joyce was with his family and Sylvia Beach, who had just agreed to publish *Ulysses* and arranged for the printing of the first thousand copies. Joyce would receive two-thirds of the net profits – so it was time to celebrate. A friend of Power’s brought him to Joyce’s table and the two started to talk. Joyce was intrigued by the young man. He asked him if he aspired to be a writer. When Power said yes, Joyce asked what he would write. “Something on the model of the French satirists,” he answered. Joyce bristled. “You will never do it,” he said. “You are an Irishman and you must write in your own tradition.” Power, surprised by his answer, told him that he rejected national identity and wanted to be known as an “international” writer, which in his mind characterized all “great” writers. “They were national first,” Joyce said, “and it was the intensity of their own nationalism which made them international in the end” (JJ 504-5). As they chatted amicably about the relationship between nationalism and literature, war was waging in Ireland. The end of that year would see the ratification of the Anglo-Irish Treaty and with it the formation of an independent Ireland. In the following year, the Irish Free State was born and *Ulysses* was published. The intensity of Joyce’s own nationalism, as it were, produced a novel that would bring him international acclaim and would define, or at least be closely associated with, the nation of Ireland.¹ The symbolic importance of the formation of the Irish Free State

¹ And ironically so. As Fritz Senn laments, Ireland “vilified or neglected” Joyce, only to revere him as a “national icon” later on. “Nowadays,” he observes, “genuine appreciation is at variance with crass commercialism” (“Potency of Error” 241).
and the publication of *Ulysses* in the same year has been made before, so much so that now it might be deemed a banal observation. Yet traditionally, 1922 is considered to be a paradigmatic year in Irish history. After centuries of conflict with, subordination to, and general ill-will toward its neighboring nation, Ireland had finally achieved independence. It could control its own destiny and could join the international community as a member of its own rather than as the British Empire’s oldest underling. Ireland and Joyce would enter the international community in their own right, whether Joyce, Power, or anyone else in that dancehall knew it or not.

There is, however, a lingering question: how important really was 1922? Should it be considered as important in Irish history as 1641, 1798, 1801, 1848, or 1916? The creation of the Irish Free State was a significant development, yet the State was not entirely detached from the United Kingdom. It was still part of the British Empire, specifically a dominion of the Commonwealth, and nominally led by the Governor-General, who was appointed by the king, and the Executive Council, the president of which was in turn appointed by the Governor-General. Although the President of the Executive Council was nominated by the Oireachtas and exercised *de facto* executive powers, the office was *de jure* subordinate to the king. The Oireachtas and Executive Council controlled domestic affairs, yet its foreign affairs were officially dictated by Westminster. Most controversially, members of the Oireachtas had to take an oath of allegiance to the new constitution and to the king, something that infuriated Irish republicans to no end and would be a prominent cause of the Irish Civil War. It took more than twenty-five years for Ireland to gain its total sovereignty.

---

2 Andras Ungar, for example, notices the coincidence: “In a sustained gesture, *Ulysses* appropriates the argument current in 1904 concerning the future of Ireland, which readers in 1922 would have judged to have been the political development most prescient about the establishment of Irish sovereignty eighteen years later” (*Joyce’s Ulysses* 7).
from the British, a series of legislative and constitutional changes after the Civil War that culminated in the formation of the Republic of Ireland in 1949 – eight years after Joyce had passed away. Nineteen twenty-two was a significant first step in Ireland’s exit from the United Kingdom, yet it should not be regarded in the same way as, say, 1776 is in the United States when the colonies formally and irrevocably broke away from Great Britain.

Nineteen twenty-two can be viewed in a number of ways, yet it is perhaps a mistake to view at as a “beginning” or an “end” in Irish history. It is, rather, just another development in the long tumultuous relationship between two nations. The formation of a pseudo-independent nation-state came at the heels of the Third Home Rule Bill of 1914, which provided similar stipulations as the Anglo-Irish Treaty. The differences between the state that would have been established by the Home Rule Bill and the Irish Free State were not drastic, a key difference being that the Free State was allowed to maintain its own standing army. They both established a separate government for Southern and Northern Ireland that was nominally governed by London. Neither state was a republic nor did either have any official option of departing from the Commonwealth. The United Kingdom was allowed to maintain three naval ports and several government and civil service administrations were retained (Bartlett, Ireland 401-22; McGarry 258-95). Had the republican rebels not acted in 1916, Ireland could very well have achieved autonomy peacefully and within constitutional parameters. The end result, though not identical, may have been similar. Moreover, when the Irish Free State eventually did become the Republic of Ireland, it produced its own set of problems that resembled the original grievances nationalists levied against the English. Far from the egalitarian society that was the hope of many nationalists, Ireland remained poor and dominated by the Catholic Church. Women’s rights were curtailed even by the standards
of the first half of the twentieth century, and the government would implement censorship for decades. The Censorship of Publications Act of 1929, what Samuel Beckett characterized as a “constitutional belch” (87), severely curtailed modernist Irish writing, leading many prominent Irish writers such as Stephen MacKenna and Arnold Bax to leave the country. The irony of this, as Declan Kiberd points out, is that the Irish Free State was “cutting off one of the major supply lines which had made independence possible” (6) – which is to say, the cultural supply lines that distinguished the Irish as a people. Although these issues improved over the years, Ireland lagged behind its Western European counterparts economically and socially well into the second half of the twentieth century, becoming one of the most conservative and reactionary nations in the West (MacCabe 169). Meanwhile, far from the socialist republic the likes of James Connolly and James Larkin had hoped for, the capitalist economic and political apparatuses did not change, except for the fact that they were commandeered by (more of) the Irish elite rather than the English elite – and even that is contentious. As Trevor L. Williams summarizes:

The influence of colonialism on the Irish economy as a whole is a complex issue . . . but one can hazard a guess that the case of Ireland under British capitalism did not differ markedly from the experience of modern states whose economies are heavily dominated by transnational corporations, the profits of which are overwhelmingly repatriated rather than reinvested in the “colonial” economy. (Reading 40)

Ireland’s independence from the United Kingdom was achieved at an enormous cost, yet the well-being of the average Irish person was by many standards less than enviable. The freedom Ireland enjoyed because of 1922 left much to be desired, which is why one should be skeptical of elevating it to a grandiose status or, for that matter, any status. The so-called
change 1922 wrought could be seen as the transition from a colonial nation to a postcolonial
nation, with all the travails and tragedies that unfortunately have accompanied former
European colonies that became their own in the twentieth century. The name and governing
bodies of Ireland may have changed but it is debatable how far the other kinds of change –
socially, economically, culturally, and politically – went. “The real meaning of 1922, in the
longue durée of history,” Kiberd solemnly concludes, “is not national liberation but the
moment of transfer from one elite to another” (11).

This transition was largely based on the popular view that the dominant theme of
Irish history has been a centuries-old feud between two rival nations inhabited by ethnically
and culturally distinct peoples (Bartlett, “What Ish My Nation” 44; Moody 80). Irish
nationalists and republicans especially regarded the relationship between England and
Ireland as a “clash of two civilizations,” with the former ruthlessly and unscrupulously
imposing its will on the latter. This narrative became prominent in the nineteenth century
with the rise of cultural and political nationalist movements such as the Irish Revival and the
Irish Republican Brotherhood (IRB) or “Fenians” among others that became increasingly
separatist and sectarian in nature. The term “Irish nationalist,” it should be noted, is not
monolithic, which can cause problems when discussing nationalist movements of the time.
The Fenians, for example, held different beliefs and prerogatives than the Home Rulers, and
the Invincibles were remarkably different than the Fenians from which they branched off.

---

3 James Connolly, a critic of this reading of Irish history, sarcastically summarized it as such:
According to this luminous (?) exposition of Irish history, we are to believe that the two nations have for
seven hundred years been engaged in unceasing warfare, that the one country (Ireland) has during all that
time been compelled to witness the merciless slaughter of her children by famine, pestilence and the sword;
that each succeeding generation has witnessed a renewal of the conflict and a renewal of the martyrdom,
until the sensitive mind recoils from a perusal of Irish history as from the records of a shambles, and all,
forsooth, because Irishmen and Englishmen could not agree upon the form of political administration best
suited for Ireland. (Erin’s Hope 7)
This passage, as well as Connolly’s broader reading of Irish history, will be examined in the last chapter.
Cultural nationalists did not have the same goals as the political nationalists; the former didn’t necessarily want an independent country but rather an Irish culture totally distinct from the English one, whereas political nationalists felt that gaining political independence from the United Kingdom was the best way to help and protect the Irish people. The socialist nationalists of the likes of Connolly and Larkin were considerably different from other movements in that they concerned themselves with class struggle and, moreover, international cooperation with the downtrodden classes throughout Europe and beyond. Then, of course, the unionists both in Ulster and the other provinces were also nationalists – just of a different country. Indeed, the characteristics of an Irish nationalist before, during, and after Joyce’s time are as broad as the concept of nationalism itself.

However, for the purposes of this study, the term “nationalist” will refer to a person who wants either political or cultural independence from the United Kingdom. From the Irish Parliamentary Party (IPP) to the Revivalists, Irish nationalists believed that those born in Ireland or who “identified” (a word which admittedly carries several meanings) as Irish deserved independence from the United Kingdom or at the very least an acknowledgment that they were inherently different from the English, Welsh, and Scottish nations that composed the kingdom – that they are not simply “Western Britons.” Unionists do not fall into this category, nor do the Irish who did not care one way or the other about their national or cultural identities, like Power or arguably, at least at some moments in his life, Joyce himself.

Despite their differences, one thing that several of these nationalist manifestations had in common was the adoption of the previously mentioned historical narrative that pitted the English against the Irish. This version of Irish history portrayed the English of
conquering, bullying, oppressing, prosecuting, humiliating, or otherwise unfairly treating the Irish at every opportunity, preventing Ireland from reaching its full potential both within the British Isles and in Europe. This view was prevalent among cultural and political nationalists of the nineteenth century, especially those that can be described as “Gaelic-Catholic.” Indeed, it is difficult to find a nationalist movement at the time that did not indulge in Hibernophilia and Anglophobia. It was framed as, in the words of Len Platt (although it is itself a popular refrain), “the battle of two civilizations” (30). This narrative was resonant in the Irish psyche in Joyce’s time – so much so that Joyce indulged in it, stating both in person and in his work that the Irish suffered under unforgiving English control that demoralized them politically, culturally, economically, and even existentially for more than seven-hundred years.

England, he wrote in his lecture “Ireland: Island of Saints and Sages” which he delivered in Trieste in 1907, was as “cruel as she was cunning: her weapons were, and are, the battering-ram, the club and the noose” (OCPW 119; my emphasis). Not only does he acknowledge England’s past crimes, he accuses it of continuing its oppression at that very moment.⁴ His admonishment of the English was thorough:

The English now laugh at the Irish for being Catholic, poor and ignorant; it will seem hard, for some, however, to justify this disdain. Ireland is poor because English laws destroyed the industries of the country, notably the woollen one; because, in the years in which the potato crop failed, the negligence of the English government left the flower of the people to die of hunger; because, while the country is becoming depopulated and, though criminality is almost nonexistent, judges under the present

---

⁴ It is reminiscent of Leopold Bloom’s speech about his fellow Jews in “Cyclops”: “I belong to a race too . . . that is hated and persecuted. Also now. This very moment. This very instant” (U 12.1467-68).
administration receive the salaries of a Pasha, and government and public officials pocket huge sums for doing little or nothing. (119-20)

This conventional narrative, convincing as it is, has met considerable resistance in recent historiography, and so has the notion that Joyce agreed with it in its totality.\(^5\) Contemporary Irish historians and theorists such Seamus Deane, Roy Foster, Thomas Bartlett, Conor Cruise O’Brien, David George Boyce, and David Lloyd have challenged this historical framing. They have questioned the idea that Irish history over the last millennium had been as simple as a feud between the Protestant, royalist English and Anglo-Irish and the Gaelic-Catholic, republican Irish. Bartlett argues, for example, that the idea of this dichotomy in Irish history has been grossly exaggerated, pointing out several times throughout the sixteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries that Protestants had often been at the forefront of Irish agitation against the English, and that many of the so-called uprisings such as the 1798 Rebellion were suppressed mostly by Irish, not English, soldiers against both Catholic and Protestant rebels (*Ireland* 221-27, “What Ish My Nation?” 44-59; Holmes 338-39).\(^6\) From the Ulster Plantations and the Protestant Ascendancy to the Great Famine and Home Rule, from the Cromwellian conquests to the Black and Tans, Irish history is fraught with considerable complexity that challenges the notion that Ireland’s greatest struggles were caused by the English alone or, at times, at all.\(^7\)

---

\(^5\) Although Joyce’s views on England were considerably complex, he never quite relinquished his youthful resentment of the English. In 1936, his daughter Lucia was admitted into St. Andrew’s Hospital in Northampton for treatment of her severe mental illness. After hearing about her desire to leave the hospital, Joyce allegedly remarked to a confidant that he supported her wish because “he would never agree to his daughter being incarcerated among the English” (Bowker 482). Although he may have been joking, it is indicative of an attitude not so much different from the one he held in 1907.

\(^6\) Bloom himself says as much in “Eumaeus”: “Another little interesting point, the amours of whores and chummies, to put it in common parlance, reminded him Irish soldiers had as often fought for England as against her, more so, in fact” (*U* 16.1040-42).

\(^7\) For more information regarding the complex relationship between Protestants and Irish nationalism, especially during the “Protestant Ascendancy,” itself a contestable term, see Bartlett, *Ireland* 79-266; S. Connolly; Foster,
Ireland has been prominent since at least the 1930s with the formation of the *Irish Historical Studies* journal (C. Brady, “‘Constructive’” 4; Fanning 147). Seamus Deane, Foster, T. W. Moody, R. Dudley Edwards, and Oliver MacDonagh are few of the several historians who have wrestled with Ireland’s past, both expanding and disputing conventional Irish historiography that fueled the founding of the Republic itself.8

In tandem with these scholars, Joycean scholarship also underwent significant debates about Joyce’s stance on nationalism and history. Over the last few decades, much attention has been paid to these issues by Dominic Manganiello, Andrew Gibson, Emer Nolan, James Fairhall, Robert Spoo, Colin MacCabe, Derek Attridge, Platt, and others. Joyce made several comments in his interviews, letters, lectures, and other sources on these issues that were provocative, puzzling, and most importantly contradictory, giving scholars plenty of material to work with – and this is *in addition* to his fiction. Despite the disagreements between these scholars in both fields, there are a few conclusions that are broadly agreed upon. First, perhaps most obviously, nationalism played an instrumental if not defining role in the formation of an independent Ireland, most noticeably in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. Moreover, the nationalism that pushed Ireland toward independence evolved considerably in the second half of the nineteenth century. The political nationalism of Charles Stewart Parnell and Home Rule gave way to the cultural nationalism of the Irish Revival and the Literary Revival and finally toward the militant nationalism that pushed its adherents to rebellion in 1916 – all of which happened during Joyce’s lifetime. Second,
Joyce’s own views on the matter were considerably nuanced if not ambiguous. Even those scholars such as Richard Ellmann, who considered Joyce apolitical and neutral in the historical and political events of his day, broadly defining him as an internationalist aesthete, have documented Joyce’s divergence from this stance, as seen in the beginning of this chapter.

I intend to argue a third point, one that specifically deals with the relationship between nationalism and historiography: Irish nationalism had an indelible influence on Irish historiography, one which aligns with the tenets of what could be considered postmodern historiography. As Hayden White outlines in *Metahistory*, historiography is just as influenced by aesthetics and literary conventions as it is by “objective” facts. With regard to nationalism, Lloyd recapitulates White’s theory by stating that the “historical judgement of nationalism is accordingly always also an aesthetic one” (*Ireland* 24). Nineteenth century Irish nationalism shaped history in its own image in particularly sectarian, befuddling, and creative ways. Likewise, Joyce was both a product of and a participant in this, molding Irish history in intricate ways that were enlightening if not totally accurate. Joyce’s treatment of major Irish historical events such as the 1798 Rebellion, the Great Famine, and England’s various invasions of Ireland and movements such as the Irish Revival, Home Rule, and Sinn Féin were inherently tainted by nationalism, despite several arguments suggesting otherwise. It is not so much a question of whether Joyce was a nationalist or politically-inclined. As will be shown, the consensus is mixed. Rather, the question that should be addressed is how Joyce used, depicted, and was influenced by nationalism as evident in his own historiography. His historiography, if anything else, shows the influence, strengths, curiosities, and immense follies of Irish nationalism before, during, and after 1922.
THE TWO JOYCES

Apolitical Joyce. Before delving into Joyce’s historiography, it is important to go over the divergence of opinion regarding Joyce’s stance on nationalism and politics. This wide spectrum can be imperfectly parsed into two rival factions: one that views Joyce as an apolitical and cosmopolitan aesthete who rejected or transcended politics and another that considers him a participant in the Irish colonial nationalist struggle. The latter view has received considerable critical attention since the 1980s, commonly framed in postcolonial and cultural studies theory with the intention of replacing the older, more standard former view made prominent by Ellmann in the 1940s (Stević 41). As Joseph Kelly notes, Ellmann’s canonical biography dismisses Joyce’s engagement with socialism and, more generally, his association as a realist or political writer (165). “The Joyce in Ellmann’s biography . . . was incapable of seriously practicing politics” (172). Due largely to Ellmann, “Joyce’s politics were either ignored or considered adolescent, native, and inconsequential” for decades (175). Ellmann and others relied on astute yet selective readings of Joyce’s work, letters, and events in his life, focusing on his humanist qualities rather than his political ones and his “non serviam” mantra. For example, he writes about an interview Joyce granted to Georges Borach in 1918 in which he disavows politics in an unambiguous manner. “I attach no importance to political conformity. . . . As an artist I am against every state” (JJ 446). In his 1901 essay “The Day of the Rabblement,” he discusses the proper position of the artist in society. For him, the artist must separate himself intellectually and emotionally from society at large. “No man, said the Nolan, can be a lover of the true or the good unless he abhors the multitude; and the artist, though he may employ the crowd, is very careful to isolate himself” (OCPW
50). By referencing “Nolan,” or Giordano Bruno, an Italian cosmological theorist from Nola who was burned at the stake for heresy by the Roman Inquisition in 1600, Joyce stresses the notion that the artist must be wary of the proverbial masses. The Irish Literary Theatre (ILT), which was the main topic of the essay, opened in 1899 to produce contemporary and artistic, if not avant-garde, European and Irish plays, something Joyce and many other artists felt Dublin lacked. Founded by W. B. Yeats, Lady Gregory, Edward Martyn, and George Moore, the theatre was controversial, staging scandalous works such as Yeats’ *The Countess Cathleen* and Martyn’s *The Heather Field*. A supporter at first, Joyce had a change of heart when the ILT produced what he considered to be boorish plays that appealed to popular and, in particular, nationalist sentiment. Upon abandoning its iconoclasm, Joyce withdrew his support. He chastised Yeats’ “treacherous instinct of adaptability” as well as Moore, whose “new impulse [had] no kind of relation to the future of art” (51). The ILT was simply becoming too considerate of its audience:

If an artist courts the favour of the multitude he cannot escape the contagion of its fetichism and deliberate self-deception, and if he joins in a popular movement he does so at his own risk. Therefore, the Irish Literary Theatre by its surrender to the trolls has cut itself adrift from the line of advancement. Until he has freed himself from the mean influences about him – sodden enthusiasm and clever insinuation and every flattering influence of vanity and low ambition – no man is an artist at all. (51-52)

Writing barely two years after the ILT’s opening, Joyce turned his back on the theatre rather quickly. He showed in addition to a mercurial nature a conviction that art must be divorced from the popular movements and influences around it. Ellmann attributes his distaste for the
ILT to disparaging remarks made by Lady Gregory and others that left him “[r]esentful and inert, angry and indifferent” (JJ 135). It wasn’t so much political or aesthetic for him as it was personal. Moreover, Joyce expressed some doubt that the Irish could produce its own national literature, suggesting instead that they should emulate foreign writers. “A nation which never advanced so far as a miracle-play affords no literary model to the artist, and he must look abroad. Earnest dramatists of the second rank, Sudermaun, Bypruson, and Giocosa, can write very much better plays than the Irish Literary Theatre has staged” (OCPW 50-51). He particularly admired Henrik Ibsen and his critique of Norwegian society, writing in his lengthy 1900 profile on Ibsen, “Ibsen’s New Drama,” that by “the force of his genius, and the indisputable skill which he brings to all his efforts, Ibsen has, for many years, engrossed the attention of the civilised world” (45). When it came to Irish nationalist writers, however, he did not have much faith in their abilities to engross the world or, for that matter, to write true literature. In a review of a collection of poems by William Rooney, a member of the Gaelic League and friend of Arthur Griffith, Joyce chastises his poetry, claiming it compromised its artistic merit with its patriotic overtures. One “must not look for these things when patriotism has laid hold of the writer. He has no care then to create anything according to the art of literature, not the greatest of the arts, indeed, but at least an art with a definite tradition behind it, possessing definite forms. Instead we find in these pages a weary succession of verses, ‘prize’ poems – the worst of all” (62). Writings like these, most of which he composed when he was in his twenties, led Ellmann and others to conclude he was apolitical – a position that was solidified in Joycean scholarship for decades.⁹ According to

---

⁹ Yet, being the great scholar that he was, Ellmann entertained the idea that Joyce was politically conscious at least some of the time. He wrote, for example, that Joyce’s politics were socialist when he was living in Trieste (JJ 196).
Emer Nolan, this apolitical view of Joyce promoted by Ellmann “did much to create our contemporary estimate of Joyce,” one which created a lasting “image of Joyce as an Irishman unswayed by patriotism, who not merely refused to participate in a popular nationalist movement in his own country but rebuked and challenged it at every opportunity, thus contributes significantly to our current approval of his ideological maturity” (Nationalism 2). This version of Joyce is perhaps best embodied by Stephen in Stephen Hero: “Stephen had begun to regard himself seriously as a literary artist: he professed scorn for the rabblement and contempt for authority” (122-23).

**Political Joyce.** Beginning in the 1980s, several scholars challenged this notion, insisting instead that Joyce, far from being apolitical, consciously engaged with Irish nationalism and particularly the Literary Revival as a willing participant of “the battle of two civilizations.” According to this faction, Joyce was not silent nor apathetic about the great political upheavals of his time. To view Joyce as apolitical or detached from the tumultuous events of his times betrays a facile understanding of his work. Platt, for example, argues that Joyce’s specific nationalist loyalties were with the Gaelic-Catholic side of the Literary Revival rather than that Anglo-Irish Protestant side as represented by Yeats, John Millington Synge, and others. Joyce found fault in the latter’s approach to the so-called Revival, which emphasized

---

Moreover, Terence Killeen expresses skepticism with interpolating too decisively political viewpoints from his early-life articles and lectures:

Too much can be made of the positions espoused in these articles, and too much has been made of them in some recent publications that wish to enlist Joyce in the post-colonial cause. These articles, and the lectures that Joyce gave in Trieste around the same time, are of considerable interest but are not necessarily fodder for the creation of a ‘political Joyce.’ The political pieces were written within a narrow time-frame – from 1907 to 1912 – and they reflect Joyce’s feelings and views at that stage; they should not be taken out of their context or used to buttress positions that the writer might well no longer espouse. (204)

Killeen’s assessment certainly lends credence to the “Ellmann school” of Joycean scholarship.

Some texts from the “Ellmann” school include Ellmann’s canonical James Joyce and The Consciousness of Joyce; Gross; Kenner, Dublin’s Joyce; Parrinder; and Peake.
mythical and pastoral tropes and themes that he deemed pretentious, patronizing, and at times aristocratic (18-47). Others like Joseph Kelly focus on his dedication to “liberalism” rather than ethno-religious identity. “Joyce was a political nationalist committed to the liberal progress of Irish society. His rejection of the Literary Revival was not merely egoistic, nor merely aesthetic. It was political” (28).11

There is some overlap between this position and Ellmann’s in that both claim to some extent that Joyce was “liberal” – though, it should be emphasized, not liberal in the nineteenth-century political sense of the term that Joyce would have been accustomed with. Kelly used the term imprecisely, referring to his humanist sympathies: his commitment to social tolerance and equality as well as his opposition to xenophobia, superstition, militarism, fanaticism, and prejudice, whether they are achieved by political means or not. It is a distinction that is at times not made explicit. Joyce rejected parliamentary politics and the Home Rule movements as futile and subservient to British interests, and he distanced himself from the likes of Matthew Arnold and John Stuart Mill (Manganiello 20-21; Nash, “Liberalism” 149) – although, as will be discussed later in the dissertation, Joyce critically and thoughtfully engages with them. The failure of Parnell and the IPP to achieve Home Rule during the 1880s and 1890s left Joyce, like so many of his countrymen and countrywomen, bitter and disillusioned more than fifteen years after Parnell’s death. In “Home Rule Comes of Age” (1907), Joyce rails against liberalism and the IPP. To him, the English Liberal Party was more detrimental to Home Rule than the Conservatives. Although Liberals had supported Home Rule and the Conservatives opposed it, Joyce believed the

11 The definition of “political” in relation to Joyce has, of course, fostered vigorous debate. Unlike Kelly, for example, Jean-Michel Rabaté believes that it was Joyce’s dialectical “egoism” and “hospitality” that made him political.
former were dishonest and hypocritical, advancing a bill that afforded “the executive council in Dublin no legislative power, no power to fix or control taxes, no control over thirty-nine of the forty-seven government offices, including those of the constabulary and the police, the supreme court or the agrarian commission” as well as safeguarded unionist interests. The Conservatives were open about their opposition to an independent Ireland that would challenge British power in its own backyard. Cruel as their position was, they were at least upfront and “logical.” As for the IPP, he characterized its members as feckless and “bankrupt,” hoarding wealth for their own benefit and betraying Parnell in his time of need (OCPW 143-44). He elaborates on his criticisms five years later in “The Shade of Parnell,” when Parliament was debating the ultimately successful Third Home Rule Bill. He accused the IPP of gross arrogance and incompetence, claiming that the members did not so much hand over Parnell to the English as they “tore him apart themselves” (196). Joyce’s rejection of liberal parliamentary politics, as Peter Maguire maintains, was held not just by Joyce but by many in his generation after Parnell’s death, indicative of a generational split and the ascension of republican ideals (294-96).

The difference between these rival viewpoints on Joyce’s politics and nationalist leanings can be ambiguous in that the nature of political identification and engagement is itself subject to debate. “It is not always easy,” Joseph Brooker observes, “to distinguish between a socialist concern for reciprocal, supportive relations between individuals and a conservative defense of the finely woven, interpersonal fabric of custom and tradition, the transcendence of which is a revolutionary chimera” (121). In other words, supporting a better, more equal society is something the politically inclined, both left and right, lay claim to, as do those who choose not to identify as political. Likewise, the difference between
engagement with and apathy towards political matters can be hard to discern. Not only does Joyce’s writing provide considerable fodder for both interpretations, some, such as Seamus Deane, hold the act of writing, not just the content, to be political in itself. “The relationship between literature and politics was not, for Joyce, mediated through a movement, a party, a combination or a sect. For him, the act of writing became an act of rebellion; rebellion was the act of writing” (Celtic Revivals 99). Echoing Deane, Aleksandar Stević argues that “[a]esthetic disinterestedness, with its investment in the principle of universality, thus emerges as a form of resistance to the demands of nationalism, and indeed, as a vital tool of Joycean politics. . . . [A]estheticism amounts to a dissenting political stance” (49). Even Joyce’s so-called apathy could be construed as a subversive political act; Joyce was political even when he was not.\(^\text{12}\)

For the purposes of this dissertation, I will argue that Joyce was neither neutral in the nationalist debates nor partial toward any particular nationalist faction such as the Gaelic-Catholic faction. Joyce’s position on Irish nationalism is rather nuanced, a distinct position characterized by its contrarianism. He was both a product of and participant in the vigorous nationalist debates during that time, yet he proves resistant to allying himself with one of the two so-called “civilizations.” Such a binary opposition is something Joyce was fiercely opposed to. Rather than supplementing these distinctions, he systematically dismantled them.\(^\text{13}\)

\(^\text{12}\) Stević also seems to echo Philippe Sollers, who argues that “Joyce’s refusal to indulge in the slightest dead pronouncement is exactly itself the political act, an act which explodes at the heart of the rhetorical polis, at the heart of the narcissistic recognition of the human group: the end of nationalisms decided by Joyce at the time when national crises are at their most virulent” (108). See Fairhall, Question 63-64 and Nash, Act 164 for similar sentiments regarding the “political act” of writing.

\(^\text{13}\) Regardless, see Attridge, Joyce Effects and Peculiar Language; Attridge and Howes; Cheng, Amnesia and Race; Fairhall, Question; Gibson, Revenge and Strong Spirit; Gibson and Platt; Hofheinz; Manganiello; MacCabe (particularly 158-171); E. Nolan, Nationalism; Orr; Platt; Potts; Spoo, Language; Tymoczko; Ungar,
NATIONALISM AND HISTORIOGRAPHY

Theories of Nationalism. In order to understand Joyce’s relationship with nationalism, it is important to understand the nature of nationalism itself. Nationalism is a protean concept, a mesh of ideologies that mean different things to different people. Edward Said, for example, described nationalism as “a word that has been used in all sorts of sloppy and undifferentiated ways.” The closest he came to a definition is admitting that nationalism is consistent in uniting people that may share a common “history, religion, and language” and is an effective tool against colonialism (74). According to some scholars, most famously Benedict Anderson, nationalism is a mechanism used to invent or “imagine” communities. “Nations” are neither scientific, monolithic, nor a historical precedent. Rather, nationalism is a modern European phenomenon that grew out of the Enlightenment and the advent of mass print media as a means to consolidate political power and cultural identity. Some scholars, of course, have challenged that notion, claiming that nationalism is not merely invented but a palpable sociopolitical ethos with origins well before the modern age. Nationalism also has an ethnic component that, although always present, came into full fruition during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, one which emphasized a folkloric definition of “the people,” vernacular languages, and racial identity (Hobsbawm 103-4). This, in turn, spawned fidelity to cultural symbols, myths, and traditions embodied by a particular people (A. Smith 49).

14 See B. Anderson 5-7 for his specific definitions of “nation,” “community,” and other concepts integral to his work.

15 Marshall McLuhan argued the same point (8).

16 There is no one standard definition of nationalism that proves satisfactory for this dissertation. The debate about the definition, characteristics, influences, and ramifications of nationalism is sprawling and intense.
Ireland proved no exception to this movement, which swept across Europe in the nineteenth century. For example, the Irish Revival, which began approximately in the late-nineteenth century, was a product of Irish cultural nationalism that had fomented throughout the century. The failure of Parnell and the Second Home Rule Bill in the 1890s led to an emphasis on cultural rather than political independence, as the former was more attainable than the latter. It was colonial in nature, forged by its tumultuous and oppressive relationship with England. Irish nationalists of all kinds defined Ireland by its relationship with England, frequently pointed out England’s oppression of Ireland and disapproving of any contention that suggested otherwise. Ireland was a unique, proud nation whose very essence was formed by its relationship with England rather than in spite of it. Nationalists also tended to emphasized Ireland’s uniqueness by weaving victimhood and hagiography into the narratives of its long history. They sought to achieve cultural autonomy by canonizing its historical

Distinguished nationalism scholar Umut Özkitirimli separates nationalist theory into four categories: Primordialism, Modernism, Ethnosymbolism, and New Approaches (49-169). It is fair to say that each category can describe nationalism and in particular Irish nationalism of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries with intriguing but limited insight. Primordialism, for example, was employed by many Revivalists in the nineteenth century. It was an essentialist argument that proposed the Irish were culturally and ethnically unique. They perceived the world “in polycentric terms as naturally divided into unique peoples, each with its separate origins in space and time, its laws of growth and decay, and its special creative role to play in human progress” (Hutchinson 196). However, modernists such as Eric Hobsbawm would have it that the Revivalists were politically motivated in their assessment of “Irishness,” cynically exploiting popular angst of the political and economic situation many Irish faced in the nineteenth century (102).

Then there is the issue of the nation-state itself. An autonomous or independent nation-state was the ultimate goal of political nationalists, though not necessarily cultural nationalists. Although political nationalists considered nationalism to be inseparable from the nation-state, cultural nationalists believed that securing an independent political nation was secondary to preserving a distinct cultural heritage and that, moreover, the nation-state might inhibit that cultural heritage through a mixture of political corruption and apathy among the masses (Foster, Modern Ireland 455; Lloyd, Ireland 19-36). Nationalism without a nation-state may seem contradictory but it is precisely what many Revivalists intended. On the other hand, Hannah Arendt pointed out that many cultural nationalists indeed wanted the state and the nation to be one and the same, writing that under this kind of nationalism the state was transformed “from an instrument of the law into an instrument of the nation” (275).

Overall, the various manifestations of nationalism must be studied and understood with the caveat that nationalism’s elusiveness can both buttress and hinder an argument regarding nations and ethnic identity, something Joyce may very well have appreciated.
heroes, legends, and myths, portraying Ireland in a sanguine light. Seamus Deane summarizes the tenets of Irish nationalism at the time:

[C]entral to the nationalist position were the claims that (a) Ireland was a culturally distinct nation; (b) it had been mutilated beyond recognition by British colonialism; and (c) it could nevertheless rediscover its lost features and thereby recognize once more its true identity. In order to hold the mirror up to nature it was first necessary to hold it up to legend; the reflection would represent Irish nature in the form of its heroic national character, pursued with great energy in the cultural field, even as its alter ego – the commercial, the economic, the religiously conformist version of the contemporary Irish – was derided as a betrayal of that heroic face, even though it was its inescapable companion. (Strange Country 53)

Nineteenth century Irish scholars such as Douglas Hyde and Eoin MacNeill built their careers on the premise that Ireland was unique, focusing extensively on Celtic folklore, language, and history. MacNeill, for example, argued that Ireland was instrumental during the Early Middle Ages in “saving” Western Europe from barbarism by promoting Christian and classical scholarship (Hutchinson 124) – a position alluded to in the title of Joyce’s “Ireland: Island of Saints and Sages."17 Throughout the nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, this kind of organic nationalism – that is, one that emphasized Ireland’s inimitable traits and contributions to the wider world – prevailed. As many scholars have pointed out, organic nationalism stands in stark contrast to the more pluralistic nationalism of the eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries, which tended to focus on self-determination, liberalism, and

---

17 See, for example, D. Hyde, A Literary History and MacNeill, Celtic Ireland and Phases. It should be noted that MacNeill dismissed the notion that Ireland could be defined by ethnicity, focusing instead on culture and especially language (Hutchinson 124). MacNeill’s position of Ireland as central in the promotion of Christianity and classical scholarship in Europe also had its origins in the late-eighteenth century. See O’Halloran 7-20.
inclusiveness rather than ethnicity (Foster, *Modern Ireland* 241-58; Hobsbawm 39; Özkirimli 13). During this time, the nation was something that could be participated in by several peoples who could choose to identify with a nation. They fought for “equality, not for distinctiveness. Nationhood . . . referred not to cultural identity but to citizenship rights” (Hutchinson 62). It was a political rather than a cultural concept. These two manifestations of nationalism – one that defined the nation as a political entity that could be participated in, rooted in democracy and individualism, and the other that defined the nation as a cultural entity that one could only be born into, rooted in ethnicity and homogeneousness – would dominate nationalist debates throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (Lewis 5-7).\(^\text{18}\)

The Colonial Revival. A great irony of the Revivalist brand of nationalism was that by glorifying Ireland’s mythical past and distinct culture, they often employed colonialist methods of oppression. For all its usefulness in castigating occupiers, nationalism renders itself destructive, internalizing the ugly characteristics that made them oppressive and foreign. It simply replaces the old oppressive apparatuses with newer, native faces. This is a great conundrum of nationalism: it is a synthesis of several ideologies that produces more often than not the same unsatisfactory results, a movement that disingenuously rails against the occupier only to perpetuate its injustices. Frantz Fanon argued this point vigorously when he wrote that colonial nationalist movements are often usurped by the bourgeoisie who in their quest for dominance wield oppressive state measures and racist theories once independence has been achieved (134). A state-oriented nationalism of this nature inevitably

---

\(^{18}\) See Lewis for an excellent study of nineteenth and twentieth century nationalism, particularly 1-96.
fails to continue the process of decolonization.\textsuperscript{19} At the same time, he was supportive of national \textit{culture}, which is not the same thing as nationalism. National culture is a colonized people’s main ideological weapon against its colonizers. It was a crucial step in the fight against foreign hegemony. As he writes:

A national culture is not a folklore, nor an abstract populism that believes it can discover the people’s true nature. It is not made up of the inert dregs of gratuitous actions, that is to say actions which are less and less attached to the ever-present reality of the people. A national culture is the whole body of efforts made by a people in the sphere of thought to describe, justify and praise the action through which that people has created itself and keeps itself in existence. A national culture in under-developed countries should therefore take its place at the very heart of the struggle for freedom which these countries are carrying on. (188)

This national culture is found in neither the present nor the future but rather in the past. Fanon points out that the colonizer “distorts, disfigures and destroys” the culture of the colonized (169). In order to resist the colonizer, the colonized must restore its past – but it must do so in a way antithetical to the colonizer’s own national culture. That is, the colonized must be careful to forge the past in its own image rather than reflect the colonizer’s own historiography, one that is “logically inscribed from the same point of view as that of colonialism” (170).

\textsuperscript{19} Interestingly, Lloyd argues that this failure was also acknowledged in great length by James Connolly, whom he considered to have much in affinity with Fanon (\textit{Ireland} 40). Connolly’s anti-imperialism and socialist nationalism will be interrogated in the final chapter.
Irish Nationalism and Monolithic Historiography. By the time Joyce came of age in the last decade of the nineteenth century, Irish historiography underwent a tremendous transformation under the influence of nationalists of all spectrums and was struggling with this very problem. As Ireland became more sectarian, so did historical interpretation. The cultural nationalist movements such as the Irish Revival, although closely associated with the likes of Hyde, whose efforts to revitalized the Irish language Kiberd characterized as “fitful attempts” (9), and Yeats of the ILT in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, actually had its origins in the mid-eighteenth century during the burgeoning Patriot movement. Organizations such as the Physico-Historical Society in the 1740s and the Royal Irish Academy in the 1780s sought to study and “preserve” a distinct Irish history and culture, not as a means to distance itself from England *per se* but to highlight its camaraderie and place within the kingdom. Ironically, these efforts were political in nature and were meant to ease the strained relations of England and Ireland during the end of the eighteenth century. They demanded civil rights within, not separation from, the kingdom (Foster, “History” 124; Hutchinson 55-65; Kidd 1200-1). As the nineteenth century progressed, the emphasis on pluralism broke down and began to be replaced by sectarianism. The emphasis also changed from political to cultural, and as such Irish culture was portrayed increasingly as inimitable and antithetical to English culture. The various stages of the Irish Revival (Hutchinson identifies at least three) followed a similar structure:

Originating first among romantic intellectuals (poets and scholars), they crystallize into scholarly and cultural institutions to become translated by modernist intellectuals (journalists, pamphleteers, and so on) into a socio-political programme. Cultural nationalism thus passes through common phases of *preparation, crystallization* and
socio-political articulation, emerging from the fusion, with varying degrees of success, of two different groups of people. (49)

In order to achieve their socio-political goals – the total or at least partial separation from the Union – nationalists created a history and a culture that justified Ireland’s independence from England. Specifically, they had to emphasize that Ireland was exceptional, incapable of coexistence within the United Kingdom, and deserving of autonomy. Using an argument similar to Fanon’s, Seamus Deane remarks that in the quest to establish something “essential” about a nation, nationalists, particularly colonial or “insurgent” nationalists, construct a historical narrative that mirrors rather than refutes the historical narrative put forth by the colonialists:

All nationalisms have a metaphysical dimension, for they are all driven by an ambition to realize their intrinsic essence in some specific and tangible form. The form may be a political structure or a literary tradition. Although the problems created by such an ambition are sufficiently intractable in themselves, they are intensified to the point of absurdity when a nationalist self-conception imagines itself to be the ideal model to which all others should conform.

That is a characteristic of colonial and imperial nations. Because they universalize themselves, they regard any insurgency against them as necessarily provincial. In response, insurgent nationalisms attempt to create a version of history for themselves in which their intrinsic essence has always manifested itself, thereby producing readings of the past that are as monolithic as that which they are trying to supplant. (‘Introduction’ 9)
Deane suggests that this nationalist historiography is inherently flawed because of its “monolithic” nature. It is not so much history but rather a mythology with historical facts interwoven throughout. Myths, according to Moody, “combine elements of fact and of fiction; they are a part of the dead past that historians study, as well as being part of the living present in which we all, historians included, are involved” (71). From the myth of “an ancient Irish nation struggling for seven centuries to recover its independence from the domination of England” (80) as put forward by Thomas Davis and the Young Irelanders in the 1840s to the Great Famine and Land War myths of the 1880s which castigated the English and the predatory Anglo-Irish landlords (82-83; Bartlett, “‘What Is My Nation’” 51-56), these narratives obfuscated these rather complicated and multifaceted events, blowing important facts out of proportion and at times making facts up to serve a larger ideological purpose.

However, the concept of mythology implies that there is a set of historical events or a historical narrative beyond fallibility. For something to be “mythical,” there must be another narrative that is objective or completely “accurate” in nature. Which begs the question: what exactly is history? It is no doubt a complex, if not rhetorical question with a number of intriguing answers. “History,” Stephen Dedalus says, “is a nightmare from which I am trying to awake” (U 2.377). His statement, one of the most well-worn lines in Joyce’s oeuvre, suggests that history is in a sense like a dream, which is to say, illusory. However, the fact that he is trying so desperately to awake from it suggests he is very much present in history. It could be said that the intersection of reality and illusion could be considered history, an imperfect definition of a nightmarish concept. “Nightmare” also highlights the negative aspects of history. Much like Stephen, Irish nationalists at the time tended to dwell on the truly horrific events such as the Great Famine and the Siege of Drogheda. The more
lauded aspects of Irish history tended to be when the Irish fought against the English and their minions, such as the 1798 Rebellion and the Young Irisher Rebellion of 1848, or when Ireland was not under the yoke of England and was a formidable power in itself. 

MacNeill’s scholarship and, as we shall see later in the chapter, the Citizen’s historical renderings in “Cyclops” can attest to this. Irish historiography at the time was torn in distinguishing between myth and nightmare, foreigner and native, and victim and perpetrator. As a leading Irish historian at the time Alice Stopford Green20 wrote in 1912, “history is more backward in Ireland than in any other country”:

Here alone there is a public opinion which resents its being freely written, and there is an opinion, public or official, I scarcely know which to call it, which prevents its being freely taught. And between the two, history has a hard fight for life.

Take the question of writing. History may conceivably be treated as a science. Or it may be interpreted as a majestic natural drama or poem. Either way has much to be said for it. Both ways have been nobly attempted in other countries. But neither of these courses is thought of in Ireland. Here history has a peculiar doom. (9)

Defining what history is, or what it should be, was the nightmare in itself.21

On the Uses and Disadvantages of History for Joyce. Joyce’s own historiography was influenced by several thinkers and texts. One of them of particular resonance was Friedrich Nietzsche. The relationship between Nietzsche and Joyce has only recently received critical

---

20 Green was a close confidant of diplomat, anti-imperialist crusader, and Irish “martyr” Roger Casement (M. O’Callaghan 49-51; Ó Siocháin, “Roger Casement’s” 1n1). The relevance of this will be made clear in the third chapter.

21 The “exceptionalism” of Irish historiography has been reiterated well beyond Green’s time. Donal McCartney, for example, wrote in 1973: “[I]n Ireland, more so perhaps than in most other countries, politics have always been openly dependent on attitudes to the past” (4). With all due respect to McCartney, this claim is rather exaggerated.
attention after decades of offhand observations and musings by scholars. Direct references to Nietzsche do not appear often in his work, yet Nietzschean thought proves to be an intriguing undercurrent. Sam Slote, for instance, argues that Stephen’s aesthetic theory from *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* bears some resemblance to Nietzsche’s theory of “experiment” from *The Gay Science*, which entails the concepts of “self-creation” and “self-fashioning” (*Nietzschean Ethics* 7). Nietzsche offered Stephen and Joyce an alternative to the nationalist and religious ideologies by way of “individual dissent” (Bixby 57). The themes of individualism, rebellion, and morality feature prominently in these studies, yet it should be noted that beyond *The Gay Science, Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, and *Beyond Good and Evil*, texts which have received considerable attention in both Nietzschean and Joycean scholarship, there is a text early in Nietzsche’s career that complements Joyce’s historiography well. “On the Uses and Disadvantages of History for Life” (1874) is a searing attack on what Nietzsche considers to be the failures of modern historiography. The themes of this essay would not only reappear in Nietzsche’s later works but they would also manifest in Joyce’s. Nietzsche was concerned with what he considers the “degree of sleeplessness, of rumination, of the historical sense” that pervaded nineteenth century historiography (62). Historical studies were becoming too detached and desensitized from the present. History was being defined as a mere case-study of human behavior that was increasingly moralizing and paralyzing, stifling human thought and creativity. Moreover, the academic study of history was becoming more scientific, something he opposes. To him, history should not be

---

22 There are only a few direct references. Besides “A Painful Case” in *Dubliners* and Stephen’s internal comment that “I’m the Übermensch” (*U* 1.708), one of distinction comes from a letter he wrote to George Roberts in 1904 that he signs off as “James Overman,” an allusion to “Übermensch” (*L* 1:56). Ellmann, for one, dismissed this reference as simply “ironic” (*JJ* 162).

23 See Slote, *Nietzschean Ethics* 19-37 for more on this subject. For further information on the broader relationship between Nietzsche and Joyce, see Bixby 45-56; Buttigieg 187-207; T. Murphy 715-34; and Spoo, *Language* 17-22.
treated as a science but as a form of art, a “drama” or “tragic art” that nourishes life. History “stands in the service of an unhistorical power, and, thus subordinate, it can and should never become a pure science as such, for instance, mathematics is” (67). The accumulation of knowledge of the past should not be the end goal of historical studies in itself. Rather, it should aid in the “service of the future and the present and not for the weakening of the present or for depriving a vigorous future of its roots” (77). History cannot be objective because objectivity implies that the popular or mainstream views of the time in which the “objective” historian writes are the “proper” ones. Nietzsche believed that regarding history as an objective, impersonal science was itself curiously enough a “mythology” which encouraged death rather than life (90-91). Nietzsche’s conception of history as uplifting and invigorating, something that should be forged rather than submitted to, is a far cry from Stephen’s, which in addition to being profoundly morbid and pessimistic was also deterministic, rooted perhaps in his mantra of the “[i]nelfuctable modality of the visible” (U 3.1).24 Nietzsche would have had qualms with Stephen’s determinism precisely because of its gloomy verdict and apparent objectivity. Nietzsche, according to White, wanted “to draw historical knowledge back within the confines of human needs, to make it the servant of human needs rather than their master” (Metahistory 349).25 Stephen does not recall history so much as he renders it hopeless – precisely the opposite effect Nietzsche felt history should

24 There is a caveat in reading Nietzsche: his aphoristic and idiosyncratic styles lend themselves to many contradictions (and deliberately so) in order to obstruct reductive generalizations. As Alexander Nehamas writes:

Nietzsche uses his changing genres and styles in order to prevent his readers from overlooking the fact that his views necessarily originate with him. He depends on many styles in order to suggest that there is no single, neutral language in which his views, or any others, can ever be presented. His constant stylistic presence shows that theories are as various and idiosyncratic as the writing in which they are embodied. (37)

However, that is not to say that no conclusion can be derived from his writing, and “On the Uses and Disadvantages of History for Life” has ample and useful commentary on historiography.

25 See White, Metahistory 331-75 for more discussion of Nietzsche’s historiography.
have. The self-proclaimed “servant of two masters” (U 1.638), Stephen is perhaps subject to a third: history itself.26

*Metahistory and Power Dynamics.* It should be noted that many historians and critics in the nineteenth century believed that historiography is, or at least should be, a “realistic” (though not necessarily scientific) portrayal of past events. According to White, each of the important historical and ideological movements of the nineteenth century such as Positivism, Anarchism, and Liberalism claimed to offer a “realistic” portrayal of social reality and history (*Metahistory* 47-48). What distinguishes nineteenth century historiography, what made it “realistic,” was the distinction between the “dissertative” mode of discourse and the “narrative” mode of discourse. The former was the interpretation of historical events and the latter was the representation of historical events. Building upon the Enlightenment ethos, nineteenth century theorists and historians attempted to establish a clear demarcation and held that the narrative mode was essential to historical studies: that is, for something to truly be considered a historical work, it must be framed in a narrative mode. As the distinguished nineteenth century Italian historian Benedetto Croce observes, “Where there is no narrative, there is no history” (qtd. in “The Question of Narrative” 4). The dissertative mode in itself, even if it is factually accurate and analytically plausible, is not necessarily history (2-4).

Of course, an objection to this line of thinking is that narrative itself is only a means to tell a story and does not actually convey the story, of what happened, in itself. Although the difference between the two modes of discourse was seemingly clear, it often became blurred as social and ideological influences engulfed historical thought. Nationalism, for

26 Or fourth, rather, as the third master is one who “wants [him] for old jobs” (1.641).
instance, spurred several kinds of narratives such as the tragic, comic, and farcical about a given country. Ireland itself was frequently depicted in a tragic mode, in which the native inhabitants were constantly oppressed and robbed of their rights and resources by malevolent foreigners. The problem with this historiography is when this representation is considered an interpretation. The conflation of the two modes deeply unsettled nineteenth century historical thought. Some theorists such as Karl Marx, Alexis de Tocqueville, and Carl Maria von Weber did attempt to establish a more scientific method of historiography, one which included “laws” and evident patterns, yet they often lapsed into narrative modes. Marx famously wrote in *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon* (1852), for example, that “Hegel remarks somewhere that all facts and personages of great importance in world history occur, as it were, twice. He forgot to add: the first time as tragedy, the second time as farce” (15; my emphases). In using these terms, he reveals that even the more scientific-minded philosophers of history could not fully divorce themselves from the narrative mode.\(^{27}\) Hegel also argues that the narrative mode of discourse was determined by an “internal vital principle” (qtd. in White, “The Question of Narrative” 4), which was in turn determined by contemporary politics. It is “the precondition of the kind of interest in the past which informed historical consciousness” (4). Although there is much debate about what exactly determines this “kind of interest,” in colonial countries, as Lloyd believes, it is determined by state power. Employing a Gramscian analysis of power dynamics, Lloyd postulates that the ruling classes and their allies in the state dictate historical narrative. The disenfranchised colonial population can only have a “subaltern historiography” which remains “episodic and

---

\(^{27}\) See White, *Metahistoire* 281-330 for more discussion of Marx’s historiography. Also see Bann and Bentley 395-464 for more on nineteenth century historiography.
fragmentary” until it captures control of the state (*Ireland* 25). Power dynamics determine the narrative mode of discourse, the representation of history.

For his part, Joyce lays bare the “internal vital principle” early in his career. There are several instances during his time in Trieste in which he expounded on his anti-colonialist viewpoint in his assessment of Irish history but, at the same time, reaffirms colonialist tropes regarding that history, something Fanon warns against. In “Ireland: Island of Saints and Sages,” he compares English subjugation of Ireland to the Belgian subjugation of the Congo Free State, one which killed millions of people, and presumptuously (though rather accurately) to the future Japanese conquest of Pacific Asia, referring to them as “Nipponese dwarfs.” While referring to nearly every punitive aspect of English rule in Ireland, from Oliver Cromwell and the Penal Laws to the “Wild Geese” driven from Ireland due to the Jacobite Wars and the contemporary opposition to Home Rule, Joyce underscores the notion that the English robbed Ireland of its potential and vitality. England, as quoted before, “was as cruel as she was cunning: her weapons were, and are, the battering-ram, the club and the noose” (*OCPW* 119). In “Fenianism: The Last Fenian” (1907), another lecture he delivered in which he defends the militancy of the IRB, he once more emphasizes England’s colonial violence in graphic terms. “They say (and *history fully supports* them in making such a claim) that any concession by England to Ireland has been granted unwillingly, at bayonet-point” (138; my emphasis). That same year in “Ireland at the Bar,” the title of which Joyce appropriated from Prime Minister William Gladstone’s speech he delivered in 1886 in Parliament in support of the Home Rule Bill (Kelleher 199), he laments the treatment of an Irishman from Galway standing trial for murder, the infamous “Maamtrasna Murders.” The man, Myles Joyce (no relation), only spoke Irish. He had to have a court translator translate
the proceedings, which Joyce claimed led to the man’s guilty verdict and death sentence.

Joyce’s outrage is palpable, and he makes clear the connection between the plight of Myles

Joyce and the nation at large:

The figure of this bewildered old man, left over from a culture which is not ours, a
deaf-mute before his judge, is a symbol of the Irish nation at the bar of public opinion.

Like him, Ireland cannot appeal to the modern conscience of England or abroad. The

English newspapers act as interpreters between Ireland and the English electorate

which, though it lends an ear every so often is finally irritated by the eternal

complaints of the Nationalist deputies who, it believes, have come to their House

with the aim of upsetting the order and extorting money. . . . But the Irish do know

that it is the cause of all their suffering, and this is why they employ extremely violent

methods to resolve it. (OCPW 146-47)

The last sentence seems to justify nationalist agitation in Ireland. Passages like these, which

abound in several of Joyce’s lectures and essays during the first decade of the twentieth

century, demonstrate Gibson’s description of “Ireland: Island of Saints and Sages” as

“clearly an anti-colonial project” (Strong Spirit 116-17). It is also worth noting that Joyce’s

time in Trieste was deeply influenced by that city’s own colonial situation. Trieste was an

Italian enclave within the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Joyce was sympathetic to the Italian

Irredentist movement at the time. Indeed, many of his articles were published in Irredentist

newspapers and he was influenced by the Italian socialist journalist Guglielmo Ferrero. He

---

28 At the same time, such passages also highlight Joyce’s rather selective “distinctive authorial interests” (Kelleher 201). Joyce made a number of mistakes in “Ireland at the Bar,” such as the precise nature of Myles Joyce’s questioning, his age, and the number and names of those arrested (201-2). For more on Joyce’s engagement with the Maamtrasna Murders, see Flood 879-88; Garvin 159-69; Gibbons 79-81; Kelleher 195-213; E. Nolan, “Cultural Critic” 119-20; and Valente, Problem 252-56.
was also delivering his lectures and writing his articles in Italian, the vernacular language of Trieste but not an official language of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. This may have been his way of directly appealing to the colonial similarities between the Triestines and the Irish. “[F]or Joyce,” as Manganiello points out, “there were striking political resemblances between the two cities. The theme of the occupied city was perfectly represented them in” (43). Joyce’s time in Trieste, particularly his exposure to Irredentism and socialism, certainly influenced his anti-colonial positions.

Ostensibly, Joyce’s writing from this time period only reaffirm the anti-colonialist, rather than the colonialist, representation of Irish history. However, on closer inspection there are times when he adopts colonialist tropes. Joyce’s interrogation of Laudabiliter, a papal bull allegedly issued in 1155, makes the dilemmas of nationalism abundantly clear.

Laudabiliter: Myth and Garbled Historiography

Counterfeit Document, Real Resentment. Laudabiliter is one of the most controversial decrees made by the Catholic Church in Irish history, one which supposedly justified England’s conquests of Ireland for centuries. In “Ireland: Island of Saints and Sages,” Joyce reiterates the common interpretation of Laudabiliter: that it granted King Henry II dominion over Ireland and commanded the Irish to accept English authority. The English “came to Ireland following the repeated requests of a native king, without, it seems, much wanting to and without the sanction of their monarch, but provided with a papal bull from Adrian IV.

29 According to one of Joyce’s contemporaries in Trieste, “the Triestine dialect remained the ‘customary language’ of the Joyce family long after they had moved from Trieste to Paris” (Kelleher 198).
30 His time in Trieste has inspired several works exploring his views and engagement with anti-colonialism, Irredentism, socialism (which will be discussed in the third chapter), anarchism, and even Hungarian nationalism (which will be discussed in the second chapter). See Caraher 171-214; Manganiello 43-57; McCourt, “Tarry Easty” 23-58 and Years; and Mecsnöber, “Eastern Europe” 15-45 and “Arthur Griffith” 341-59.
and a papal letter from Alexander” (*OCPW* 115). This interpretation is flawed for several reasons. First and foremost, many historians consider the bull to be a forgery. The earliest reference to the document comes from *Expugnatio Hibernica*, a historical account written approximately in 1189 by Giraldus Cambrensis, despite the fact it was supposedly issued in 1155. It was mentioned in reference to another papal bull, *Quoniam ea*, allegedly issued by Pope Adrian IV’s successor, Alexander III (whom Joyce alluded to) in 1172. It gave Henry II (whom Cambrensis dubbed “[o]ur western Alexander [the Great]” [*History* 124]) full authority and consent to rule over Ireland in order to “establish” the laws and discipline of the Church. *Quoniam ea* was contradicted by three authenticated papal bulls regarding Ireland issued by Alexander III that year and was not written in the standard *dictamen* of the papal Curia. *Quoniam ea* was deemed so suspect by Cambrensis’ contemporaries that it was conspicuously omitted in his later works, including subsequent editions of the *Expugnatio*. His veracity and his bias against the Irish have been called into question by contemporaries and modern historians alike. Of the eight documents Cambrensis cited in the *Expugnatio*, six have been declared forgeries (Duggan, “Power” 256-58). With regard to *Laudabiliter*, no original or diplomatic copy exists. In fact, no copy of it independent of Cambrensis’ account has ever been discovered (260-61). Secondly, the year in which it was supposedly issued does not neatly correspond with the actual invasion of Ireland. Henry II did not invade Ireland until 1171, sixteen years after the bull was granted. His invasion probably had more to do with reining in the Cambro-Norman invasions launched in 1169 and 1170 by Richard FitzGilbert de Clare (otherwise known as “Strongbow”) than with pleasing the pope. Thirdly, *Laudabiliter* was likely based on other decrees by Adrian IV and Alexander III regarding foreign conquest. *Laudabiliter* is remarkably similar to an authentic letter Adrian IV sent to
King Louis VII of France, *Satis laudabiliter*, in 1159, in which he forbade Louis VII to launch a crusade in Spain or any expedition without the consent of the local political and religious authorities. If *Laudabiliter* was based on an actual letter, it most likely forbade Henry II to invade Ireland without the approval of Irish kings and clergy, and even then, it would not have granted him lordship over Ireland. He was simply there to spread Christian values and establish an annual tax of “one penny from every household” for the Church (262-64). He eventually did secure letters from Irish bishops and nobility authorizing his invasion, which suggests that he was aware of the original bull’s stipulations. Although Alexander III approved of the invasion in a letter to him in 1172, he still did not grant him authority over Ireland, considering it more of (in modern terms) an armed intervention (265-67). Cambrensis probably fabricated or at least embellished *Laudabiliter* in order to legitimize English rule in Ireland.

With the Church’s supposed approval, Henry II’s invasion and subsequent English conquests had legal and moral authority. The sentiment stuck. For centuries, *Laudabiliter* was considered a “stock-in-trade of both sides of the Anglo-Irish debate” ("Making" 154), a sticking place cited by several leaders and historians as justification for or against English rule and the Church. Perhaps a medieval demonstration of Lloyd’s contention that the ruling classes and their allies dictate historiography, *Laudabiliter* was, in fact, a piece of propaganda. Joyce was just one of the countless English and Irish who believed in its authenticity, referencing it several times in his non-fiction to justify his contempt for the Church and his belief of the Church’s collusion with English authorities in their oppression of Ireland. In a letter, he wrote that “the Church is still, as it was in the time of Adrian IV, the enemy of Ireland” (*L* 2:187). In “Fenianism: The Last Fenian,” he claims that the
“country allowed itself to be exploited by England, while, at the same time, adding to St Peter’s pence, perhaps in recognition of Adrian IV who, in a moment of generosity, made a present [of] the island to Henry II” (*OCPW* 140). Just as in “Ireland: Island of Saints and Sages,” he refers to Ireland as a “present.” Although subsequent copies over the centuries have been deemed suspect by royal authorities and the Church, usually due to a lack of adherence to the standard formatting and dating of the time (Duggan, “Making” 154-55), there is no direct evidence to suggest that Joyce was aware of the repudiation of the bull’s authenticity.

However, Cambrensis’ obvious bias against the Irish should have been enough for someone like Joyce to at the very least be skeptical of his account, a skepticism held by many of his contemporaries both in Ireland and abroad. American Presbyterian minister and historian David S. Schaff, for example, wrote in 1907 that the *Laudabiliter* “may not be genuine” (109) but added that the debate was inevitably tainted by nationalism and religion: “Scholarship and patriotism have made it possible for the Irish writers to use much argument to show that the bull is a forgery and the alleged fact a fancy, whether of a prophetic enemy of Ireland or by a historical bungler is not known. The Protestant has an easier way out of the difficulty in affirming that the pope may make mistakes” (109-10n2). James Connolly, one such Irish writer, denied its credibility (2:373), as did Thomas Moore in *The History of Ireland* (354-57). Father Thomas Burke, a popular nineteenth century nationalist priest

---

31 Unless otherwise indicated, all references to James Connolly’s work in this dissertation henceforth are from his *Collected Works."

32 See Thatcher 4 for a comprehensive overview of criticism of *Laudabiliter*’s authenticity up to 1903 when Thatcher’s book was published. Unsurprisingly, historiography on *Laudabiliter* was divided between Catholic and Protestant and Irish and English lines. There were, however, exceptions. Eighteenth century English historian Francis Plowden, for example, concluded that the papal bull was genuine, yet expressed severe skepticism about the motives of Henry II and Adrian IV as well as Cambrensis’ veracity. “It has been heretofore observed,” he writes, “that the courtly prelate Cambrensis had endeavoured, as he was commissioned, to render
who was mentioned in “Grace” (D 142), included a treatise in one of his works that also casted doubt. The fact that Joyce expressed no suspicion of the document may indicate that he was bending historical veracity to prove a larger point, one that was closely tied to nationalist narratives of the time. Although the Church probably did not grant Henry II full permission to invade and rule Ireland, the Church’s subsequent behavior since the eleventh century fed into several nationalist notions that they colluded with the English. Joyce, like so many others, used a questionable premise (in this case, a forged document from the Middle Ages) to argue for a wider historical “truth.” Laudabiliter may have been dubious, but it was employed to indict the English and the Church for high crimes against Ireland.

As we shall see throughout the dissertation, a similar pattern of dubious conjecture and willful obfuscation can be found in references to other historical events such as the 1798 Rebellion, propagated most noticeably by Joyce’s hapless characters but at times by their creator. Indeed, Joyce’s interrogation of Laudabiliter highlights the foibles of postcolonial considerations of Irish history and perhaps more pointedly the trepidations of employing such a critical paradigm in Joyce studies – especially, no less, in this dissertation. What is apparent in Joyce’s handling of Laudabiliter and those like it are the rush to admonishment of England and Rome, the inherent victimization of Ireland, and the murky sensibilities of those who would weaponize what is ultimately a case of fraudulent documentation from early medieval times to further nationalist discourses. Hundreds of years before England would colonize non-European peoples and lands that in turn would lay the foundation of

---

33 The treatise itself was written by Reverend P. H. Moran, Bishop of Ossory. See Burke 224-45. Burke will be discussed in greater detail in the third chapter.
34 The supposed text of Laudabiliter can be found in Cambrensis 144-49.
postcolonial studies in the twentieth century, the Cambro-Norman invasion of modern-day Leinster and its alleged sanctioning by the Church launched in its own right a war between peoples and nations that was waged not only with armies and weapons but with lectures and diatribes. If Seamus Deane’s “semi-colonial” approach to interpreting Irish history is sound, it could perhaps be said that the usefulness of such a postcolonial critical paradigm is rooted mostly in broader sweeps of Irish history – that is, that England had the political and material advantage in dominating its neighboring island that would remain intact until the twentieth century. The weakness of such a paradigm, however, lays mostly in wobbly critiques of more specific instances of this domination such as Laudabiliter and others that I will attempt to elucidate throughout this dissertation. What makes Laudabiliter such an interesting case-study of these issues is the fact that it has an incredulous lack of documentary support. The consensus among historians today, during Joyce’s time, and even during Cambrensis’ was that it was fictitious, a ploy used to legitimize England’s claim to Ireland. In other words, it simply was not true. Yet ironically, it would be used later on to justify Ireland’s grievances against England to great effect. The document itself, even if it did exist, was a minor component to the larger campaign in Ireland that would only expand throughout the centuries. If the postcolonial paradigm is effective in critiquing power, it is less effective in critiquing veracity, the latter being something that was all-the-more apparent during the rise of Irish nationalism in during the nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. Even at his most perceptive, Joyce could not fully resist such lapses in judgment, and these "lapses," as it were, present the most compelling rebuffs to the postcolonial paradigm.
Irish Bull as History. If Joyce’s references to *Laudabiliter* are relatively straightforward in his non-fiction, they are more nuanced in his fiction. Indeed, they align well with White’s concept of historiographical narrative and the problems with Irish historiography.\(^{35}\) They also suggest a maturation of Joyce’s own historiography. *Laudabiliter* is referenced several times in Joyce’s fiction, perhaps most amusingly in the “Oxen of the Sun” episode of *Ulysses* during the drunken conversation between Stephen and his friends. They discuss the complex, extensive interrelationships between Ireland, England, and the Church. Here, *Laudabiliter*, Adrian IV, and Henry II among others are described in a cartoonish segment:

> Irish by name and irish by nature, says Mr Stephen, and he sent the ale purling about an Irish bull in an English chinashop. I conceive you, says Mr Dixon. It is the same bull that was sent to our island by farmer Nicholas, the bravest cattlebreeder of them all, with an emerald ring in his nose. True for you, says Mr Vincent cross the table, and a bullseye into the bargain, says he, and a plumper and a portlier bull, says he, never shit on shamrock. (14.581-86)

The “Irish bull” represents a number of things. On top of Ireland and *Laudabiliter* (a papal bull), an Irish bull is a ludicrous, logically unsound, and often humorous statement (S. Davison, “‘The True-Born Englishman’” 130). According to the *Oxford English Dictionary* (*OED*), the etymology of the term can be traced to the early-eighteenth century, although “bull” in this context has been used since at least the early-seventeenth century (“bull, n.4”; “Irish, adj.”). The entire passage (*U* 14.581-650) could be described as an Irish bull. “Farmer Nicholas” is Adrian IV, who was born Nicholas Breakspear and was the only pope from England. The passage goes on to mention several historical figures and places: “lord Harry”

\(^{35}\) Duggan seems to agree with White’s theory when she writes, “The *Expugnatio* is therefore a work of art: not fiction, indeed, but generously enlivened with creative and imaginative reconstructions” (“Making” 156-57).
“the four fields of all Ireland” (14.598-99), “father of the faithful” (14.604), and “Lord Harry” (14.613) among others. They are, respectively, Henry II, the four provinces of Ireland, Henry VIII, and Henry VII. Ostensibly constructed as a parody of Jonathan Swift’s *A Tale of a Tub*, the passage lewdly skewers both the English crown and the English pope in their connivance in taking control of Ireland (Fargnoli and Gillespie 197; *U-A* 424-25; *U-N* 716). Joyce conflates the different Henrys or “Harrys” to show how each Henry built upon their predecessors to consolidate English power. Henry II’s actions have already been described. Henry VII reasserted English control and started Tudor domination over Ireland in 1494 by implementing Poynings’ Law, which gave the Kingdom of England legislative control over the Kingdom of Ireland and significantly curtailed the power of the Irish Parliament and native governors. Henry VIII was proclaimed King of Ireland (and therefore the Head of Church and State in Ireland) in 1542. His reign saw tremendous bloodshed in Ireland, such as the Kildare Rebellion of 1534-1535 (Bartlett, *Ireland* 73-82). Henry VII and VIII morph into each other several times. The drunken group cannot quite keep tabs on the monarchs, and at one point they start to merge with the bull itself. The “father of the faithful” – that is, the “Defender of the Faith,” a title bestowed upon Henry VIII by Pope Leo X in 1521 – “was grown so heavy that he could scarce walk to pasture” (*U* 14.604-5). Yet the English crown always got its way. “In short, he” – Henry VIII again, after having been previously conflated with Henry VII – “and the bull of Ireland were soon as fast friends as an arse and a shirt” (14.638-39). By the end of the story, the Irish bull and John Bull forged a friendship, although it was, much like the rest of the passage, forged in jest.

---

36 The rebellion and its leader, Thomas FitzGerald, 10th Earl of Kildare, or “Silken Thomas,” is mentioned in *Ulysses* four times (3.314, 10.407-16, 12.1861-62, 16.558).
However, rather than being a neat Swiftian parody – or, for that matter, a clear condemnation of the collusion between England and the Church – this passage is, despite its outrageousness, a subtle critique of Irish historiography. Moreover, the popular interpretation of this passage and “Oxen of the Sun” as a whole as being a representation of the steady progression of the English language has recently been undermined by genetic research. Traditionally, this passage was considered to be a direct parody of Swift’s *A Tale of a Tub*, substantiated by the canonical annotations of Don Gifford and Robert J. Seidman and Robert Janusko’s *The Sources and Structures of James Joyce’s “Oxen”* (1983). Yet in her research of Joyce’s notebooks, Sarah Davison reveals that it is in fact composed from “fragmentary echoes of multiple authors” from the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries such as Richard Steele, Sir Walter Raleigh, Daniel Defoe, John Bunyan, William Shakespeare, and Laurence Sterne (whose 1767 *Tristram Shandy* ends with a “cock-and-bull” story) rather than just Swift. The majority of Swiftian references in the episode are actually found after the passage. The episode itself is not a “historical pageant of English prose style” but a “pan-historic pastiche-work and not the series of consecutive homogenous parodies as hitherto supposed” (“Joyce’s Incorporation” 12-13). Similarly, Paul B. Armstrong suggests that the multifarious styles of the episode illustrate that “the history of a language is not a hierarchical sequence of stages in a teleological development but a series of equal but different language games” (164). It is therefore inaccurate to describe the passage as a parody of English prose style. It is more accurate to describe it as a *parody of a parody of English prose style*.37 Likewise, the

37 Armstrong goes on to write:
“Oxen of the Sun” is both an insightful demonstration of the epistemological relativity and contingency of language games and a self-aggrandizing display of powers no one can emulate. Joyce claims the transcendent status of being beyond imitation by copying everyone else but refusing to allow himself to be copied in return. His linguistic play is simultaneously an egalitarian, emancipatory denial of the priority of models over our capacity for semantic innovation and an egotistical assertion of powers that are so great that they cannot be imitated. (165)
supposed parody of Irish history in the passage cannot be clearly defined. It is simplistic to assume that Joyce was condemning the Henrys and the Church by irreverently mixing them up. Rather, he is critical of the notion that this narrative mode is indicative of such a condemnation. His “pan-historic pastiche-work” serves to emphasize the inherent folly in drawing this kind of conclusion. This is not to say that he was defending the English crown or the Church by any means, nor is it sound to suggest that he was strictly historiographic or political in motive; “Oxen of the Sun” is certainly an exercise in literary showmanship and erudition.38 Yet by creating this narrative, a rigmarole in the form of an Irish bull that mirrors the temporal mixing and lack of authority of the supposed *Laudabiliter*, he is commenting on the foolhardy efforts to make such historical determinations or, as Spoo writes, satirizing “the notion of history as organic process” (*Language* 146). The “Irish bull in an English chinashop” does not destroy English authority as the statement may suggest but rather criticizes the way in which this authority is popularly challenged. The ambiguity behind *Laudabiliter*, the dubious document that launched several English conquests, lends itself quite well to a drunken accounting of the many tragic aspects of Irish history, what Joyce would later call in *Finnegans Wake* the “marryvoising moodmoulded cyclewheeling history” (185.36-186.2).39

Joyce furthers this critical vein in *Ulysses* when he depicts the context and ramifications of *Laudabiliter*, rather than just the document itself. In the “Nestor” episode, Deasy remarks that a “faithless wife first brought the strangers to our shore here,
MacMurrough’s wife and her leman, O’Rourke, prince of Breffni” (2.392-94). Whereas Deasy doesn’t appear bothered by this, the Citizen is more than perturbed in his rendition found in “Cyclops.” “The strangers. . . . Our own fault. We let them come in. We brought them in. The adulteress and her paramour brought the Saxon robbers here” (12.1156-58). Deasy makes a glaring mistake, or rather several, in his assessment. “MacMurrough’s wife” refers to Derval, the woman apparently behind Henry II’s invasion. However, Derval was the wife of Tiernan O’Rourke, not MacMurrough. In 1152, more than fifteen years before Strongbow’s invasion, MacMurrough waged war against O’Rourke and kidnapped Derval. There is disagreement as to whether they eloped or if it was the kidnapping of a member of a prominent family, which was common practice at the time. Derval was returned to her family the following year and never married MacMurrough. “Leman,” according to the OED, is an archaic term for spouse, yet Deasy uses it in the modern sense as mistress (“leman, n.”). In 1166, MacMurrough was deposed by Tiernan’s son, which prompted him to reach out to Henry II and the Cambro-Normans for help. Although contemporary Irish chronicles at the time claim that his deposition was an act of revenge for kidnapping Derval, the fourteen-year gap between the events suggests that it probably had more to do with a conventional power struggle between rival clans (Flanagan 921-33). The revenge motive, however, was a common interpretation in Ireland well into the twentieth century as articulated by Deasy and the Citizen. They believe in this narrative because of its romantic, classical (Deasy compares Derval to Helen of Troy earlier in the passage), and misogynist connotations. The last connotation is especially relevant considering what Deasy says next: “A woman too brought Parnell low” (U 2.394). He is referring to Katherine “Kitty” O’Shea, Parnell’s leman. Unlike the alleged affair between MacMurrough and Derval, Kitty’s affair with Parnell clearly led
to Parnell’s fall from grace, moralistic and sensationalist as the case was, and with it the collapse of his Home Rule movement. This narrative of victimization, echoed by the Citizen, is deeply ironic, not just because the facts are false but because it was referenced by both unionists and nationalists to support their respective positions. Their views have metamorphosed, not unlike the way in which the various Henrys have in “Oxen of the Sun.”

Joyce’s depiction of *Laudabiliter* and its ramifications may show his anti-colonialist sympathies, yet it also indicates the prevalence of the narrative of victimhood in Irish historiography at the time, one that was based on a wider truth but supported by distorted information. The youthful Joyce in Trieste took *Laudabiliter* at face value, deliberately or inadvertently ignoring the document’s dubious authenticity in polemical lectures and articles about Irish history in order to excoriate the English for a sympathetic audience under imperial rule. Yet in *Ulysses*, his stance shifts from reverence to mockery. The document and its ramifications are presented in particularly inept and ridiculous ways. The characters who recall the events mistake simple facts and confuse major figures and words in their zealousness. They are themselves bullish men. They consider *Laudabiliter* to be the death knell of Ireland, a document which heralded over seven-hundred years of misery and oppression at the hands of the foreigners. The more separatist nationalists of their time intended to essentially reverse the effects of *Laudabiliter*. Yet Joyce, while not denying English oppression, characterizes the document in a way that makes Ireland complicit in its own downfall through the careless ignorance and bitter recapitulation of these events. These passages reflect, not refute, Cambrensis’ treachery against Ireland in the name of Ireland. By 1922, Joyce’s tragic rendering of *Laudabiliter* in 1907 had turned into farce. It is not his historical interpretation that has changed so much as his representation, a representation that
in Gibson’s words “exposes colonial history and culture as themselves productive of monstrous incongruities” (*Revenge* 182).

THE CITIZEN: FICTIONAL CHARACTER, TRUE NATIONALIST

*Michael Cusack, the GAA, Sports, and the Nation.* It is perhaps fitting to transition to a discussion of another Irish “bull,” the Citizen. There is perhaps no better character in *Ulysses* who exemplifies both the oppressive nature (as explained by Fanon) and foolhardy historiography (as explained by White) inherent in nationalism – especially the Irish colonial nationalism of the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries – than the Citizen in “Cyclops.” The Citizen is a xenophobic, chauvinistic, anti-semitic brute, impervious to any reasoning beyond his enormously distorted view of Irish culture and history. In a letter to Frank Budgen in 1919, Joyce wrote of the Citizen: “He unburdens his soul about the Saxo-Angles in the best Fenian style and with colossal vituperativeness alluding to their standard industry” (*L* 1:126). Before examining the Citizen’s frequent, choleric but nonetheless amusing historical lectures, it is important to discuss one of the people on whom he was modeled and that model’s contribution to the nationalist movement. It has been well-established that the Citizen was based on the Gaelic-Catholic sectarian nationalist and the founder of the Gaelic Athletic Association (GAA), Michael Cusack.\(^{40}\) Cusack felt so strongly about the deleterious influences of “foreign” sports such as football and cricket that he believed it necessary to revive traditional Gaelic sports such as hurling and Gaelic football. His conviction that it was essential for the Irish to resist English domination via hurling reflects the wider manifestations of nationalist thought: that anything, no matter how

\(^{40}\) Among other indications, the Citizen appeared as “Cusack” in early drafts (Groden 132-33). Moreover, as we shall see in the second chapter, Cusack makes an appearance in *Stephen Hero.*
seemingly trivial, can serve the interests of the nation. Given the pressing material and political problems the Irish faced, it would seem as though sports was not an urgent issue. Yet as Hobsbawm explains, sports effectively channel national identity on an ideological as well as a personal level:

What has made sport so uniquely effective a medium for inculcating national feelings, at all events for males, is the ease with which even the least political or public individuals can identify with the nation as symbolized by young persons excelling at what practically every man wants, or at one time in life has wanted, to be good at. The imagined community of millions seems more real as a team of eleven named people. The individual, even the one who only cheers, becomes a symbol of his nation himself. (143)

Cusack and the GAA were “portraying a romantic and mythic notion of nationality which stressed sporting physical fitness as a route to securing national self-determination. Links such as these between physical fitness and national strength were not unique to the GAA or Ireland” (Cronin, Sport 90).41 Joyce may have had Cusack in mind in developing his case-study on nationalism because his devotion to sports as a cultural and political pillar of Ireland illustrates the extreme emphasis nationalism places on seemingly symbolic or ceremonial entities. Indeed, symbols and ceremonies – and athletics are capable of being ceremonial and ritualistic – are used extensively in nationalist movements.42 The Citizen’s language is

41 Cusack was not the first to make such a distinction. Separatist athletic movements were created in order to promote the physical and spiritual development of a nation as well as to establish a strong rural network (Foster, Modern Ireland 447; Hutchinson 159; Reizbaum, “Empire of Good Sport” 90-92). Furthermore, it is not an accident that the rise of nationalism in the nineteenth century coincided with the emergence of organized professional sports both in Ireland and around the world. The modern Olympics, first convened in 1896, is a testament to its prominence (Osterhammel 706).

42 His appropriation of sports reflects his militant, domineering approach to nationalism. The Citizen’s obsession with Gaelic sports and their importance in the nationalist cause directly mirrors Cusack’s as well as the myriad of sports enthusiasts who felt athletics and politics to be inseparable. The 1860s through the 1880s
remarkably similar to Cusack’s own published work. On October 11th, 1884, one month before founding the GAA, Cusack published an article in both *United Ireland* and *Irishman* entitled “A Word About Irish Athletics.” Cusack bemoans the state of Irish sports, blaming both English connivance and Irish apathy for its decline. He sees the decline as both a cause and symptom of the overall decay of the Irish nation:

No movement having for its object the social and political advancement of a nation from the tyranny of imported and enforced customs and manners can be regarded as perfect if it has not made adequate provision for the preservation and cultivation of the national pastimes of the people. Voluntary neglect of such pastimes is a sure sign of national decay and approaching dissolution. The strength and energy of a race are largely dependent on the National pastimes for the development of a spirit of courage and endurance. A warlike race is ever fond of games requiring skill, strength, and staying-power. The best games of such a race are never free from danger. But when a race is declining in martial spirit, no matter from what course, the national games are neglected at first and then forgotten. (5)

saw a sharp rise in amateur athletics in Ireland, primarily based in Dublin. Yet nationalists were concerned that athletic organizations such as the Dublin Amateur Athletic Club (founded in 1872) and the Irish Champion Athletic Club (founded in 1873) were elitist, catered to the well-to-do and were susceptible to sub-par professional standards. Manual laborers, soldiers, policemen, and several other professions within the male adult population were prohibited from competing because they were not “gentlemen amateurs.” The management of these organizations were often composed of middle to upper-class unionists. Throughout the country traditional Irish games such as Irish football and hurling were discouraged or banned by government officials, landlords, and clergy, whereas English or otherwise “foreign” games such as cricket and polo were promoted (de Búrca 4-8).

Clear distinctions in class and political leanings within sports organizations played into the hands of nationalists like Cusack who felt it reflected a long line of attempts by the English over the centuries to suppress native Irish sports in order to further dominate the Irish and erase their identity. Cusack’s beliefs are not without justification. Official efforts to ban hurling date back to the fourteenth century. In 1366, the Statute of Kilkenny banned English colonists in Ireland from playing hurling in order to prevent them from adopting Irish customs (Garnham). The Sunday Observance Act of 1695 banned hurling, communing, and Irish football to be played on Sundays, a popular day to host games (de Búrca 2-3).
The article ends with a plea “to remove with one sweep everything foreign and iniquitous in the present system,” in order to return rightful control to the Irish. Several scholars have pointed out this article’s influence over the Citizen’s diatribes (JJ 61; W. O’Neill 380), yet what is often not commented on is Cusack’s choice of words in describing the demoralized Irish:

And further, as persons whose reason is unhinged often put off the substantial and decent clothes suitable to their condition, and deck themselves in *gaudy frippery* and *fading flowers*, thereby demonstrating that the throne of man’s dignity is uncrowned, so, too, we find the deteriorating residents of cities and the thoughtless votaries of fashion ever *impotently looking out* with feverish anxiety for some change in their dreary pastimes after having abandoned those of the people. (5; my emphases)

Cusack suggests that the decline in native sports has not only demoralized the population but also emasculated it. Phrases such as “gaudy frippery,” “fading flowers,” and “impotently looking out” imply weak and effete qualities incapable of athleticism, let alone resistance to the “pernicious influence of a hated and hitherto dominant race.” Cusack’s article is direct in its attacks against the English, something common in nationalist discourse, yet his constant references to physicality (“the strength and energy of a race”) suggest that nationalism is something that is waged not just ideologically or politically but, quite literally, physically. To nationalists like Cusack, sports is likened to masculine, political domination, and even war.\(^{43}\) It echoes Fanon’s assertion that colonialism automatically produced “a fearlessness

---

\(^{43}\) The Citizen’s evocation of “the warlike race” implies that the sheer physicality of athletics could be used as an instrument for the nation rather than for a mere pastime. It is not just the exercise of the intellect but the actual use of the body that is important in nationalist struggle. Cricket, for instance, had a “quasi-religious status” that “signaled the presence of a superior race” to the “bemused world” of the British Empire (T. Williams, “Dominant Ideologies” 316). More broadly, this concept can be traced well into the first millennium. In his analysis of the origins of Gaelic and Continental sports, William Sayers remarks that tribal societies as early as the seventh century made a connection between athletic ability and military skill. Children who could
and an ancestral pride strangely resembling defiance” (65). Compare Cusack’s letter to Michael Davitt’s statement at the GAA foundational meeting in 1884:

In any effort that may be made to revive a National taste for games and pastimes such as once developed the muscular power and manly bearing of our Gaelic ancestors, I shall be most happy to lend a hand. . . . In this, as in so many other matters, we ought to cut ourselves adrift from English rules and patronage, and prevent the killing of those Celtic Sports which have been threatened with the same fate by the encroachment of Saxon custom, as that which menaces our Nationality under alien rule. . . . There are, of course, many reasons why the physique of our people is not developed as it ought to be, but there is no doubt that one reason for the degenerate gait and bearing of most of our young men at home is to be found in the absence of such games and pastimes as formerly gave to Irishman [sic] the reputation of a soldier-like and self-reliant race. (qtd. in Beatty, “Zionism” 320-21)

A case can be made that the effeminate characteristics Cusack and Davitt associate with the decline of Irish sports can be tied to the “hegemonic masculinity” central to many strains of the Irish nationalist movement.44 As Mike Cronin writes, “One of the major reasons behind the initial spread of organized games, rugby and cricket in particular, in nineteenth century

handle a stick and ball were likely to handle weapons in their adulthood. “One aspect,” he writes, “of the function of sport in a society marked by chronic intertribal raiding seems clear enough – physical training and the whetting of competitive instinct” (119). Even then, sports were utilized for the service of one’s nation or tribe.

44 Hyde also expressed concern about the decline of Irish physicality. “The splendid physique, too, of the Irish, which is now alas! sadly degenerated through depression, poverty, famine, and the rotting out of the best blood, but which has struck during the course of history such numerous foreign observers, seems certainly to connect the Irish by a family of likeness with the Gauls . . .” (Literary History 18-19). A few decades later, Casement would reiterate this same point in his claim that England depended on Irish physicality in building its empire: [England] has also appropriated to her own ends the physical manhood of the Island. Just as the commerce has been forcibly annexed and diverted from its natural trend, so the youth of Ireland has been fraudulently appropriated and diverted from the defense of their own land to the extension of the power and wealth of the realm that impoverished it at home. The physical qualities of the Irish were no less valuable than “Irish wool” to Empire building, provided always they were not displayed in Ireland. (Crime 26; my emphases)
Britain was the cult of muscular Christianity and the embrace of manliness as a worthy value” (107). Kiberd reiterates this point by stating the British had dismissed the Celts as feminine: “A surprising number of militant nationalists accepted that diagnosis and called on the youth of Ireland to purge themselves of their degrading femininity by a disciplined programme of physical-contact sports” (25).

The Citizen’s embrace of sports, inherently competitive and combative, fits perfectly within the narrative of national development and indefinite struggle. In the midst of “Cyclops,” the Citizen’s role in promoting Gaelic sports is made explicit: “There’s the man . . . that made the Gaelic sports revival” (U 12.880). In the passage that follows, sports are explicitly linked to the development of the nation. Its language indicates that Gaelic sports are essential to Ireland’s growth as well as an act of reverence for Ireland’s forefathers:

So off they started about Irish sport and shoneen games the like of the lawn tennis and about hurley and putting the stone and racy of the soil and building up a nation once again and all to that. . . .

A most interesting discussion took place in the ancient hall of Brian O’Ciarnain’s in Sraid na Bretaine Bheag, under the auspices of Sluagh na h-Eireann, on the revival of ancient Gaelic sports and the importance of physical culture, as understood in ancient Greece and ancient Roman and ancient Ireland, for the development of the

---

45 For more discussion about this connection, see Banerjee; Beatty, Masculinity; Elias and Walshe; Innes; McDevitt; Nohrnberg 99-152; Valente, Myth; and Wawrzycka and Corcoran. Stefan Berger also makes the same point regarding European national histories in general (“Power” 35). It is important to note that this sentiment was not exclusive to Christian Europeans. Zionists also encouraged “manliness” and athleticism as a means to achieve Jewish self-determination and connection to the past. Prominent Zionist Max Nordau wrote in 1903, for example, that Jews:

must think of creating once again a Jewry of muscles. . . . Let us take up our oldest traditions; let us once more become deep-chested, sturdy, sharp-eyed men. . . . Our new muscle-Jews [Muskeljuden] have not yet regained the heroism of our forefathers who in large numbers eagerly entered the sport arenas in order to take part in competition and to pit themselves against the highly trained Hellenistic athletes and the powerful Nordic barbarians. (547)
race. The venerable president of this noble order was in the chair and the attendance was of large dimensions. After an instructive discourse by the chairman, a magnificent oration eloquently and forcibly expressed, a most interesting and instructive discussion of the usual high standard of excellence ensued as to the desirability of the revivability of the ancient games and sports of our ancient panceltic forefathers. (12.889-907)⁴⁶

The passage features Irish to both underscore and parody the expression of Irish topics. Barney O’Kiernan’s (Brian O’Ciarnain) and Little Britain Street (Sraid na Bretaine Bheag) are written in Irish. Mentioned earlier in the episode (12.859), the Sluagh na h-Eireann (“the Army of Ireland”) was a sister organization to the GAA that complained to Parliament on June 16th, 1904 via Joseph Nannetti that it was forbidden to play Gaelic games in Phoenix Park when “foreign” games like polo were permitted (U-A 341; U-N 683). The use of Irish is not unique to this passage as it is found throughout the episode. Rather, the Irish complements what is unique about this passage: the portentous references to race and nation in relation to sports. “Racy of the soil,” “building up a nation once again,” “the development of the race,” and “the ancient games and sports of our ancient panceltic forefathers” are all indicative of the Citizen’s belief in the sanctity of the Irish race, its victimhood status, and its potential for greatness. He believes athleticism was one of the keys to the success of ancient Greece and Rome as well as ancient Ireland, which he compares flatteringly to the Mediterranean civilizations. The Citizen’s belief in the physical prowess of a nation is not surprising considering the crude, earthy manner in which he conducts himself. This is not to mention the fact that Cusack himself was said to have created the GAA after lamenting one

⁴⁶ With the exception of “Brian O’Ciarnain’s,” “Sraid na Bretaine Bheag,” and “Sluagh na h-Eireann,” the emphases are mine.
day that he saw very few people play sports in Phoenix Park, vowing to “preserve the physical strength of our race” (de Búrca 8).

“Racy of the Soil” and “A Nation Once Again.” The two terms the Citizen uses, “racy of the soil” and “a nation once again,” have specific origins and connotations that in addition to their ostensible meanings reveal not only a considerable amount about the influences on the Citizen but also the more sectarian wings of the Irish nationalist movement. “Racy of the soil” is more than a generic term which describes the essence of a race, arguably a variation of the Biblical expression “salt of the earth” (King James Bible, Matt. 5:13). It can be traced to two specific sources: Archbishop Thomas Croke and Thomas Davis. Croke used the phrase in a letter he wrote to Cusack a few months after “A Word About Irish Athletics” was published (Greene 79). He was responding to a request made during the inaugural meeting of the GAA on November 1st, 1884 in Hayes’ Hotel in Tipperary. Cusack and his cohorts nominated Croke, Parnell, and Davitt as “patrons” of the new association. Details of the meeting were published two days later by the Cork Examiner, giving the poorly attended meeting (no more than thirteen men showed up) much-needed publicity (de Búrca 13-14). Croke responded to Cusack in a letter on December 18th, which was published on the 27th in United Ireland, accepting his offer. Much like Cusack, he bemoans the diminution of Irish sports and rails against English hegemony in nearly every aspect of Irish life:

[We] are daily importing from England not only her manufactured goods, which has practically strangled our own manufacturing appliances, but, together with her fashions, her accent, her vicious literature, her music, her dances, and her manifold mannerisms, her games also her pastimes, to the utter discredit of our own grand
national sports, and the sore humiliation, as I believe, of every genuine son and
daughter of the old land.

Ball playing, hurling, football, kicking according to Irish rules . . . and all such
favourite exercises and amusements amongst men and boys, may now be said to be
not only dead and buried, but in several localities to be entirely forgotten and
unknown. And what have we got in their stead? We have got such foreign and
fantastical field sports as lawn-tennis, polo, croquet, cricket, and the like – very
excellent, I believe, and health-giving exercises in their way, still not racy of the soil,
but rather alien to it, as are, indeed, for the most part the men and women who first
imported and still continue to patronise them. (1; my emphasis)

Croke echoes Cusack’s resentment of the English – if not the people, then at least their
products and their culture – and his grim assessment of Irish heritage. He uses the phrase to
emphasize the exceptional nature of Irish sports, imbuing a certain sacredness to them
(perhaps not surprising given that he was an archbishop). Croke would become one of the
GAA’s most dedicated supporters.

Yet Croke, a highly educated man, most likely quoted or at least was aware of the
phrase’s origins. “Racy of the soil” was the motto of The Nation, a nationalist newspaper
cofounded in 1842 by Davis. The prospectus of the newspaper used the phrase to encourage
Irish people of all creeds, religions, and ethnicities to unite. Davis hoped that the Irish would
adopt a “nationality which may embrace Protestant, Catholic, and Dissenter, Milesian and
Cromwellian, the Irishman of a hundred generations, and the stranger who is within our
gates; not a nationality which would preclude civil war, but which would establish internal
union and external independence” (“The Nation” 8). This plurality was in line with
eighteenth and early-nineteenth century manifestations of nationalism. The irony of this inclusiveness is not lost on critics, given that Croke, Cusack, and the Citizen argue the exact opposite in terms of what constitutes “Irish.” “Racy of the soil” implies that being Irish means being born on the land, rather than being part of a specific ethnicity (Cairns and Richards 135; Cheng, “Terrible” 35). The “evergreen verses” (U 12.916) that Joyce references was a poem written by Davis published in The Nation on July 13th, 1844, “A Nation Once Again” (633). Much like the Citizen, the poem harkens back to classical Greece and Rome, specifically the Battle of Thermopylae and the assassination of Julius Caesar. Yet there is no mention in the poem of the sanctity of the Irish race as the Citizen or Cusack would have it. It is, rather, a call for Irish people of different identities to come together to form one nation. What is most mortifying about these references is that they come from Davis, a Protestant, the kind of person who was not considered truly “Irish” by the people who quoted him. Cusack, after all, had no qualms about walking into any given pub and calling the waiter a “Protestant dog” (JJ 61).

Thus, Cusack’s contribution to the nationalist movement was important and indicative of just how sectarian and bitter his brand of Gaelic-Catholic nationalism was. His literary embodiment in the Citizen would prove even more outrageous in his

---

47 Joyce seems to agree with Davis about the myth of Irish ethnic homogeneousness in “Ireland: Island of Saints and Sages”: “In Ireland we can see how the Danes, the Firbolgs, the Milesians from Spain, the Norman invaders, the Anglo-Saxon colonists and the Huguenots, came together to form a new entity, under the influence of a local god, one might say” (OCPW 118-19). In the midst of the tragic sectarianism that plagued Ireland in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, there were always more levelheaded people besides Davis and Joyce who acknowledged this. John Hume, for example, said in 1993: “We are by nature a very diverse people. Our very blood is diverse, one of the most diverse peoples in the world. Because of our island location, our blood is Milesian, Celt, Norman, Viking, Spanish, Huguenot, Scots, English” (“Hume Endorses Unionist Right” 10). The parallels between Hume’s comment and Davis’s and Joyce’s are compelling – so much so that it is possible Hume was paraphrasing at least one of them.
historiographical representation, which in some ways rivals that of Cambrensis in its outlandishness.

**D. P. Moran: Another Citizen.** Before delving into the Citizen’s grossly distorted historiography, it is important to mention another influence of his. The Citizen’s rhetoric closely matches that of the firebrand journalist David Patrick “D. P.” Moran. Several of the Citizen’s comments, particularly his Irish utterances, were directly inspired by him. Moran was a pithy critic in his time, an *enfant terrible* of Irish journalism. Since the beginning of his career in the 1890s, Moran made a name for himself as an advocate of extreme Gaelic-Catholic nationalism. He wrote during a resurgence of Irish nationalist journalism; in 1891, there were approximately thirty-one newspapers in Ireland that described themselves as “national” or “nationalist,” a stark contrast to the one newspaper in the same category twenty years prior (Hobsbawm 105). As Vincent Deane points out, among the tenets of his political and social views was that the Anglo-Irish were athwart to the “real” Gaelic-Catholics (“Moranism” 69). In a series of articles in the *New Ireland Review* (later published collectively in 1905 as *The Philosophy of Irish Ireland*), he excoriated revered Anglo-Irish figures such as Jonathan Swift, Henry Grattan, and Wolfe Tone, his main point of contention being that they were either Protestant or non-Gaelic, if not both (34-40).48 He denied the legitimacy of the IPP in Westminster, considering them to be lackeys to the English and not “real Irishmen” (69). He lambasted everything he considered tainted, even marginally so, with English influence, from cricket to Dublin schools such as Belvedere to the English language itself. He was a member of the Gaelic League and a staunch advocate of the Irish

---

48 See V. Deane, “Moranism” 69; Hutchinson 175; and Potts 32-33.
language – a language he himself was never fluent in (V. Deane, “Moranism” 67-69; Delaney 190). Many of his contributions to the Irish language came in the form of insults and derogatory comments directed against the English, Protestants, Unionists, and other enemies of the Irish.

In many ways, Moran reiterates the beliefs of the Gaelic League and its founder Hyde. In his famous 1892 “On the Necessity for De-Anglicising Ireland” address, Hyde outlines his vision for an Ireland divorced from the insidious influence of the English and “West-Britonism.” The most effective way to do this is to promote the Irish language:

[The] Irish race is at present in a most anomalous position, imitating England and yet apparently hating it. . . . In order to de-Anglicise ourselves we must at once arrest the decay of the language. We must bring pressure upon our politicians not to snuff it out by their tacit discouragement merely because they do not happen themselves to understand it. We must arouse some spark of patriotic inspiration among the peasantry who still use the language, and put an end to the shameful state of feeling – a thousand-tongued reproach to our leaders and statesmen – which makes young men and women blush and hang their heads when overheard speaking their own language. . . . I appeal to everyone whatever his politics – for this is no political matter – to do his best to help the Irish race to develop in future upon Irish lines. (121, 137-38, 161)

In addition to encouraging the spread of the Irish language, Moran also opposed West-Britonism. He resented shoneens, or “toady” (Ó Dónaill), more than the English themselves. In his writings, he stresses the utter necessity of purging Ireland of England not so much politically but culturally and linguistically:
We must retrace our steps and take as much of our inspiration as possible from our own country and its history. We must be original Irish, and not imitation English. Above all, we must re-learn our language, and become a bi-lingual people. . . . A distinct language is the great weapon by which we can ward off undue foreign influence, and keep ourselves surrounded by a racy Irish atmosphere. (Philosophy 26)

Moran’s influence on Joyce and especially the Citizen has been assessed before, yet some of the connections that have been made are rather tenuous. “Some Joyceans argue,” Platt acknowledges, “that Joyce is close to Moran on the cultural nationalism issues,” pointing out that the two men were critical of the Protestant leadership of the Literary Revival, Moran more so (190). They were weary of what they thought to be Yeats’ unctuous, pastoral portrayal of Ireland and the vapid oratory of Irish Revival leaders (embodied in Ulysses among others by Dan Dawson in “Aeolus,” whose speech is mocked by the men in the newsroom). They felt that such rhetoric was merely adapting English customs rather than opposing them (Gibson, Strong Spirit 143; Manganiello 24-25; E. Nolan, Nationalism 47-53). “We practically have no literature of national self-criticism,” Moran wrote. “No brilliant Irish minds have ever turned themselves with sincerity on to their own countrymen” (Philosophy 79). Joyce is thought to have been weary of Moran’s “militant Catholic consciousness” (Potts 47), and the Citizen is a jaundiced depiction of everything that was unsavory about it.49

49 The Citizen was not the first militant nationalist character in literature. Scarlett Baron argues that in addition to Cusack and Moran, an influence of the Citizen was the character “the Citizen” in Gustave Flaubert’s Sentimental Education (1869), a “vehemently chauvinistic” man in a novel “much concerned with prevalent discourses of nationalism and citizenship” in post-revolutionary France (178, 182). See 177-91 for her persuasive argument.
On close inspection, there is evidence to suggest that Joyce was influenced by specific passages of *The Leader*. Far from being loosely modeled after Moran, the Citizen and other characters say several things that are lifted out of or directly inspired by Moran’s newspaper. Although it is difficult to state with certainty which issues, if any and to what scrutiny, of *The Leader* Joyce had read, it should be noted that it was very popular among students at University College Dublin when Joyce studied there and Joyce mentioned the publication at least three times in his letters (McMahon 74). It is fair to state that it had subliminal influence on the Citizen. It is noteworthy, for instance, that the colloquial style in which the narrator of “Cyclops” tends to introduce paragraphs is reminiscent of Moran’s caustic language. “The popular thing all over Ireland is to shout about Nationality, about Ireland a Nation, immortal spirit, of this and that and the other thing,” Moran wrote on September 29th, 1900 (“Current Affairs” 65). Its phrasing is similar to the narrator’s derisive descriptions of the Citizen “gassing . . . about the invincibles and the old guard and the men of sixtyseven and who fears to speak of ninetyeight and Joe with him about all the fellows that were hanged, drawn and transported for the cause by drumhead courtmartial and a new Ireland and new this, that and the other” (*U* 12.480-84) and “talking about the Irish language and the corporation meeting and all to that” (12.679-80), not to mention the passage regarding Irish sports quoted earlier, among other sections. The Citizen’s speech is laden with Irish words and phrases. “Arrah” (12.141), “a chara” (12.148), “shoneens” (12.680), “shebeen” (12.802), “Sassenachs” (12.1191), and “ráimeis” (12.1239) are all words

---

50 There have been scholars who have noticed this textual influence before. See FitzGerald 118-19; Gula, *Tale* 11n19 and 84n42; McMahon 66-85; Nohrnberg 120-35; and Radford 291. Of them, McMahon’s analysis was the most thorough and focused on *The Leader*, which I hope to supplement here.

51 See *L* 1:227 and 2:209. In the former, he asked Harriet Shaw Weaver to send Sylvia Beach a copy in 1925. In 1909, he wrote a letter to Arthur Edward Clery thanking him for his positive review of *Chamber Music* published in *The Leader*, of which he was an editor at the time (*L* 2:233).
popularized by Moran.\footnote{They mean “indeed,” “my friend,” “toady,” “speakeasy,” “English person,” and “nonsense,” respectively (Ó Dónaill).} He was fond of shoneen and ráimeis, using them often (Fitzgerald 118). The Citizen’s use of Irish is similar to Moran’s in that it is sparse, pejorative, and even inaccurate (McMahon 81). As previously mentioned, despite Moran’s obsession with the Irish language, he never mastered it.\footnote{In contrast, Cusack was a native Irish speaker and was well-known for his writing in Irish (de Búrca 9).} As with many Irish publications such as Freeman’s Journal, Irish Daily Independent, and United Irishman, every issue of The Leader had at most one article written in Irish, and there is at least one issue, March 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 1901, that doesn’t have an Irish article at all. It is curious to note that one of Moran’s most frequently used Irish word, ráimeis, was written primarily in its Anglicized version “rawmaish” for the first few months of the publication. This could be due to the difficulty of rendering the word phonetically rather than translation. Moran “wanted the language to be spoken. At all costs, he begged, let it be preserved from the academicians, the grammarians, the philologists and the spelling cranks” (Inglis 110). It is strange nevertheless, given Moran’s passionate, if not fanatical, promotion of Irish. Likewise, the Citizen’s Irish is token at best, and there is at least one instance when he uses it incorrectly. In a feebleminded insult, he calls Denis Breen (and indirectly Bloom) a “pishogue” (U 12.1058). Pishogue (piseog in Irish) is a magical spell, whereas the Citizen probably meant to say “pithogue” (piteog), which means dandy or homosexual (O’Mahoney 384-85). There is debate about whether this mistake was made intentionally by Joyce to emphasize the Citizen’s foolishness or unintentionally by Joyce himself. The latter is feasible given that Joyce’s command of Irish was limited (390; McCrea 148). Regardless of its genesis, the error demonstrates that even some of the greatest
advocates of Irish failed to master it and used the Anglicized version of the language rather than proper Irish.

Outside of syntax and certain Irish words, there are even more specific references to The Leader in “Cyclops.” The “twenty millions of Irish” (U 12.1240-41) the Citizen mourns is not an invention of Joyce. Rather, it is possible to trace it to John Dillon, a nationalist MP, former Parnellite and Land Leaguer (Callanan, “Dillon”), as reported by Moran. On January 30th, 1901, Dillon gave a speech to a branch of the United Irish League in Newry, rallying the Irish to unite behind the IPP. His windy speech includes a dubious statement regarding the Irish population. As reported in the Freeman’s Journal the following day, he said:

When we enter the British House of Commons as a united party, with a united Ireland at our back, do we speak only with the voice – are we armed only with the power – of the dwindling remnant of our race whom oppressive and alien tyranny has still allowed to live in Ireland? No: we go there as the representatives of a mighty nation, scattered by oppression and conquest throughout the globe, but numbering its people by many millions, certainly not less than twenty millions, a nation which, as sure as tomorrow’s sun will rise, can be welded into one army if the children of Ireland will only hold together here for the old cause. . . .

[D]oes anyone imagine that a Party in Parliament speaking with the voice and armed with the power of twenty millions of nationalists scattered throughout the world will speak to deaf ears, or that its demand will be rejected? (“Mr. John Dillon” 5-6; my emphases)

Dillon considers the millions of Irish immigrants in the United States, the United Kingdom, and elsewhere to be Irish, as much so as those who stayed behind. He does not recognize a
difference between people born in Ireland and those of Irish descent. It is a rather romantic view of the Irish people, one in which geographical and cultural boundaries do not affect one’s “Irishness.” Moran, however, held a decidedly different stance. He constantly mocked Dillon’s phrase in *The Leader*. In February 9th of that year, he excoriates Dillon for encouraging the “Anglicisation” of Newry, reiterating “the old bogus tune . . . the Sourfaces and the English mind have been conquering and demoralising this country” (“Current Affairs” 381). As tenuous as his accusation is – to him, Dillon’s crime was merely speaking in Ulster – Moran takes it further, questioning the identities of Irish emigrants entirely:

Nothing can get out of the heads of men like Mr. Dillon that there are twenty millions of Irish people abroad. It is a very absurd idea, and the repetition of it from numberless platforms does a great amount of harm to our green people. The strength and hope of Ireland is with the people of Ireland. Most of the Irish people abroad have, we believe, ceased to trouble themselves about their country. They were glad, they had reason to be glad, to get out of this imitation, dull place. . . .

What exactly the effective strength of the Irish people abroad is we are not in a position to state, but it were about time we dropped our childish talk of twenty millions. (381-82)

Not one to let things go, Moran wrote about this phrase again on February 23rd:

If Mr. Dillon’s “20,000,000 of the Irish race at home and abroad” at Newry was really an estimate, and not a fine rhetorical flourish, it must have been based on this quite wrong impression. If he imagines there is a permanent Greater Ireland beyond the seas, he imagines a vain thing. . . .
The foreign-born Irish of the first generation are largely, but not wholly, National in sentiment, but from the second generation on they are simply English, or American, or Australian, of Irish descent. . . . Germans, Poles, Italians, and Irish may flock to [America’s] shores, but its language, its traditions, its genius – all are predominantly Anglo-Saxon. It absorbs all its immigrants into itself, and their children are no longer German or Irish, but American of Irish or German descent, which is quite another matter. And so with Australia or England. In none of these countries can there be a lasting Greater Ireland. Painful though it be to some natures to contemplate it, the process of Anglicization is natural and inevitable, and goes steadily, steadily on. . . .

The thing to keep steadily before our minds is that emigration is wholly a loss to Ireland – a loss not balanced by swollen estimates of the numbers and power of our race abroad. We have no real surplus population, nor colonies of our own in which our race may renew itself. (‘‘And Abroad’’ 416-17)

Moran rejects the notion that emigrants, particularly second-generation and beyond, are truly Irish. One is either Irish or is not. He notes that countries which accepted a large number of emigrants are Anglo-Saxon in character. Moran, after all, did not think even Protestants born in Ireland were truly Irish. It is not surprising that he would refuse to recognize the “Irishness” of people of Irish descent. In fact, he makes a bizarre claim that less than half of Irish-born emigrants were Irish nationals based on the fact that less than a quarter of London Irish societies were composed of London-born Irishmen.\textsuperscript{54} The article suggests that this

\textsuperscript{54} Moran had written about this before The Leader. “The Irish people who emigrate, never having been really Irish at all, quickly become absorbed into whatever community they fall among, during their own life-time; and in the next generation all signs of their Irish origin are usually lost” (Philosophy 17).
twenty millions line, itself an imprecise estimate of Irish population congregate, has been repeated several times. It is likely that Dillon was not the first to come up with it or that it was a popular expression before 1901. Regardless, the phrase’s inclusion in several different issues of *The Leader* indicates that it had a profound effect on Moran and likeminded nationalists. Of course, the Citizen uses the phrase in a positive, inclusive manner much like Dillon. He considers emigrants to be Irish and is convinced they honor Ireland as “the land of bondage” and will “come again . . . with a vengeance” (*U* 12.1373-74). It may appear that Moran’s repudiation of this line rules him out as a source for the Citizen’s use of it, yet the fact that Moran dwelt on that particular phrase for so long, uttered just a few years before 1904, might actually indicate the Joyce had him in mind. Joyce himself used the line in “Ireland at the Bar” in 1907 in the same manner as Dillon: “There are twenty million Irish scattered throughout the world. The Emerald Isle contains only a small part of them” (*OCPW* 146). The highest population ever recorded in Ireland was roughly eight million people in the 1840s, not the twenty millions the phrase projects, although had the Great Famine not occurred the population in Ireland could have reached about eighteen million by 1904 (*U-A* 350; *U-N* 686). Joyce was at considerable odds with Moran and even Dillon, yet their shared use of the phrase shows how ubiquitous it was in Irish discourse.

Moran’s shadow in *Ulysses* is not limited to “Cyclops,” either. In “Eumaeus,” Skin-the-Goat rails against British interference of Irish industries. Echoing the Citizen, Skin-the-Goat offers a “lengthy dissertation” on Ireland’s resources. Ireland was:

---

55 In criticizing an American lecture tour given by English historian James Anthony Froude, Father Thomas N. Burke wrote in *English Misrule in Ireland* (1873) that some speculated he was sent by the British government to counter the rise and influence of Irish Americans: “that they saw here *eight millions of Irishmen* by birth, and perhaps *fourteen millions Irish* by immediate descent” (9; my emphases). Although six million shy of the proverbial twenty millions, the refrain is similar.
the richest country bar none on the face of God’s earth, far and away superior to England, with coal in large quantities, six million pounds worth of pork exported every year, ten millions between butter and eggs and all the riches drained out of it by England levying taxes on the poor people that paid through the nose always and gobbling up the best meat in the market and a lot more surplus steam in the same vein. . . . You could grow any mortal thing in Irish soil, he stated, and there was that colonel Everard down there in Navan growing tobacco. Where would you find anywhere the like of Irish bacon? But a day of reckoning . . . was in store for mighty England, despite her power of pelf on account of her crimes. (16.988-1000)

There are a number of inaccuracies to his claims, which are not worth repeating in depth here (U-A 548; U-N 771-72; Wicht 243). Much like the Citizen, Skin-the-Goat has illusions of grandeur about Ireland’s assets and resources. What connects this passage with the Citizen goes beyond that. In the first years of its publication, The Leader focused extensively on national industry. Much like Griffith and Sinn Féin, Moran encouraged industrialization as a means to strengthen Ireland, although unlike Griffith, who believed in industrial protectionism in order to foster national self-sufficiency, his underlying intention was to restore Irish self-respect rather than economic independence (Hutchinson 170; Inglis 113). Nearly every issue included at least one article about Irish manufacturing and resources. Moran believed that national industry was a bellwether of national strength. “The connection between the decay of a national identity and the decay of an industry,” Moran writes in 1900, “is much more close and intimate than the mere general effect on the spirit of the people at first suggests. In fact, enquiry will show that national industry depends upon upholding the national life” (“Irish Fashions and Irish Industry” 277). One recurring column, called “Nation
Building,” focused on several Irish industries. Some of the industries covered include bicycles, clothing, candles, jam, and even gum; no industry was too small for Moran. “Nation Building” and other such columns had a similar structure. They would exult the industry, claiming that it manufactured a significant number of high-quality products, some of which were the envy of the world. They would then claim that foreign-made products, especially those from England, Scotland, the United States, and Germany, flooded the Irish market, making it impossible for the Irish industries to thrive.56 “The most popular industry in Ireland is the production of ráimeis and resolutions,” he observes, “so much so that under cover of all the rhetorical smoke Englishmen, Scotchmen and men from Munich and Jews have practically taken over the real industrial management of this country” (“Writing Paper” 199). This was attributed to English policy or Irish apathy, if not both. The columns would usually conclude that native industries would be more than capable of providing for everyone in Ireland, attributing statistics and information that they do not bother to cite. The righteous tone found in these articles parallel those of the Citizen and Skin-the-Goat among other nationalist characters in Ulysses. In a 1901 “Nation Building” article, for example, Moran is rather indignant about the overlooked candle and wax industry in Ireland. He alleges that no one in Ireland or the rest of the British Isles have heard of Rathbornes, which, having been founded in 1488, was the oldest factory in the United Kingdom:

If the oldest factory in the Three Kingdoms was situate in England, Scotland or Wales the Press of these countries would write it up, indeed such a business would not be beneath a magazine article, and then all Ireland would know the tidings through the

56 German products in particular will be discussed in the second chapter.
columns of our truly National snippets. As if happens to be in Ireland, people never heard of it. (“Candles” 370)

There were, of course, at least a few people in Ireland who had heard of Rathbornes, including the advertising managers of *The Leader* who printed advertisements for them several times. In another “Nation Building” article, he claims that the Irish would add five-and-a-half million more pounds into the economy every year if they exclusively bought Irish-made clothing: “Why doesn’t Ireland clothe herself!” (“The Clothes We Wear” 117). He frequently criticizes the Irish just as much as the English for industrial decline. In his view, the Irish simply weren’t loyal or savvy enough to see the value of Irish products: “A large proportion of the Irish jam-eaters, we understand, don’t mind paying an extra penny or so a pound if the jam is – English,” even though the “quality of the Irish jam is . . . just as good” (“Jam” 137). Moran calculates that buying Irish jam would produce hundreds of thousands of pounds in revenue for Irish industry. If the Irish would only exercise some ingenuity, they would be able to trounce the English: “The modern Irishman won’t think or calculate, and the Saxon and other foreigner, without half his natural brains, is beating him at every point.”

In an article that seems to closely correspond with the Citizen and Skin-the-Goat’s praising of Irish resources, Moran reports on several mines found in the country: “Waterford was considered rich in mineral wealth, lead, copper, and iron being found, and even now, I believe, the Knockmahon mine is a very extensive one.” He cites figures that put iron exports at hundreds of thousands of tons (“Bygone Industries – II” 28-29). He wrote dozens of articles in a similar vein. Overall, his promotion of Irish industries was based on hyperbole, shaming, insinuation, and wishful thinking – the very qualities found in the Citizen and Skin-the-Goat.
Interestingly, a 1901 issue extends his lingering influence in *Ulysses* even further. The March 16th issue published a letter to the editor from someone familiar with masonry. Responding to an article about the housing industry, the writer criticizes the apathy he felt many Irish had towards bricklayers and foremen. The details of the article are not memorable, yet his conclusion is conspicuously similar to the Citizen’s rhetoric:

> Our country has, alas!, been too much diluted with sentiment, while the life blood of the nation was ebbing away. For, after all, what makes a nation? Its trade and commerce are the pith and marrow, the main arteries on which a nation exists. Let Ireland then build up her industries which she can only do by the strong will, stout hearts; and willing hands of her people, and as sure as the sun rises in the heavens, when there is a country worth fighting for, Ireland will fight and Ireland will be right. ("The Building Industry" 39)

The sweeping rhetoric is characteristic of Moran, yet the letter was signed off by one "GARRYOWEN." Garryowen, of course, is the name of the mongrel who accompanies the Citizen and who at the end of “Cyclops” lunges after Bloom. It is presumptuous to assume Joyce had named the dog after this writer. No evidence suggests that this is the case or that Joyce had read the article. However, it is worth noting that on top of this letter, Garryowen is a possible reference to a thuggish nationalist song of the same name, which itself takes its name from a notoriously rough neighborhood of Limerick (*U-A* 319; *U-N* 674). This may be a reason why the writer of the letter adopted this name. Marianna Gula notes that sobriquets like Garryowen in the episode are open caricatures of this kind of cultural nationalist practice (*Tale* 37-38). Moreover, the song is mentioned in the “Circe” episode of *Ulysses*. Right

57 For another intriguing theory regarding the origins of the dog’s name, see Goldberg 8-9.
before Stephen gets into a fight with the English soldiers, the song is played along with “God Save the King” as the Citizen and Major Tweedy celebrate together:

THE CITIZEN

_Erin go bragh!_

_(Major Tweedy and the Citizen exhibit to each other medals, decorations, trophies of war, wounds. Both salute with fierce hostility.)_

PRIVATE CARR

I’ll do him in.

PRIVATE COMPTON

_(moves the crowd back) Fair play, here. Make a bleeding butcher’s shop of the bugger._

_(Massed bands blare Garryowen and God save the king.) (15.4620-30)_

The scene is a telling juxtaposition between Irish and English nationalism. It shows a comradery between the two, even though they are ostensibly antagonistic. It is an illustration of the conceptual affinities they share. As Seamus Deane writes, “Irish nationalism is, in its foundational moments, a derivative of its British counterpart. Almost all nationalist movements have been derided as provincial, actually or potentially racist, given to exclusivist and doctrinaire positions and rhetoric. These descriptions fit British nationalism perfectly” (“Introduction” 7-8). This “paradigmatic moment” (Cheng, _Race_ 233) aligns well with Deane’s argument, and indeed shows just how skewed and contradictory this Gaelic-Catholic brand of nationalism was. This conflation of nationalist songs also lends itself well to the conflated historiography the Citizen – whomever he was based upon – engages in.
“Redskins in America.” The Citizen makes several historical claims that are either heavily embellished or unequivocally false, usually with the purpose of demonizing the English and absolving the Irish, taking the line of many sectarian nationalists during this time. The tragic narrative is powerful when expressed in the Citizen’s melodramatic style. Although many of his statements are false, the way in which they are presented nevertheless make a compelling case against the English. As Maguire points out, the Citizen’s “boorishness” and his use of Irish are the results of the deprivations of colonialism and are used as methods of countering English history, culture, and language which “contain the connotations of colonialism” (314). A telling example of this is when he rails against the use of corporal punishment in the British navy. When Bloom suggests that any military force would do the same, the Citizen remains indignant:

We’ll put force against force, says the citizen. We have our greater Ireland beyond the sea. They were driven out of house and home in the black ’47. Their mudcabins and their shieldings by the roadside were laid low by the batteringram and the Times rubbed its hands and told the whitelivered Saxons there would soon be as few Irish in Ireland as redskins in America. Even the Grand Turk sent us his paistres. But the Sassenach tried to starve the nation at home while the land was full of crops that the British hyenas bought and sold in Rio de Janeiro. Ay, they drove out the peasants in hordes. Twenty thousand of them died in the coffinships. But those that came to the land of the free remember the land of bondage. And they will come again and with a vengeance, no cravens, the suns of Granuaile, the champions of Kathleen ni Houlihan. (U 12.1364-75)
One peculiarity about this passage is the Citizen’s claim that *The Times* (London) bragged about the Irish dying and leaving in droves during the Great Famine and compared them to the dwindling indigenous American population in the United States. Although it is true that the British government’s appalling handling of the Great Famine led to catastrophe, his reference, as John Simpson carefully outlines, is actually an amalgamation of quotes from two different editorials from two different newspapers after the Great Famine (“Vengeance”). The first editorial comes from *The Times* in 1854, roughly five years after the Great Famine ended. The editorial was primarily about the emigration of Germans to England and America. Writing sympathetically about the “mild, blue-eyed, flaxen-haired young German,” the author unflatteringly compared them to the Irish. “As for the Irish, troublesome at all times, they have gone – that is, the surplus is gone – gone with a vengeance. But these Germans; you may see them in crowds at the London Docks, and other resorts of emigrant-ships, looking peaceful and ingenuous” (“The Ministerial Arguments and Admissions Point” 8). The Irish press quickly picked up on the sneer. *Freeman's Journal* excoriated the editorial the following week:

‘As for the Irish – troublesome at all times – they are gone – that is, the surplus is gone – gone with a vengeance.’ Would any one believe that an Englishman, not to say any human being, now existing, could pen such a sentence as the above, in reference to the most fearful national misfortune which has fallen upon any people of modern times, and which ended in the death or expatriation of nearly 3,000,000 of his fellow-creatures? Yet such are the terms in which its own influence was so disastrously and fatally exerted.
Gone with a vengeance. Even the *Times* does not venture to say ‘thank God.’

(“English Recognition of Irish Bravery” 3)

The quotation was circulated for decades in Irish publications and by word-of-mouth, cited by nationalists as evidence of England’s inhumanity toward Ireland. Despite the *Freeman’s Journal*’s comment that *The Times* did not write “thank God,” the expression was eventually added to the quotation. Seven years after the original publication, leader of the Young Irelanders William Smith O’Brien wrote this regarding Irish soldiers who were fighting in the American Civil War in the *Morning Post*:

[There] is not among the nations of the earth a people who entertain towards the United States of America so much affection as is felt by the Irish. They have not forgotten that they were received and fostered by the Americans at a time when they were driven from their homes by English misgovernment, and when their death, proscription, and exile were hailed by England with a shout of exultation which was not confined to the prejudiced masses for whom were written the memorable words, ‘The Celts are gone. Thank God, the Celts are gone – gone with a vengeance.’ They are even still reminded that this exultation was shared, and is shared, by the leading statement of England – by Ministers and Viceroys who are still in the habit of find in every decrease of the population of Ireland a subject of congratulation. (6; my emphasis)

His comment that the English were still celebrating Irish emigration showed how disdainful and visceral the original editorial was. The quote had already been distorted to underscore English cruelty – and it would be distorted even further by dragging indigenous Americans

---

58 For an interesting article on O’Brien’s coverage of the American Civil War, see R. Davis 45-53.
into the conversation. The earliest reference to indigenous Americans in relation to this quote comes from an editorial in *The Nation* on June 14th, 1856. “Her organs of opinion rejoiced that the Irish were ceasing to exist in Ireland, and congratulated themselves that the Celt would as soon be as rare here as the Red Indian is in New England. When the war broke out, *The Times* said, ‘the Irish are gone – gone with a vengeance’ – and with a vengeance it would seem to be” (“Anglo-Saxon Ideas” 665). Much like the “thank God” appendage from O’Brien, the comparison with the indigenous Americans stuck. Although the original *Times* editorial did not mention indigenous Americans, subsequent retellings would typically include at least one of the two references. Several fin de siècle publications and speeches in Ireland and around the world held that *The Times* compared the emigration of the Irish in the 1840s to the displacement and murder of the indigenous Americans during the nineteenth century. In September 21st, 1881, for example, the *Freeman’s Journal* wrote: “The Times . . . was still the relentless enemy of the Irish race as it was when it declared in triumph that a Catholic Celt would soon be as rare in Connemara as a red Indian on the shores of Manhattan” (“The Land League” 2). What started as a brief, ignorant comment in an editorial primarily about German immigrants in 1854 morphed into a wildly inaccurate anecdote widely cited by Irish nationalists as evidence of English heartlessness. The Citizen may not have been aware of the quote’s dubious origins but its sentiment was enough for him.

Indeed, what is striking about this quote is that it was referenced well into the twentieth century, particularly in popular history books. Moreover, several Joyce scholars who have commented on the passage failed to pick up on its inaccuracy, focusing instead on the Citizen’s sentiment. The quote appears in Andrew Martin Sullivan’s *The Story of Ireland*, first published in 1867 and republished in subsequent editions. “But alas! in cruelties of
oppression endured, Ireland is like no other country in the world. . . . Now at last England would be at ease. Now at last this turbulent, disaffected, untamable race would be cleared out. ‘In a short time,’ said the Times, ‘a Catholic Celt will be as rare in Ireland as a Red Indian on the shores of Manhattan’” (563-64). As it happens, Sullivan was a nationalist and an editor of The Nation in 1856 when the reference to indigenous Americans came about. He was also considered one of the most influential historians in nineteenth-century Ireland. Not only was he well-renowned, The Story of Ireland became part of the school curriculum (Caball 150; Gula, Tale 105). Seumas MacManus’s The Story of the Irish Race (1921) reiterates Sullivan. “The London Times . . . when the exodus was most pitiful, screamed with delight in one of its editorials, ‘They are going! They are going! The Irish are going with a vengeance. Soon a Celt will be as rare in Ireland as a Red Indian on the shores of Manhattan’” (610). The quote proves resilient when Thomas Gallagher in his popular historical book Paddy’s Lament (1982) references MacManus’s quotation (143). The fact that the quote was typically referenced in works that were not strictly academic suggests that it entered the popular imagination of Irish history. Even some Joyce scholars failed to pick up on it. Weldon Thornton and Gifford and Seidman managed to recognize MacManus’s quote (284; 358), yet as Simpson notes they seem to believe there actually was one (“Vengeance”).59 Several commentators over the years referenced the quote without any mention of its fabrication (Maguire 313; E. Nolan, Nationalism 98-99; K. O’Callaghan 102). One scholar, Mary Lowe-Evans, even took the quotation as fact, citing Gallagher as her source in her 1989 study Crimes Against Fecundity: Joyce and Population Control (8). These scholars, as sharp as their analyses were, usually framed the quote as reflective of England’s supposed cruelty

59 For more details regarding The Times reference, see Simpson, “Vengeance” and U-N 689. I am indebted to Simpson’s meticulous research of newspaper and journal articles that I have referenced extensively.
toward the Irish during the Great Famine. They rightly point out that millions of Irish died and left Ireland as a result of the Great Famine, even if they fault the Citizen for his grandiose rendering.\textsuperscript{60}

The passage, however, is not without merit. Although \textit{The Times} quote is inaccurate, the Citizen’s other statements – mainly that the British continued to sell other Irish crops during the potato blight, that the Grand Turk and other foreigners tried to help the Irish while the British remained idle, that thousands of Irish died while crossing the Atlantic – are sound. The Irish had every right to resent the British for its actions in the Great Famine, a pivotal moment in Irish history. Its effects reverberated throughout the country, severely disrupting its population, economy, culture, politics, and language. With such a huge portion of the population dead or exiled, there were literally fewer people around to speak Irish, vote, or play hurling. An exodus of such magnitude, in which a quarter of the population vanishes, would damage any country, especially one as small as Ireland. The Great Famine was just one example of British injustice toward Ireland, an event countless nationalists never ceased to recall.

\textit{The Citizen’s Great Famine}. However, the actual events of the Great Famine are far more complicated than the Citizen implies. It is true that other crops such as wheat were exported out of Ireland, yet this merely exacerbated rather than caused the severe shortage of food. The foodstuffs would have needed to be stored and distributed through a system that neither

\textsuperscript{60} Comparisons between the Irish and indigenous Americans were not limited to the context of the Great Famine, either. In 1953, Father John A. O’Brien compared the Irish to indigenous Americans in arguing his “great replacement” theory: “Economists and sociologists are agreed that, if this ominous trend continues, in another century the Irish race will have vanished \textit{much like the Mayans}, leaving only their monuments behind them” (17; my emphasis).
the English authorities nor for that matter the Irish landlords were readily able if not willing to set up. This is evident by the fact that the coastal fishing industry collapsed during this time. Fishermen resorted to selling their nets and boats in order to buy imported foodstuffs such as maize. The Sultan of Turkey did donate £1,000 to the cause, yet his motives may have had more to do with seeking an alliance with the United Kingdom than with helping the Irish poor.61 Thousands of Irish immigrants did die on their voyage to the United States and elsewhere, although the emigration rate in Ireland remained high throughout the nineteenth century and their deaths had more to do with the poor sanitary conditions of the time and opportunistic shipping companies than with the English (Gray 639-65; Moody 82).

The British government – two governments, rather: first under Prime Minster Robert Peel from 1845 to 1846 and then John Russell from 1846 to 1852 – clearly handled the Great Famine poorly, yet it is more of a case of gross negligence than meditated mass-murder. Moreover, the Irish landlords were also largely culpable in the tragedy. As Mary E. Daly summarizes:

Many key facts are clear: the Irish Famine was real, not artificial, food was extremely scarce; it could not have been solved by closing the ports; charges of genocide cannot be sustained. However it is undoubtedly the case that the British response was inadequate and was unduly influenced both by domestic political concerns such as repeal of the corn laws and by Providentialism. (“Revisionism” 85)62

---

61 In 1847, the Cherokee and Choctaw Nations of American Indians raised a total of $800, which is worth several thousand dollars in today’s currency, for the relief efforts (Kinealy 104-5; Shrout 553). The “redskins in America” tried to help the Irish avoid the very fate the Citizen and countless Irish had warned against.

62 For more discussion about the Great Famine and the historiographical and revisionist debates which surround it, see Daly, “Revisionism” 71-89; Edwards and Williams; Gray 639-65; and Ó Gráda.
This statement does not disprove the Citizen’s allegations so much as it puts them in context. The Citizen captures the pith of the British bungling of the crisis, yet he mixes justifiable outrage with gross exaggeration, undermining the argument he ferociously makes. As Edward J. Ahearn describes the Citizen’s rant, “its undeniable element of historical truth [is] overwhelmed by prejudice” (80). His narrative representation gets in the way of proper interpretation. Joyce constructs the Citizen in this way in order to show that nationalists, whether they be an Orangeman like Deasy or an Anglophobic sectarian like the Citizen, use the same foolish methodologies and narratives to support their causes – causes that are ultimately undermined by these representations.

However, the Citizen’s misquoting of The Times and flawed recounting of “black ’47” pales in comparison to one of the most infamous passages of “Cyclops,” in which he delivers a histrionic overview of Irish history beginning in ancient times. His sweeping account portrays Ireland as a world power robbed of its prestige by the “perfide Albion” (U 12.1209), the perfidious English. One would think from reading the passage (the beginning of which has already been quoted) that Ireland was once on par with the Persian Empire:

Where are our missing twenty millions of Irish should be here today instead of four, our lost tribes? And our potteries and textiles, the finest in the whole world! And our wool that was sold in Rome in the time of Juvenal and our flax and our damask from the looms of Antrim and our Limerick lace, our tanneries and our white flint glass down there by Ballybough and our Huguenot poplin that we have since Jacquard de Lyon and our woven silk and our Foxford tweeds and ivory raised point from the Carmelite convent in New Ross, nothing like it in the whole wide world. Where are the Greek merchants that came through the pillars of Hercules, the Gibraltar now
grabbed by the foe of mankind, with gold and Tyrian purple to sell in Wexford at the fair of Carmen? Read Tacitus and Ptolemy, even Giraldus Cambrensis. Wine, peltries, Connemara marble, silver from Tipperary, second to none, our farfamed horses even today, the Irish hobbies, with king Philip of Spain offering to pay customs duties for the right to fish in our waters. What do the yellowjohns of Anglia owe us for our ruined trade and our ruined hearths? And the beds of the Barrow and Shannon they won’t deepen with millions of acres of marsh and bog to make us all die of consumption? (12.1240-57)

This passage is little more than, to use a phrase of the Citizen, ráimeis (12.1239): nonsense. Or, more articulately, “incoherent, half- or ill-informed, contradictory, and thus basically nonsensical” (Wicht 241). There is no evidence to suggest that Irish products were exported to Rome during the time of Juvenal (the first and second centuries C.E.). It was the English who encouraged linen-weaving in Ireland and poplin and woven-silk manufacturing were introduced to Ireland by the Huguenots in the seventeenth century. It was only in the early-nineteenth century that Jean-Marie Jacquard of Lyon invented the Jacquard loom (Wicht 241-42). The reference to Cambrensis is puzzling even for the Citizen, considering he was notoriously misleading about Ireland and generally flattering about England in his accounts of the Cambro-Norman conquest of Ireland. The rest of this passage is equally and risibly false.63

63 Griffith composed a less hyperbolic yet still questionable synopsis of ancient Irish trade in The Resurrection of Hungary (1904):

The history of Irish trade commerce and industry has yet to be written. Ancient Ireland traded extensively with the Roman Empire, Gaul, Spain and Greece. In the Middle Ages Ireland carried on extensive commerce with France, Flanders, Italy, Spain, Portugal, German, and independent Scotland, Wales and England. The Guild merchants of the great Continental trade centres mostly included Irishmen – Bordeaux, Rouen, Bruges, and other cities contain memorials of the Irish merchants. A Flemish sixteenth-century writer records that in his time the Irish merchants held two fairs yearly in Bruges, where they sold friezes, serges, furs, skins, etc. An Italian poet of the Middle Ages sings the praise of Ireland for the “noble woolen
In spite of all this, one should not condemn the Citizen too harshly. Not only was his exaggerations of Ireland’s past glories common in eighteenth and nineteenth century antiquarianism, which often compared ancient Ireland to the classical civilizations of Greece and Rome (Kidd 1202), the passage’s emphasis on material goods and trade is a reflection on Ireland’s industrial decline in the nineteenth century – or rather stagnation, as Ireland was never truly industrial – as well as the hypothetical greatness Ireland could have achieved was it not for English domination. The Citizen does not recall a nonexistent free and powerful Ireland of the past so much as he projects a free and powerful Ireland onto the future. His representation is indicative of the yearnings Irish nationalists had at the time – not just the fiery Gaelic-Catholic brand of nationalism the Citizen so perfectly embodies but several other brands that, despite their differences, wanted Ireland to stand on its own rather than be defined by its subservient relationship with the world’s largest empire. They may have been nationalists, but they were also people, individuals who lived under the whims of another nation, arguing about the forgone past in their dingy pubs perhaps to distract themselves, even if for a moment, from the lack of opportunity and the undesirable conditions in which they found themselves through no fault of their own. The Dublin of 1904 naturally lends itself to such a bitter mix of outrage, delusion, and lugubriousness.

The Citizen’s diatribes sound quite similar to Joyce’s disparaging remarks about the English in “Ireland: Island of Saints and Sages” (E. Nolan, Nationalism 99; Van Mierlo 28). The Irish “mudcabins and their shielings by the roadside were laid low by the batteringram”
Joyce accused the English of using in their administration of Ireland. The Citizen of 1904 may have been a fictional character but he was based on real people and would serve as a kind of precursor to the real Joyce of 1907 in another colonial city in another fractured country in another fractured imperial empire in the same fractured continent. If Oscar Wilde’s claim that life imitates art has any standing, it may also be safe to extend his sentiment to history: that is to say, history imitates life. In Joyce’s lifetime, the “battering-ram” was turned on its masters. Ireland achieved the independence the Citizen and so many of his fellow nationalists had always dreamed of. The “cracked lookingglass of a servant” at which Stephen gloomily looks on top of the British guntower was meant to symbolize “Irish art” (U 1.147), yet it could also serve as a metaphor for the historiography Joyce, Stephen, the Citizen, Deasy, and the men in “Oxen of the Sun” among many others had to grapple with. The intense nationalism that engulfed the nation also engulfed its historiography, something Joyce never ceased to challenge even as he fell victim to it – in Paris, in Zurich, in Trieste, in Dublin, and in his work.

In the following chapters, I seek to interrogate the extent of just how “cracked” their historiography was by focusing on strategic historical events and persons. The first chapter will focus on the 1798 Rebellion, arguably one of Ireland’s fiercest and largest historical events that is referenced extensively throughout Joyce’s work. The rebellion produced extensive and extraordinarily partisan historical scholarship and a supplemental public remembrance during Joyce’s time that largely alienated Joyce. The second and third chapters are not quite as focused on a singular historical event, yet they seek to interrogate more theoretical historical issues and the various misappropriations and misinterpretations thereof.
The second chapter will center on Arthur Griffith’s misappropriation of nearly a millennium’s worth of Hungarian history that intended to justify his nationalist intentions for Ireland – a misappropriation that has inherent relations with the emergence of modern globalization, inter-European migration, and Zionism that Joyce was aware of. The third and final chapter will focus socialist historiography, a kind of historiography I will argue most closely aligns with Joyce’s own. The chapter will discuss the misinterpretations and misappropriations of a host of historical events, some as ancient as the Brehon Laws and as contemporary (in Joyce’s time) as the Boer War, as well as the dubious presence of prominent Irish socialists such as James Connolly and Roger Casement in Joyce’s work and corresponding Joycean scholarship. If the dissertation fails to adequately encompass the breadth of Irish historiography, nationalist distortions, and Joycean engagement with thereof, it can perhaps serve as an example for just how difficult, if not foolhardy, such an endeavor can be. Yet it may also serve the purpose of highlighting the intense nationalism that Joyce had to contend with, which makes such an exploration so overwhelming.
Chapter 1

Rhapsodies About Damn All: The 1798 Rebellion as the Cracked Mirror of Irish Nationalist Historiography


–U 11.626-27

In order to fully demonstrate just how contrived and contentious nationalist historiography was during Joyce’s time, this chapter will focus one of the most controversial events in Irish history, something that is referenced throughout Joyce’s work: the 1798 Rebellion. The historiography of the rebellion is fraught in controversy. Perhaps more so than the fabled decree of Laudabiliter, the rebellion is one of the most divisive and commemorated events in Irish history. It led directly to the Act of Union, legally binding Great Britain and Ireland and reducing the Irish, once a majority of their own nation, albeit with severe political and cultural restrictions for most of the population, to a minority in another nation with the same restrictions. It was to Foster “probably the most concentrated of violence in Irish history,” causing an estimated thirty-thousand deaths (Modern Ireland 280). The controversy over the causes, events, and aftermath of the rebellion began as soon as it ended. “The 1798 rebellion,” to quote Kevin Whelan’s astute observation, “was fought twice: once on the battlefields and then in the war of words which followed in those bloody footprints. . . . [It] never passed into history, because it never passed out of politics” (Tree 133). The historiography of the rebellion varied considerably over the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, demonstrating historiography’s potential as a political and ideological

---

1 Vincent J. Cheng would disagree, as he recently stated that the Battle of the Boyne of 1690, not the 1798 Rebellion, is the most commemorated event in Irish history (Amnesia 67). I would respectfully counter that they are equally torturous in Irish historical memory.
tool ripe for partisanship or, in Slote’s view, “a science in that it treats historical events as exploitable resources” (*Nietzschean Ethics* 82). Each manifestation of nationalism in Ireland during this time used, or rather, exploited the events of that year to further their political goals. The sectarianism which shaped the rebellion increased significantly afterwards, with each sect – religious, political, ethnic, and otherwise – taking the rebellion apart to drive a wedge between them. The Irish never quite let go of the rebellion as a response to England’s more recent subjugation. The physical battle was succeeded by a historiographical and, perhaps more tangibly, a personal one, more than a hundred years after the actual event.

In his overview of nineteenth and twentieth century Irish historiography *The Irish Story* (2001), Foster devotes an entire chapter to the rebellion, the only chapter to focus on a specific historical event. This is perhaps due to his belief that “1798 has, in fact, a history of commemoration, as well as a history of itself” (212). He summarizes the evolution of its historiography as follows:

The historical treatments of the rising set hard into *orthodoxy* during the nineteenth century. From the unionist side (epitomized by the enormous collections of material published by the *rabidly partisan* Richard Musgrave), it was a *bloodthirsty religious war* for the expropriation of Protestants, led by priests and fueled by the memories of the seventeenth century. Moreover, writers like Tom Moore had early on established the *nobility* of the enterprise. So did the *cult* of Robert Emmet. Much of the resistance struggle waged by Hugh O’Neill and Red Hugh O’Donnell against the Elizabethan Conquest was praised by Irish Tory romantics like Samuel Ferguson and Standish O’Grady, the glamour of Lord Edward FitzGerald and Emmet (young, handsome, articulate, liberal, Protestant) was covertly celebrated by
some unlikely protagonists from the mid nineteenth century. For the radical nationalist tradition (at least from the growth of the Young Ireland movement in the late 1830s, and further bolstered by the Fenian journalism of the 1860s), 1798 was a heroic rising against oppression, after a series of reverses for the cause of Catholic equality, precipitated by government agents provocateurs.

Both sides rather played down the French input, and the pre-existing tensions in the countryside at large. Both put the events of 1798 firmly into a continuum of linked struggles for ‘freedom’, an interpretation greatly boosted by the ‘faith-and-fatherland’ version popularized from the 1870s by the Wexford Franciscan Patrick Kavanagh and the nationalist journalist A. M. Sullivan, and apostrophized in a more mystical way by Patrick Pearse when he hailed Tone as the greatest apostle of Irish nationalism because ‘he died for us’. (216-17; my emphases)²

Although Foster parses the difference of opinion regarding 1798 to two categories, other historians such as Whelan discern several other, more specific categories: conservatives Anglicans, unionist Anglicans, evangelical Presbyterians, classical liberals, conservative Catholics, Fenians, republican radicals, and so forth. Even then, these sects can be divided into subsects with several inevitable cases of overlap. It can be so muddled, in fact, that writing about 1798 is inherently unstable and partisan. As Whelan writes, “A simple conclusion is that, whatever this writing was about, it was not directly about 1798 at all.

---

² Reverend Patrick “P. J.” Kavanagh is referenced in one of the many outrageous lists in “Cyclops” (U 12.928-29). Kavanagh’s work on 1798 was a “faith and fatherland model of the rebellion as a Catholic crusade devoid of United Irish influence” (Whelan, Fellowship 126) and “simple, even simplistic” (Tree 170). Kavanagh was also active politically, developing a friendship with activists such as Maud Gonne. Gonne claimed in A Servant of the Queen (1938) that Kavanagh wrote anti-war leaflets during the Boer War that would be distributed in army recruitment offices in Dublin by Gonne’s organization Inghinidhe na hEireann (or “Daughters of Erin”). Having “[h]onoured me with his friendship,” she wrote, Kavanagh was a “tall, ascetic, looking as if the spirit had burnt the flesh away” (292). See Gula, Tale 54-55 as well.
Therefore the standard narrative accounts of 1798 . . . have to be seen as post-rebellion polemics, not as neutral or objective sources” (Tree 174). Simple as it may be, this conclusion aptly characterizes the presentation of 1798 in Joyce’s work.

THE BATTLE OF THE BALLADS

The scholarship on the rebellion in Joyce’s work is not quite as substantial as it should be. Anne Fogarty, one of the few Joyceans to write about 1798, observed that to “connect Joyce with the 1798 rebellion may seem like a willful and arbitrary conjunction” (“‘Where Wolfe Tone’s Statue’” 19). However, she concludes that “the fitful, intermittent and seemingly scanty references to the events of 1798 and the ironic commentary on the endeavour to commemorate the rebellion a century later may be seen . . . as consistent with Joyce’s complex reworking and refraction of Irish history in his fiction” (20). Indeed, the rebellion is referenced several times in *Ulysses* and figures closely associated with it – Tone, FitzGerald, and Emmet among others – appear throughout Joyce’s work. In *Ulysses*, it is commemorated most compellingly in the medium of ballads, particularly in “Sirens.” This episode is well known for its rich musicality and linguistic complexities, yet not quite as much attention has been paid to its historiographical aspects. Bloom, Richie Goulding, Ben Dollard, Simon Dedalus, Tom Kernan, Lenehan, Hugh Boylan, and Bob Cowley gather in the Ormond Hotel for an afternoon of food, drink, and reminiscence of not just their own personal lives but the history of Ireland. The episode ends on a famous scatological note, with Bloom farting as he reads Emmet’s “Speech from the Dock” painted on a shop window. Towards the end of his stay at the Ormond, most of them (Lenehan and Boylan have left at this point) gather around Dollard as he plays on the piano “The Croppy Boy,” a ballad
dedicated to the rebellion, while Bloom sits in the dining room writing a letter to Martha Clifford. The ballad is rather mawkish if not preposterous in its outlook (“[l]ugugugubrious” and “[l]umpmusic” according to Bloom [11.1005-6]), yet it strikes a nerve with the group. The ballad is interspersed throughout Bloom’s internal monologue and is intertwined with a few other ballads regarding the period, including “The Memory of the Dead,” “The Boys of Wexford,” and “The Thirty-Two Counties,” during Dollard’s rendition and shortly afterwards. The allusions to these ballads reveal the sentiments many Irish held regarding the rebellion, the actual events and the ramifications that reverberated throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

*Shed a Tear for the Croppy Boy.* There is little doubt as to why Joyce decided to use “The Croppy Boy” in “Sirens.” It was one of the most well-known ballads regarding the rebellion from the nineteenth century. Although its origins can be traced to Wexford a few years after the rebellion, it wasn’t published in print until 1845. Appearing in *The Nation* under the name of Carroll Malone (the pseudonym of William B. McBurney), “The Croppy Boy” quickly became popular. Joyce himself was an admirer of the song. In a letter to his son Giorgio in 1934, Joyce wrote out the song for him and characterized it as “a pure and noble musical poem, profoundly sincere and dramatic. . . . This is not a patriotic song like *Wearing of the Green.* You could sing it just as well at Sheffield as at Cork” (*L* 3:334, 336). His description is surprising considering its overt nationalist overtones and association with certain nationalist movements. Ostensibly, it lends credence to Joyce’s “apolitical” reputation. Indeed, *Ulysses* demonstrates that the ballad can be divorced, at least somewhat, from its political and historical connotations. The first reference to “The Croppy Boy” in the novel is
less than flattering. In “Hades,” Martin Cunningham, Jack Power, and Simon Dedalus mock Kernan’s adulation of Dollard’s singing of the ballad:

–O, draw him out, Martin, Mr Power said eagerly. Wait till you hear him, Simon, on Ben Dollard’s singing of The Croppy Boy.

–Immense, Martin Cunningham said pompously. His singing of that simple ballad, Martin, is the most trenchant rendering I ever heard in the whole course of my experience.

–Trenchant, Mr Power said laughing. He’s dead nuts on that. And the retrospective arrangement. (6.144-50)

The men initially do not appear to take Kernan or the song seriously, although Simon is eventually overcome by the song in “Sirens.” Kernan himself elaborates on his praise in “Wandering Rocks.” Kernan is a unionist who among other things claimed FitzGerald and many in the United Irishmen “were on the wrong side” (10.789-90). He muses about the brutal execution of Robert Emmet on Thomas Street: “Greasy black rope. Dogs licking the blood off the street when the lord lieutenant’s wife drove by in her noddy” (10.764-66). The imagery of the blood-soaked street and dogs licking it up would become a common trope in the recollection of Emmet’s execution. Pádraic Pearse, for example, referenced it in a speech he delivered in 1914, claiming he had heard it from a friend that knew an old woman who claims she was there (70-71). Incidentally, this description bears close resemblance to a similar scene in William John FitzPatrick’s The Sham Squire (1866), one of the more popular accounts of the rebellion, as related by an eyewitness: “After, or about this time, the executions at the corner of Bridgefoot Street, in Thomas Street, were going on, and the blood flowing from the block whereon the poor rebels were quartered clogged up the sewers, and
some dogs were licking it up” (184). Joyce owned a copy of the book in his Trieste library (Ellmann, *Consciousness* 108), making it possible Kernan’s thought is derived from it. Regardless, Kernan comments on FitzGerald. Granting that FitzGerald and his lot “were gentlemen,” he is reminded of Dollard’s “[m]asterly rendition” of “that ballad”: “At the siege of Ross did my father fall” (*U* 10.791-93). The scene ends on an ironic note when he curses himself for missing the Lord Lieutenant’s cavalcade along Pembroke Quay. In “Sirens,” Kernan pressures Dollard to perform the ballad. “The Croppy Boy. Our native Doric” (11.991). As Dollard sings, Bloom’s mind dithers on various subjects, many of which have nothing to do with the rebellion or nationalism. While Kernan, Dollard, Dedalus, Cowley, and the barmaids become enchanted by the song, Bloom has become increasingly despondent. His discussion with Goulding has left him jaded and not in a particularly receptive mood to bar-singing, and he is certainly not swept up by its nationalist sentiments. In fact, he scoffs at the idea that the eponymous character would not have known the priest was a British agent. “Breathe a prayer, drop a tear. All the same he must have been a bit of a natural not to see it was a yeoman cap” (11.1248-49). Bloom’s distance from the ballad and its enthusiasts is palpable both intellectually and, quite literally, physically, as he is in the dining room.

Before delving into the place of the ballad in “Sirens,” it is important to understand the context in which the ballad as a medium was written and spread. Ballads or “street songs” have existed in Europe for centuries. In Ireland, they can trace their origins to its extensive bardic traditions, yet the first Irish ballads commemorating modern political and historical events can trace its origins to the late-seventeenth century during the Jacobite wars. During the eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries, ballads were one of the most prominent
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mediums in which to convey political and ideological messages, and they remained popular up to the early-twentieth century (Zimmermann 15-36). In the late-eighteenth century, during the rise of the Volunteers, the United Irishmen, and other rebel groups, they became especially important in disseminating their message. The leaders of the United Irishmen faced a challenge in delivering their message to a largely illiterate populace; although the literary rates of the period are difficult to determine, it is likely that during the 1790s more than half of the population could not read or write, and it was not until the mid-nineteenth century that a majority of Irish were literate (A. Murphy 25). The high rates of illiteracy during that time hindered the United Irishmen, the upper echelon of which were highly educated (many at Trinity College). There is considerable debate about the extent in which printed material influenced the rebellion. James S. Donnelly Jr., for example, points out that “the political impact of the press might be considered insignificant. In fact, however, neither the small printings nor the high level of illiteracy offers any guide to the popular influence of the newspapers in the United Irish camp” (6-7). Radical newspapers such as the Northern Star and the Union Star flourished during the 1790s, as did radical pamphlets. Public readings of newspapers, pamphlets, and other materials helped disseminate information and rally the populace behind the cause (A. Murphy 32-33; Donnelly Jr. 5-7; Whelan, Tree 59-74). In 1795, a collection of political ballads, crudely named Paddy’s Resource, was published in Belfast and soon became a bestseller not only in Ireland but in the United States. The book offers a glimpse into the patriotic zeal the United Irishmen stirred. According to Donnelly Jr., the ballads contained three overarching themes: “the thoroughly oppressive nature of the existing political and social order; an uncritical, indeed lyrical, admiration for the principles of the French Revolution, together with gloating over the progress of French
arms; and stirring calls for religious amity, self-respect, and total dedication to the cause of national independence” (11). Incidentally, *Paddy’s Resource* also gave birth to Ireland’s most famous nickname, the “Emerald Isle,” which appeared in the poem “Erin” by William Drennan and was popularized by a 1798 edition of the volume (Beiner, *Forgetful Remembrance* 1). There were many factors that led to this embrace of radical writing, yet Thomas Paine’s *The Rights of Man* (1791) played an instrumental role (Beiner, “Disremembering 1798” 12; Donnelly Jr. 8). Tone himself confirmed this when he wrote in his autobiography that *The Rights of Man* was “the Koran of Blefescu [Belfast]” (41).

Radicals were eager to spread the word by whatever means necessary, and ballads were an imperfect yet nevertheless effective propaganda tool used by the United Irishmen.

In the leadup to the rebellion, the United Irishmen made a tactical decision to proliferate ballads for political ends. The group:

consciously turned to political ballads as a major means of spreading republican ideology and stimulating revolutionary enthusiasm. In doing so, they showed a sound political instinct. Not only was the oral folk tradition in Irish rich in song, poem, and story, but the broadside ballad in English had also become common in rural areas by the closing decades of the eighteenth century. (Donnelly Jr. 10)

Although few original copies of ballads from 1798 remain (Donnelly Jr. 11; Dunne 149; Moulden 28; Zimmermann 40), they are both enlightening and contradictory with regard to the United Irish cause and to its broader effects on the population. As Tom Dunne notes, “neither the popular nor the bourgeois ballads can be read in any simple way as evidence of politicisation. Instead they offer dim and constricted reflections of what some
contemporaries thought popular political mentalities were, or could be, and – given the paucity of other sources – they have real value” (140).³

The ballads from the rebellion and those that commemorated them are a reflection of the intrigues of historiography: its veracity, its polarization, and its appeal to the masses. Not even the so-called “eyewitness accounts” were immune to partisanship and scrutiny. They were, in fact, engulfed by them. A mere five years after the rebellion, two seminal memoirs were published: Memoirs of the Different Rebellions in Ireland (sometimes known as Memoirs of the Various Rebellions in Ireland) (1801) by Sir Richard Musgrave and The History of the Irish Insurrection (1803) by Edward Hay. The two memoirs embody the deep partisanship and sectarianism regarding the historiography of the rebellion. Musgrave’s account is a blistering indictment of the United Irishmen. Musgrave, who was an Anglican unionist from Ulster, a former member of Grattan’s Parliament, and an unapologetic member of the Protestant Ascendancy, laid the groundwork for the sectarianism that would characterize the nineteenth century in that he accused not just the United Irishmen but the entire Irish Catholic population of stirring religious hatred. Not only did the “popish bigots” want to depart from England, they desired to expel the Protestants from Ireland:

It is not what is erroneously and ridiculously called emancipation that the mass of the Irish Roman Catholics want: it is the extirpation or expulsion of the Protestants, the

³ For a broader discussion of the effects of literacy, public readings, and eighteenth century “pop culture” in Ireland, see A. Murphy (particularly 17-48) and Whelan, Tree 59-98.

Thomas Davis, for one, argued in 1844 that ballads were not as accurate or insightful as prose history – “the worst prose history is superior to the best Ballad ones” – but nevertheless grasped the “highest ends of history”:

To hollow or accuse the scenes of glory and honour, or of shame and sorrow; to give to the imagination the arms, and homes, and senates, and battles of other days; to reuse, and soften, and strengthen, and enlarge us with the passions of great periods; to lend us into love of self-denial, of justice, of beauty, of valour, of generous life and proud death; and to set up in our souls the memory of great men, who shall then be as models and judges of our actions – these are the highest duties of history, and these are best taught by a Ballad History. (“A Ballad History of Ireland” 122)
exclusive occupation of the island for themselves and its separation from England, which they have aimed at from the beginning of Elizabeth’s reign to the late rebellion; and which the rebels unequivocally announced, whenever they spoke their real sentiments without fear or restraint. (2:482)

His memoir is a two-volume tome rife with accounts of Catholic barbarity and intolerance. His account of Catholic savagery rivals those from the accounts of the massacres from 1641. His description of the insurrection in Kildare, for example, is as follows:

The following horrid circumstances attended the murder of George Crawford, and his grandchild of the age of fourteen years. He had formerly served so long in the fifth dragoons, as to be entitled to a pension, and was at that time a permanent sergeant in Captain Taylor's corps of yeomen cavalry. He, his wife, and granddaughter, were stopped by a party of the rebels as they were endeavouring to make their escape, and were reproached with the appellation of heretics, because they were of the protestant religion. One of them struck his wife with a musket, and another gave her a stab of a pike in the back, with an intent of murdering her. Her husband, having endeavoured to save her, was knocked down, and received several blows of a sirelock, which disabled him from making his escape. While they were disputing whether they should kill them, she stole behind a hedge, and concealed herself. They then massacred her husband with pikes; and her granddaughter having thrown herself on his body to protect him, received so many wounds in the breast, the head, and thighs, that she soon after expired. (1:303)

In contrast to Musgrave’s account, Hay’s was sympathetic to the United Irish cause. A participant in the rebellion who was tried and acquitted in court several times, Hay blamed
England and the Irish Protestants, particularly the Orangemen, for provoking the rebellion. He claims that members of the United Irishmen such as himself were reluctant to wage war but ultimately had no choice given the government’s provocations and the unrelenting bigotry of Protestant extremists. He also highlighted the United Irishmen’s opposition to sectarianism. If sectarianism was the root cause of the conflict, it was because of the terror induced by the Protestants. His memoir is also full of horror stories regarding the British army and yeomen. He describes, for example, a lurid atrocity of a yeoman captain, one Mr. Gowan:

On a public day in the week preceding the insurrection, the town of Gorey beheld the triumphal entry of Mr. Gowan at the head of his corps, with his sword drawn, and a human finger stuck on the point of it.

With this trophy he marched into the town, parading up and down the streets several times, so that there was not a person in Gorey who did not witness this exhibition; while in the mean time the triumphant corps displayed all the devices of Orangemen. After the labor and fatigue of the day, Mr. Gowan and his men retired to a public-house to refresh themselves; and, like true blades of game, their punch was stirred about with the finger that had graced their ovation, in imitation of keen fox-hunters, who whisk a bowl of punch with the brush of a fox before their boozing commences. This captain and magistrate afterwards went to the house of Mr. Jones, where his daughters were; and, while taking a snack that was set before him, he bragged of having blooded his corps that day, and that they were as stanch bloodhounds as any in the world. The daughters begged of their father to show them the croppy finger, which he deliberately took from his pocket and handed to them.
Misses dallied it about with senseless exultation, at which a young lady in the room was so shocked that she turned about to a window, holding her hand to her face to avoid the horrid sight. Mr. Gowan perceiving this, took the finger from his daughters, and *archly* dropped it into the disgusted lady’s bosom. She instantly fainted, and thus the scene ended! (118-19)

One of the horror stories that peripherally appears in *Ulysses* is the tale of “Tom the Devil,” a sergeant of the North Cork regiment who was according to Hay “most ingenious in devising new modes of torture” such as rubbing moist gunpowder into the hair of suspected rebels and lighting it on fire (106), a practice known as “pitchcapping.” Tom the Devil makes a brief appearance in “Penelope” when Molly recalls a “Tom the Devils ad” (*U* 18.1343). Although Molly doesn’t elaborate, nor is it clear if Joyce was alluding to the memoir directly, the reference demonstrates how Tom the Devil and the atrocities of his fellow soldiers as recollected by Hay were seared into the Irish psyche more than one hundred years after the rebellion.

Of the two accounts, Musgrave’s was especially influential. What made Musgrave so damaging was his denial of the notion that the United Irishmen rebellion was based on secular, republican principles that were closely aligned with those of the Enlightenment and the French republicans. This point, perhaps more so than his sensationalist horror stories, was a truly dishonest and partisan misreading of the United Irishmen. Musgrave conveniently ignores the fact that many Protestants, Presbyterians especially, joined and indeed led the United Irishmen. As Marianne Elliott points out, “the ideas of the United Irishmen were quite in keeping with the radicalism inherent in Presbyterianism” and “United Irish thinking was steeped in the Presbyterian contractual tradition, and it was this old, yet deeply revolutionary
tradition, which was behind their reluctant resort to arms after 1795” (*Watchmen* 9, 12). His account, moreover, may have had a role in influencing public opinion in Great Britain against the Irish (*Whelan, Tree* 143). It received fierce criticism from scholars such as Plowden, who called his work “false, inflammatory and malignant” (qtd. in Woods, “Plowden”). Likewise, Hay’s account muddled many aspects of the rebellion and seems to downplay the role the United Irishmen, especially in Wexford. It had a “marked lack of specific detail,” which was “designed to minimize any legal repercussions” (Whelan, *Tree* 158). Both memoirs, albeit in different ways and to different effects, discredited the nonsectarian origins of the rebellion and established the precedent of describing the rebellion as unequivocally sectarian. During the next sixty years after the rebellion, several accounts, ranging from long memoirs to short journal articles, were published along these lines, and many of them reiterated if not reprinted entire sections of Hay and Musgrave’s work. John Mitchel’s *The History of Ireland* (1869), for example, quotes extensively from Hay, including entire paragraphs (1:247-304, 2:13-95). *Kavanagh’s A Popular History of the Insurrection of 1798* (1870) quotes Hay approximately fifty times. Although each subdivision of Irish society such as the Catholic Church, the radical republicans, the Presbyterians, and the parliamentary liberals among others had a different judgement of the rebellion, the essence of these arguments were bitter and partisan (*Whelan, Tree* 133-75). There was always at least one particular religious group that provoked the rebellion. The republican, inclusive nature of the United Irishmen was either

---

4 For more regarding the significant Presbyterian influence on the United Irishmen, see Elliott, *Partners* and *Watchmen*; McBride, *History* 67-94 and “Protestant” 305-30; and *Whelan, Fellowship* and *Tree*. The intransigence of Irish Presbyterians can be traced well before the late-eighteenth century. John Milton, for example, wrote in 1649 that they “open their mouths . . . with as much devilish malice, impudence, and falsehood, as any Irish rebel . . . and from a barbarous nook of Ireland brand us with the extirpation of laws and liberties; things which they seem as little to understand, as aught that belong to good letters or humanity.” He also called them “a generation of highland thieves” who “proved ungrateful and treacherous guests” (qtd. in Elliott, *Watchmen* 9-10).

5 See note 32 of the introduction of this dissertation.
downplayed or ignored outright. By the end of the nineteenth century the historiography of
1798 was “forced into the straitjacket of sectarian interpretation” (Gula, Tale 54).6

This assessment, however, has lost legitimacy over time. Modern historians such as
Richard Kearney argue that the United Irishmen were largely “universalists,” committed to
creating a secular, nonsectarian society based on the ideals of the Enlightenment and the
French republicans’ 1789 “Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen.” As he
writes, this “early idea of the Irish republic was largely universalist, therefore, in the sense
that it operated on the assumption that once the antagonisms of embattled religions,
languages and races disappeared a new culture of world citizenship would take its place”
(30). Foster maintains that the United Irishmen were “internationalist liberals” who had
“little time for ‘ethnic’ considerations” (Modern Ireland 270). Their alleged sectarianism is
one of the most contested points in the historiography of the rebellion. Although there is
evidence that many in the movement, especially Catholics, secretly wanted separation from
England and the creation of a homogenous ethnoreligious state – something that the fin de
siècle Gaelic-Catholic nationalist movements openly advocated – the United Irishmen
remained loyal to republican principles leading up to and during the rebellion. It is only
afterwards that the supposedly sectarian impetus of the rebellion was maintained by both

6 Prominent memoirs, accounts, and historical novels about the rebellion published in the nineteenth-century
include The Autobiography of Wolfe Tone (1826); The Sham Squire (1866) and Secret Service Under Pitt (1892)
by William John FitzPatrick; O’Halloran; or, The Insurgent Chief (1824) by James McHenry; A Popular
History of the Insurrection of 1798 (1870) by Patrick “P. J.” Kavanagh; Charlton, or, Scenes in the North of
Ireland (1823) by John Gamble; Yesterday in Ireland (1829) by Eyre Evans Crowe; Personal Narrative of the
“Irish Rebellion” of 1798 (1828) and Sequel to Personal Narrative of the “Irish Rebellion” of 1798 (1832) by
Charles Hamilton Teeling; The United Irishmen, Their Lives and Times (1842) by Richard R. Madden; History
of the Irish Rebellion in 1798 (1845) by W. H. Maxwell; Some Account of the First Apparent Symptoms of the
Later Rebellion in the County of Kildare (1800) by James Alexander; Memoirs of Myles Byrne (1863) by Myles
Byrne; A Personal Narrative (1832) by Thomas Clooney; The History of Ireland (1:247-304, 2:13-95) (1869)
by John Mitchel; The History of Ireland (2:362-520) (1809) by Francis Plowden; The History of the Rebellion
in Ireland (1803) by James Gordon; “Recollections of the Battle of Ballynahinch” (1825) by Iota (James
Thomson); and “Recollections of 1798” (1825) by E. (Samuel Edgar).
Gaelic-Catholic nationalists and Protestant unionists, particularly in Ulster. As Whelan characterizes it, “the curious trajectory of Irish political nationalism in the 1790s . . . entered the decade as a Protestant phenomenon but exited it as a Catholic one” (Tree 140).7

“The Croppy Boy” fits neatly in this divide. It is patently supportive of the United Irishmen and, specifically, the Catholics. The rebels are exclusively associated with Catholics. The eponymous character does not consult a United Irish official or even a military rebel but rather a priest. The evil (not to mention sacrilegious) yeoman taunts the croppy boy after revealing himself, telling him that he has “one short hour” to live. “And, Amen, say I, may all traitors swing!” (qtd. in Bauerle 270). The poem is bleak if not gothic, but more importantly, it is sympathetic to the United Irish cause and demonizes the English one. The term “croppy” itself is loaded. It refers to the tonsured or “cropped” hairstyle of the French republicans that were adopted by many United Irishmen, including FitzGerald. Although initially a secular symbol, it was quickly used as a slur by Orangemen against Catholics (Dunne 141; Paulin 94). It was also at times levied against supposed Catholic sympathizers such as the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland during the rebellion, General Charles Cornwallis, who was nicknamed “Cropwallis” due to his perceived leniency toward the rebels (Whelan, Tree 143). “The Croppy Boy” retained its sectarian character well into the nineteenth century. As mentioned, the ballad was published in The Nation in 1845 at the height of the Young Irelanders movement. Like the United Irishmen, the Young Irelanders attempted to construct a nonsectarian, uniform Irish nationalist identity in part by creating a “heterogenous and

---

7 There are a number of sources that elaborate on the United Irishmen’s republican ideals and the retroactive manipulation of those ideals after the rebellion. See Bartlett et al.; Beiner, “Disremembering 1798” 9-36 and Forgetful Remembrance; Elliott, Partners xiii-xx, 3-50; Foster, Modern Ireland 259-86; Gering 151-55; Kearney 25-38; O. MacDonagh, States 1-14; and Whelan, Fellowship and Tree. These texts do engage in thorough discussions of other factors such as economics, class, and of course religion, yet they all maintain the United Irishmen’s initial nonsectarian character.
hybridized culture” that purged ballads like “The Croppy Boy” of its sectarian context (Lloyd, *Anomalous States* 99). However, the project failed as ballads and other works of art were used to reinforce rather than dismantle sectarianism. The ballad and the term croppy were so closely associated with Catholic sectarianism that it retained its character well into the late-twentieth century.⁸

Yet despite this, the ballad is beloved by unionist Kernan and the rest of the group, who are not exactly unionists, eliciting what F. L. Radford calls “a mélange of confused loyalties” (278). Joyce was also an admirer of the ballad, having sung it several times in his youth and even in a concert in 1904 (which a critic from *Freeman’s Journal* described as a “pathetic rendering”) (JJ 52, 168). And Bloom, despite his identification with Ireland and its struggles with England, is not roused by the song compared to Dollard and the others. Joyce recontextualizes (though not totally invalidates) “The Croppy Boy”: its content, its reception, its structure, and its underlying themes. As Lloyd argues, Joyce “adulterates” many of the ballads in *Ulysses* both as a “motif and stylistic principle” (*Anomalous States* 108). Regarding the content, Joyce and the singing group in *Ulysses* dismisses its nationalist and sectarian meaning, focusing instead on its aesthetic value and the personal character of the eponymous croppy. He compares it to “The Wearing of the Green,” another ballad commemorating 1798 first published in the 1840s. The ballad commends the rebels for their

---

⁸ August Gering, for example, argues that Seamus Heaney and Paul Muldoon retained this association in their work. Heaney’s 1969 poem “Requiem for the Croppies” “identifies the United Irishmen in exclusively Catholic terms. This approach . . . became a feature of his early poetry” (158). His 1971 poem “Craig’s Dragoons” “follows ‘Requiem for the Croppies’ in its undercutting of the notion of a transreligious united front through its use of sectarian-charged language. . . . [T]he title and musical setting of ‘Craig’s Dragoons’ reify the religious factionalism challenged by the ecumenical United Irishmen and the Young Irelanders” (161-62). Likewise, Muldoon’s 1983 poem “The More a Man Has, the More a Man Wants” “registers the enthusiasm (and fanaticism) that such nationalistic cultural responses can generate” (170). Even as Muldoon “indicates the potential for ecumenical alliance by remembering the Protestant heroes of the United Irishmen Rising, he undercuts that possibility by intimating the ultimate superseding of the Unitedmen’s ideals by a narrowly Catholic Irish nationalism” (172).
bravery against the English, who are “hanging men and women there for wearin’ of the green” (qtd. in Bauerle 221). Although the song is considerably more violent than “The Croppy Boy” both in its descriptions of violence and its call to arms (“then since the colour we must wear is England's cruel red / 'Twill serve but to remind us of the blood that she [Ireland] has shed”), its core message of British treachery, republican virtue, and heroism is similar to that of “The Croppy Boy.” Joyce, however, draws a distinction between the “patriotism” of “The Wearing of the Green” and the “sincere” and “dramatic” qualities of “The Croppy Boy.”

---

9 For reference, the lyrics to “The Wearing of the Green” are as follows:

Oh, Paddy dear, and did you hear
The news that's going round?
The shamrock is forbid by law
To grow on Irish ground;

St. Patrick’s Day no more we’ll keep,
His color can't be seen,
For there’s a cruel law again
The wearin’ of the green.

I met with Napper Tandy
And he took me by the hand,
And he said, “How’s poor old Ireland,
And how does she stand?”

“She’s the most distressful country
That ever yet was seen,
They’re hanging men and women there
For wearin’ of the green.”

Then since the color we must wear
Is England’s cruel red,
'Twill serve but to remind us of
The blood that they have shed;

You may take the shamrock from your hat
And cast it on the sod,
But, never fear, 'twill take root there
Tho’ under foot 'tis trod.

When laws can stop the blades of green
From growing as they grow,
And when the leaves in summer time
Their verdure dare not show,
It is puzzling as to why this is. One clue that stands out is his actual transcription of “The Croppy Boy.” Ellmann writes that Joyce’s transcription of the ballad in his letter is “inaccurate in places” (L 3:334), and Zack Bowen makes the same point with regard to its rendition in “Sirens” (Musical Allusions 197). It is more fitting to describe Joyce’s transcription as “inconsistent” rather than “inaccurate,” as variation is inherently in the nature of ballads. Printers would often copy ballads from other printers, leaving room for omissions, improvisations, and of course incompetence (Moulden 28). Though not inaccurate, Joyce’s transcription may not have been in line with the one Dollard would have most likely used in 1904. Moreover, Joyce wrote the letter in 1934, roughly fifteen years after his composition of Ulysses. There are several versions of the ballad and it is difficult to tell which version Joyce referenced. Regardless, there are certain changes that differ significantly from the original version in The Nation. The following is the original version published in 1845:

“Good men and true! in this house who dwell,
To a stranger bouchel, I pray you tell,
Is the Priest at home? or may he be seen?
I would speak a word with the Father Green.”

“The Priest’s at home, boy, and he may be seen;
‘Tis easy speaking with Father Green;
But you must wait, till I go and see

Then I will change the color that I Wear in my caubeen; But till that day, please God, I’ll stick To wearin’ of the green. (qtd. in Bauerle 221)
If the holy father alone may be."

The youth has entered an empty hall –
What a lonely sound has his light foot-fall!
And the gloomy chamber’s chill and bare,
With a vested Priest in a lonely chair.

The youth has knelt to tell his sins:
“Nomine Dei,” the youth beings;
At “mea culpa” he beats his breast,
And in broken murmurs he speaks the rest.

“At the siege of Ross did my father fall,
And at Gorey my gallant brothers all.
I alone am left of my name and race,
I will go to Wexford and take their place.

“I cursed three times since last Easter day –
Once at mass time I went to play;
I passed the churchyard one day in haste,
And forgot to pray for my mother’s rest.

“I bear no hate against living thing;
But I love my country above my King.

Now, Father! bless me, and let me go
To die, if God has ordained it so.”

The Priest said nought, but a rustling noise
Made the youth look above in wild surprise;
The robes were off, and in the scarlet there
Sat a yeoman captain with fiery glare.

With fiery glare and with fury hoarse,
Instead of blessing, he breathed a curse: –
“’Twas a good thought, boy, to come here and shrive;
For one short hour is your time to live.

“Upon yon river three tenders float,
The Priest’s in one, if he isn’t shot –
We hold his house for our Lord the King.
And, amen say I, may all traitors swing!”

At Geneva Barrack that young man died,
And at Passage they have his body laid.
Good people who live in peace and joy,
Breath a prayer and a tear for the Croppy Boy. (203)\textsuperscript{10}

Compare this to what Joyce wrote:

Good men and true in this house who dwell
To a \textit{country} bouchel (boy) I pray you tell
Is the priest at home and can he be seen
I would speak a word with Father \textit{Breen}.

The priest’s at home and he may be seen
Tis aisy talking with Father \textit{Breen}
So just step inside until I see
If the holy father alone may be.

The youth has entered a lonely hall
What a solemn sound makes his low footfall
And the gloomy chamber is chill and bare
With a vested priest in an oaken chair.

The youth has knelt and confessed his sins.
In \textit{nominee Dei} the youth begins
And at \textit{mea culpa} he beats his breast
And in broken murmurs confesses the rest.

---

\textsuperscript{10} With the exception of “bouchel” in line 2 and the Latin phrases in lines 14 and 15, the emphases are my own.
I cursed three times since last Easter Day
And at masstime once I went to play
I passed the churchyard one day in haste
And forgot to pray for my mother’s rest.

I bear no hate to a living thing
But I love my country beyond the King
So bless me, father, and let me go
To die, if God has ordered it so.

The priest said nought but a rustling noise
Made the youth look up in wild surprise
And before his eyes there sat in a chair
A yeoman captain with fiery glare.

With fiery glare and with fury hoarse
Instead of a blessing he breathed a curse
’Twas a good thought boy to come here and shrive
For one short hour is your time to live.

On yonder river two tenders float
The priest’s in one if he isn’t shot
I hold this house for my lord the King
And Amen, say I, may all traitors swing!

At Geneva barracks that young man died
And at Passage they have his body laid.

Good people, who hear this in peace and joy,

Breathe a prayer, drop a tear, for the Croppy Boy. (L 3:334-35)\(^{11}\)

There are a number of differences between the two versions. Most are inconsequential substitutions of words and punctuation that are natural results of transcriptions published over decades. One such difference, for example, is that the “three tenders” of line 37 in the original is changed to “two tenders” of line 33 in Joyce’s version. Although not particularly important, whether this was in the version Joyce cited or a careless mistake on his part is unclear. Yet a few of the differences, emphasized above, are noteworthy. In line 2, Joyce’s croppy boy is described as a “country” bouchel rather than a “stranger” bouchel in the original. This is significant in that “country” assigns a specific identity to the croppy boy, rather than a “stranger” who theoretically could reside anywhere. This change may have been due to the perception of the United Irish rebellion of being a rural, agrarian uprising as opposed to an unanimously Irish one. Given that many strains of fin de siècle cultural nationalism characterized the country as being “organically” Irish (perhaps best represented in Yeats), the change is fitting.\(^{12}\) Even more conspicuous is the next major change. Joyce’s version has a Father “Breen” in lines 4 and 6, as opposed to the Father “Green” of the original

---

\(^{11}\) With the exception of the Latin phrases in lines 14 and 15, the emphases are my own.

\(^{12}\) The cultural and political “rivalry” between country and urban Irish persisted well after the end of the Irish Revival. For example, Maud Griffith, the wife of Arthur, complained to W. T. Cosgrave in 1926 that the new Irish Free State government “made one think how dreadful we [Dubliners] were not country people” (qtd. in Dolan 179). See Berger, “Towards a Global” 3; McGee 116; O’Connell 174-77; A. Smith 69; and Tymoczko 158-59.
version. It is, perhaps, the least subtle difference between the two versions. Green, of course, is the color most associated with Ireland and, as “The Wearing of the Green” and indeed many other ballads show, the United Irishmen. In the original version, the priest is quite obviously associated with Ireland, yet this association is lost in Joyce’s Father “Breen.” Such a stark difference would not have been unnoticed by Joyce. He either appreciated this change in that it made the ballad more “sincere” and less sectarian or he deliberately changed the name to fit his personal preferences. In lines 22 and 35, there are small differences that alter the meaning significantly in reference to the King. Rather than “I love my country above my King” of the original, Joyce’s version has it as “beyond the” King. The “my” in the original endears the croppy boy, even if begrudgingly, to the crown, whereas the “the” in Joyce’s version makes no such admission of endearment or loyalty. Again, the “for our Lord the King” of the original is changed to “for my lord the King.” The yeoman in the original says “our Lord” in that he believes the Irish are still unquestionably subjects of the crown. Yet the yeoman in Joyce’s version says “my lord,” implying that he acknowledges the croppy boy’s lack of sincere allegiance to the crown. Either way, Joyce’s version subtly highlights rather than ignores the sectarian differences between the two characters, which is the opposite effect of the “Green/Breen” switch earlier in the ballad.

However, the most glaring difference between the two versions is not a change of the text but rather an omission. The fifth stanza of the original version (“At the siege of Ross . . . and take their place”) is missing in Joyce’s version. The stanza contains the only specific references to the 1798 Rebellion and the major battles fought in Wexford. Both versions do reference the Geneva Barracks in Wexford, yet they are made in passing and are rather impersonal. In contrast, the fifth stanza is in first-person. It establishes the personal reasons
why the croppy boy wants to fight, the deaths of his brothers and father, while also acknowledging the political ones: to protect his “name and race.” Most of all, it is the only part of the ballad that mentions Wexford outright. The removal of this stanza in Joyce’s version further depoliticizes, decontextualizes, and dislocates the ballad from Wexford and 1798.

In “Sirens,” “The Croppy Boy” unfolds in an internal monologue. With a few exceptions, Bloom summarizes, rewords, or embellishes the stanzas rather than quotes them verbatim. When the various fragments are compiled and placed together, it looks like this:

[G]ood men and true. The priest he sought. With him would he speak a word. . . . The priest’s at home. A false priest’s servant bade him welcome. Step in. The holy father. . . . The voice of warning, solemn fell his footsteps there, told them the gloomy chamber, the vested priest sitting to shrive. . . . In nomine Domini, in God’s name he knelt. He beat his hand upon his breast, confessing: mea culpa. . . . His sins. Since Easter he had cursed three times. You bitch’s bast. And once at masstime he had gone to play. Once by the churchyard he had passed and for his mother’s rest he had not prayed. A boy. A croppy boy. . . . All gone. All fallen. At the siege of Ross his father, at Gorey all his brothers fell. To Wexford, we are the boys of Wexford, he would. Last of his name and race. . . . He bore no hate. . . . My country above the king. . . . Bless me, father, Dollard the croppy cried. Bless me and let me go. . . . The false priest rustling soldier from his cassock. A yeoman captain. . . . With hoarse rude fury the yeoman cursed, swelling in apoplectic bitch’s bastard. A good thought, boy, to come. One hour’s your time to live, your last. . . . On yonder river. . . . I hold this house. Amen. He gnashed in fury. Traitors swing. . . . At Geneva barrack that young man
died. At Passage was his body laid. Dolor! . . . Pray for him, prayed the bass of Dollard. You who hear in peace. Breathe a prayer, drop a tear, good men, good people. He was the croppy boy. \( (U\ 11.1008-9,\ 1016-17,\ 1020-22,\ 1032-33,\ 1040-43,\ 1063-65,\ 1068,\ 1072,\ 1074,\ 1081-82,\ 1097-99,\ 1105-6,\ 1120,\ 1131-32,\ 1139-41) \)

With the exception of the fifth stanza, the ballad is sung in order of the original. Bloom’s internal rendition riffs on key elements while retaining, with exceptions, its original structure. His rendition does not so much repeat the lyrics as it curtly narrates them, and much like Joyce’s 1934 letter, some lyrics are missing or incorrect. The first two stanzas rendered by Bloom do not mention the priest’s name, yet Bloom does reveal early on the priest’s treachery (“the false priest’s servant” [11.1016]). The “vested priest sitting to shrive” (11.1022; my emphasis) transplants the word “shrive” from line 35 of the original ballad, another noticeable jump in the rendition. When Bloom describes the fifth stanza, he weirdly mentioned “the boys of Wexford” (11.1064). Not only is this not in the original ballad, it is an allusion to two other ballads. The “Boys of Wexford” was another ballad that commemorated 1798, first alluded to in \textit{Ulysses} in “Aeolus” (7.427-8). “The Boys of Kilkenny,” unlike “The Croppy Boy,” does not commemorate 1798 and is rather anodyne.\(^{13}\)

---

\(^{13}\) For reference, here are the lyrics to “The Boys of Kilkenny”:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{The Boys of Kilkenny are stout roving blades} \\
\text{Whenever they meet with the nice little maids} \\
\text{They kiss them and coax them and spend money free} \\
\text{Of all towns in Ireland, Kilkenny’s for me} \\
\text{In the Town of Kilkenny, there runs a clear stream} \\
\text{In the Town of Kilkenny, there lives a fair dame} \\
\text{Her lips are like roses, her cheeks much the same} \\
\text{Like a dish of fresh strawberries covered in cream} \\
\text{Like a dish of fresh strawberries covered in cream} \\
\text{Her eyes are as black as Kilkenny’s famed coal} \\
\text{Which through my poor bosom have burnt a big hole} \\
\text{Her mind like its river is mild, clear and pure}
\end{align*}
\]
Moreover, the ballad appears earlier in “Proteus,” when Stephen recalls Kevin Egan teaching it to his son Patrice. “I taught him to sing *The boys of Kilkenny are stout roaring blades*. Old Kilkenny: saint Canice, Strongbow’s castle on the Nore. Goes like this. *O, O*. He takes me, Napper Tandy, by the hand. *O, O the boys of Kilkenny . . . .*” (3.257-62). Interestingly, Stephen quotes two ballads instead of one. The “Napper Tandy” line is from “The Wearing of the

But her heart is more hard nor its marble I’m sure
Her heart is more hard nor its marble I’m sure

Kilkenny’s a fine town, it shines where it stands
The more I think on it, the more my heart warms
If I was in Kilkenny, I’d think myself at home
For it’s there I’d have sweethearts, but here I have none
It’s there I’d have sweethearts, but here I have none ("Boys of Kilkenny")

Compare them to the lyrics of “The Boys of Wexford”:
In comes the captain’s daughter, the captain of the Yeos,
Saying, “Brave United man, we’ll ne’er again be foes:
A thousand pounds I’ll give you and fly from home with thee;
I’ll dress myself in man’s attire and fight for liberty.”
   We are the Boys of Wexford who fought with heart and hand
To burst in twain the galling chain, and free our native land.

And when we left our cabins, boys, we left with right good will,
To join our friends and neighbours encamped on Vinegar Hill;
A young man from our ranks a cannon he let go;
He slapped it into Lord Mountjoy – a tyrant he laid low.
   We are the Boys of Wexford who fought with heart and hand
O bust in twain the galling chain, and free our native land.

At Three Rocks and Tubberneering how well we won the day,
Depending on the long bright pike, and well it worked its way:
At Wexford and at Oulart we made them quake with fear;
For every man could do his part, like Forth and Shelmaliere.
   We are the Boys of Wexford who fought with heart and hand
To burst in twain the galling chain, and free our native land.

My curse upon all drinking – ’twas that that brought us down;
It lost us Ross and Wexford, and many another town.
And if for want of leaders we lost at Vinegar Hill,
We’re ready for another fight and love our country still.
   We are the Boys of Wexford who fought with heart and hand
To burst in twain the galling chain, and free our native land. (qtd. in Bauerle 288)
Green.” Much like how Stephen conflates “The Boys of Kilkenny” with “The Wearing of the Green,” Bloom conflates “The Croppy Boy” with another Irish ballad that differs in context and political meaning. Unlike the rest of the stanzas, the seventh and ninth stanzas of the original are separated by Bloom’s narrative, further punctuating the disjointedness of the rendition. It is only the last stanza that is quoted nearly verbatim.

The jumbling of various ballads and their varied textual interplay make it difficult to not only keep track of what is being sung but also, in Adam Piette’s words, to properly align the “memory-contexts” of the ballads (184). Bloom’s “generalizing dissolution of musical flow” reflects “the flow of immaterial nostalgia that Joyce identified with the Irish mind” (186). Joyce’s distortions of the ballads are themselves reflections of the confusing and disjointed historiography of 1798. I defer to André Topia’s assertion that in *Ulysses* the bond between the primary and secondary text is not a straightforward dichotomy but rather a “devaluation of the very structures of writing” which relies upon a “system of distortion and contamination by which the parody subverts the text from within” (104-5).

Joyce’s handling of “The Croppy Boy” is just one example of how the historiography of 1798 is contaminated by its own problematic assertions and intertextuality – something that will become even more evident in discussions of the other ballads.

---

14 Topia continues:

[]In the interior monologue, the text splits and disintegrates, becoming vulnerable to a multitude of other texts which it receives without entirely maintaining control over them.

The consequence of this is, first, the possibility of manipulation of the borrowed text and, secondly, a return effect from the new version to the original version which it contaminates and puts in perspective. Hence an increasing instability in the notion of origin: discourses weave through the text in such a way that one cannot really distinguish the original from its more or less distorted version. The element of parody is injected into the texture of the writing in such a manner that the reader is confronted with variations which he is tempted to take for the norm, which in its turns is inevitably subverted by that hesitation between origins. The text – which one then hesitates to call original, parody or quotation – becomes a place where the author pits discourses against one another, always distorting them slightly. (104)

See Attridge, *Joyce Effects* 111-16 and *Peculiar Language* 160-72; Beplate 162-64; Piette 184-89; and Topia 103-25 among other sources for more on the intertextual contaminations prevalent in *Ulysses* and “Sirens” in particular, a notoriously difficult narrative episode.
The Ballad Boys and the Memory of the Green. As mentioned, Bloom’s rendition of “The Croppy Boy” references several other ballads, most of which honor 1798. “The Boys of Wexford,” “The Boys of Kilkenny,” “The Wearing of the Green,” “The Thirty-Two Counties,” and “The Memory of the Dead” appear throughout Ulysses. Although they are dispersed throughout the novel, they are quoted the most in “Sirens.” The episode serves as a base of sorts in which the ballads are compared, contrasted, and most importantly fused together to create a compelling but convoluted history of the rebellion.

Outside of “The Croppy Boy,” “The Boys of Wexford” and “The Memory of the Dead” are 1798 ballads cited the most in “Sirens.” As mentioned, Bloom renders the fifth stanza of “The Croppy Boy” thus: “All gone. All fallen. At the siege of Ross his father, at Gorey all his brothers fell. To Wexford, we are the boys of Wexford, he would. Last of his name and race” (U 11.1063-65). He rearranges the lines slightly which makes it rather jagged. The most important difference, however, is the reference to the “boys of Wexford,” which does not appear in the original ballad. “The Boys of Wexford” contains more details about the rebellion. It references the Battles of Three Rocks and Tubberneering and specific locations such as Mount Forth and Shelmaliere. These battles were all United Irishmen victories in County Wexford. It also references Vinegar Hill, the headquarters of the rebels in Wexford that was soundly defeated by the British. It curses the British military commander Lord Mountjoy, one of the few times in which a 1798 ballad references a real-life figure. Moreover, the ballad is considerably more jingoistic that “The Croppy Boy.” While “The Croppy Boy” primarily focuses on one rebel in an unspecified location who ultimately does not fight, “The Boys of Wexford” commemorates the thousands of rebels who fought against
the British in the county. Some of the most intense fighting occurred in Wexford, which is why many of the ballads that commemorate the rebellion originated there. The ballad includes details of the actual fighting such as the use of pikes, which were a primitive but common weapon of the United Irishmen (Whelan, *Fellowship* 67-68): “Depending on the long bright pike, and well it worked its way.” It also assigns blame to the defeat of the United Irishmen to alcoholism. “My curse upon all drinking – ’twas that that brought us down.” Whereas “The Croppy Boy” ends on a somber note, “The Boys of Wexford” ends with a call to arms and a burst of unwavering patriotism: “We’re ready for another fight and love our country still.” The differences between the two ballads are pronounced. “The Croppy Boy” steers clear of massive battles and armies, instead focusing on the deceitfulness of the British and the stoic heroism of the croppy boy. The croppy boy does not just fight for the United Irishmen cause but also for his fallen family members. It is at its core a personal, emotional story. In contrast, “The Boys of Wexford” deems the perfidy of the British to be a given. Rather than focus on one person, it commemorates the entire rebel army at Three Rocks, Vinegar Hill, and Tubberneering. It has no trace of introspection or remorse. The only sorrow felt in the ballad is for the loss of the war, not the loss of family or friends.

If any introspection can be derived from “The Boys of Wexford,” however, it is done so by Bloom. The first reference to the ballad is in “Aeolus.” Bloom overhears “two shrill voices, a mouthorgan, echoed in the bear hallway from the newsboys squatted on the doorsteps: *We are the boys of Wexford[.] Who fought with heart and hand*” (7.427-28).

---

15 This was a traditional drill used to train the Irishmen:
   - Put the butt of the pike on the top of your brogue;
   - Measure it from there to the top of your waist;
   - Give your thrust forward, step back;
   - And be on guard again. (Whelan, *Fellowship* 67)
Although Bloom does not express contempt for what he hears, its description is underwhelming. He comes to comment on its sentiments for the first time in “Lestrygonians.” As Bloom walks toward College Green, he recalls a protest he was nearly swept up in near Trinity College in 1899, in which protestors were shouting pro-Boer slogans. “Silly billies,” he thinks, “mob of young cubs yelling their guts out. Vinegar hill. The Butter exchange band. Few years’ time half of them magistrates and civil servants. War comes on: into the army helter-skelter: same fellows used to. Whether on the scaffold high” (8.437-39). Bloom compares the protestors’ enthusiasm to that of the rebels at Vinegar Hill, the devastating United Irishmen defeat. He cynically figures that many of these pro-Boer activists will eventually abandon their contempt for the British and become part of the establishment. As we shall see later in the dissertation, many republican and socialist nationalists in Ireland supported the Boers during the Boer War (1899-1902), identifying their struggle for national self-determination against the British with their own.\(^\text{16}\) Bloom ends his analysis by referencing the chorus of yet another nationalist song, “God Save Ireland!” by T. D. Sullivan: “‘God Save Ireland!’ said the heroes; / ‘God save Ireland!’ said they all: / ‘Whether on the scaffold high / Or on the battle-field we die, / Oh, what matter, when for Ireland dear we fall!’” (15-16). Bloom scoffs at the “mob” mentality and jingoism that these songs encourage. He is unimpressed with the zeal of these protestors – an attitude that will resurface with regard to the adults in “Sirens.”

\(^\text{16}\) Technically, this conflict is known as the Second Boer War, the First Boer War having been fought in 1880-1881. For the purposes of this dissertation, I will refer to the Second Boer War simply as the Boer War, which I will discuss extensively in the third chapter.
The ballad makes a rather unremarkable appearance in “Circe” during Bloom’s confrontation with the British soldiers. A navvy finds out where a nearby shebeen (unlicensed bar) \( (U-N\ 731) \) and attempts to drag the soldiers with him:

\[
\text{THE NAVVY}
\]

\((shouts)\)

We are the boys. Of Wexford. . . .

\[
\text{THE NAVVY}
\]

\((shouts)\)

The galling chain.

And free our native land. \((U\ 15.621-23, \ 28-31)\)

“The Boys of Wexford” reflects a wryness on Bloom’s part: not on the rebellion \textit{per se} but on its commemoration. Rather than the stirring rendition offered in “Sirens,” the ballad makes its last appearance in the form of a drunken navvy literally dragging British soldiers with him in the middle of the red-light district. He is, in a figurative sense, dragging the memory of 1798 with him. Of all the 1798 ballads featured in “Sirens,” “The Boys of Wexford” ends at the mercy of the very soldiers it rails against.

Not all of the ballads in “Sirens,” however, are referenced in a similar vein. “The Memory of the Dead,”\(^\text{17}\) unlike “The Boys of Wexford,” does not go into details regarding

\(^{17}\) For reference, here is the original ballad as published in \textit{The Nation}:

\begin{verbatim}
Who fears to speak of Ninety-Eight?
Who blushes at the name?
When cowards mock the patriots’ fate,
Who hangs his head for shame?
He’s all a knave or half a slave,
Who slight his country thus;
But a \textit{true} man, like you, man,
Will fill your glass with us.

We drink the memory of the brave,
\end{verbatim}
the rebellion, nor, unlike “The Croppy Boy,” does it take place in 1798. As the title suggests, it is a simple, elegant reminiscence of the rebellion. It mourns the passing of the rebels more than forty years after the fact. It was originally published anonymously in *The Nation* in 1843

---

The faithful and the few –
Some lie far off beyond the wave,
Some sleep in Ireland, too;
All – all are gone – but still lives on
The fame of those who died:
All true men, like you, men,
Remember them with pride.

Some on the shores of distant lands
Their weary hearts have laid,
And by the stranger’s heedless hands
Their lonely graves were made.
But, though their clay be far away
Beyond the Atlantic foam –
In true men, like you, men,
Their spirit’s still at home.

The dust of some is Irish earth;
Among their own they rest;
And the same land that gave them birth
Had caught them to her breast;
And we will pray that from their clay
Full many a race may start
Of true men, like you, men,
To act as brave a part.

They rose in dark and evil days
To right their native land:
They kindled here a living blaze
That nothing shall withstand.
Alas! that Might can vanquish Right –
*They* fell, and pass’d away;
But true men, like you, men,
Are plenty here to-day.

Then here’s their memory – may it be
For us a guiding light,
To cheer our strife for liberty,
And teach us to unite.
Through good and ill, be Ireland’s still,
Though sad as theirs your fate;
And true men be you, men,
Like those of Ninety-Eight. (393)
by John Kells Ingram. The ballad quickly gained popularity in Ireland, especially among the Young Irelanders. This ballad is unique among the 1798 canon in that the:

historically specific personalities and events of the rebellion are represented merely as nameless exiles and ghostly dead, shades whose physical and individual existence is less important than their symbolic and sacrificial death. The particular causes for which they fought – be they republican principles or sectarian redress – are not recognized by the ballad. Instead, the rebels’ cause is generalized into a more mythic kind of heroic gesture, disengaged from any ideological program. (Ryder 52)

Although the argument could be made that “The Croppy Boy” is also ideologically disengaged, the ballad takes place during the actual rebellion and contains a plot (albeit with nameless stock characters). “The Memory of the Dead” contains the comradery found in “The Boys of Wexford” and the sorrow of “The Croppy Boy,” yet it manages to avoid the ideological underpinnings and specific characterizations of both – and with good cause. Ingram and many republican nationalists at the time had to worry about charges of sedition by the British government. A year after the ballad was published, Daniel O’Connell, Charles Gavan Duffy (the editor of The Nation who interestingly enough dismissed ballads in his 1883 Four Years of Irish History as “commonly nonsense daubed on tea-paper” [66]), and five others were tried for sedition. The crown used “The Memory of the Dead” as evidence. The ballad, particularly the lines “Alas! that might can vanquish right – / They fell and passed away; / But true men, like you, men, / Are plenty here to-day” were read aloud in court as proof of their intention to wage violence against the state. The men were found guilty and sentenced to a year or less in prison, which was fortunate for them considering high treason carried the penalty of capital punishment. Although the ballad was used as evidence against
them, many nationalists and Young Irelanders continued to refer to it, especially the famous first line. From thereon in, nationalists and Young Irelanders had to be careful in their exegesis of 1798. They did so by “de-republicanizing” and “de-sectarianizing” the rebellion, which despite the trial “The Memory of the Dead” was handy in (Ryder 53-57). Furthermore, the imprecision of these ballads with regard to actual details of the rebellion reflected “highly-coloured memories that were conjured up on the utterance of code-words like ‘pitch cap’, ‘triangle’, ‘yeoman’, ‘croppy’, and – above all ‘ninety-eight’. Indeed, so potent did the date prove in touching chords of memory that there was no real need to articulate it” (Cronin, “Memory” 117). As paradoxical as it may be, the ballad sectarianized and de-sectarianized the rebellion at the same time.

When “The Memory of the Dead” appears in *Ulysses*, it is articulated rather haphazardly. It is first mentioned by Kernan in “Wandering Rocks”: “They rose in dark and evil days. Fine poem that is: Ingram” (10.790). He goes on to mention Dollard and his rendition of “The Croppy Boy,” confusing the two. Later on in “Sirens,” Bloom quotes its famous first lines when listening to Dollard: “Who fears to speak of nineteen four? Time to be shoving. Looked enough” (11.1072-73; my emphasis). Much like Dollard’s conflation of the two ballads, Bloom confuses two dates, citing the current year, 1904, rather than 1798. The error may have been intentional on Bloom’s part, an irreverent rift to a ballad of a bygone era. At the very least, it highlights the loose temporal nature of historical remembrance, if not overtly suggesting a presentist reading of the events. Near the end of “Sirens,” two refrains are quoted: “True men like you men . . . . Will lift your glass with us” (11.1276-78). Curiously, these lines are spoken by one of the gentlemen still in the Ormond after Bloom leaves and is reflecting on Emmet’s last words. It is a coy afterthought, paired with Bloom’s
scatological reaction to Emmet’s plea. Still, the ballad makes another appearance in “Cyclops” when the narrator bemoans the Citizen “gassing out of him about the invincibles and the old guard and the men of sixtyseven and who fears to speak of ninetyeight” (12.480-81). It is also quoted directly by the Citizen himself. “The memory of the dead, says the citizen taking up his pintglass and glaring at Bloom” (12.519-20). The Citizen has the last word, as it were, regarding the ballad.

The last major 1798 ballad reference in *Ulysses* is “The Wearing of the Green.” As mentioned, it was first quoted by Stephen in “Proteus,” mistakenly bunched together with “The Boys of Kilkenny.” It appears again indirectly in “Hades”: “As they turned into Berkeley street a streetorgan near the Basin send over and after them a rollicking rattling song of the halls. Has anyone here seen Kelly? Kay ee double ell wy” (6.372-74). The streetorgan is playing the popular American tune “Has Anybody Here Seen Kelly?”, an adaptation of the English tune “Kelly from the Isle of Man” (*U-A* 113; *U-N* 593). The songs, published 1909 and 1908 respectively, are anachronisms. It is hard to determine whether Joyce was aware of this, yet given its content – a maid lamenting the loss of her Irish boyfriend in London in the English version and in New York in the American one – it may have reinforced the details mentioned in the episode (Bauerle 276). The American version mentions “The Wearing of the Green”: “Over on Fifth Avenue, a band began to play, / Ten thousand men were marching for it was St. Patrick’s Day, / The ‘Wearing of the Green’ rang out upon the morning air” (“Has Anyone Here Seen Kelly”). It is an indirect reference, yet it goes to show the popularity as well as the extensive intertextuality of the song both in Irish culture and in *Ulysses*. It appears again in “Circe” when the Old Gummy Granny, haunting Stephen, says, “You met with poor old Ireland and how does she stand?” (15.4587-88),
and in “Eumaeus” when Bloom comments, “there certainly is though every country, they say, our own distressful included, has the government it deserves” (16.1096-98; my emphasis). In the former, the ballad is remembered in an outrageous reverie and in the latter, it is buried in a jumbled mesh of prose. Unlike many of the other ballads commemorating 1798 in *Ulysses*, “The Wearing of the Green” is devoid of its context. In each case, the 1798 Rebellion is irrelevant to its citation. The text dismisses the ballad much in the same way Joyce does in his 1934 letter. The fervent patriotism and graphic violence espoused in the ballad is subservient to the arguably more meditative and thoughtful ballads.

There is one more, less prominent ballad that is referenced directly in “Sirens.” “The Thirty-Two Counties”\(^{18}\) makes a brief yet noteworthy appearance towards the end of the

\(^{18}\) For reference, the lyrics to “The Thirty-Two Counties” are as follows:

*Here’s to Donegal*
And her people brave and tall
Here’s to Antrim, to Leitrim and to Derry
Here’s to Cavan and to Louth,
Here’s to Carlow in the South
Here’s to Longford, to Waterford, and Kerry.

Then clink your glasses, clink
’Tis a toast for all to drink
And let every voice join in the chorus
For Ireland is our home
And wherever we may roam
We’ll be true to the dear land that bore us.

*Here’s to Tyrone,*
Where O’Neill long held his own
*Here’s to Monaghan, Fermanagh and Kildare, boys!*
Here’s to her whose stroke
Broke the hated Penal yoke
And you know that’s the brave County Clare, boys.

Then clink your glasses, clink
’Tis a toast for all to drink
And let every voice join in the chorus
For Ireland is our home
And wherever we may roam
We’ll be true to the dear land that bore us.

*Here’s to Sligo and to Down,*
And Armagh of old renown
Here’s to Kilkenny famed I story
Here’s to Wexford by the sea,
That near set old Ireland free
And here’s to Royal Meath in all her glory.

Then clink your glasses, clink
’Tis a toast for all to drink
And let every voice join in the chorus
For Ireland is our home
And wherever we may roam
We’ll be true to the dear land that bore us.

Here’s to Galway and Mayo,
That never feared a foe
Here’s to Wicklow, its peaks and its passes
Here’s to Limerick famed to all
For its well-defended wall
And still more for the beauty of its lasses.

Then clink your glasses, clink
’Tis a toast for all to drink
And let every voice join in the chorus
For Ireland is our home
And wherever we may roam
We’ll be true to the dear land that bore us.

Here’s to gallant Cork,
The next county to New York
Here’s to Roscommon bright and airy
Here’s to Westmeath,
Where a tyrant scarce can breathe
And here’s to unconquered Tipperary.

Then clink your glasses, clink
’Tis a toast for all to drink
And let every voice join in the chorus
For Ireland is our home
And wherever we may roam
We’ll be true to the dear land that bore us.

Queens County too we’ll toast,
And Kings for both can boast
They are the spots the invaders got some trouble in!
And now to finish up,
Fill a bright and brimming cup
And we’ll drink, boys, to jolly little Dublin!

Then clink your glasses, clink
’Tis a toast for all to drink
And let every voice join in the chorus
For Ireland is our home
And wherever we may roam
We’ll be true to the dear land that bore us. (“The Thirty-Two Counties”)
Chapter 1
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episode. “Near bronze from anear near gold from afar they chinked their clinking glasses all, brighteyed and gallant, before bronze Lydia’s tempting last rose of summer, rose of Castile. First Lid, De, Cow, Ker, Doll, a fifth: Lidwell, Si Dedalus, Bob Cowley, Kernan and big Ben Dollard” (11.1269-72). The final reference is the sound of clinking glasses: “Tschink. Tschunk” (11.1280). This onomatopoeia precedes Bloom’s flatulent reading of Emmet’s lapidary words. The ballad is not from 1798, although it does allude to the rebellion when it commemorates Wexford (“That near set old Ireland free”). By the end of “Sirens,” the ballads are merged into a jaunty, drunken remembrance of past times. It is perhaps this reason why so many of the ballads in “Sirens” were mixed up, jaunty, and muffled: because they reflected the uneasy intimacy in which 1798 was commemorated and, reciprocally, muffled.

MEMORY OF THE MARTYRED: ELITIST HISTORIOGRAPHY OF 1798

It is in vogue in current historiographical studies to denounce, in the words of Ranajit Guha, the colonial elitist historiography (37-44) and instead devote scholarship to forge, in the phrase popularized by E. P. Thompson, a history from below in which the common people are the subject, rather than the object, of history. If anything, the ballads firmly establish such a history of the rebellion. They are about, and were composed by, ordinary laymen whose names are forgotten – if they were taken down at all. Yet for Joyce’s part, much of 1798 is commemorated in the guise of elitist historiography – that is, the oft-cited leaders or “heroes” of the rebellion and the United Irishmen such as FitzGerald, Emmet, and Tone. Joyce’s characters dwell upon these men considerably, as did many in Ireland at the time.

---

19 As he writes, “In English History Proper the people of this island . . . appear as one of the problems Government has had to handle. To this day many academic history schools languish under the Norman yoke, and the seed of William the Bastard occupies the Chairs” (279).
But as with his renditions of the ballads, Joyce skewers them for his own purposes, demonstrating that real-life, “prominent” figures can be just as conflated and contaminated by historiographical uncertainties as the fictional stock characters found in the ballads.

*History from Above.* These elite leaders appear early in Joyce’s work. As discussed in the introduction, Joyce commented on the heterogenous ethnicity of such leaders in “Ireland: Island of Saints and Sages.” In a postcard he wrote to his brother Stanislaus in 1912, he mentions that he bought a copy of Tone’s autobiography for his pupil and patron Francesco Sordina (*L* 2:304). The first reference in his published work of these men comes in “Ivy Day in the Committee Room.” Mr Henchy, in his rant against the “hillsiders and fenians” who he believes are “in the pay of the Castle,” remarks that one of them, a “certain nobleman,” is a “lineal descendant of Major Sirr.” “O, the heart’s blood of a patriot!” he exclaims. “That’s a fellow now that’d sell his country for fourpence – aye! – and go down on his bended knees and thank the Almighty Christ he had a country to sell” (*D* 106). He is referring to Henry Charles Sirr, the ruthless police chief or “Town Major” of Dublin during the rebellion who is perhaps most famous for arresting FitzGerald (right after shooting him in the shoulder) and Emmet through his network of spies, cheats, and otherwise ungentlemanly characters (*D* 106n4). He is typically regarded as “a symbol of Irish collaboration with the conquerors” (Cheng, *Race* 112) by Joyce and many other Irish. Although this reference is brief and quickly glossed over, it is a reminder of the trauma inflicted by Sirr and the heroic downfall often attributed to FitzGerald, which is itself projected unto Parnell’s downfall by the treacherous elements of Irish society.
The first major reference to these men in Joyce’s work appears in *Portrait*. Stephen recalls the induction of the memorial to Wolfe Tone on the centennial of the rebellion. After turning down a beggar on Grafton Street, Stephen sees an equally curious site:

In the roadway at the head of the street a slab was set to the memory of Wolfe Tone and he remembered having been present with his father at its laying. He remembered with bitterness that scene of tawdry tribute. There were four French delegates in a break and one, a plump smiling young man, held, wedged on a stick, a card on which were printed the words: *Vive l’Irlande*!

But the trees in Stephen’s Green were fragrant of rain and the rainsodden earth gave forth its moral [sic] odour, a faint incense rising upward through the mould from many hearts. The soul of the gallant venal city which his elders had told him of had shrunk with time to a faint mortal odour rising from the earth and he knew that in a moment when he entered the somber college he would be conscious of a corruption other than that of Buck Egan and Burnchapel Whaley.

. . . . The Ireland of Tone and of Parnell seemed to have receded in space. (5.355-77)

Stephen’s recollection of the ceremony is brief and cynical. It is, indeed, only three sentences long. It is much different than the actual ceremony held on August 15th, 1898, which according to many contemporary accounts was a large and lively affair. *The Irish Times*, for instance, devoted a few articles to the ceremony, which simply laid the foundational stone for the statue of Tone in St. Stephen’s Green. On the same page that reported the American conquest of the Philippines and Cuba and the British “Khartoum” expedition, the *Times* reported that thousands of people attended the event. Representatives throughout Ireland,
including fifteen hundred from Belfast, as well as from the United States, France, England, South Africa, and Australia attended. Irish luminaries such as John O’Leary, James Stephens, John Dillon, John Redmond, John Howard Parnell, and Yeats were on hand. The procession sung nationalist ballads, including (noticeably) “Memory of the Dead” and the “Marseillaise.” In his speech, Redmond reiterated the common view that the rebellion “was merely a movement of resistance on the part of men driving to arms by barbarities of every kind,” yet faulted this view in that the rebellion was actually “an ably-planned effort to achieve the liberty of Ireland. They were not driven to arms simply by the barbarities of the English troops. They were driven to arms by a higher and loftier idea – the idea of winning freedom for their country.” Yeats also commented that, as paraphrased by the newspaper, that “the movement had been made by the people of Ireland themselves; and had come straight from their hearts” (“’98 Centenary” 5).

The commemoration was provocative to say the least. Thousands of Irish marched through the streets of Dublin past significant sites of the rebellion such as Stafford Street (Tone’s birthplace), Newgate Prison (where many rebels including FitzGerald were held), St. Michan’s Church (where some of the rebels were buried), James’s Street (where FitzGerald was arrested by Sirr), and Thomas Street (where Emmet was executed) – some of the same spots various characters in “Wandering Rocks” encounter. The procession also provoked a backlash. Riots led by unionists occurred in Belfast as their delegates returned home (“Rioting in Belfast” 6). The event’s enormity is in stark contrast to Stephen’s brisk description as a “tawdry tribute.”

However, as Fogarty maintains, the vignette of the event in Portrait contains several layers of irony. First, the only detail Stephen recalls is the presence of four plump Frenchmen
praising Ireland in French, which suggests that the nationalist ardor of the event was a foreign import, a relic of republican France whose military aid and inspiration to the United Irishmen the current nationalists conveniently downplayed much in the same way Stephen dismissed the French enthusiasts. Second, Stephen conspicuously omits any other descriptions of the event, instead dwelling on four people instead of the thousands of others who attended. Third and perhaps most importantly, the foundational stone remained empty and was eventually destroyed. The statue of Tone that was supposed to be installed was never erected (“Where Wolfe Tone’s Statue” 24-25). In the immediate sense, the absurdity of it appealed to Joyce’s “sense of humour as well as [reinforced] his perception of the futility of nationalist ceremonials that seem to be all show and no content” (25). In a broader, more encompassing sense, the passage, though it “contains insights which depend certainly on a play of irony . . . also attempts to uncover the dilemmas of trying to construe and come to terms with history in a colonial society whose past remains a contested entity, at once a looming, ineradicable presence and imbued with the impossible distance of otherness” (26). The “otherness” in this case are the presence of the Frenchmen, who are the only specific representatives of the ceremony, the curt description of the ceremony, which is considerably smaller than the ceremony itself (and, for that matter, the actual rebellion) as well as the aloofness in which Stephen approaches the ceremony. Not only is his recollection short, it is just that: a recollection. It is a small memory of an individual of an event that commemorates the large memory of an entire group of people, arguably an entire nation. Stephen is replacing “the limiting vision of nationalist self-determination with the indeterminacy of ironic commentary.” However, at the same time, his “disaffection is not simply a result of a privatized sense of alienation or of adolescent chagrin; it also stems from a deep-seated
reaction to the political problems of the country which is precipitated by his effort to encompass the conflicts of the eighteenth-century past” (27). In other words, Stephen’s reduction of the ceremony was not so much based on personal grievances or an apolitical stance but rather a political reaction to the *fin de siècle* nationalist fervor. Although Fogarty offers keen observations regarding the passage, she neglects to reference the passage describing St. Stephen’s Green to reinforce her point. Stephen’s description of Dublin and its “soul” as both a once “gallant venal city” to one “shrunk with time” reflects his cynicism regarding his surroundings. The city of paralysis is also a city of decay, a wasteland brimming with iniquity. The memory of the centennial, for all its supposed glory and enormity, is rendered moot to the “mortal odours” rising from the park.

It is also worth noting that he makes historical errors in his reference to Buck Egan and Burnchapel Whaley. John “Bully” Egan was a notoriously belligerent politician who opposed the Act of Union (Geoghegan, “Egan”), yet Stephen was most likely referring to Thomas “Buck” Whaley and his father, Richard “Burnchapel” Whaley, who were well-known for their corruption and gambling, their alleged membership to the “Hellfire Club,” and as Protestants to their shifting loyalties to the Union. Stephen mentions them because their house, 86 Stephen’s Green, became part of University College Dublin, where Stephen was heading (*P* 5.369n3). His misassociation of these men with Dublin further exacerbate his discontent with the political situation in Ireland as well as distaste for the memory of that particular area. It stands in stark contrast to the “Ireland of Tone and of Parnell,” which in this context represents the ideal of an independent and upstanding nation of Ireland – the very thing the centennial was attempting to commemorate but fell short in Stephen’s rueful opinion.
“Every kind of nationalist,” according to F. S. L. Lyons, “paid homage to the United Irishmen including, no doubt, many who would have recoiled in horror from any re-enactment of Tone’s insurrection” (247). Yet despite this fact, despite all the fanfare and high hopes of the ceremony, and despite the several “‘98 Committees” that sprang up throughout the country to commemorate the centennial (C. McCarthy 10), the Tone statue would never come to fruition. It can perhaps serve as a metaphor for the lamenting and dispirited historiography of 1798 in Joyce’s work. If anything, it is a common trope, as the first reference to Tone in *Ulysses* is itself a reference to Stephen’s bitter memory. In “Wandering Rocks,” when Boylan’s secretary Miss Dunne is working in her office (and reveals the exact date of the novel for the first time), Joyce offers a unique description of its location: “Five tall white-hatted sandwichmen between Monypeny’s corner and the slab where Wolfe Tone’s statue was not, eelied themselves turning H. E. L. Y’S and plodded back as they had come” (10.377-79; my emphasis). It is, much like the other references to Tone, not a flattering tribute.

*Lord Edward FitzGerald and the Loyal(ist) Opposition.* The nationalist enthusiasm spurred by the rebellion in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries drew heavily upon the cults of personality of dead “martyrs” (George 62). In 1919, Griffith wrote in *Sinn Féin*, “In the martyrology of history, among crucified nations, Ireland occupies the foremost place” (qtd. in C. O’Brien, *Ancestral Voices* 9). In a letter to Yeats in 1915, Gonne wrote of the Irish soldiers fighting in World War I:

---

20 Martyrology was a prominent feature of many European nationalist movements at the time, not just Ireland’s. See Fordahl 293-313.
Others have died with a definite idea of sacrifice to an ideal, they were held by the stronger and deeper rhythms of the chants, leading in wonderful patterns to a deeper peace, the peace of the Crucified, which is above the currents of nationalities and storms, but for all that they will not be separated from Ireland for as an entity she has followed the path of Sacrifice and has tasted of the Grail and the strength they will bring her is greater. (Gonne and Yeats 363)

The demise of one such Irish martyr, FitzGerald, was seared into the collective memory of Ireland ever since his brutal arrest and demise in Newgate Prison. The references to FitzGerald in Joyce’s work mostly center on his arrest by Francis Higgins, known as the “Sham Squire,” and Sirr, both of whom cast a shadow on FitzGerald’s eventful and revolutionary life. In *Ulysses*, the first such reference occurs in the “Hades” episode, which is fitting as it is one of the more morbid episodes of the novel. Bloom arrives in Prospect Cemetery in Glasnevin to attend Paddy Dignam’s funeral. As Father Coffey conducts the ceremony, Bloom muses about this aspect of his profession, how it weighs down on his appearance, and moreover, the effluvia of the deceased:

Eyes of a toad too. What swells him up that way? Molly gets swelled after cabbage. Air of the place maybe. Looks full up of bad gas. Must be an infernal lot of bad gas round the place. Butchers, for instance: they get like raw beefsteaks. Who was telling me? Mervyn Browne. *Down in the vaults of saint Werburgh’s lovely old organ* hundred and fifty they have to bore a hole in the coffins sometimes to let out the bad gas and burn it. Out it rushes: blue. One whiff of that and you’re a doner. (6.605-12; my emphasis)
Although Bloom does not name FitzGerald specifically, he does reference Saint Werburgh’s Church, one of the oldest churches in Dublin and the resting place of FitzGerald (and, incidentally, Sirr). The church is renowned for its crypts and pipe organ (U-A 118; U-N 596), yet Bloom thinks of the gas emitted from the coffins rather than the organ. The bizarre reference and ghastly imagery notwithstanding, Bloom sets the precedent in which these figures are remembered. It is not so much their lives – the “warm fullblooded life” (U 6.1005) that Bloom cherishes – which are commemorated than their deaths and resting places. Bloom and others pay the most attention to these things in seemingly nonrelated events.

Saint Werburgh’s Church is a brief and indirect reference to FitzGerald. The other references in Ulysses are more direct – yet not always about FitzGerald himself. Curiously, throughout the novel and indeed much of Joyce’s work, FitzGerald is referenced in relation to his pursuers, Higgins and Sirr. When Freeman’s Journal editor Myles Crawford walks into the office in “Aeolus,” Professor MacHugh unceremoniously greets him: “And here comes the sham squire himself! professor MacHugh said grandly.” To which he responds, “Getonouthat, you bloody old pedagogue! the editor said in recognition” (7.348-50). Higgins’s moniker, it should be noted, came from the fact that he married his wife by pretending to be a country gentleman when in actuality he was a lowly legal clerk. If that was not ignoble enough, he allegedly assaulted his mother-in-law soon after his marriage, an act that landed him in prison and also in infamy. Like Sirr, he was considered a fiend and a turncoat by the Irish. Starting out as a waiter in a porter house, he rose to become a legal clerk, then rose to prominence in Dublin high society by owning gambling houses and eventually the Freeman’s Journal, which he used to besmirch the likes of Grattan and others who sought some kind of autonomy from Great Britain. He was also an informant for Dublin
Castle. His most recognized act came in 1798 when he revealed FitzGerald’s hiding location to Sirr for £1000, sealing his fate. Although interest in his life was rejuvenated in the mid-nineteenth century with the publication of FitzPatrick’s unflattering biography *The Sham Squire*, he was always a controversial figure (Forbes; *U-A* 135; *U-N* 602; Woods, “Higgins”).

In 1845, for example, Richard R. Madden describes him as the “notorious Higgins, of *The Freeman’s Journal*” (359) and the newspaper as a “government paper” (335) and “government organ” (469). In 1917, Griffith devoted a column to the *Freeman’s Journal*, claiming it was “hired by the British Government in Ireland to disrupt the Volunteers of 1782, to traduce Grattan, to slander the United Irishmen, to promote the Union, to assail O’Connell.” Moreover, the “proprietor of the ‘Freeman’ at this period was one Francis Higgins, infamous in Irish history as ‘The Sham Squire.’ Higgins, who was originally at [sic] pot-boy in a publichouse in Fishamble Street, Dublin, became a successively a forger, a convict, a brothel keeper, a gambling house owner, a blackmailer, and the editor and proprietor of the ‘Freeman’s Journal’” (“A Short History” 3). “Sham squire” became a household name, often levied in jest (or at times, in earnest) against charlatans, cheats, thieves, other disreputable characters – and unionists. Though not necessarily always in the context of patriotism or loyalty to Ireland, the name is employed in that context throughout *Ulysses*. It rouses Crawford’s indignant response and an even more dubious one shortly thereafter. When Lambert invites him for drinks, he provokes a bizarre exchange:

**MEMORABLE BATTLES RECALLED**

−North Cork militia! the editor cried, striding to the mantelpiece. We won every time!

North Cork and Spanish officers!

−Where was that, Myles? Ned Lambert asked with a reflective glance at his toecaps.
–In Ohio! the editor shouted.

–So it was, begad, Ned Lambert agreed.

Passing out he whispered to J. J. O’Molloy:

–Incipient jigs. Sad case.

–Ohio! the editor crowed in high treble from his uplifted scarlet face. My Ohio!

–A perfect cretic! the professor said. Long, short and long. (7.358-69)

What Crawford is referencing here has dumbfounded many Joyce scholars. Thornton cannot make any sense of this passage, although he, Gifford and Seidman, and Slote et al. note that the North Cork militia was notorious for its brutality (as noted earlier in the chapter) and its humiliating defeats. It is strange, then, that Crawford would brag about the militia and its prowess. Although this could be construed as an ironic joke, his references to the “Spanish officers” and Ohio have no straightforward relationship to the rebellion. Gifford and Seidman and Slote et al. speculate that they refer to, respectively, the Wild Geese, many of whom were commanded by Spanish officers, and to the ill-fated British military expedition of the Ohio Valley on July 9th, 1755 known as “Braddock’s Defeat,” which used regiments based in Cork and were reinforced by local militias. On closer inspection, Crawford may have been conflating the North Cork militia, which was founded after 1755, with the regiments based in Cork, specifically, the 44th and 48th Regiments of Foot (Preston 44). The latter gained a notoriety of their own after Braddock’s Defeat, when nearly five hundred regimental soldiers, including its commander General Edward Braddock, were killed and even more wounded after having failed to capture a French fort during the French and Indian War (1754-1763). Braddock was “the plenipotentiary of the British imperial might” (43), having previously commanded the British garrison in Gibraltar (50-52). The battle, which despite
Crawford’s insistence took place in Pennsylvania, attracted considerable press attention and a sizable historiography in the decades that followed, which often focused on “the rawness of Braddock’s troops, Irish drafts or American recruits” (Pargellis 253). Although Irish soldiers were often associated with the regiments, the London Evening Post stressed right after the battle that the “regiments of the Irish Establishment are not properly speaking Irish Troops, but consist of English and Scotch, with a few natives of Ireland mixed with them, and sometimes none at all” (qtd. in N. Davis 315). Moreover, the British army in general was feared by both the British and Irish public in peacetime as undisciplined and cruel. Nevertheless, the Irish regiments were faulted for poor training and, much like the North Cork militia, sheer brutality (Preston 55-57). Given this, it may be that Crawford was emphasizing the (wrong) militia’s belligerence and incompetence in battle. Lambert’s snide remark about “incipient jigs” and MacHugh’s playful observation about the cretic perhaps imply that Crawford’s comments are little more than bibulous ramblings (he is described, after all, as having a “harsh voice” and a “scarlet face” [U 7.346, 7.367]) (Thornton 112-13; U-A 135; U-N 602). Thornton believes that Crawford simply lost his mind (112-13). Regardless, the title of the segment, “Memorable Battles Recalled,” indicates that conflict was the subject Crawford had in mind. As brief as it is, this extract reiterates the dubious, jumbled nature of the historiography of 1798, particularly the irrelevant and contrived associations it can evoke.21

21 For more on Braddock’s Defeat and the British soldiers stationed in Ireland, who comprised approximately one third of the entire British army in the eighteenth century (Preston 55), as well as an overview of the battle’s historiography in the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries, see Cohen 546-56; N. Davis 310-28; Pargellis 253-69; and Preston.
Later on in “Wandering Rocks” when Kernan muses about the “gentlemen” of the rebellion, he mentions FitzGerald and Sirr by name and, although not by name, alludes to Higgins:

Mr Kernan approached Island street. Times of the troubles. Must ask Ned Lambert to lend me those reminiscences of Sir Jonah Barrington. When you look back on it all now in a kind of retrospective arrangement. Gaming at Daly’s. No cardsharping then. One of those fellows got his hand nailed to the table by a dagger. Somewhere here Lord Edward Fitzgerald escaped from Major Sirr. Stables behind Moira house.

Damn good gin that was.

Fine dashing young nobleman. Good stock, of course. That ruffian, that sham squire, with his violet gloves gave him away. (U 10.781-89)

Kernan is immediately reminded of violence by Island Street, and not just the violence of the rebellion, or the “troubles.” Rather, he thinks about the violence at Daly’s Club, an eighteenth century gambling house on College Green most likely similar to the one Higgins owned, citing a crude anecdote unspecific to anyone. He also mentions Sir Jonah Barrington, an Irish Volunteer, jurist, and member of parliament allied with Grattan who wrote popular memoirs about eighteenth century Irish life (U-A 274-75; U-N 656). His shifting thoughts about gamblers and rakes are juxtaposed by his reference to FitzGerald and Sirr, who fought each other in that area on May 18th, 1798. He then thinks of FitzGerald’s rendezvous with his wife, Pamela, in nearby Moira House, which was owned by a sympathizer when he was in hiding (275; 656-57). Kernan then, inexplicably, reflects on the quality of his drink before praising FitzGerald and condemning Higgins, who is described as mischievous and decadent.
What is telling about this passage is the way in which Kernan casually and breezily fluctuates from one violent recollection to another, mentioning both well-known and obscure figures from the time in the same breath. His descriptions, terse they may be, are colorful, especially the observation of the “violet gloves,” which is not traceable to any known source. Regardless, Kernan’s greatest error, or at least partial error, is attributing FitzGerald’s arrest to Higgins. In 1892, FitzPatrick published *Secret Service Under Pitt*, which caused a sensation by outing Francis Magan, a Catholic barrister, as the informer who revealed FitzGerald’s location to Higgins. Although Magan provided the information, it was Higgins who took the credit and also the £1000 reward offered by Dublin Castle. Joyce most certainly was familiar with this book as well as John T. Gilbert’s three-volume *History of the City of Dublin*, published from 1854 to 1859, which Joyce consulted heavily when writing “Wandering Rocks” as well as “The Dead” (FitzPatrick, *Secret Service* 119-55; Shovlin 116-18; Whelan, “Memories” 81-82). Kernan, once again, gets his facts wrong. It is forgivable in the sense that Higgins did lead authorities to FitzGerald, although his role and omniscience were not nearly as profound as legend held. The “Sham Squire,” if nothing else, was phenomenal in bending the truth for personal gain, something which continued even after his death in 1802.

Outside of Higgins’s brief cameo in “Cyclops,” where he is listed among the “many Irish heroes and heroines of antiquity” as “Francy Higgins” (*U* 12.175-76, 12.180), the last major references to members of this trifecta occur in “Circe.” Near the end of the episode, during the famous “Dublin’s burning” passage reminiscent of the Easter Rising, Bloom imagines FitzGerald fighting “against Lord Gerald Fitzedward” (15.4686), an ironic yet fitting final reference to FitzGerald. The convoluted historiography of 1798 becomes so
outrageous that in the end one of its heroes does not fight his pursuers, his enemies, or even his allies, but rather himself. His name, despite being evoked several times throughout *Ulysses*, becomes in itself a joke. As Radford puts forth, Joyce here “compresses the growth of the seeds of violence, from conflict to conflict until no peace is left, even within factions” (316). As Dublin crumbles in Bloom’s hallucination, so do its sacred cows: in person and in name.

As for Higgins and Sirr, they appear earlier in the episode, but in the context of another 1798 martyr, Emmet. This appearance, as well as Emmet himself, will be discussed later in the chapter.

*The Wolfe Tones.* Like Fitzgerald, Tone receives considerable attention in Joyce’s work. The foundational stone in St. Stephen’s Green as described in *Portrait* has already been discussed, yet that was not quite the first reference to Tone in the novel. In the first chapter, Tone is indirectly alluded to on two occasions. The first occurs very early in the novel. While attending Clongowes Wood College, Stephen wanders the cold grounds and is inexplicably reminded of one of Tone’s close friends and fellow United Irishman, Archibald Hamilton Rowan: “The sky was pale and cold but there were lights in the castle. He wondered from which window Hamilton Rowan had thrown his hat on the haha and had there been flowerbeds at that time under the windows” (1.104–7). Stephen is referring to his infamous escape to France. According to legend, he visited the castle and threw his hat into the haha, or dry moat, in order to fool his pursuers (8n7). Young Stephen is awed by the site, a rather familiar and mundane one in his life. The second reference occurs a little further into the chapter when Stephen and his classmates leave school for the holidays. As they are being
ferried back to Dublin in horse-drawn cars, he observes that the “drivers pointed with their whips to Bodenstown. The fellows cheered” (1.457-58). Bodenstown is where Tone is buried. It was a popular pilgrimage destination for various nationalists as early as 1873. The drivers’ pointing their whips may have been a gesture of respect (Fogarty, “‘Where Wolfe Tone’s Statue’” 28; Howes 73; Woods, “Pilgrimages” 36-39).  

Stephen’s omission of its relevance to Tone is significant. Pilgrimages to Bodenstown were time-consuming, lengthy, but moreover well-known in nationalist circles during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. From 1891, approximately the time Stephen is a student at Clongowes, trips to the burial site were organized by the IRB. They were typically scheduled around June 20th, Tone’s birthday. Travelling to Bodenstown from Dublin required an at least half-hour, fairly expensive train ride and then a three kilometer walk or bicycle ride to the graveyard. The journey was by all accounts an elaborate outing. Large scores of people, sometimes numbering in the hundreds and occasionally the thousands, made their way to the site as bands played along the route (one of them, “The Wolfe Tone Band,” accompanied them in 1873) (Woods, “Pilgrimages” 36-39). Guest speakers gave orations and visitors laid wreaths. This tradition was so popular that it would continue into the next century – even into the Irish Civil War. In 1920, The Irish Times reported that a large contingent of Irish Volunteers left for Bodenstown from Rutland Square on bicycles led by their officers (“The Wolfe Tone Pilgrimage” 7). The pilgrimage may have its origins in a letter published in The Nation on August 3rd, 1872 (Woods, “Pilgrimages” 38). The letter encouraged people to spend their Sundays – the only day of leisure for most workers – travelling to important historical sites to foster the nationalist cause. Rather than using these Sundays for rest and relaxation, especially during the summer months when the
weather is tolerable and even pleasant (a rarity in Ireland), one “Dun Padruic” wrote, “Could not these excursions be systematised and utilised, made to keep the national spirit in a stage of healthy vitality, and to promote that national education, on the general diffusion of which the speedy or remote realization of our hopes of national independence rests?” Besides Bodenstown, Padruic encouraged people to travel to Bray to commemorate 1798 and to Clontarf to commemorate the High King of Ireland’s defeat of the Vikings in 1014, among other hallowed grounds. Not unlike Moran and his perorations, Padruic ended his plea to his countrymen by urging them to use the little leisure time they had to promote the cause of a country “in a state of disgraceful slavery” (“A Good Suggestion” 490-91). It is curious that young Stephen was intelligent enough to know the anecdote regarding Rowan yet for whatever reason was unaware of, or at least neglected to think of, Bodenstown’s sanctity among Irish nationalists. Fogarty claims that these two brief yet significant traces “form part of the topography of Stephen’s imagination,” that they “seem at once romantically distant and disturbingly alien” (“‘Where Wolfe Tone’s Statue’” 28). Although this is accurate, it is also true that Stephen’s omission regarding Bodenstown reflects a direct apathy or ignorance on his part, not to mention the irony that he encountered the town leaving for the holidays when most people went there on their holidays.

In Ulysses, Tone is directly alluded to more often than in Portrait, yet they are, like in Portrait, rather dismal and underwhelming. The first time Tone is referenced has already been discussed. Outside a brief reference along with FitzGerald in “Cyclops” (12.184), he is mentioned again in the episode. “And the citizen and Bloom having an argument about the point, the brothers Sheares and Wolfe Tone beyond Arbour Hill and Robert Emmet and die for your country, the Tommy Moore touch about Sarah Curran and she’s far from the land”
(12.498-501). There is quite a lot to this sentence. Tone is mentioned alongside Henry and John Sheares, leaders of the United Irishmen who after the rebellion were tried and executed for treason. Allegedly, they went to the gallows “hand-in-hand” (Woods, “Sheares”). There is a certain macabre sentimentality to the story, making the pairing of the brothers with Tone conspicuous. Arbour Hill is the location where Tone died under unclear circumstances. Emmet is referenced in relation to his last words as well as his lover Sarah Curran (which will be discussed later in the chapter). Despite the direct references, there is a lack of clarity in the passage. It is unclear what “point” exactly the Citizen and Bloom are arguing about, nor is it clear who is saying what, betraying a multitude of voices and an ambiguity reminiscent of “The Croppy Boy” rendition in “Sirens.”

The final references to Tone appear in “Circe.” As in “Sirens,” Tone is referenced in relation to a ballad. During the confrontation with the two English soldiers, Stephen hallucinates about King Edward VII:

THE VIRAGO

Green above the red, says he. Wolfe Tone.

THE BAWD

The red’s as good as the green. And better. Up the soldiers! Up King Edward! (U 15.4516-20)

Both characters allude to Davis’ poem “The Green Above the Red,” a street ballad in a similar vein to “The Memory of the Dead” and “The Wearing of the Green.”

22 For reference, Davis’ poem is as follows:

Full often when our fathers saw the Red above the Green,
They rose in rude but fierce array, with sabre, pike, and scian,
And over many a noble town, and many a field of dead,
They proudly set the Irish Green above the English Red.

But in the end, throughout the land, the shameful sight was seen –
Chapter 1

Newman 138

takes up the Irish cause and the Bawd takes up the English one. The poem is about 1798 and mentions Tone and FitzGerald by name. Simple, repetitive, and jingoistic, “The Green Above the Red” seems to describe a fight between two colors rather than two nations. It makes “The Wearing of the Green” look nuanced in comparison. It is an unrefined way to introduce Tone into the conversation, as psychotic as the hallucination in “Circe” might be. Indeed, the final reference to Tone, which occurs during the “Dublin is burning” section, has Tone pitted against Grattan (15.4682-83), the rebel against the parliamentarian. If there is a latent commentary in this pairing, it is deeply buried in the facetiousness of the whole affair. At this point, the heroes of 1798 become a caricature of their revered public image.

The English Red in triumph high above the Irish Green;
But well they died in breach and field, who, as their spirits fled,
Still saw the Green maintain its place above the English Red.

And they who say, in after times, the Red above the Green,
Were withered as the grass that dies beneath a forest screen;
Yet often by this healthy hope their sinking hearts were fed,
That, in some day to come, the Green should flutter o’er the Red.

Sure ’twas for this Lord Edward died, and Wolfe Tone sunk serene –
Because they could not bear to leave the Red above the Green;
And ’twas for this that Owen fought, and Sarsfield nobly bled –
Because their eyes were hot to see the Green above the Red.

So, when the strife began again, our darling Irish Green
Was down upon the earth, while high the English Red was seen;
Yet still we held our fearless course, for something in us said,
“Before the strife is o’er you’ll see the Green above the Red.”

And ’tis for this we think and toil, and knowledge strive to glean,
That we may pull the English Red below the Irish Green,
And leave our sons sweet Liberty, and smiling plenty spread
Above the land once dark with blood – the Green above the Red!

The jealous English tyrant now has banned the Irish Green,
And forced us to conceal it like a something foul and mean;
But yet, by Heavens! he’ll sooner raise his victims from the dead
Than force our hearts to leave the Green, and cotton to the Red!

We’ll trust ourselves, for God is good, and blesses those who lean
On their brave hearts, and not upon an earthy king or queen;
And, freely as we lift our hands, we vow our blood to shed
Once and for evermore to raise the Green above the Red! (184-86)
Yet it is Emmet at the end who has the last word, literally in his life and figuratively in Joyce’s treatment. With it comes a humorous yet sobering revelation about the historiography of 1798 and an irreverent commentary of the history from below mantra prevalent in historiographical studies.

*Where Robert Emmet’s Body and Last Words Were Not.* Emmet has a special place in Joyce’s historiography. Unlike Tone and FitzGerald, Joyce did not allude to Emmet prior to *Ulysses*, but in *Ulysses* he receives significantly more attention than the two. He is the only member of the three that has lengthy passages – the ending of “Sirens” and the execution scene in “Cyclops” – devoted to him. Although the deaths of Tone and FitzGerald were the main focus of Joyce’s allusions, it is Emmet’s death that is truly revered. Emmet’s gruesome public execution occurred five years after the rebellion, yet it served both in Joyce’s work and in Irish collective memory as a sort of closure, not just for the rebellion but for its incessant evocation in nationalist discourse.

As mentioned, it is mostly Emmet’s death, rather than his life, that is commemorated. Joyce draws attention to three aspects of his last day: his “Speech from the Dock,” his execution, and his burial. The first references to Emmet refer to his burial, which was just as eventful as but more mysterious than his execution. The official burial place is in Bully’s Acre near Kilmainham Hospital, yet several rumors, some of which came immediately after his execution, maintain that this remains were secretly removed to either St. Michan’s Church, Glasnevin, or Aungier Street among other possible locations (Geoghegan, *Robert Emmet* 265-66; *U-A* 124; *U-N* 598). Bloom indicates as much when he attends Dignam’s funeral in Glasnevin: “Who lives there? Are laid the remains of Robert Emery. Robert
Emmet was buried here by torchlight, wasn’t he? Making his rounds” (U 6.977-78). Kernan concurs with Bloom (one of the few times a character in Ulysses actually does) in “Wandering Rocks.” When he passes the church and recalls the aftermath of his bloody execution (discussed previously in the chapter), he tries to remember where he is buried. “Let me see. Is he buried in saint Michan’s? Or no, there was a midnight burial in Glasnevin. Corpse brought in through a secret door in the wall. Dignam is there now. Went out in a puff. Well, well” (10.769-72). The parallel between the two statements is conspicuous. They both make small errors in their thoughts in that Bloom misidentifies a tombstone and Kernan at first thinks he is buried in Saint Michan’s. They both have a casual tone regarding the death and end on a facetious note. As much as Bloom and Kernan may take Emmet seriously, they cannot seem to help having an irreverent outlook on his final resting place. It is still uncertain where that is exactly, despite the several attempts in the years after his death to uncover it. Both St. Michan’s and Glasnevin today have stones marking the alleged burial site. Even Yeats suggested the British authorities interned his remains in an unmarked grave in order to prevent shrine-building, which ironically only encouraged Emmet’s deification. As he says in a speech in 1904: “His enemies seemed to have wished that his dust might mingle with the earth obscurely; that no pilgrimages might come to his tomb and keep living the cause he served. And by so doing they have unwillingly made all Ireland his tomb” (Uncollected Prose 319).

One of the more vulgar and comical scenes of Ulysses is the one in which Emmet’s famous last words at the end of “Sirens” are rendered. Much like the earlier “ballad” section of the episode, the narrative muddles the original language:
Bloom viewed a gallant pictured hero in Lionel Marks’s window Robert Emmet’s last words. Seven last words. Of Meyerbeer that is. . . .

Seabloom, greaseabloom viewed last words. Softly. *When my country takes her place among.*

Prrprr.

Must be the bur.

Fff! Oo. Rrpr.


One, two. *Let my epitaph be.* Kraaaaaa. *Written. I have.*

Prrpffrrppfff.

*Done.* (11.1284-94)

Criticism on this passage usually focuses on the nature of language, its commentary, if any, on Emmet’s genuine sentiments, and its appropriation by nationalists in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Bowen characterizes the passage as “part of Joyce’s over-all tendency in the chapter to build up a seemingly serious situation or state of mind and then ruthlessly but comically destroy the illusion” with “Bloom provid[ing] the final degrading air of accompaniment to Emmet’s noble sentiments with a blast of burgundy-generated gas” (*Musical Allusions* 210). Succinct as this analysis is, MacCabe offers a more theoretical, deconstructive reading, describing the passage and to a larger extent “Sirens” as a “dramatization of the materiality of language” with Bloom serving as a “de-composer of the voice and music into material sounds” (83). The divided and distanced language was Joyce’s way of refusing “the full unified identity offered by ultranationalism” (87). Emmet’s words
in particular “spell out the paralysis of nationalism in its demand that writing must be stopped until the achievement of nationhood. . . . [as] Emmet, and nationalism, wish to fix meaning and abolish writing,” something that Bloom’s flatulence repudiates by enacting “a process of separation which denies to the subject the position of separated from the world” (88) and thereby emphasizing the irrationality of nationalism. Emer Nolan challenges this deconstructive reading, claiming that far from MacCabe’s position, “the imaginary identifications of Irish nationalism . . . may indeed appear to be entirely delusory until they are properly examined in the overall context of social relations” (Nationalism 67). As flippant as the reiteration of Emmet’s last words may be, this hardly implies indifference or, for that matter, resistance to them. He is careful to let go of his gas until he is sure no one is near him and the tram can cover his noise. Moreover, Emmet did not wish to “abolish” writing as he meant to “postpone” it, in that a “free Ireland alone could attest to the meaning of that action: the articulation of its significance could not precede the achievement of that liberation on a material level. It implies that writing about nationalism is by necessity deformed in contemporary conditions” (68). In other words, Bloom’s actions were not a deliberate act of commentary on or resistance to nationalism but rather an inevitable consequence of nationalism’s inherent nature. As innovative as some of Nolan’s points are – “Bloom’s eye uses the linear organization of Emmet’s sentence to organize the retention and release of air from his bowels” (68) – her overall counter to MacCabe’s deconstructionism is strong.

Regardless, it is worth noting that Bloom’s reaction to Emmet and the major figures of the rebellion differs from those of other characters. Compare, for example, Bloom’s encounter of Lionel Marks’s window to Kernan’s walk on Island street in “Wandering
Rocks” (U 10.781-93). The narrative’s portmanteaus (“Seabloom, greaseabloom” [11.1284]), incorrect grammar (“viewed last words” [11.1284]), shortened words (“bur” [11.1287] and “burgund” [11.1291]), and generally disjointed and staccato phrasing stand in stark contrast to Kernan’s straightforward and eloquent language, reverence and informality aside. When Kernan comments on his liquor, he does so in a complete sentence (“Damn good gin that was” [10.787]), unlike Bloom. And whereas Kernan’s identification of important sites and figures of 1798 is accurate, Bloom makes a mistake by associating Giacomo Meyerbeer with “seven last words” (11.1275). The Seven Last Words of Christ (1838) is an oratorio written by Saverio Mercadante, whom Bloom alluded to earlier in “Lotus Eaters,” not Meyerbeer, whom Bloom also alluded to in “Lestrygonians” (Bowen, Musical Allusions 99, 138, 210; U 5.403-4, 8.624; U-A 311; U-N 672). It is, of course, a minor mistake (the two names are similar), yet it fits into an overall pattern of Bloom’s frequent errors and deviations of language in relation to 1798.23

The greatest inaccuracy of all in this passage, however, does not come from Bloom. It is something that has received surprisingly scant consideration in Joycean scholarship: the accuracy of Emmet’s “Speech from the Dock.” Emmet’s speech is one of the most revered political speeches in modern Irish history – or arguably, the entirety of recorded Irish history. As Patrick Geoghegan points out, no other part of his life has received nearly as much attention (Robert Emmet 244), and it would lend itself to a number of panegyrics. Pearse, for example, would call it “the most memorable words ever uttered by an Irish man” (70). It would cement Emmet as a paragon of Irish martyrdom, placing him, in Yeats’s words,

23 And, generally speaking, his various misapprehensions and confusions he makes throughout the novel (Slote, “Thomistic” 195), or what Robert Martin Adams called his “obvious mushiness of intellect” (103), a diagnosis iterated in “Circe”: “He is a rather quaint fellow on the whole, coy though not feebleminded in the medical sense” (U 15.1800-1).
“foremost among [Ireland’s] saints of nationality” (*Uncollected Prose* 315), and in Connolly’s words, “the most universally praised of all Irish martyrs. . . . the democracy of the future will reveal him” (1:102-3). Although his speech, particularly the concluding statement, was almost universally well-received since 1803 and became proverbial enough for Joyce to reference, there is no consensus as to whether he actually said it. To clarify, this is how Emmet allegedly concluded his speech:

> Let no man write my epitaph; for as no man who knows my motives dares now vindicate them, let not prejudice or ignorance asperse them. Let them rest in obscurity and peace: my memory be left in oblivion and my tomb remain uninscribed, until other times and other men can do justice to my character. When my country takes her place among the nations of the earth, then, and not till then, let my epitaph be written.

> I have done. (qtd. in Geoghegan, *Robert Emmet* 253-54)

However, there is no conclusive evidence which proves he said it. The textual history of this speech is complicated and extensive, yet many scholars believe that several parts of the speech were either fabricated, expunged, or embellished afterwards for political reasons: first by British authorities to suppress sedition and then by Irish nationalists to encourage it. The actual speech could be in fact a combination of two different versions, the official court records and the text from Madden’s *United Irishmen*, and the famous last few sentences featured in “Sirens” may not have been said at all (Geoghegan, *Robert Emmet* 244-54; Vance 185-91). R. N. C. Vance maintains that the speech “is an interesting and unnoticed illustration of the persistence of literary myth-making as late as the nineteenth century” and that it “enshrines a myth of nationalist defiance and has become part of a tradition which is more

---

24 There are exceptions. Foster, for example, dismisses it as “attitudinizing in the dock” (*Modern Ireland* 286).
important than anything Emmet ever did or said himself” (185, 190). Yet despite this, Lionel Marks, Bloom, and indeed many Irish took these words at face-value, not questioning or, barring that, caring whether they are authentic. One of the more infamous passages in *Ulysses* could very well be based on a fabrication – a particularly egregious one given its influence on political and cultural life in Ireland.

The farce of his “Speech on the Dock,” however, pales in comparison to that of Emmet’s execution as depicted in *Ulysses*. The execution is parodied twice: first in “Cyclops” and again in “Circe.” In “Cyclops,” the execution of “the hero martyr” (12.609) appears in between two of the Citizen’s rants. Gifford and Seidman maintain the protracted section (12.525-678) is a parody of an early-nineteenth century newspaper feature-story (333). Indeed, it does read like a feature-story, albeit a wacky and irreverent one. What distinguished this passage from the other parodies found in “Cyclops” is that underneath its pomp and levity are profound and serious references to Emmet’s real-life execution, which was by all accounts horrific even by the standards of the time. Contrary to a common conception of hangings as quick, efficient, and relatively painless, they are by any conceivable standard a “slow, painful and unreliable method of killing” (Geoghegan, *Robert Emmet* 263). Emmet’s death took more than thirty minutes. Indeed, most hangings are a long, excruciating affair. They caused so much distress to the condemned that most recorded executions from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries reported the victims pleading, shaking, crying, yelling, fighting, or otherwise losing control of their faculties on (and certainly before) the scaffold (Gatrell 29-55). Yet Emmet was apparently calm throughout, betraying neither a sign of fear nor loss of nerve. He was allegedly so composed that he gave money to his executioner and helped him put the rope around his neck. Even as he was slowly
suffocating, he did not emit a cry. After he died, the executioner cut off his head and presented it to the crowd, exclaiming, “This is the head of a traitor, Robert Emmet. This is the head of a traitor” (Geoghegan, *Robert Emmet* 264-65).

The execution in “Cyclops” is described much more frivolously. As Patrick R. Mullen observes, the “sanitization of the execution in the parody is pushed to the limits of the absurd” (106). At the same time, however, it features serious commentary as well as authentic details from the date and its description during the time. It is described in the beginning as “affecting in the extreme” and an “already gruesome spectacle” (*U* 12.525, 531). The delegation present was fully aware of the “nameless barbarity which they had been called upon to witness” (12.571). Once Rumbold, the “worldrenowned headsman” (12.596), arrived, Joyce treats the reader to arguably one of the goriest passages in *Ulysses*:

As he awaited the fatal signal he tested the edge of his horrible weapon by honing it upon his brawny forearm or decapitated in rapid succession a flock of sheep which had been provided by the admirers of his fell but necessary office. On a handsome mahogany table near him were neatly arranged the quartering knife, the various finely tempered disemboweling appliances (specially supplied by the worldfamous firm of cutlers, Messrs John Round and Sons, Sheffield), a terra cotta saucepan for the reception of the duodenum, colon, blind intestine and appendix etc when successfully extracted and two commodious milkjugs destined to receive the most precious blood of the most precious victim. The housesteward of the amalgamated cats’ and dogs’ home was in attendance to convey these vessels when replenished to that beneficent institution. (12.614-26)
Although Emmet’s body was beheaded rather than drawn and quartered, the passage is still frighteningly realistic with regard to public executions around this time. Joyce does not spare any details; there are smaller references which demonstrate the passage’s authenticity. Sarah Curran is present in the passage, bidding him farewell. Their embrace, on top of the execution, brings the audience and even some of the British authorities to tears: “there was not a dry eye in that record assemblage” with “provostmarshal . . . Tomlinson” murmuring, “Blimey it makes me kind of bleeding cry, straight, it does” (12.657-58, 669-70, 676-77).

Both Emmet’s trial and execution caused intense anguish to many of the witnesses. One account from the early-twentieth century alleges that at the conclusion of the trial, the judge, despite delivering a death sentence, “burst into tears” and Emmet’s council Leonard McNally (sometimes spelled “MacNally”) “flung his arms around him and kissed him on the forehead” (M. MacDonagh 396-97). 25 Even The London Chronicle, which was not exactly sympathetic to Emmet’s cause, gave an unusually flattering account of his last moments:

In short he behaved without the least symptom of fear, and with all the effrontery and nonchalance which so much distinguished his conduct on his trial yesterday. He seemed to scoff at the dreadful circumstances attendant on him; at the same time, with all the coolness and complacency that can be possibly imagined – though utterly unlike the calmness of Christian fortitude. Even as it was, I never saw a man die like him; and God forbid I should see many with his principles. (qtd. in Madden 466)

A century afterward, Pearse would reiterate this reporter’s words by describing the execution as “a sacrifice Christ-like in its perfection” (69) – just one of the many demonstrations of his

25 According to FitzPatrick in Secret Service Under Pitt, McNally was also a spy for Dublin Castle, something Connolly among others believed. For more on his treachery, see J. Connolly 1:99; Elliott, Partners 73; FitzPatrick, Secret Service 35-36, 174-210; and Woods, “MacNally.”
“supreme . . . iconography” he held at the time and even more so by the composition of *Ulysses* (Radford 279). The passage has a few key phrases which come from the era as well. The hero martyr is about to be “launched into eternity” (*U* 12.638), which was a common newspaper euphemism of the time (Geoghegan, *Robert Emmet* 265), and the “animated altercation” (*U* 12.572) that breaks out among the delegation is itself an offhand reference to Emmet’s uprising, which was commonly derided by the British as a “scuffle on a Dublin street” (Paulin 99). “That monster audience simply rocked with delight” (*U* 12.650-51) adds authenticity to the carnivalesque spectacle that were public executions at the time.27

The “Cyclops” passage, however, ends right before the actual execution. In “Circe,” the spectacle concludes in spectacular fashion. Emmet’s speech and its rendition in “Sirens” are referenced throughout the episode. “BELLO,” for example, tells Bloom “[y]our epitaph is written” (15.3197-99) and Nannetti repeats Emmet’s words, “When my country takes her place among the nations of the earth, then, and not till then, let my epitaph be written. I have . . .” To which Bloom responds, “Done. Prff!” (15.3387-90). Interestingly, Emmet is incarnated as “The Croppy Boy” in “Circe,” which picks up where “Cyclops” left off:

THE CROPPY BOY

*(the ropenoose round his neck, gripes in his issuing bowels with both hands)*

I bear no hate to a living thing,

But I love my country beyond the king. (15.4531-35)

When “RUMBOLD, DEMON BARBER” (15.4536) carries out the execution, Joyce’s stage directions are truly grotesque. Rumbold “gives up the ghost. A violent erection of the hanged

---

26 The phrase was also used in many 1798 accounts, such as in M. MacDonagh 407.
27 John Rocco argues that the passage “could have been one of Foucault’s example in *Discipline and Punish* of the execution as spectacle.” See his excellent essay for elaboration.
sends gouts of sperm spouting through his deathclothes on to the cobblestones. . . . he plunges his head into the gaping belly of the hanged and draws out his head again clotted with coiled and smoking entrails” (15.4548-57). Rocco attributes the Croppy Boy’s ejaculation and Rumbold’s gruesome evisceration as both an indicator of the close relationship between eroticism and death and “a satirical attack upon the cult of violence that had gripped the Irish imagination since the early days of the Celtic Revival.” His assessment is certainly reasonable, yet it is important to point out that in the end, it is Emmet who is infused with the legend of the Croppy Boy. His last words and execution are extinguished in an extravagant spectacle under the guise of a popular and maudlin legend. The Rabelaisian demise is not just a satirical attack on the cult of violence espoused by Irish Revivalists but also on the memory of Emmet himself. Rumbold literally immerses himself in the victim’s entrails, only to emerge unscathed and immediately forgotten in Bloom’s reverie as Bloom quickly turns his attention to Private Carr. This, perhaps, serves as a metaphor on Emmet’s macabre remembrance, his fusion with legend, and its gross consumption that is tossed as quickly as it is consumed.

Indeed, Emmet’s life, particularly his failed uprising, is not described in any serious detail in *Ulysses* and in Joyce’s other work. It is only his last two days that are commemorated, and even then his demise is intertwined with a fictional character from a ballad commonly sung in pubs. In the immediate aftermath of the uprising, Emmet’s reputation was far from stellar. Emmet’s uprising was criticized by Grattan, O’Connell, and other prominent Irish figures as futile and arrogant. There were even speculations that Prime Minister William Pitt staged the uprising in order to have an excuse to clamp down on republican sentiment (Radford 280-86). Joyce himself referred to it as a “ridiculous
rebellion” in “Fenianism: The Last Fenian” (*OCPW* 138). Overall, one of the great heroes of 1798 and its aftermath is reduced to a morbid figurehead, ridiculed and distorted. In Joyce’s notes for “Cyclops,” he considered having Bloom say or think, “Rob. Emmet’s prophecy. Longer delayed the better” (Herring 100). His prophecy, as it were, was of secondary importance because of the rickety historiography that followed him. It is not what Emmet had done but what was done to him that is of importance – an irony elaborated on if not exploited by Joyce.

THE MAN IN THE MACINTOSH AND THE LAST WORDS ON 1798

As riveting as the execution scenes are, they do not provide the last words on Emmet nor on his legacy. In “Eumaeus,” the narrator comments somewhere in his ramblings about Parnell and his affair with Katherine O’Shea that “the legitimate husband happened to be a party to it owing to some anonymous letter from the usual boy Jones” (16.1533-35; my emphasis). The “boy Jones” or “Trinity boy Jones” was the alleged codename for the Dublin Castle informer Bernard Duggan, who became infamous for gaining Emmet’s trust in the leadup to the rebellion. Duggan, whom FitzPatrick referred to as a “master of duplicity” (*Sham Squire* 276), pretended to support and indeed participated in the 1798 Rebellion and other United Irishmen activities, yet his role as a mole is well-documented and his codename became a household term for spy, a role he would hold well into the 1820s (Hughes and MacRaild 65-69; *U-A* 557-58; *U-N* 776). In the context of the Parnell affair, the narrator’s casual dropping of the term is just another indication on the lasting legacy of Emmet and his rebellion. Yet there is another brief reference that sheds light into not just Emmet but also one of Joyce’s
most enigmatic characters. During Bloom’s “trial” in “Circe,” a peculiar apparition points the finger at Bloom:

THE MAN IN THE MACINTOSH

Don’t you believe a word he says. That man is Leopold M’Intosh, the notorious fireraiser. His real name is Higgins. (U 15.1560-62)

The identity of “the man in the macintosh” is one of the more intriguing mysteries in Ulysses. In this context, “Leopold M’Intosh” is a reference to one John M’Intosh, a Scotsman who maintained secret arsenals filled with gunpowder and weapons for Emmet’s uprising. When one of his depots accidently exploded, Emmet was forced to launch the uprising earlier than planned. M’Intosh would later cooperate with Sirr, leading him to an arsenal on Patrick Street (Madden 360).28 The apparition’s accusation that Leopold M’Intosh’s real name is “Higgins” is a reference to the maiden name of Bloom’s mother, Ellen Higgins, as well as one of Bella Cohen’s prostitutes, Zoe Higgins (U-A 476; U-N 739). Ostensibly, this is just another hallucinatory conjecture, yet on closer inspection it could be considered a sly association between Emmet, M’Intosh, and the elusive “man in the macintosh” that haunts Ulysses.

The identity of the man in the macintosh has baffled Joyce scholars ever since his appearance. He is first identified in “Hades” as a mysterious attendee of Dignam’s funeral who dumbfounds Bloom: “Now who is that lankylooking galoot over there in the macintosh? Now who is he I’d like to know? Now I’d give a trifle to know who he is. Always someone turns up you never dreamt of. . . . Where the deuce did he pop out of?” (U 6.805-7, 825). Bloom remembers him throughout the day. Several candidates have been proposed over the years: James Clarence Mangan (Begnal 565-68); James Duffy (J. Lyons 133-38; Raleigh 59-

28 For his cooperation, M’Intosh was given the death sentence (Madden 360).
62); an acquaintance of Joyce’s father, “Wetherup” (*JJ* 516); Stanislaus Joyce (Raleigh 59-62); the ghost of Bloom’s father (Gordon, “M’Intosh Murder Mystery” 94-101 and “M’Intosh Mystery: II” 214-25); Bloom’s *doppelgänger* (Crosman 128-36); Joyce himself (DeVore 347-50; Thomas 117-18);²⁹ Christ or Death (Crosman 128-36; Tindal 161);³⁰
“Dusty Rhodes” from “Oxen of the Sun” (Damon 220n15); John Douglas from Arthur Conan Doyle’s 1914 novel *The Valley of Fear* (Hart 633-41); Theoclymenus (Gilbert 171); Hades (Herring 115-17); no one in particular (Adams 217-18; Herring 106; Kermode 49-74) or “all in all” in Brook Thomas’s estimation (74); the Y from the Hely’s sandwichboardmen (Gunn et al. 78-79); an invention of Bloom’s imagination (Borson 685-89); the epitome of human misery (Rowan 631-40); and, in a feat of academic conjecture, a “gigantic perambulating condom avoiding life’s deluge” (Lowe-Evans 58).³¹ Indeed, “macintosh” and its variants are mentioned nineteen times throughout the novel, including in “Hades,” “Wandering Rocks,” “Sirens,” “Cyclops,” “Nausicaa,” “Oxen of the Sun,” “Circe,” “Eumaeus,” and “Ithaca” (Hanley et al. 192-212; Raleigh 59). These possible identities have been argued to varying degrees of plausibility. I wish to propose, however, another possibility: the man in the macintosh is the ghost of Robert Emmet.

Before elaborating on this theory, it should be noted that sleuthing in Joyce’s work can be notoriously conjectural and circumstantial. Phillip F. Herring, for one, holds the view that “if we are obliged to be skeptical about interpreting Joyce aright, we should be equally skeptical about Joyce’s skepticism” and that scholars should “reject implausibility” in order

---

²⁹ More famously, this claim was made by Vladimir Nabokov. As he phrases it, “Bloom glimpses his maker!” (320)

³⁰ Bloom remarks that the man is the thirteenth attendee of the funeral: “Death’s number” (*U* 6.826).

³¹ Facetious or not, Lowe-Evans was not the first scholar to identify M’Intosh as such. Frank Kermode called him “a hooded phallus hunting tombs” (73).
to “limit the range of possible meanings” (79). With regard to M’Intosh, he believes that the character is “clearly intended to mystify Bloom and thus the reader” and “merely a teasing construct of words,” that “the more evidence one gathers, the less one understands,” and that his “identity was never meant to be discovered” (83, 106, 199, 206). However, Senn maintains the necessity of skepticism in interpreting Joyce’s work, that scholars could “benefit from such a unique education in applied skepticism” (*Joyce’s Dislocutions* 97). Likewise, Alistair Stead once commented that he was “confident that Joyce is at war with the single-minded pedant in his work” (146). In other words, the skepticism inherent in Joyce’s work lends itself to disparate interpretations of the same text. Using Senn’s line of thinking, I wish to present a few key details that conspicuously point to Emmet, one of the “grim icon[s] for eight hundred years of Irish history” (Radford 275). M’Intosh is first mentioned in Glasnevin, which as stated before is a possible burial site of Emmet. Bloom describes him as “lankylooking” (*U* 6.805), which is an accurate description of Emmet’s thin frame.\(^3\) Bloom later asks where he is but to no avail, much like the search for Emmet’s remains. In “Sirens,” Bloom wonders “who was that chap at the grave in the brown macin” (11.1250) right after questioning the plausibility of “The Croppy Boy,” whom the man in the macintosh transforms into in “Circe.” In “Cyclops,” it is said that “[t]he man in the brown macintosh loves a lady who is dead” (12.1497-98), a claim repeated in “Oxen of the Sun”: “Man all tattered and torn that married a maiden all forlorn. Slung her hook, she did. Here see lost love. Walking Mackintosh of lonely canyon” (14.1551-53). Emmet was famously in love with Sarah Curran, and their tryst in Dublin in the middle of his manhunt was most

---

\(^3\) A contemporary described him as “thin and alert” with “short fair hair, [a] sharp visage and [an] expressive countenance” (“Wednesday, Sept. 14” 610). Madden also described him as “slight in his person . . . . his forehead high and finely formed . . . . his nose sharp, remarkably thin and straight . . . . and his complexion sallow” (471).
likely responsible for his capture. In “Wandering Rocks,” “a pedestrian in a brown macintosh, eating dry bread, passed swiftly and unscathed across the viceroy’s path” (10.1271-72). His consumption of the dry bread has led some scholars to believe that M’Intosh is, if not literally, a figure of Christ. Emmet was often compared to Christ, and the fact the man nonchalantly crossed the viceroy’s path indicates he was at the very least not impressed with the emissary of the British Empire. It has already been noted that in “Circe” Bloom is briefly accused of being “Leopold M’Intosh” by “THE MAN IN THE MACINTOSH” and that in itself betrays a curious yet direct connection with Emmet. Finally, it could be said that M’Intosh looms over Bloom throughout the day much like Emmet’s memory loomed over Ireland ever since his death.

The last point is especially abstract. I do not claim that I by any means have “solved” the M’Intosh puzzle. However, I submit the theory with the caveat that “we must vaunt no idle dubiosity as to its genuine aurthership and holusbolus authoritateness” (FW 181.3-4). It is fair to state that the specter of Emmet, along with Tone, FitzGerald, and the other leaders, victims, perpetrators, and comrades of 1798, both famous and obscure, haunt Bloom throughout Ulysses and, moreover, Ireland ever since that fateful rebellion. Unlike Tone, Emmet’s statue stands proudly in four locations: one in Dublin and three in the United States (including, of course, in Emmetsburg, Iowa). As recently as April 2019, the United States Congress renamed the small triangular piece of land on which Emmet’s statue stands in the nation’s capital as “Robert Emmet Park” (S. Lynch 11). Yet while these statues are now considered a positive symbol of Irish pride and resilience, Joyce’s treatment of Emmet and the other participants of 1798 is much less charitable. His treatment seems to reflect the trepidations, contradictions, and hollowness in which they were remembered in Ireland. No
one in Joyce’s work devotes much critical thought into what they did during their lives, and as with M’Intosh, no one seems to recognize or genuinely engage with them. Rather, it is their gruesome deaths, their valiant but ultimately futile sacrifices, that receive the attention and maudlin praise. The interpretive activity on M’Intosh is perhaps symptomatic of the historiographical issues raised in this chapter; specifically, how supplementing uncertainly and ambiguity with a clear narrative and unambiguous identification was rampant in Irish historiography and exemplified most cogently in the 1798 Rebellion.

As mentioned before, the rebellion was the costliest conflict in Irish history in terms of sheer casualties and is often compared to the Easter Rising. But while 1916, small in comparison to 1798 and certainly to World War I, led to Ireland’s independence and the dissolution of the Union, the United Irishmen rebellion strengthened Great Britain’s stronghold of the island and reinforced its union. The rebellion would not be the last word in the struggle for Irish independence, but its aftermath was confounding. “Romantic Ireland’s dead and gone,” Yeats wrote in his poem “September 1913.” His treatment of 1798, though different than Joyce’s, is just as compelling:

   Was it for this the wild geese spread  
    The grey wing upon every tide;  
    For this that all that blood was shed,  
    For this Edward Fitzgerald died,  
    And Robert Emmet and Wolfe Tone,  
    All that delirium of the brave?  
    Romantic Ireland’s dead and gone,  
    It’s with O’Leary in the grave. (51-52)
In 1905, Joyce wrote that “the whole structure of heroism is, and always was, a damned lie and that there cannot be any substitute for the individual passion as the motive power of everything – art and philosophy included” (L 2:81). The legacy of 1798 may have been a damned lie to Joyce, but he also recognized it was far from dead and gone – and certainly romantic.
The Hungaro-Hiberno-Hebraic Compromise: Irish Nationalism and the Rest of the World

Whoever has seen anything of the world knows that just these little daily customs can easily be transplanted everywhere. The technical contrivances of our day, which this scheme intends to employ in the service of humanity, have heretofore been principally used for our little habits. There are English hotels in Egypt and on the mountain-crest in Switzerland, Vienna cafes in South Africa, French theatres in Russia, German operas in America, and best Bavarian beer in Paris.

When we journey out of Egypt again we shall not leave the fleshpots behind.

Every man will find his customs again in the local groups, but they will be better, more beautiful, and more agreeable than before.

Theodor Herzl, *Der Judenstaat* [The Jewish State] (75)

The last two chapters have predominately concentrated on Irish history and affairs. This chapter will present a contrast by focusing on the historiography of another European colonial country in comparison to Ireland’s and, moreover, the appropriation of such history and its wider ramifications in Ireland. Like Ireland, Hungary was a former colonial or “semi-colonial” (Kabdebo 21) European nation dominated by its larger, more powerful neighbors, Turkey and Austria, both of which led formidable multinational empires. The Austrian Empire itself was the remnant of the Holy Roman Empire and the other territories controlled by the House of Hapsburg for centuries. The Austrian Empire officially came into being in 1804, just three years after Ireland was legally incorporated into the United Kingdom. Like the British Empire, the Austrian Empire faced significant insurrection and resentment from its largest neighboring constituency throughout the nineteenth century. In 1867, that
insurrection, along with Austria’s defeat in the Austro-Prussian War a year prior, led to yet another massive modification of the empire. The Austro-Hungarian Compromise of 1867, or Ausgleich, established a dual monarchy, a separation of powers between Austria and Hungary, and a nomenclatural change to the “Austro-Hungarian Empire.” Under an arrangement analogous to Home Rule, Hungary gained significant autonomy that would remain intact until the end of World War I, when the Austro-Hungarian Empire dissolved into various independent nation-states. The parallels between Ireland and Hungary are many and well-documented. Indeed, these parallels fostered a mutual reverence and solidarity between the two nations that in several times throughout the nineteenth century emulated each other. This relationship was something that Joyce was aware of, and it led him to reference Hungary in various capacities throughout his work. Much has been written about these Hungarian references (Bloom’s Hungarian origins producing the most prolific scholarship), yet less attention has been paid to Hungary’s historiography and, moreover, its correlation with Ireland’s in Joyce’s work. Joyce’s treatment of Hungary’s historiography serves as an underlying commentary on the manifestations of Irish historiography as well as the Irish nationalist movements of the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. A discussion of this commentary must include a study of Joyce’s friend, founder of Sinn Féin and one of modern Ireland’s founding fathers: Arthur Griffith. Griffith’s appropriation of Hungarian history, particularly in his series of newspaper articles that were later compiled into a book entitled The Resurrection of Hungary (1904), was in itself appropriated and critiqued by Joyce. It served, in fact, as a foundation for Joyce’s evaluations of the merits and pitfalls of nationalist historiography and curiously reveals significant trends in the
nationalist upheavals and trends both in Ireland’s shores and beyond. This chapter will
discuss, but no means exclusively focus on, Griffith’s historiographical appropriations.

IRELAND AND THE WORLD: THE TENSIONS OF GLOBALIZATION AND
NATIONAL SELF-DETERMINATION

Hungarian Connections. Joyce’s references to Hungary both in and outside the context of
Griffith have been studied before. Before delving into Griffith’s political principles and
influence in Joyce’s work, it is important to go through the references themselves. Joyce’s
first known engagement with Hungary – which, for the purposes of this chapter, includes
Hungarian culture, history, literature, artists, politics, language, and so forth – can be traced
to an unpublished holograph discovered by Stanislaus Joyce from 1899, “Royal Hibernian
Academy ‘Ecce Homo’” (OCPW 17-22). If his engagement with Hungarian historiography
was tangential in this essay, however, Joyce’s first major engagement appears in Stephen
Hero. The novel features Joyce’s first direct reference to Hungary. When Stephen attends a

1 Joyce was just seventeen years old when he wrote the essay during his student days at University College
Dublin. He was reviewing an exhibition of the Hungarian artist Mihály Munkácsy at the Royal Hibernian
Academy. The exhibition included several paintings of the Passion of the Christ, one of which, Ecce Homo
(1896), caught Joyce’s attention. The essay is brief and does not reference Hungary directly. It mainly focuses
on what Joyce considered to be the painting’s bold aesthetics, particularly its characterization as pure “drama.”
The essay could easily serve as a complement to his other early writings regarding aesthetics and drama such as
“The Day of the Rabblement,” “Drama and Life,” and “Ibsen’s New Drama” composed when Joyce was a
university student. This painting inspired one of Joyce’s first forays into aesthetic contemplation (Takács
163). It is also worth noting that Munkácsy was one of Hungary’s most celebrated artists in the nineteenth century, a
man who, as Joyce would later in life, led a cosmopolitan lifestyle largely outside of his native country
(including in Paris). Ecce Homo in particular had nationalistic relevance in that Munkácsy intended to exhibit
it during the Hungarian millennial celebrations honoring the conquest of the Carpathian Basin by ancient
Hungarian tribes in 896 (Gula, “Reading the Book” 48-50). Whether the teenage Joyce realized it or not, he
was already engaging with Hungarian nationalism in his work, and Munkácsy’s aesthetic and nationalistic
influence has been noted by several scholars.

See N. Davison 195; Fáj 55n32; Gula, “Reading the Book” 48-60; and Mecsnőber, “Arthur Griffith” 347
and “Eastern Europe” 35. N. Davison and Mecsnőber note the similarities between the essay and Joyce’s
descriptions of Jews in “Nestor” and “Circe” in Ulysses, whereas Fáj postulates that the painting may have
inspired the name of “H.C.E.” in Finnegans Wake.
nationalist meeting (one that features “a very stout black-bearded citizen” [61], an early version of the Citizen in *Ulysses*), he recalls the orators droning on about the nationalist struggles in Europe and their outrageous reenactment in sports:

A glowing example was to be found for Ireland in the case of Hungary, an example, as these patriots imagined, of a long-suffering minority, entitled by every right of race and justice to a separate freedom, finally emancipating itself. In emulation of that achievement bodies of young Gaels conflicted murderously in the Phoenix Park with whacking hurley-sticks, thrice armed in their just quarrel since their revolution had been blessed for them by the Anointed, and the same bodies were set aflame with indignation by the unwelcome presence of any young sceptic who was aware of the capable aggressions of the Magyars upon the Latin and Slav and Teutonic populations, greater than themselves in number, which are politically allied to them, and of the potency of a single regiment of infantry to hold in check a town of twenty thousand inhabitants. (62)

Stephen is characteristically indignant and critical in this passage. He singles out the “case of Hungary,” which is a direct reference to Griffith, who himself was alluded to earlier in the passage as “the editor of the weekly journal of the irreconcilable party” (61), and his “Hungarian Policy.” Stephen’s main contention with these patriot-athletes is that they failed to recognize that the “long-suffering minority,” the ethnic Hungarians or Magyars, themselves oppressed several peoples, including the Latins (Romanians), Slavs (Slovaks, Croats, Serbs, and Ukrainians), and Teutons (Swabian and Saxons) (Mecsnóber, “‘Eastern Europe’” 29). Indeed, Griffith mentions the rivalry between these ethnic groups in *Resurrection* yet, like the Gael athletes, conveniently dismisses it and highlights their mutual
political interests (the details of which will be discussed later in the chapter). The direct comparison between the Gaels and the Magyars emphasizes the importance ethnicity was placed in their respective nationalist struggles – specifically, how the nation is a “politically mobilized ethnic group seeking to secure state power” (Suzman 1). Stephen ridicules both the struggle for so-called national determination and the justification behind it. Joyce showed in his early writings, particularly in “Ireland: Island of Saints and Sages,” that he did not consider the Irish aggressors against other peoples per se but rather grossly incompetent and self-destructive, which is comparable to the Magyars here. He also rejected the idea of a homogenous Irish “race,” which, as we shall see, can also be applied to the Hungarian parallel. And by describing Stephen as a “young sceptic,” Joyce positions himself once again as the lone voice of reason against the rabble – not unlike the figure of Christ in Ecce Homo. This parallel could also be extended to Hungary itself: that is, Hungary is the young, vulnerable skeptic resisting the oppression and bigotry of the rabble. This sort of positioning of Hungary as Christ in the Passion was common in Hungarian and indeed other central and eastern European historiographies during the nineteenth century (Berger, “Power” 41). It was made by Griffith himself in Resurrection. The title notwithstanding, he wrote in the introduction that Hungary “was brought to a glorious resurrection” (xxxi). Joyce’s treatment of Hungary becomes more nuanced and sympathetic in his later work, yet in Stephen Hero he demonstrates that at a young age he was aware of as well as averse to the “case of Hungary” and its importance in the Irish nationalist movement.

There are no references to Hungary in Portrait (the passage from Stephen Hero is noticeably absent). Hungary, it seems, does not have a place in Stephen’s bildungsroman. Joyce more than makes up for it, however, in Ulysses with the inclusion of the Hungarian
Jew Bloom. Bloom’s Hungarian ethnicity is the driving force behind most of these references, including those to Griffith. Bloom is accused in “Cyclops” of being the source of Griffith’s advocacy for the case of Hungary. “John Wyse saying,” the narrator relates, “it was Bloom gave the ideas for Sinn Fein to Griffith to put in his paper all kinds of jerrymandering, packed juries and swindling the taxes off the government and appointing consuls all over the world to walk about selling Irish industries” (12.1573-77). Jerrymandering, packed juries, tax evasion, and other forms of obstruction and civil disobedience were all tactics used by the Hungarians during the mid-nineteenth century in their independence movement and were outlined by Griffith in Resurrection. Griffith encouraged the Irish to use similar tactics against the British as part of his Sinn Féin movement. Later in “Cyclops,” the same accusation is levied against Bloom: “He’s a perverted jew, says Martin, from a place in Hungary and it was he drew up all the plans according to the Hungarian system. We know that in the castle” (12.1635-37). The men in Barney Kiernan’s are convinced that Bloom and Bloom alone is responsible for imbedding the Hungarian Policy in Griffith’s apparently malleable mind and express contempt for the plan, considering it a giant swindle in the anti-semitic tradition. The ramifications of their xenophobia and anti-semitism under the context of Griffith and his scheme will be discussed later in the chapter.

Before then, it is important to discuss the references to Hungary that do not allude to Griffith directly. Bloom’s “otherness” has been studied extensively under different tropes: his Jewishness, his ethnicity, his queerness, and so forth. In regard to his Hungarian extraction, it is pronounced clearly in Bloom’s alleged participation in the Hungarian lottery scheme referenced a few times in the novel. First mentioned in passing in “Lestrygonians”
(8.184-85), it is brought up again three more times. “Selling bazaar tickets or what do you call it royal Hungarian privileged lottery. True as you’re there. O, commend me to an israelite! Royal and privileged Hungarian robbery” (12.776-79). It appears amongst Bloom’s personal items in “Ithaca” (“2 coupons of the Royal and Privileged Hungarian Lottery” [17.1808]) and is mentioned contemptuously by Molly in “Penelope” (“either he’s going to be run into prison over his old lottery tickets that was to be all our salvations” [18.1224-25]). Joyce’s inclusion of the Hungarian lottery scheme is intriguing. He took the idea from an article in the June 16th, 1904 edition of Illustrated Irish Weekly Independent and Nation, which reported on the illegal printing of tickets for “The Privileged Royal Hungary Lottery” in London (Adams 100-1; U-A 162; U-N 624). Bloom was arrested in 1893 or 1894 but was let go due allegedly to his Masonic connections and “a friend in court” (U 12.776). As Luca Crispi observes, the lottery scheme idea first appeared in Joyce’s notes in 1918 yet was only included in the actual text in 1921 (Joyce’s Creative 193-194), which supports his assertion that Joyce was “usually more concerned with the other elements of the story at first and only establishes its precise temporal coordinates in the characters’ lives afterwards” (193). Bloom’s illegal endeavor shows a less reputable side to a character often lauded for his integrity and kindness. On top of having “a touch of the artist” and “a soft hand under a hen” (U 10.582, 12.845), he has a touch of, to phrase it charitably, an entrepreneur. More importantly, however, it provides easy fodder for his companions to chastise his “otherness,” particularly his Hungarian extraction, Jewishness, and ties to the Freemasons.

However, Crispi’s observation hints at something less obvious: Joyce’s loose handling of temporality. A notorious appropriator, Joyce added the lottery scheme three years after his initial thought. Based on a historical fact, the scheme is transplanted ten years
before its actual occurrence to accommodate Bloom’s fictitious personal history (although it is safe to assume this was not the first time such a scheme was devised in England, Ireland, or elsewhere). The article was published on Bloomsday, the same year in which Griffith’s *Resurrection* was published. Besides emphasizing Bloom’s connection to Hungary, the scheme underwrites the notions that historical temporality was inherent in Joyce’s handling of Hungary and that even the more miniscule references to the nation are connected, if precipitously, to Griffith’s handling of Hungary. The lack of faith many in *Ulysses* have in the Hungarian Policy parallels their lack of respect for Bloom. They consider both Griffith’s plan and Bloom’s lottery scheme to be hatched from the same nefarious foreign influence they find antithetical to their strain of nationalism. Both schemes are suspicious not only because of their riskiness but because of their foreignness, demonstrating a natural distrust of foreign influence, however useful it might be, as well as resistance to the republicanism and abstentionism encouraged in Griffith’s brand of nationalism.

The lottery scheme was mentioned in “Ithaca” along with a few other materials of Hungarian extraction. Bloom has “assorted Austrian-Hungarian coins” (17.1807), a “local press cutting concerning change of name by deedpoll” (17.1866-67), and an “indistinct daguerreotype of Rudolf Virag and his father Leopold Virag executed in the year 1852 in the portrait atelier of their (respectively) 1st and 2nd cousin, Stefan Virag” (17.1875-77). He also carries with him several memories of Hungary. He recounts how his great-grandfather, for example, saw “Maria Theresa, empress of Austria, queen of Hungary” (17.1909-10) and how Milly’s blond hair could be indicative of “blond ancestry, remote, a violation, Herr Hauptmann Hainau, Austrian army” (17.868-69) (this reference is of particular relevance

---

2 Specifically, the deedpoll is for Bloom’s father, Rudolph.
and will be discussed later in the chapter). He is reminded of Franz Liszt’s Hungarian rhapsodies in “Sirens” (“Like those rhapsodies of Liszt’s, Hungarian, gipsy-eyed” [11.983]), one of which he supposedly hears while escaping the Citizen’s wrath at the end of “Cyclops” (12.1828). All of these memories recall Hungary or at least central and eastern Europe with varying degrees of relevancy. The coins are especially relevant in that they indicate the Ausgleich whereas the others are from in the reign of the Austrian Empire. Bloom carries these recollections with him much like coins, jumbling them with the same curiously and lack of temporal strictness evident in Joyce’s composition. They establish in the words of Ferenc Takács the “memory-setting of the novel” (165). Along with his material possessions it is clear Bloom appreciated his family’s Hungarian nationality.³

Joyce’s appropriation of Hungarian sources and temporal bending achieves a twofold objective: it demonstrates how this appropriation delegitimizes the concept of “national characteristics” and degrades (to borrow the term from Lloyd, itself appropriated from Antonio Gramsci and Guha [Iggers et al. 234]) subaltern struggle. At the same time, it also demonstrates how Joyce predicted and appreciated the rise of globalization and the multiculturalism that resulted from, both intentionally and unintentionally, the rise of nationalism in nineteenth century Europe. There are a number of ways to argue this, but I will focus on two topics: globalization (particularly the subtopics of multiculturalism and migration) and Zionism, both under the Hungarian context.

*Globalization and Multiculturalism.* If nationalism is difficult to precisely define, globalization is even more so. Although nationalism is a contested term, there is arguably a

---

³ See Mecsnóber, “‘Eastern Europe’” 30-31 for a thorough inventory of these Hungarian references.
broad consensus regarding the issues any theory of nationalism would face, a reasonable
canon of theory and scholarly research, and its historiographical applications. The concept
of globalization lacks such a consensus. The term “globalization” is even more
indiscriminately applied in historiographical and political discourses than “nationalism” and
itself was devised well after the term “nationalism.” If nationalism originated in the early-
modern era or the medieval ages, globalization is a modern phenomenon. Aidan Beatty, for
example, characterized globalization as “the geographical spread of capitalism” that dominated the nineteenth century (“Marx” 836). Globalization may also be more liberally
defined as a process that precipitously “turned immigrants and refugees into accepted
members of the vast and somewhat abstract community of the nation” (Osterhammel 700).
Nationalism, simply put, came first and globalization followed. Significant scholarship was
not even devoted to globalization until the 1990s (694). Nevertheless, the foundations were
there. Modern global migration arguably began with the “Great Exchange” of the fifteenth
and sixteenth centuries, yet the nineteenth and twentieth centuries saw unprecedented
migration in all continents. The formation of immigrant nation-states such as the United
States, Canada, Australia, and Argentina among others as well as the rise of colonialism and
later imperialism led to the diaspora of several European peoples (at the horrific expense, it
should never be forgotten, of indigenous populations, many of which were forced into
diasporas of their own). Ireland is perhaps the most cited example of mass migration in the
nineteenth century, having lost millions of its people to immigration in the decades after the
Great Famine. Although mass migration is often associated with European migration to the
Americas, there was also significant inter-European migration that Joyce, of course, was a
part of. This mass migration produced several issues regarding the nature of ethnicity,
culture, government, economy, trade, and national identity. Along with the positive achievements of this mass migration came the deleterious effects: nativism, xenophobia, racism, and all kinds of institutionalized discrimination and personal bigotry. If nationalism can be at least partly defined as “the most complex institutional architecture ever invented by mankind,” globalization can be considered “a process, or a bundle of processes, of integration” of various nation-states and, less tangibly, of cultures and ethnicities (696). In other words, globalization is the largest form of networking and cultural exchange the world had ever seen, themselves outgrowths of imperialism. This is this definition that, for the purposes of this dissertation, I will use henceforth.

The effects of modern globalization resonate throughout Joyce’s work. Much has been made about Joyce’s experiences in multinational imperial enclaves such as Trieste (what Damien Keane called a “somewhat literally Balkanized city” [401]) and cosmopolitan cities such as Zurich and Paris. Yet the multinational or cosmopolitan nature of Dublin is not brought up nearly as much, the simple reason being is that Dublin during Joyce’s time was neither multinational nor cosmopolitan. The overwhelming majority of Dubliners were born in Ireland, and Dublin was not a desirable destination for most European immigrants. Still, Bloom, Haines, and Almidano Artifoni aside, Dublin had a number of residents born outside of Ireland or of non-Irish extraction. As Bloom walks along Grafton Street in “Lestrygonians,” for example, he encounters quite a few vestiges of such a past. “He passed, dallying, the windows of Brown Thomas, silk mercers. Cascades of ribbons. Flimsy China silks. A tilted urn poured from its mouth a flood of bloodhued poplin: lustrous blood. The huguenots brought that there” (U 8.620-23; my emphasis). He is referring to the influx of French Huguenots that immigrated to Dublin in the late-seventeenth century to avoid
prosecution in the continent. The Huguenot population settled there and became, much like the English, Danish, and Scots before them (among others), more Irish than the Irish themselves. The Huguenots serve as a motif throughout the novel, demonstrating that even *fin de siècle* Dublin, one of Europe’s more downtrodden cities, was never ethnically homogenous (this motif will be discussed in detail later in the chapter). Bloom also mentions Chinese silk, which shows that at least materialistically, Dublin reaped certain benefits of global trade. Curiously, he associates the silk with blood and describes it in gushing terms: “cascades” and “flood.” It reflects his frequently morbid characterizations of what he sees throughout the novel, yet also indicates a kind of insidiousness that lies in the most mundane of things.4 Except that in this case, it is associated with the fruits of global migration and trade.

Indeed, many of the references to globalization are economic rather than cultural. Germany, for example, was a fierce competitor of the United Kingdom, provoking severe economic anxiety (although cultural concerns were an issue as well). Earlier in “Lestrygonians,” Bloom gazes upon the window of Yeates and Son and reminds himself to get new spectacles. “Must get those old glasses of mine set right. Goerz lenses six guineas. Germans making their way everywhere. Sell on easy terms to capture trade. Undercutting”

---

4 Bloom’s observations here and indeed throughout the novel recall Sigmund Freud’s famous analogy in *Civilization and its Discontents* (1930) of the topography of Rome as a representation of the human unconscious. Likening the minutiae of a city to the “past” of the mind, Freud comments on the complexities and absurdities of historical memory. “If we want to represent historical sequence in spatial terms we can only do it by juxtaposition in space: the same space cannot have two different contents. Our attempt seems to be an idle game. It has only one justification. It shows us how far we are from mastering the characteristics of mental life by representing them in pictorial terms” (70-71).

Much has been written on the mimetic or “hypomimetic” qualities of Joyce’s Dublin, the latter argued by Slote: the Dublin of *Ulysses* is “not mimetic but rather the background to mimesis; in other words, in *Ulysses* Dublin is hypomimetic” (“Thomistic” 191). It should be noted, however, that Slote primarily focused on Joyce’s engagement with the 1904 edition of *Thom’s Directory* in writing *Ulysses*. McLuhan also characterized *Ulysses* as “a modulation of space” (18). See Adams; Bénéjam and Bishop; Budgen; Gunn et al.; Kain; MacCabe 28-29; and T. Williams, *Reading* 35-36 on the topic among other sources.
Bloom’s economic analysis refers to the notion that Germany, in its competition with the other imperial powers of the nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, granted generous subsidies to German companies to dominate or “undercut” the market by way of selling inexpensive products. Goerz, an optical firm, enjoyed considerable success because of this. The term “made in Germany,” which appears in three of Joyce’s novels, was popularized during this time, referring to products that were of slipshod quality or unfairly subsidized. Ironically, of all the German products Bloom could have mentioned, Goerz optics were far from slipshod. They were, rather, considered some of the finest optics in Europe, setting a standard for industrial quality and technical innovation for their time (Sachsse 596-98). Still, the term appears a few times in Ulysses. In “Scylla and Charybdis,” Stephen quips that William Shakespeare was “made in Germany . . . as the champion French polisher of Italian sandals” (9.766-67). His main point is that many of Shakespeare’s plays took place in Italy, yet the term’s connotation with regard to foreign products, in this case French polish and Italian sandals, fits well here. In “Circe,” Edward VII arrives “robed as a grand elect perfect and sublime mason with trowel and apron, marked made in Germany” (15.4454-55), an allusion to the term’s original connotation as well as a jest at Edward VII’s Hanoverian origins as a member for the House of Saxe-Coburg and Gotha (U-A 174, 522; U-N 618, 761). Philip Keel Geheber, moreover, argues that Edward VII’s inclusion is part of a thematic arc in “Ithaca” that connects prostitution to imperial decline (“Filling” 66). Given this, the

---

5 Stephen may have also been poking fun at eighteenth and nineteenth century German scholars such as Georg Gottfried Gervinus who expropriated the playwright as “unser [our] Shakespeare” (U-A 327). It wasn’t so much these scholars thought Shakespeare to be literally German but rather that he was Germany’s “intellectual property” in that his artistic sensibilities were decidedly German or, more specifically, Teutonic. This was an amusing idea among English-speaking scholars, one of whom, Matthew Arnold, wrote about it directly (Celtic Literature 129). Joyce himself did so in “Ireland: Island of Saints and Sages,” pointing out that the Germans were instrumental in “present[ing] Shakespeare as a poet of worldwide significance” as well as stimulating scholarship on Celtic studies (OCPW 109). See also Manganiello 47.
reference to “made in Germany” may also imply that in relying on these products Ireland was prostrating itself to foreign domination.\footnote{In “Eumaeus,” Stephen makes a glib remark to such effect, though not in the German context: “In this country people sell much more than she ever had and do a roaring trade. Fear not them that sell the body but have not power to buy the soul. She is a bad merchant. She buys dear and sells cheap” (\textit{U} 16.736-38).} This connotation of the term appears in \textit{Portrait} when a heckler in the fictionalized depiction of the premiere of Yeats’s \textit{The Countess Cathleen} shouts “Made in Germany!” (5.1854), accusing Yeats of selling out to the decadent literary style of the continent – the same literary style that Joyce championed in “The Day of the Rabblement.”\footnote{“A nation which never advanced so far as a miracle-play affords no literary model to the artist, and he must look abroad” (\textit{OCPW} 50).} German trade practices are also mentioned in \textit{Stephen Hero}. In the middle of a dithering conversation, Stephen’s friend Cranly references “all the Germans who made small fortunes in Dublin by opening pork-shops”: “I often thought seriously . . . of opening a pork-show, d’ye know . . . and putting \textit{Kranliberg} or some German name, d’ye know, over the door . . . and makin’ a flamin’ fortune out of pig’s meat” (119).\footnote{With the exception of the first ellipse, the ellipses are in the original text.} Although pork-shops are not quite industrial, Cranly’s desire indicates how pervasive German products and industry were in Ireland and throughout Europe. Cranly’s factitious opportunism stands in contrast to Bloom’s criticism. Whereas the former finds amusement in the pervasiveness of German products, Bloom is critical of it, suggesting that the German undercutting of the market hurts Irish industry.

Bloom’s criticism was not unwarranted. Although his reference to Goerz products was misplaced, affordable German products did inundate the British and Irish markets to much chagrin. A bestselling book from this time, \textit{Made in Germany} (1896) by Ernest Edwin “E. E.” Williams, is a testament to this (Minchinton 229). The book garnered a significant amount of attention, not just from the public but from economists, politicians, and other
public figures.⁹ “The phrase is fluent in the mouth,” Williams writes, “how universally appropriate it is, probably no one who has not made a special study of the matter is aware” (10). He entreats the reader to “[r]oam the house over, and the fateful mark will greet you at every turn, from the piano in your drawing-room to the mug on your kitchen dresser. . . . As you rise from your hearthrug you know over an ornament on your mantlepiece; picking up the pieces you read, on the bit that formed the base, ‘Manufactured in Germany’” (11), and so forth. He argues that through a combination of external factors and deliberate government policies, Germany was able to sell its products to the United Kingdom easily and cheaply – “Billig und Schnell,” or “Cheap and Fast” as the Germans referred to it (134). He does not argue the products were slipshod _per se_, at least as of late. Instead, he attributes the phenomenon to British labeling laws and free trade, German tariffs and subsidies (the “undercutting” Bloom spoke of), lower transportation costs, German proclivities to “adaptability” and learning English, a robust education system (including funding of trade and technical schools), and superior foreign consular services (130-63). This last point is of special interest. Near the end of “Wandering Rocks” when the viceroy cavalcade passes through Nassau Street, Dublin eccentric Cashel Boyle O’Connor Fitzmaurice Tisdall Farrell “stared through a fierce eyeglass across the carriages at the head of Mr M. E. Solomons in the window of the _Austro-Hungarian viceconsulate_” (U 10.1261-63; my emphases). Solomons was an Austro-Hungarian diplomat as well as an optician and spectacles manufacturer (Igoe 277; _U-A_ 286; _U-N_ 662). Robert Tracy cites this passage as evidence that Joyce was emphasizing the unwelcomed unions both England and Austria were imposing

---

⁹ George Bernard Shaw, for example, references Williams in an 1897 letter regarding a Fabian meeting: “I had to go, as it was important that Williams and his Protection gospel should be looked after. We scattered his limbs on the blast” (qtd. in Minchinton 237).
upon their respective neighbors (534-35). Although this is true, I would add that the passage also alludes to the German, or Pan-German, economic practices that Williams and others wrote about, Bloom’s comments on Goerz optical products, as well as Griffith’s advocacy of economic protectionism, his resentment of foreign industries, and the praise he lavishes upon Hungary’s economy after it obtained autonomy within the Austro-Hungarian empire, which to him exceeded Austria’s economic output in many respects (Resurrection 68-69).10

Issues such as the inundation of foreign products, both German and English, and their stranglehold on the Irish economy pervade Ulysses. They find a stringent if not bizarre articulation earlier in “Lestrygonians” in a contested passage among Joyce scholars. As Bloom perambulates, he runs into George Russell (AE) riding a bicycle pontificating to someone next to him. “Of the twoheaded octopus, one of whose heads is the head upon which the ends of the world have forgotten to come while the other speaks with a Scotch accent. The tentacles . . . ” (U 8.520-22). Bloom interprets Russell’s cryptic statement as having to do with the occult – “Something occult: symbolism” (8.530) – or something equally conspiratorial such as Freemasonry, as do other scholars (U-A 173; U-N 618). However, Hugh Kenner believes that Russell was actually talking about Great Britain’s domination of the Irish economy: “It seems a fair speculation that Joyce’s AE was discoursing of British economic power, its tentacles stretched toward Ireland, its two heads London and Edinburgh, the latter of course characterized by a Scotch accent” (“Taxonomy” 205). He notes that Russell’s language in this passage is more reminiscent of his economic writings (he was the editor of the Irish Homestead, a publication of the Irish Agricultural Organisation Society) than his theosophical ones (204-5). Moreover, the image of an octopus “strangling” other

10 For more on the prevalence of the phrase “made in Germany” and Williams’ book, see Jones 34 and Minchinton 229-42.
nations was common in the late-nineteenth century political rhetoric and cartoons and was applied to imperial or otherwise hegemonic entities such as the United Kingdom, Russia, Japan, and, perhaps most famously, Standard Oil (Ottens). Bloom briefly contemplates his statement before moving on, yet it is another rather cartoonish indication of how ubiquitous and fraught the economic anxiety globalization had wrought upon Ireland.

Regardless of the bi-headed octopus and the Sinn Féin position on protectionism, Bloom is not necessarily going to avoid buying Goerz lenses. Bloom, like most Dubliners, is not a wealthy man. Bloom is a practitioner of husbandry (Osteen 94) and a firm believer in the “powers of . . . mass products” (130), which makes it more than plausible that he would buy the lenses. Right before he “commemorates” Emmet’s last words in front of Lionel Marks’s antique shop in “Sirens,” he recalls another foreign product, this time Swedish: “That’s what good salesman is. Makes you buy what he wants to sell. Chap sold me the Swedish razor he shaved me with. Wanted to charge me for the edge he gave it. . . . Six bob” (U 11.1265-67). These references reveal a begrudging acceptance of globalization on the part of Cranly, Bloom, and many others in Ireland in the backdrop of the economic protectionism Griffith was advocating. They may rail against it in private or joke about it in public, but in the end economic necessity, let alone convenience, will dictate their purchases of products, foreign and domestic.\(^{11}\)

“**Oriental Paddies**” and **National Characteristics.** The exchange globalization entailed was not just economic but also cultural. The concept of “national characteristics” rose alongside the initial emergence of nationalism in the eighteenth century. The people of each nation, the

\(^{11}\) See Osteen for more on economic issues in *Ulysses*, particularly 70-155 for the earlier chapters such as “Lestrygonians” and “Aeolus.”
concept goes, have a certain set of characteristics besides language and religion. National characteristics referred to inherent or “organic” personal qualities. The Irish, for example, were often characterized as good-humored and irascible whereas the English were considered rational and reserved. What have been questioned as racist stereotypes starting in the late-twentieth century held considerable cultural approbation in Joyce’s time. Joyce himself wrote about national characteristics in the beginning of “Ireland: Island of Saints and Sages”:

Nations, like individuals, have their egos. It is not unusual for a race to wish to attribute to itself qualities or glories unknown in other races – from the time when our forefathers called themselves Aryans and nobles to the Greeks who were wont to call anyone barbarian that did not live within the sacrosanct land of Hellas. The Irish, with a pride that is perhaps less explicable, love to refer to their land as the land of saints and sages. (*OCPW* 108)

This personification of nations, particularly of Hungary, is apparent throughout Joyce’s work. In *Dubliners*, the Hungarian “ego” is most apparent in “After the Race” in the form of the “huge Hungarian named Villona” (33). One of the four drivers along with Charles Séguin, a Frenchman, André Rivière, a French-Canadian, and Jimmy Doyle, the Irishman, Villona is described as being “in good humour,” “an optimist by nature,” “a brilliant pianist,” and “very poor” (33-34). These all correspond to the common Western European view of the Hungarian – or, more broadly, the Bohemian, which indiscriminately included all the peoples of Eastern and Central Europe since at least the early-nineteenth century (“Bohemian, n. and adj.”), a connotation Joyce himself employs as we shall see – as affable, positive, and powerless. Villona’s musical talent may also be an allusion to Hungary’s exceptional
contribution to classical music. When he is riding in the car, he “kept up a deep bass hum of melody for miles of the road” (D 34) and plays the piano throughout the night. Indeed, the four main characters neatly fit the characteristics of their respective nationalities, and the story constantly references the nationalities of everyone involved in the race:

Now and again the clumps of people raised the cheer of the gratefully oppressed.
Their sympathy, however, was for the blue cars – the cars of their friends, the French.

The French, moreover, were virtual victors. Their team had finished solidly; they had been placed second and third and the driver of the winning German car was reported a Belgian. (32)

The French were “virtual victors” because in addition to placing second and third, the winner was from Belgium, a country which shares some of the language, culture, and history with France (32n4). Moreover, the spectators cheer for the French cars because the predominately Catholic French traditionally helped the predominately Catholic Irish in their rebellions against the English, most notably in the leadup to the 1798 Rebellion (Bartlett, Ireland 79; Bowen, “After the Race” 57). Joyce describes the four main characters as having “spirits [which] seemed to be at present well above the level of successful Gallicism” (D 32), reinforcing French domination. Their nationalities are explicitly emphasized towards the end of the story when they make toasts: “They drank . . . it was bohemian. They drank Ireland, England, France, Hungary, the United States of America” (37; my emphasis). Perhaps more so than any other story in Dubliners, “After the Race” constantly reiterates the characters’ nationalities. Fairhall reads the story as a microcosm of the economic and imperial rivalries of their respective nations, with the imperial powers, as represented by Ségouin and the Englishman Routh, dominating or otherwise outshining the smaller nations, as represented
by Doyle and Villona, both in the race, when they sit in the back of the car, and the card game they play afterwards, when Doyle loses heavily and Villona plays the piano throughout the night (“Big-Power” 299-308). R. B. Kershner argues that the “main thrust of the narrative is Jimmy Doyle’s attempt to learn a language that is unfamiliar to him but that he aspires after: the language of sophisticated European society” (72). Charles Peake also notices a difference in the description of Doyle from the rest of the characters. While the three continentals are described as in “good humour,” Doyle was “too excited to be genuinely happy” (D 33). Doyle, the son of a former “advanced nationalist” (33), is the only person from a country that was not autonomous at the time, something that alongside his defeat in the end of the story highlights his colonial status (Peake 23-24). The story is based on the Gordon-Bennett motor race that took place in Ireland in July 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 1903, the coverage of which also “perhaps unconsciously . . . suggested the race’s aspect as a microcosm of competition among the leading capitalist and imperialist powers” (Fairhall, “Big-Power” 302). The Irish Times, for example, wrote positively about the coverage Ireland would get from hosting the race, commenting on January 17\textsuperscript{th}, 1903 that it “would attract people from every part of Europe, and Dublin, for a week or so . . . its streets thronged with the latest specimen of English, French, German, and American motors. Huge sums of money would be laid out by all these people.” It also focused on national characteristics, noting among other things that it would be “a Titanic struggle” between nations and that England was ruled out as a host because it did not have the infrastructure to do so but more importantly the “practical English people would never tolerate it” (“Gordon-Bennett” 7). Three days later, another Times article extolled the race as “magnificent advertisement for Ireland,” suggesting it would invigorate Irish industry as well as ingenuity. “Might not many Irish boys, who would see such an
extraordinary sight as would be present by the race, be brought to apply their minds and devote their energies to scientific pursuits to the immeasurable advantage of the country at large!” (“Editorial Article 3” 4). Joyce was certainly aware of the upcoming race and its potential importance for Ireland in that, among other reasons, he wrote about it for the *Times*. In April 1903, he conducted an interview with the French motorist M. Henri Fournier that the *Times* later published. The interview is rather mundane, although the story’s title may have its origins in it.12

Villona’s presence is rather mute as he does not speak in the story until the end when he literally has the last words:

The cabin door opened and [Doyle] saw the Hungarian standing in a shaft of grey light.

–Daybreak, gentlemen! (D 38)

Far from an amusing side character – and a poorly-named one at that as several Hungarian critics have noted (Mecsnőber, “‘Eastern Europe’” 28; Takács 163) – Villona serves two purposes for Joyce. First, he represents the role as artist, his last pronouncement “standing in a shaft of epiphany-like light, a foreshadowing of the artist as priest” (Bowen, “Hungarian Politics” 138). Yet he is also a symbol of “the lessons of Hungarian politics,” deliberately paired with Doyle, poor, and from a smaller nation in a precipitous union with its considerably more powerful neighbor. Bowen speculates that *Resurrection*, which was published in the same year when Joyce was writing the story, directly inspired Villona’s inclusion (138-39; Fairhall, “Big-Power” 308). Tekla Mecsnőber makes the same point, yet

---

12 [Joyce]: Will you remain any time in Ireland? [Fournier]: After the race? [Joyce]: Yes. [Fournier]: I am afraid not. I should like to, but I don’t think I can. (“The Motor Derby” 223; my emphasis)
she highlights “the flatness of the Hungarian character” and his “unabashedly physical and artistic” nature which, paired with the “repressed” Doyle, imply solidarity between the two and “symbolize their national stereotypes: both of them truly take ‘after the race’ of their forefathers” (“Arthur Griffith” 347-48). Indeed, Villona has the last word in announcing the sunrise, a metaphor for the rising – or resurrection as it were – for Hungary as well as Ireland.

Villona’s pairing with Doyle can trace its origins to a long line of Hiberno-Hungarian comparisons. Similarities between the two nations, particularly their histories, have been drawn as early as the eighteenth century. In 1707, for example, Prince Ferenc Rákóczi II of Hungary made the comparison to other diplomats after he had dethroned the Hapsburgs, comparing his rebellion to the Stuart Rebellion in Ireland. French diplomats acknowledged this comparison at the time, as they were eager to support opposition to the English and their allies, including the Hapsburgs (Kabdebo 20-21). As Hungarian diplomat Ladislas Hengelmüller wrote about Rákóczi II in 1913: “He further explained that Hungary’s connection with Austria was of the same nature as Scotland’s with England, whereas the Austrians wanted to treat them as the English did Ireland, as a conquered country, without, however, ever having conquered them” (219). In the nineteenth century, Western Europeans considered Hungary to be an eastern backwater, its people more similar to “orientals” than to the French or English. In her 1893 biography of her husband, Lady Isabel Burton, the wife of English “adventurer” and orientalist Sir Richard Francis Burton, relates her husband’s views on Hungary (quoted at length here):

The Hungarian is a Tartar with a coat of veneer and varnish. Hungary is, as regards civilization, simply the most backward country in Europe. Buda-Pest is

---

13 He wrote the first unexpunged English translation of Arabian Nights in the nineteenth century. The translation was so risqué by Victorian standards that he was forced to print it himself (J. Thompson; U-A 559; U-N 777).
almost purely German, the work of the Teutons, who, at the capital, do all the work; you hardly ever hear in the streets a word of Magyar, and the Magyars have only managed to raise its prices and its death-rate to somewhat double those of London.

The cities, like historic Gran on the Danube, have attempts at public buildings and streets; in the country towns and villages the thoroughfares are left to Nature; the houses and huts, the rookeries and doggeries are planted higgledy-piggledy, wherever the tenants please; and they are filthier than any shanty in Galway or Cork. . . . They speak a tongue of Turkish affinity, all their sympathies are with their blood-kinsmen the Turks, and they have toiled to deserve the savage title of ‘white Turks,’ lately conferred upon them by Europe.

All Englishmen who have lived long amongst Hungarians remark the similarity of the Magyar and the southern Irish Catholic. Both are imaginative and poetical, rather in talk than in books; neither race ever yet composed poetry of the highest class. Both delight in music; but, as the ‘Irish Melodies’ are mostly Old English, so the favourites of Hungary are gypsy songs. Both have the ‘gift of the gab’ to any extent, while their eloquence is notably more flowery than fruity. *Both are sharp and intelligent, affectionate and warm-hearted; easily angered and appeased, delighted with wit, and to be managed by a bon mot; superficial, indolent, sensitive, punctilious, jealous, quarrelsome, passionate, and full of fight.* Both are ardent patriots, with an occasional notable exception of treachery; both are brilliant soldiers; the Hungarians, who formerly were only cavalry men, now form whole regiments of the Austrian Line. . . .
As regards politics and finance, Buda-Pest is simply a modern and eastern copy of Dublin. The Hungarian magnate still lives like the Squireen and Buckeen of the late Mr. Charles Lever’s ‘earliest style;’ he keeps open house, he is plundered by all hands, and no Galway landowner of the last generation was less fitted by nature and nurture to manage his own affairs. . . .

They were once a barrier against Tartar savagery, a Finnish race, invited by the Byzantine Emperors to act as a buffer against Mohammedanism. . . . And where, we may ask, is the power that can muzzle these Eastern ban-dogs? who shall take away the shillelghs of these Oriental Paddies? (505-7; my emphasis)

Burton’s comparison of the Irish to the Hungarians, with their alleged punctiliousness, barbarity, and folksiness, was pervasive in Western European writing about Hungary (McCourt, “Tarry Easty” 26). Burton, who lived and died in Trieste about fifteen years before Joyce arrived, harbored racial and cultural condescension toward the two peoples that was considered perfectly normal. 14 In Resurrection, Griffith quotes another Englishman, “Ambassador” Charles Boner, 15 who reiterated Burton’s sentiments in his analysis of the Austro-Hungarian feud:

A Hungarian . . . always dwells on and cherishes his wrongs, and like the Irish, never loses an opportunity of putting them forward prominently. . . . [Hungarians] are the

---

14 Compare Burton’s characterization of the Hungarians to Arnold’s characterization of the Irish:
The Celt, undisciplinable, anarchical, and turbulent by nature, but out of affection and admiration giving himself body and soul to some leader, that is not a promising political temperament, it is just the opposite of the Anglo-Saxon temperament, disciplinable and steadily obedient within certain limits, but retaining an inalienable part of freedom and self-dependence; but it is a temperament for which one has a kind of sympathy notwithstanding. And very often, for the gay defiant reaction against fact of the lively Celtic nature one has more than sympathy; one feels, in spite of the extravagance, in spite of good sense disapproving, magnetized and exhilarated by it. (Celtic Literature 109)
See also his Irish Essays 68 for a similar description.
15 Boner was a poet and journalist but not an ambassador, one of the many errors in Resurrection (Brayne).
very opposite of the German. He is slow to assert and scrupulous in examining. The Hungarian, borne away by imagination and his hot passions, boldly asserts as fact the promptings of his ardent temperament, and he will often lavish forth assertions as recklessly as he has always hurled defiance against his opponent. (qtd. in 75, 77)

Boner felt that the comparison between the Austrian (or German) with the Hungarian was analogous to that of the English (or Scot) and the Irish: “They are as different as possible in nature, education, aims and political views. In character they are as unlike as the Irish and Scotch – indeed, I have often thought the buoyant Hungarian, swayed easily by passion resembled the former, while the Austrian, thrifty and methodical, reminded me of him of the north country” (qtd. in 79). “Is there a reader,” Griffith remarks, “to whom this is not familiar, who, substituting ‘Irishmen’ for ‘Hungarians,’ and ‘Englishmen’ for ‘Germans,’ cannot recall having read in the books of the English the same passage?” (77). Furthermore, Burton’s comment about the Hungarians acting as a “buffer” first against the Tatars and later the Ottomans was reiterated in the introduction of Resurrection:

In the eighth century of our era the warlike Magyars burst in upon the rich plains ringed by the Carpathians, and raised their standard about the fertile land. . . . Thenceforward Hungary from being the menace became a sentinel of Christendom, standing by the Asiatic Gate, and holding it against the unbelievers who sought to force an entrance with the sword. . . . But at length the Turkish power in Europe was broken, under the walls of Vienna, by the Poles, and the French, and the Hungarians with the Austrians, flung themselves upon their old enemy. (xvii-iii)

Ostensibly positive, these descriptions of Hungarians as fierce warriors who later fell from grace and lost their ability to sustain a civilization were deeply condescending yet
nevertheless prevalent. Moreover, they are arguably similar to how many Irish viewed themselves during the resurgence of nationalism in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries.

Yet at the same time, even English elitists like Burton evoked Hungary in their attempts to ameliorate the Irish question. He used the example of the dual monarchy to justify his support for Home Rule:

Every province of Austro-Hungary (the Dual Empire which should and will be tripled to Austro-Hungaro-Slavonian) enjoys the greatest advisable amount of ‘Home Rule’ by means of its own Landstag or Diet. The little volumes, each in the local dialect, containing the rules and regulations for legislative procedure are broadcast over the country; and I would especially recommend those which concern the Diet of Istria and – a thing apart – the Diet of Trieste City to the many who are now waxing rabid with alarm at the idea of an Irish Parliament in the old house on College Green. (304)

Burton’s influence on Joyce has been noted before. John McCourt, for example, speculates that Joyce may have been familiar with Burton, even going as far as suggesting Burton’s writing may have inspired the oriental imagery throughout *Ulysses*, including Bloom’s reveries in “Calypso” (4.86-98) and “Lotus Eaters” (5.27-34). He points out that Burton used the Hungarian parallel in arguing for Home Rule, particularly the idea of a dual monarchy and a separate parliament, twenty years before Griffith advocated for it publicly (“Tarry Easty” 24-28). Moreover, this parallel was not solely promoted by the English and Irish. Hungarians also felt a solidarity with Ireland throughout the nineteenth century in the lead up to and aftermath of the *Ausgleich*. O’Connell’s agitation in the 1830s and 1840s, for example, was covered extensively in the Hungarian press. The tactics of his Repeal Association were
copied by Hungarian nationalists. Two prominent Hungarian politicians, Bertalan Szemere and Ferenc Pulszky, visited Ireland in 1837, later lamenting on the horrific poverty in the country and laying responsibility squarely on the British. William Smith O’Brien visited Hungary in 1861, writing in his diary that he believed, like Burton, that Ireland needed its own parliament – forty years before Griffith, and twenty years before Burton, came to that conclusion. The rapport between Irish and Hungarian nationalists continued through Griffith’s appropriation of the latter’s activities (Kabdebo 20-28; P. Murray viii-ix).16

With this in mind, it is more than fitting that Joyce would include Villona in “After the Race,” describing him as massive, poor, musical, and ultimately simple, depriving him of any input until the very end – and even that, a mere two words, was underwhelming. As mentioned, Joyce did not hesitate to write about “national characteristics” in large part because he was not averse to the concept himself (E. Nolan, “Cultural Critic” 115-16).17 The “question on national traits,” according to Ellmann, “interested him very much.” In a revealing anecdote, he claims that Joyce “allocated the seven deadly sins among the European nations. Gluttony, he said, was English, Pride French, Wrath Spanish, Lust German, Sloth Slavic. ‘What is the Italian sin? Avarice,’ he concluded, recalling how often he had been cheated by shopkeepers and how wickedly he had been robbed in Rome. As for his own people, the Irish, their deadly sin was Envy . . . .” (JJ 382; my emphasis). Frank Budgen noted that Joyce “attached greater weight to race, nation, and to some real yet indefinite thing one might call type” (175). Joyce also discussed the supposed similarities between the Irish and the Jews: “They were alike, he declared, in being impulsive, given to

16 See Kabdebo for an excellent study on the Hiberno-Hungarian relationship in the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries.
17 It should be noted that Nolan wrote about “racial theory” rather than “national characteristics,” yet the two concepts overlap considerably in nineteenth century nationalist thought.
fantasy, addicted to associative ‘Hebraism and Hellenism’ in mind, that there were two basically different ways of thinking, the Greek and the Jewish, and the Greek was logical and rational” (*JJ* 395). His comparison between the Irish and the Jews will be explored later, but his comments on gentile Europe clarify some of the national characterization found in his work.

“*Eumaeus*” and the Tension Between Nationalism and Globalization. Passages in “*Eumaeus*” make the national characterization in “After the Race” look tame in comparison. The theme of national characteristics and, for that matter, globalization reverberates throughout. I wish to argue that “*Eumaeus*” demonstrates that globalization, despite being an outgrowth of imperialism, is in significant ways the inverse of nationalism. Nationalism depends on the subjugation – legally, physically, and culturally – of its citizens, whereas globalization challenges or at least loosens this subjugation. One cannot change one’s country of birth. As Stephens says, “When the soul of a man is born in this country there are nets flung at it to hold it back from flight” (*P* 5.1047-48). Yet one can challenge the nation’s supremacy on oneself. Citizens are no longer subjects of the nation-state but rather are global objects in their own right. In “*Eumaeus*,” the linguistic boundaries that traditionally shaped prose and solidify meaning are stretched to their limits. I believe this is analogous to the emergence of globalization, which itself had a problematic relationship with the nationalism that dominated Ireland and the rest of Europe in the nineteenth century. Although there are no direct references to Hungary in the episode, the tensions and problems inherent in the Hungarian parallel with Ireland are analogous to the tensions and problems inherent in the relationship between globalization and nationalism.
First, I would like to focus on the theme of “national characteristics” in “Eumaeus.” Midway through the episode, Bloom recalls the sailor D. B. Murphy’s account of witnessing a man getting stabbed to death in Trieste by an Italian (U 16.576-77). Bloom remarks that “there was nothing intrinsically incompatible about it” as “that stab in the back touch was quite in keeping with those italianos” (16.864-66). He continues:

[H]e was none the less free to admit those icecreamers and friers in the fish way not to mention the chip potato variety and so forth over in little Italy near the Coombe were sober thrifty hardworking fellows except perhaps a bit too given to pothunting the harmless necessary animal of the feline persuasion of others at night so as to have a good old succulent tuckin with garlic *de rigueur* off him or her next day on the quiet and, he added, on the cheap. (16.866-72)

There is much to decipher here. Bloom refers to the Italian community that congregated nearby the Coombe neighborhood of Dublin. Having immigrated there for centuries, they were known for their food shops, skilled and unskilled labor and seasonal migration.\(^\text{18}\) Dubliners often identified these Italian immigrants as ice-cream vendors. Indeed, census records in 1901 show that of the twenty-three ice-cream vendors registered in Dublin, sixteen were Italian immigrants and the seven others may have been of Italian descent (Simpson, “Italian Colony”). One such vendor, “Rabaiotti’s icecream car” (U 10.229), appears in “Wandering Rocks” and again in “Circe” (15.5, 150). The “harmless necessary animal” is an allusion to Shylock in *The Merchant of Venice*, himself an extraordinarily stereotypical character (U-A 546; U-N 770). The Italians’ apparent appetite for cats seems to reinforce the savagery Bloom attributes to them (Bloom, after all, has a fondness for cats). Moreover, he

\(^{18}\) Molly recalls in “Penelope” that “I got that little Italian boy to mend” (18.1015) a statue Milly broke.
speculates in “Ithaca” that Molly had an affair with “an Italian organ-grinder” (*U* 17.2137), which may have contributed to his distaste for them. This passage is a reaction to Murphy’s story about Trieste, which may be a nod to Joyce’s time there. As stated before, the city was a multiethnic enclave in the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Yet given Joyce’s statement about the inherent “avarice” of the Italians made after the publication of *Ulysses*, the reference to Trieste is not the only personal one of the passage. Bloom’s judgment on “those italianos” is not so different than Joyce’s appraisal. Both of them, much like Burton, acknowledge the humanity of the Eastern (or in the Italians’ case, Southern) European while at the same time glibly commenting on their supposedly more ignoble traits.

After opining on the Italians, Blooms turns his attention to another Southern European people, the Spanish:

Spaniards, for instance, he continued, passionate temperaments like that, impetuous as *Old Nick*, are given to taking the law into their own hands and give you your quietus doublequick with all those *poignards* they carry in the abdomen. It comes from the great heat, climate generally. My wife is, so to speak, Spanish, half that is. Point of fact she could actually claim Spanish nationality if she wanted, having been born in (technically) Spain, i.e. Gibraltar. She has the Spanish type. Quite dark, regular brunette, black. I for one certainly believe climate accounts for character.

(16.873-80; my emphases)

This short passage is remarkable in that it contains even more allusions to national characteristics than the previous one. “Old Nick” is traditionally an English nickname for the Devil, yet according to the *OED* it may have originated as a reference to the Italian
philosopher Niccolò Machiavelli (“Old Nick, n.”). There are two references to *Hamlet*: “Quietus” is from Hamlet’s “To be or not to be” soliloquy (“When he himself might his quietus make / With a bare bodkin” [3.1.75-76]) and “poignards” are some of the items Laertes wagers against Claudius in his fencing match against Hamlet (“six French rapiers and poniards, with their assigns, as girdle, hangers, and so” [5.2.3795]). A poignard, like a bodkin or “stiletto” (*U* 16.585), is a long, lightweight knife that was popular with knights and noblemen during the medieval ages (“Poignard, n.”; “Stiletto, n.”). Although these knives were used in Western Europe (as evident in *Hamlet*), they also have an orientalist connotation in that they were popular among soldiers from the Caucasus during the Safavid Empire (Floor 225). Bloom ostensibly differentiates between the Italians and the Spaniards, yet his language indicates otherwise. Bloom’s archaic terminology harken back to medieval times among Mediterranean people, at once orientalizing and indiscriminately scrutinizing various nationalities. Bloom and Murphy’s description of the knife reinforce this indiscrimination. Murphy, after all, mentions the reasoning behind a conspiracy theory regarding the Phoenix Park Murders of 1882: “That was why they thought the park murders of the invincibles was done by foreigners on account of them using knives” (*U* 16.590-92). Authorities entertained the idea that Irish-Americans or Continental Europeans committed the murders – not because of their weapon of choice, but because the murders happened right after Parnell’s release from prison (Fairhall, *Question* 12; *U-A* 542-43; *U-N* 769). American Fenians were considered suspects at one point due to alleged eyewitness accounts of hearing

---

19 Samuel Butler references this etymology in *Hudibras* (1684): “Nick Machiavel had ne’r a trick, (Though he gave his Name to our Old Nick)” (qtd. in “Old Nick, n.”).
20 Poniards are mentioned again in “Circe” when “THE NYMPH” attempts to assassinate Bloom: “(she draws a poniard and, clad in the sheathmail of an elected knight of nine, strikes at his loins)” (*U* 15.3460-61).
21 In “Penelope,” Molly envisions a scenario with Bloom in which “I can tell him the Spanish and he tell me the Italian” (*U* 18.1476), demonstrating that the link between Italian and the Spanish was not uncommon, even among those like Molly who essentially lived in Spain.
the murderers speak in American accents, including “two suspicious looking sailors at Monaghan” (Corfe 198; my emphasis). There were also more hysterical theories that the murders were “part of some international plot, some emanation of the vast anarchic threat to society and order that was thought of vaguely as socialism or anarchism or nihilism, and whose tangled web linked America and Russia and Britain” (230). Murphy’s comment was a half-truth, indicating the investigators’ suspicions but for entirely different reasons. Still, with this kind of indiscriminate orientalizing, the finer details are negligible. His characterization derives from “the commonplace British prejudice that Mediterranean peoples are inclined to be hot-blooded, oversexed, and emotionally unrestrained” (U-A 546), which Bloom attributes to the hot climate: “It’s in the blood, Mr Bloom acceded at once. All are washed in the blood of the sun” (U 16.889-90).

As erroneous as these claims are, Bloom could be forgiven in that they were culturally acceptable at the time. However, his claim that Molly could attain Spanish citizenship and that Gibraltar was a part of Spain are unequivocally false. Gibraltar was a British colony and though Molly’s mother was Spanish, she would not have been entitled to Spanish citizenship as children of servicemembers stationed at the British garrison were not granted citizenship by the Spanish government (U-A 546; U-N 770). Although claim leaves room for ambiguity in that he refers to “nationality,” rather than citizenship, the way he phrases it – that she could “claim” Spanish nationality – may imply both. Moreover, later in the episode Stephen teases Bloom by claiming Katherine O’Shea was the king of Spain’s daughter, “adding something or other rather muddles about farewell and adieu to you Spanish onions and the first land called the Deadman and from Ramhead to Scilly was so and so many” (U 16.1414-17). The narrator describes Stephen’s drunkenly (or possibly intentionally) garbled fragments from
various ballads and nursery rhymes. Bloom considers the rumor plausible as O’Shea did live in Spain at some point with her husband (U-A 524, 556; U-N 762, 776). Much like the perpetrators of the Phoenix Park Murders, O’Shea is demeaned due to lazy, offhand hearsay derived from national characteristics. The only accurate claims Bloom makes are in his physical descriptions of Molly. Indeed, he reveals an obsession with the female form when he later describes Italian (and by extension, Mediterranean) women: “splendid proportions of hips, bosom. You simply don’t knock against those kind of women here. . . . Besides, [Irish women] have so little taste in dress, most of them, which greatly enhances a woman’s natural beauty, no matter what you say” (U 16.892-7). His comments were inspired by visiting the National Library at the end of “Lestrygonians” that were exhibiting copies of Praxiteles’ statues, or “antique statues” (16.892), which is more than fitting. His national characterizations, ludicrous portrayals of Italians and Spaniards, arcane references, and incorrect information are all derived from the same shallow thinking that drives his chauvinistic and voyeuristic fixation on the female body. It highlights, as Stephen Watt articulates, that “women and especially the female body are contextualized not only within a language of commodity aesthetics and exchange, but within colonialist and nationalist discourses as well” in this episode and throughout Ulysses” (759). His admiration of the lifeless, stone, and especially of note, Greek statues is an apt reflection of that – as is his admiration of inanimate objects in general. Later in the episode, he shows Stephen a photograph of Molly, at once fetishizing and orientalizing her:

Stephen . . . looked down on the photo showing a large sized lady with her fleshy charms on evidence in an open fashion as she was in the full bloom of womanhood in evening dress cut ostentatiously low for the occasion to give a liberal display of
bosom, with more than vision of breasts, her full lips parted and some perfect teeth, standing near, ostensibly with gravity, a piano on the rest of which was *In Old Madrid*, a ballad, pretty in its way, which was then all the vogue. Her (the lady’s) eyes, dark, large, looked at Stephen, about to smile about something to be admired.

... (*U* 16.1427-35)²²

This sensual description of this photograph demonstrates the “transformation of women into image-commodities” in *Ulysses*, revealing a “pattern of ideological quilting . . . in which various economies are brought into proximity to each other through one commodity: the figure of woman” and how “representations of women and Otherness are intricately tied to what might be termed counter-hegemonic discourse” (Watt 765, 768).²³ This photograph, along with the image of Katherine O’Shea which “loosened many a man’s thighs” (*U* 16.1355), have the same effect on Bloom as “those Grecian statues, perfectly developed as works of art” (16.1450-51). Whatever is “real” about them is overshadowed by their aesthetic and inanimate representations, which themselves feed into and are reflections of the puerile characterizations of Eastern and Southern Europeans displayed throughout “Eumaeus.”²⁴

Yet as foolish as these characterizations are, they pale in comparison to descriptions of non-Europeans in the episode, much of which comes from the sailor Murphy. “I seen queer things too,” he remarks, “ups and downs” (16.465-66). After mistaking Stephen’s

---

²² It is possible that the photograph is not of Molly at all but of someone else. “Taken a few years since. In or about ninety six. *Very like her then*” (16.1438-39; my emphasis). This would fit the themes of mistaken identity and rampant ambiguity in “Eumaeus.” However, the “[v]ery much like her then” description may also refer to the fact that to Bloom, Molly’s appearance has not changed much since the photo was taken. Molly also complains in “Penelope” about Bloom “showing [Stephen] my photo its not good of me . . .” (18.1302-3). For the sake of argument, I agree with the latter interpretation.

²³ See also King 345 and Lawrence 366.

²⁴ It is also worth noting that some characters in *Ulysses* are unsure of Molly’s ethnicity. In “Sirens,” for example, Dollard asks Simon Dedalus if she is Irish (11.510).
father for a world-famous sharpshooter whom he saw perform in Stockholm, he indulges the curiosity of the men in the cabman’s shelter with a summary of his adventures:

  Why, the sailor answered upon reflection upon it, I’ve circumnavigated a bit since I first joined on. I was in the Red Sea. I was in China and North America and South America. We was chased by pirates one voyage. I seen icebergs plenty, growlers. I was in Stockholm and the Black Sea, the Dardanelles under Captain Dalton, the best bloody man that ever scuttled a ship. I seen Russia. Gospodi pomilyou. That’s how the Russian prays. (16.458-63)

His lurid tales of the world are not only adventurous or fascinating, they are “queer,” a term that is close to oriental in connotation. Murphy’s characterization of the oriental countries depends even more on aesthetic and inanimate representations. They come in the form of yarns and visual props, and some of Murphy’s claims are so outlandish that even Bloom is skeptical. “I seen a Chinese one time . . . that had little pills like putty and he put them in the water and they opened and every pill was something different. One was a ship, another was a house, another was a flower. Cooks rats in your soup . . . the chinks does” (16.570-73).

It should be noted his passage is awfully similar to *Swann’s Way* (1913) in which Marcel Proust describes a Japanese custom sans the rats:

  And just as the Japanese amuse themselves by filling a porcelain bowl with water and steeping in it little bits of paper which until then are without character or form, but, the moment they become wet, stretch themselves and bend, take on color and distinctive shape, become flowers or houses or people, permanent and recognizable, so in that moment all the flowers in our garden and in M. Swann’s park, and the water lilies on the Vivonne and the good folk of the village and their little dwellings and the parish church and the whole of Combray and of its surroundings, taking their proper shapes and growing solid, sprang into being, town and gardens alike, from my cup of tea. (54)

Joyce appropriation of Proust’s Japanese anecdote is another instance of indiscriminately describing different cultures, much in the same way Murphy does, that was pervasive in both laymen and the intellectual circles to which Joyce and Proust belonged. It also could be considered a “Proustian moment” of “bring of the past directly into the present,” a theme of “Eumaeus” (Maddox Jr. 158-59).

Furthermore, despite Joyce’s claim that he never read much of Proust (*JJ* 508), the parallels between this passage and Proust’s are too strong to ignore. Christine Froula contradicts Joyce’s claim in Ellmann’s work, as *Ulysses*, especially “Proteus,” is laden with Proustian influences as well as statements by Arthur Power who maintained Joyce admired the Frenchman’s work (106-21).
Murphy’s derogatory description of the Chinese is not incongruous with Bloom’s own views. In “Lotus Eaters,” he muses on missionary work in China: “Save China’s millions. Wonder how they explain it to the heathen Chinee. Prefer an ounce of opium. Celestials. Rank heresy for them” (5.326-28). In “Hades,” he imagines “Chinese cemeteries with giant poppies growing produce the best opium” (6.769-70). Bloom demonstrates a typically condescending Western attitude toward the Chinese, focusing on their perceived appetite for opium. The irony here is that the British inundated China with opium in the early-nineteenth century, resulting in appalling addiction rates and overdoses that devastated the country. Bloom, and indeed the Irish, should have been more sympathetic to the Chinese given Ireland’s own history with the British and the devastating results of an overreliance of a crop. The consumption of rats, moreover, was not considered unusual by the Chinese or, for that matter, the French. Take, for example, this article from a nautical magazine from 1875: “It is well known that rats are eaten as an ordinary dish by many nations – by the South Sea islanders, by many of the African tribes, by the Chinese, and even by the French. In China it is a common custom for the natives to come on board a ship entering harbour and give a few dollars for permission to catch rats for the purpose of eating them” (“Rats on Board Ship” 986; my emphasis). The article defends the practice, noting that popular Western meats such as pigs and rabbits are also dirty animals that eat fowl and that foreign foods such as tea and potatoes were once considered repugnant by Europeans. It also maintains that eating rats could easily improve malnutrition in Europe but “mistaken national prejudice” prevents it (989). Murphy, eating the “food” in the cabman’s shelter, and Bloom, who was introduced in *Ulysses* eating “with relish the inner organs of beats and fowls” (4.1-2), are in no position to look down upon the practice or the Chinese, yet the entrenchment of orientalist
dispositions at the time overruled the reason of experienced European sailors, getting the better of Murphy, who (ostensibly) should know better, and Bloom, who is often lauded for his fairmindedness and (ostensible) resistance to prejudice.\(^{26}\)

In the Americas, Murphy claims to see something more disconcerting: “I seen maneaters in Peru that eats corpses and the livers of horses. . . . Chews coca all day. . . . Stomachs like breadgreaters. Cuts off their diddies when they can’t bear no more children. See them sitting there stark ballocknaked eating a dead horse’s liver raw” (16.470-71, 479-81).\(^{27}\) Unlike his story about the Chinese, he attempts to prove his Peruvian tale by showing the men in the cabman’s shelter a postcard with an image described by the narrator as “a group of savage women in striped loincloths, squatted, blinking, suckling, frowning, sleeping amid a swarm of infants (there must have been quite a score of them) outside some primitive shanties of osier” (16.475-78). He then informs the men that they way to protect oneself from these savages is to use glass. “Glass. That boggles ‘em. Glass” (16.486). Bloom notices that the postcard was addressed to a man in Chile, thus doubting the story. Moreover, the postcard’s caption indicates that it is of an indigenous village in Bolivia. Not only is this not in Peru, it is in a landlocked country, making it an unlikely destination for a sailor. Indeed, the references to the indigenous cannibals and their fear of glass are derived from anecdotal stories from John Locke, a man who among other things was involved in the Atlantic slave

\(^{26}\) There are several other examples of condescending and derogatory comments about the Chinese in *Ulysses*:

“*And the call me the jewel of Asia, Of Asia, The Geisha*” (6.355-57); “I read in that *Voyages in China* that the Chinese say a white man smells like a corpse” (6.682-83); “Built on bread and onions. Slaves Chinese wall” (8.490); “Chinese eating eggs fifty years old, blue and green again” (8.869-70); “O, the chinless Chinaman! Chin Chong Eg Lin Ton” (9.1129); “I suppose theyre just getting up in China now combing out their pigtails” (18.1540-41); and so forth.

\(^{27}\) Though Bloom was neither a cannibal nor a consumer of horses, he did, as mentioned, enjoy eating offal for breakfast, which presents a small yet interested parallel between the natives and him.
and John Smith, one of England’s first New World colonizers (U-A 540; U-N 767-68). It is doubtful Murphy would have known this, yet it exhibits how ubiquitous these tall tales were of those indigenous peoples. To complement his stories, he shows the men his chest tattoos of an anchor “in blue Chinese ink” (U 16.668) as well as “the figure 16 and a young man’s sideface” (16.675-76) done by “Antonio,” a Greek sailor who was later devoured by sharks. Watt notices that in Murphy’s stories “racial and ethnic difference is always encoded as rebarbative, and the appetites of the Other are equated with the frightening instincts of the sharks that devoured his Greek friend, Antonio” (763). In other words, Murphy crudely but forcefully adopts the orientalist position, making a spectacle of these people through the medium of the postcard which depicts them as animals and sterilizes them as humans, especially the women.

Stephen himself is guilty in this, not so much in Ulysses but at least in one section of Portrait. When arguing with Lynch about aesthetics, he claims that the “Greek, the Turk, the Chinese, the Copt, the Hottentot . . . all admire a different type of female beauty. That seems to be a maze out of which we cannot see” (5.1227-29). He laments that one possible “way out” is to attribute this to biological determinism: that is, men see women attractive because of the need for procreation. Stephen adamantly denies this as conflicting his principles on aesthetics, that art goes beyond rational explanation and experience. Moreover, he is concerned that this idea “leads to eugenics rather than to esthetic” (5.1235). Yet his objectification of these cultures, all of them either classical or nonexistent, to prove his point does just that. His argument highlights “a modernism not merely of rationalist demystification, but one which has truck with ideas of biological determinism and even of

---

28 Holly Brewer argues that John Locke’s involvement with and views on American slavery were complicated and contradictory, showing both anti- and pro-abolitionist positions (1038-78).
race-consciousness which would elsewhere appear to be quite foreign in Joyce’s fiction” (E. Nolan, *Nationalism* 40). In this passage and throughout *Ulysses*, biological determinism and race-consciousness, rather than foreign, proves to be the rule.

In addition to the characters’ handling of national characteristics, the narrative style of “Eumaeus” accentuates the tension between nationalist thought and globalization. Much has been commented on the unreliability of the narrative: its redundant, ambiguous, sloppy, cliché-riddled language. It is reflective of, in A. Walton Litz’s view, a “relinquishment to fatigue” (45). Fredric Jameson offers a more politically-conscious description of the episode as “a quasi-material expression of a fundamental social development itself, namely the increasing social fragmentation and monadisation of late capitalist society, the intensifying privatisation and isolation of its subjects” (138-39), as well as a less-political description of it as one of the two “most boring chapters” of *Ulysses* (the other being “Ithaca”) (126). To Slote, its “grammatical irregularities and stylistic infelicities . . . indicate and implicate more substantive patterns of mismatch, such as those between Bloom and Stephen and between Ireland and Britain” (*Nietzschean Ethics* 92; my emphasis).29 With the exception perhaps of Jameson’s judgment of “Eumaeus” as boring, all three scholars are correct. The episode exhausts the reader in a similar way Bloom and Stephen are exhausted after a night out in “Circe,” reflecting the pervasive feelings of anxiety, alienation, and nihilism in *fin de siècle* Europe. The episode creates dichotomies between characters, voices, events, and ideas. I would put forth two more “patterns of mismatch”: one between the West and the orient and

29 See C. O’Neill 12-41 for an overview on the critical analysis of “Eumaeus” over the decades. She herself proposes that the episode “is dominated not so much by Bloom’s voices as by a Bloomian voice, an exaggerated and partly distorted writing effort of the kind Bloom would admire and aspire to if he was wielding the pen. It is a voice which strives for an elevated style; the driving desire is to please and impress Stephen” (102). This view is at least partly indebted to Kenner, who wrote that Bloom “is treated to an episode written as he would have written it” because “he is finally entitled to feel like a hero” given what he had to endure throughout the day (*Joyce’s Voices* 35).
another between the local and the global. The first mismatch has already been discussed. Murphy, Bloom, and others draw upon common and rather crude orientalist tropes throughout the episode. “It is through collective versions of such linguistic slippage,” Cheng maintains, “that people(s) get stereotyped, without careful accounting for actual and specific differences” (Race 237). The other mismatch, however, is not quite as clear or at least as studied, yet I believe it is just as pervasive and dependent on the surge of nationalism as well as the burgeoning of globalization at the time. Stephen remarks that “Ireland must be important because it belongs to me” (U 16.1164-64) and later adds, “We can’t change the country. Let us change the subject” (16.1171). Stephen may not have known it but he neatly articulated the premise of globalization in that globalization undermines the foundation on which nationalization rests. Rather than reducing citizens to subjects of a nation, globalization reduces nations to subjects of the world or, at the very least, subjects to the network of other nations. Globalization enables apostates like Stephen to supersede the nation-state, to “fly by those nets” of “nationality, language, [and] religion” as he wishes to do in Portrait (5.1049-50). The significant references to orientalist or at least foreign customs and peoples, the ease with which the likes of Murphy are able to travel and narrate the world, and the characters’ reactions to them show an increasingly informal relationship between the individual and the rest of the world, physically and otherwise.

For his part, Bloom does not seek to fly by the nets of nationalism _per se_, yet he indicates a relaxed view on fidelity to one’s nation. A “friendlier intercourse between man and man” (U 16.1136-37) is at the heart of his philosophy on patriotism. “I call that patriotism. _Ubi patria_, as we learned a smattering of in our classical days in _Alma Mater_, _vita bene_. Where you can live well, the sense is, if you work” (16.1138-40). _Ubi patria, vita_
bene means “where my country is, life is good.” The correct Latin proverb, however, is *Ubi bene, ibi patria*, “where it is well with me, there is my country” (*U-A* 550; *U-N* 773). His blunder aside, Bloom reveals that his connection to the nation is “largely economic and pragmatic” rather than “metaphysical” (Slote, *Nietzschean Ethics* 97), the Latin proverb the “selfish and unpatriotic man’s motto” (Adams 102). F. K. Stanzel argues that Bloom inherited these views from his father Rudolph, who placed little importance on “[n]ational, racial, and ethnic considerations” in his migrations throughout Europe (621). Rudolph’s migration will be discussed later, yet Bloom certainly retains and furthers his father’s ethos.

This is perhaps most evident in his musings about opening a travel agency for the common layman. Inspired by Murphy’s postcard, Bloom is reminded of “a longcherished plan . . . of travelling to London *via* long sea” (*U* 16.499-501). He fashioned himself “at heart a born adventurer” that “by a trick of fate . . . consistently remained a landlubber” (16.502-3), with the exception of sailing to Holyhead, Wales, a few hours east of Dublin. He first envisions a tour to London, “our modern Babylon” (16.514), via Plymouth, Falmouth, and Southampton. He then contemplates making arrangements for a concert tour with Molly where they would travel to the aforementioned places along with “[m]argate with mixed bathing and firstrate hydros and spas, Eastbourne, Scarborough, Margate and so on, beautiful Bournemouth, the Channel islands and similar bijou spots” (16.519-21) before it dawns on him that he could turn his personal desires into a business. “A great opportunity there certainly was for push and enterprise to meet the travelling needs of the public at large, the average man, i.e. Brown, Robinson and Co.” (16.536-38). It bothered him that “the man in the street, when the system really needed toning up, for the matter of a couple of paltry pounds was debarred from seeing more of the world they lived in instead of being always
and ever cooped up since my old stick-in-the-mud took me for a wife” (16.540-44). Besides the fact that this passage is emblematic of the “flabby Dublin journalese” in “Eumaeus” that Stanislaus Joyce complained of (L 3:58) as well as being similar to a passage in “Circe” (“O Poldy, Poldy, you are a poor old stick in the mud! Go and see life. See the wide word” [U 15.329-30]), it shows that the global tourism industry, which was in a nascent yet promising stage, was an indication of the emergence of globalization. Beatty notes that the 1890s saw a “broader strengthening of global capitalism,” or globalization, and that Ireland was solidifying its transformation from feudalism and capitalism due to the various economic and agrarian reforms of the post-Famine era (“Marx” 846).³⁰ It appealed to Bloom’s sense of pragmatism and underlying feeling that the world was ready to embrace such an industry. It also reflects Joyce’s own cosmopolitanism and continental trotting, which he was able to do despite not being a wealthy or privileged man. Bloom admits as much when he thinks “tourist travelling was as yet merely in its infancy, so to speak, and the accommodation left much to be desired” (U 16.654-55). Indeed, Bloom came of age during the “secularization and democratization of travel” (Mottolese 102), and although he was referring to the Irish tourism industry, yet it is applicable to other countries.³¹

---

³⁰ This is reflected not just by Bloom’s business idea but also by Davitt, who in 1904 published a history of the Land War, The Fall of Feudalism in Ireland, or the Story of the Land League Revolution (34n147). Joyce owned a copy of this book (Ellmann, Consciousness 106).

³¹ One benefit of globalization (albeit predominately for Europeans and those of European descent) was the ability for more people to travel more freely. This complements Mottolese’s claim that “Ulysses should be read as a text of travel” (100). For more on the burgeoning travel industry as depicted in Ulysses, see Caraher 198 and Mottolese 91-111. The reception of this industry, however, was not always positive. For example, Oliver St. John Gogarty, a friend of Joyce’s and the model for Buck Mulligan in Ulysses, attacks English tourists as shallow and opportunistic in a 1906 newspaper article: “For them the railway and steamboat companies must provide cheap transit, so that they many crowd the Continent in search of health or the smug satisfaction (another form of the spirit of grasping) of having been in famous places” (“Ugly England – I” 3). Gogarty will be discussed extensively later in the chapter.
In “Ithaca,” Bloom elaborates on his idea, although here it is no longer a business proposal but a feverish and rather outrageous personal desire. Reflecting on the various indignities of his life, Bloom fantasizes about leaving Dublin behind and travelling: first through Ireland, then throughout the world, and finally through the universe itself. The places in Ireland he wants to travel to were (and still are) popular tourist attractions: “The cliffs of Moher, the windy wilds of Connemara, lough Neagh with submerged petrified city . . . the lakes of Killarney” (U 17.1974-78). The worldly places he wants to see are also popular destinations:

Ceylon (with spicegardens supplying tea to Thomas Kernan, agent for Pulbrook, Robertson and Co, 2 Mincing Lane, London, E. C., 5 Dame street, Dublin), Jerusalem, the holy city (with mosque of Omar and gate of Damascus, goal of aspiration), the straits of Gibraltar (the unique birthplace of Marion Tweedy), the Parthenon (containing statues of nude Grecian divinities), the Wall street money market (which controlled international finance), the Plaza de Toros at La Linea, Spain (where O’Hara of the Camerons had slain the bull), Niagara (over which no human being had passed with impunity), the land of the Eskimos (eaters of soap), the forbidden country of Thibet (from which no traveller returns), the bay of Naples (to see which was to die), the Dead Sea. (17.1980-90)

The passage reveals an extravagant itinerary. Yet curiously, many of these locations are grounded in local destinations Bloom encounters and thoughts he has throughout the day (Mottolese 95-96). He wants to visit Ceylon, for example, because of the tea that Kernan purchases and the Belfast and Oriental Tea Company he crosses in Westland Row in “Lotus Eaters” (U 5.17-34). He wishes to see Jerusalem and the Dead Sea not only because of his
Jewishness but because of his orientalist reverie walking on Eccles Street in “Calypso” on his way toward Dlugacz’s butchery, where he reads about the Agendath Netaim kibbutz (which will be discussed later) (4.77-98). He wants to see Molly’s birthplace of Gibraltar, as well as the Parthenon, which contains the kind of statues he dwelt on in “Eumaeus” (as previously discussed). The Plaza de Toros, located in a small town near Gibraltar, is of interest to Bloom because John O’Hara (billed as “Don Juan O’Hara”) was a British soldier garrisoned in Gibraltar who made a name for himself in the 1870s by bullfighting (although he was with the Royal Welsh Fusiliers, not the Cameron Highlanders) (U-A 599; U-N 796). The “land of the Eskimos” most likely got Bloom’s attention due to the Innuits’ consumption of seal and whale blubber. Animal fat was used to make the “sweet, lemony wax” (U 5.512) bar of soap he bought at Sweny’s in “Lotus Eaters” and relishes throughout the day. Although he does not think about or mention Wall Street directly in the novel, he does express interest in business and stock markets. Moreover, Stephen mentions the Paris stock markets in “Nestor”: “On the steps of the Paris stock exchange the goldskinned men quoting prices on their gemmed fingers. Gabble of geese. They swarmed loud, uncouth, about the temple, their heads thickplotting under maladroit silk hats” (2.364-67). There are no Dublin parallels for Niagara Falls, Tibet, or Naples per se, yet they seem to be derived from Bloom’s morbidity (the Dead Sea need not be explained). Even Bloom’s wanderlust is grounded in Dublin. His memory of place when contemplating globetrotting being entrenched in Dublin – which is to say, that he imagines the world in relation to his life in Dublin – is perhaps a fitting metaphor for the turbulent yet symbiotic relationship between nationalism and globalization at the time. Bloom expresses skepticism of Irish nationalism throughout the novel, yet it is here that he inadvertently shows a certain pride in and endearment of, if not dependency on, his
country. Even though the world was becoming more accessible and familiar to ordinary people via globalization, it still was dependent on the “nets of nationality” that Bloom and Stephen – and, as William C. Mottolese puts forth, Joyce himself – disavow. As he writes, the “modulation of Bloom’s consciousness between local Dublin culture and his imaginings about ‘exotic’ places far afield reflects Joyce’s own construction of Irish national identity, itself partially worked out through a dense ethnographic style that shifts between to registers – the local and the worldly” (96). Bloom, however, can only truly disavow them if he travels into space. “Ever he would wander, selfcompelled, to the extreme limit of his cometary orbit, beyond the fixed stars and variable suns and telescopic planets, astronomical waifs and strays, to the extreme boundary of space, passing from land to land, among peoples, amid events” (U 17.2013-16). This is of course ludicrous, and even if it were not he would inevitably be called back home to “obey the summons of recall” (17.2017-18). Bloom is condemned to wander the earth, almost entirely in Dublin, and realizes the impossibility of his dreams, yet the contrast between his worldly (and intergalactic) ambitions and his rootedness in Dublin parallels that of his disavowal of nationalism and the limitations globalization could not fully surpass.

*White Slave Traffic: The Horrors of Semicolonialism.* These passages in “Eumaeus” and “Ithaca” are just some examples of Joyce’s work that challenge his reputation as a “local” writer. It is true nearly all of his work is set in Dublin. The furthest he veers is to Cork in *Portrait*, and even that is about a three-hour train-ride from the city. Yet there several descriptions of world travel in his work, and not just from Murphy. In *Dubliners*, the eponymous character of “Eveline” considers eloping with a mysterious sailor, Frank, to
Buenos Aires (spelled “Buenos Ayres” in the story) in order to escape the drudgery of her Dublin life and her abusive father. Her last-minute decision to abandon Frank and stay in Dublin is often attributed to the feeling of “paralysis” inherent in *Dubliners*. Yet on closer inspection, her decision may have had more to do with one of the nefarious aspects of globalization: human trafficking. Kenner speculates that Eveline inadvertently escaped being swindled by Frank, who was simply planning on sleeping with her and then leaving her in Liverpool, which is where the ship was first headed (“Molly’s Masterstroke” 64-65). Katherine Mullin goes further by claiming Frank was part of the “white slave traffic,” which tricked impressionable young women in Ireland to travel abroad only to be impressed as prostitutes. Buenos Aires had a notorious reputation for being a “hub” in this trade, among other reasons because of the yellow press publishing horror stories and the city’s absorption of thousands of Irish immigrants (172-98; Maitra 589-90; Voss 25). Whether these stories were true, or at least to the extent the press presented them, is dubious. It being, however, a latent motivation for Eveline to stay in Dublin shows the influence globalization had on the Irish psyche. This influence under the context of the “white slave traffic” carries over into *Ulysses*. In “Calypso,” Bloom muses over Molly’s copy of “Ruby: the Pride of the Ring” (4.346): “Fierce Italian with carriagewhip. Must be Ruby pride of the one on the floor naked. Sheet kindly lent. The monster Maffei desisted and flung his victim from him with an oath. Cruelty behind it all” (4.436-39). The novel here was based on *Ruby. A Novel. Founded on*...
the Life of a Circus Girl (1889) by Amye Reade, a sensationalist novel about the horrific experiences of an English working girl impressed into a circus crew by her mother. Although the novel takes place exclusively in Great Britain, it does feature an Italian circus master, a Signor Enrico, renamed “Maffei” in Ulysses to sound like “mafia” (U-A 78), and dwells on the Victorian obsession with “white slavery” (Power 115-21). Ruby would be referenced again in “Circe” during Bloom’s “trial” (“I will put an end to this white slave traffic and ride Dublin of this odious pest” [U 15.1167-68]) and briefly in “Penelope” (18.493). Returning to “Eveline,” it is worth noting that this distrust of Buenos Aires is in line with the “otherness” tropes found in “Eumaeus”: a dark capital city in a colonial continent. This is one reason why Mullin characterized “Eveline” as a “‘semicolonial’ story” (172). There are, in fact, striking parallels between “Eumaeus” and “Eveline” that to my knowledge have hitherto not been raised. The sailor is “Eveline” is similar to Murphy: a mysterious Irish sailor of dubious origin who claims to have travelled the world and likes to boast about it:

He had tales of distant countries. He had started as a deck boy at a pound a month on a ship of the Allan line going out to Canada. He told her the names of the ships he had been on and the names of the different services. He had sailed through the Straits of Magellan and he told her stories of the terrible Patagonians. He had fallen on his feet in Buenos Ayres, he said, and had come over to the old country just for a holiday.

(D 29-30; my emphases)

---

35 Slote et al. does not concur with Gifford and Seidman in regard to this (580).
36 Reade’s campaign against abuses in circus labor were serious enough to draw condemnation from circus owners in England. According to an English newspaper article in 1893, “the owners of travelling circuses vowed vengeance upon her and when she lectured on her subject in the country, she did so to rooms packed by opponents who hooted her from first to last” (qtd. in Power 115).
This is a considerably more lucid yet less elaborate version of Murphy’s exploits, particularly its emphasis on South America. The “terrible Patagonians” (indigenous Argentinians) are reminiscent of the savage, liver-eating cannibals in Murphy’s Peru – yet unlike the indigenous Peruvians, the Patagonians ceased to exist by the end of the nineteenth century (Mullin 176). The reference to the “old country” emphasizes the otherness of his New World travels and the detachment it can produce. Moreover, Eveline’s abusive father proves to be xenophobic when, after hearing “the melancholy air of Italy” from an organ player, yells, “Damned Italians! coming over here!” (D 30-31), an echo of Murphy’s Trieste story and Bloom’s disparagement of Dublin’s small Italian community. Eveline’s anxiety as she is about to disembark for Buenos Aires makes her wary of the sea: “All the seas of the world tumbled about her heart. He was drawing her into them: he would drown her” (31). This harkens to one of Bloom’s lengthy tangents after hearing Murphy’s discontent with sailing: –I’m tired of all them rocks in the sea, he said, and boats and ships. Salt junk all the time.

Tired seemingly, he ceased. His questioner perceiving that he was not likely to get a great deal of change out of such a wily old customer, fell to woolgathering on the enormous dimensions of the water about the globe, suffice it to say that, as a casual glance at the map revealed, it covered fully three fourths of it and he fully realised accordingly what it meant to rule the waves. On more than one occasion, a dozen at the lowest, near the North Bull at Dollymount he had remarked a superannuated old salt, evidently derelict, seated habitually near the not particularly redolent sea on the wall, staring quite obliviously at it and it at him, dreaming of fresh woods and pastures new as someone somewhere sings. And it left him wondering
why. . . Nevertheless, without going into the minutiae of the business, the eloquent fact remained that they sea was there in all its glory and in the natural course of things somebody or other had to sail on it and fly in the face of providence though it merely went to show how people usually contrived to load that sort of onus on to the other fellow . . . (U 16.622-33)\(^\text{37}\)

Bloom is overwhelmed by the ocean’s enormity and the resolve of those who sail it. By mentioning the “superannuated old salt,” Bloom associates the ocean with queerness and duplicity.\(^\text{38}\) Bloom’s reaction to the ocean is similar to Eveline’s in that they are both overcome by the implications of sea travel as well as “queer” or at least questionable sailors such as Frank and Murphy. He also alludes to the famous “Rule Britannia” ode (which is also referenced in “Cyclops”): “Rule Britannia, Britannia rule the waves / Britons never, never, never will be slaves” (U-A 358, 543; U-N 686, 769). The reference to the British Empire’s mastery of the sea and to slavery is illuminating and ironic: illuminating in the sense that it emphasizes British imperial hegemony and ironic in that by controlling the sea in order to avoid “becoming” slaves, the British enslaved millions of people, both in the literal sense in Africa and a more figurative yet nonetheless pernicious sense in Ireland and its other colonies. Bloom’s overall point, however, is that the sea makes slaves of sailors – a point that may not have been lost on Murphy but more so on Eveline, who tried to escape her slavish conditions in Ireland by potentially becoming enslaved in Buenos Aires. If Eveline is a prototype for Molly Bloom as Kenner proposes (“Molly’s Masterstroke” 64), then “Eveline” could be viewed as an inspiration for “Eumaeus” as they both cover the

\(^{37}\) With the exception of “minutiae,” the emphases are mine.

\(^{38}\) An irony of this is that the “superannuated old salt” could also describe Bloom in “Nausicaa.”
apprehension of foreign travel and the globalization wrought by seafaring. They are more generally an ode to anxiety and ambiguity.\textsuperscript{39}

\textit{From Szombathely to Dublin: Shifting Borders Amid Inter-European Migration.} If Murphy “scarcely seemed to be a Dublin resident” (\textit{U} 16.441), it may be because his foreign travels have alienated him from his fellow Irishmen.\textsuperscript{40} Like “Rip van Winkle” (16.426), Murphy returns to Ireland alienated from own land, a cognitive dissonance common among voyagers, immigrants, and expatriates (and perhaps Joyce himself). Bloom and Stephen have lived in Ireland their entire lives (with the exception of Stephen’s brief stay in Paris), yet Molly, Murphy, and many others in Joyce’s oeuvre hail from or have been to other parts of the world. In “A Little Cloud,” for example, Gallaher enchants Little Chandler with his experiences living in London. The story immediately accentuates Gallaher’s bravado: “Gallaher had got on. You could tell that at once by his travelled air, his well-cut tweed suit and fearless accent” (\textit{D} 57). Many of Joyce’s characters who were born or have lived abroad, those of “travelled air,” are perceived differently, from faintly exotic to overtly oriental: “[I]t’s a rum world” (63) Gallaher tells Little Chandler of “dear dirty Dublin” (61). Bloom’s desire to see the world is perfectly understandable for a downtrodden petit-bourgeois Dublin denizen who has ventured no further than Holyhead. Ironically, his desire to see foreign lands is as strong as his perception among many of his peers that he himself is a foreigner. His “foreignness” is articulated most vehemently by the Citizen, yet most of those who encounter Bloom view him as Jewish, Hungarian, Masonic, feminine, queer, or just strange first and an

\textsuperscript{39} See Uphaus 28-51 for a stimulating discussion on these themes in “Eveline.”

\textsuperscript{40} He also claims to hail from Carrigaloe (16.415).
Irishman second, if at all – not the other way around (N. Davison 150; Tratner 194). Few believe him in “Cyclops” when he says his home is Ireland.

The Bloom family’s genealogy has been studied considerably in Joycean scholarship. Not only is it more germane to Griffith’s Hungarian parallel, Bloom’s family origins exemplify the rise of inter-European migration in the nineteenth century and Ireland’s unique place in it – factors that I shall discuss. Despite the ridiculing of Bloom’s Hungarian origins found in “Cyclops,” particularly his father Rudolph’s former surname “Virag,” his Hungarian namesake was adopted for a relatively short period. “Virag” is the magyarized version of the family’s original *Judendeutsch* (German Jewish) name “Blum.” The Blums most likely changed their surname to “Virag” after the 1848 Hungarian Revolution as part of an alliance between liberal Jews and the anti-Hapsburg Hungarian revolutionaries. For centuries, the Blums adopted a *Judendeutsch* name as did many Jews in Szombathely, Rudolph’s place of birth. The town was home to many Jews who had fled Austria in the seventeenth century after being expelled by Emperor Leopold I. Although residing in Hungary, the Jewish population retained certain German cultural and linguistic characteristics for centuries. The birth register of the Jewish community, for example, was written in German, not Hungarian (Stanzel 620; Ungar, “Among” 487). Bloom himself alluded to this in “Hades” when he fantasizes about raising his deceased son, Rudy. Imagining his life had he been able to rear Rudy, he would have had Rudy “[l]earn German too” (*U* 6.84), despite the fact they both would have been living in Dublin. Rudolph’s own origins reflected the inter-European migrations that affected central Europe over the previous few centuries. The family’s decision to magyarize their name was a pragmatic move to appease nationalist sentiment at the time, a pragmatism with regard to nationality that
Rudolph would maintain when he immigrated to Dublin and anglicized his surname to “Bloom.” Bloom himself openly admitted to the name-change when prompted by Stephen in “Eumaeus”: “Sounds are impostures,” Stephen says. “What’s in a name?” (U 16.362, 64). “Of course,” Bloom responds. “Our name was changed too” (16.365-66). The irony of the incessant teasing found in “Cyclops” and elsewhere is that “Virag” was the result of the nationalist sentiment of, if not fidelity to, the Blum’s adopted country of Hungary, which shows that the Blums and the Jewish community were more than capable of assimilating into their adopted countries.41

In “Ithaca,” it is revealed that Rudolph moved from Szombathely to Budapest, then Vienna, Milan, Florence, London, and finally Dublin (U 17.1909-10). Rudolph travelled extensively throughout continental Europe and the United Kingdom, becoming a “transcultural traveler” of sorts that mirrored Joyce’s own migration, albeit in the opposite direction (Stanzel 621).42 The Blooms would prove more than willing to adapt to their adopted country’s traditions and identity, something that irritated the Citizen and his ilk to no end and would establish a formidable “mind-map of collective memory” throughout

---

41 As Bloom remarks about the Jews, “they are imbued with the proper spirit. They are practical and are proved to be so” (16.1124-25; my emphasis).

The concept that Jews could not only assimilate into their adopted communities but also signify a community’s affluence or success was prevalent in Europe for centuries. In his A Philosophical Survey of the South of Ireland (1777), for example, Thomas Campbell remarks of Dublin: “As you may make a barometer of any fluid, so you may estimate the wealth of a nation from various phenomena. One pretty sure sign of poverty is, though there are Jews here, there are not enow [enough] to form a constant and regular synagogue” (48).

42 Dieter Fuchs contradicts Stanzel when he claims that the Blums reached Szombathely not from Austria but through Trieste, as it was a prominent Mediterranean port that linked ancient Judea to mainland Europe. He argues that Rudolph’s grandfather was a well-to-do sea merchant that eventually expanded his family and business to Hungary. There are a few hints of this in Ulysses, particularly in “Circe” when it is stated that “[t]here have been cases of shipwreck . . . in [Bloom’s] family” (15.950-51). He also argues that Rudolph may have been based on Trieste-based sea merchant Karl Freiherr von Bruck, who like Rudolph committed suicide late in his life. These references may explain Bloom’s discomfort with the sea as discussed earlier in the chapter (203-20). Neil R. Davison also notes that Trieste attracted many Jewish merchants in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and had a thriving integrated Jewish community (130).
Yet it is also the case that at least some of the Bloom’s lineage was determined through genetic rather than voluntary means. As mentioned earlier, Milly’s blond hair may be attributed to “a violation [of] Herr Hauptmann Hainau, Austrian army” (U 17.868-69) against Rudolph’s mother. It is possible that Hainau was the real-life Austrian military officer Julius von Haynau, whose infamy was secured in Europe by his brutal suppression of Hungarian and Italian nationalists in the 1848 Revolution, his role as the military governor of Hungary in 1849, and his actions against their Jewish supporters, such as levying a massive fine on the Jews of Hungary after the rebellion. He was reviled throughout Europe, often the subject of derogatory and grotesque political cartoons. His “violation” would have had to occur in between 1806 and 1815. His reputation notwithstanding, this would not necessarily have been beneath him (“Haynau, Julius Jacob”; Kürti 65-90; Stanzel 619-30). Simpson also notes that Haynau, the “hyena of Brescia,” was notorious throughout Europe and that Joyce may have based Bloom’s speculation on a 1851 German novel Almanach zum Lachen, which also referred to Haynau as “Hainau” and features a scene in which he rapes a Jewish woman (“Heinous Hainau”). Stanzel argues that

43 Joyce created Rudolph’s itinerary just eight months before the publication of Ulysses, reinforcing the “transcultural” aspect of the Blooms (Crispi, “Genesis” 17-18).

44 A contemporary account of Haynau describes his atrocities as follows:

If the atrocities committed at a later period by Haynau in Hungary, had not corroborated the report of those perpetrated at Brescia, contemporaries might have denied the latter credence, and considered the description of them as the dream of a madman. He spared neither age nor sex. Disabled age, women and children, were put to the sword with the same fury as the combatants. The churches were polluted by pillage and rape, and the altars sullied with the blood of the victims. Haynau himself took delight in killing by the slowest methods, accompanied by the greatest refinements of torture, the father before the eyes of his children, the children before those of their father, the husband in the arms of his wife, and brothers in each other’s arms. . . . We must ask pardon for recording facts so revolting, but truth and the wrongs of Italy demand it. (qtd. in Simpson, “Heinous Hainau”)

Another account published fifty years after the revolution described him as such:

Wholesale massacres were committed throughout the country, until at last the conscience of Europe rose up against these cruel butcheries, and the court itself removed the sanguinary baron [Haynau] from the scene of his inhuman exploits. The best men in the country were thrown into prison, and thousands of families had to mourn for dear ones who had fallen victims to the implacable vindictiveness of the Austrian government. Once more the gloom of oppression settled upon the unhappy country. (Vámbéry and Heilprin 434)
Joyce included this brief anecdote to reinforce Bloom’s multiethnicity. I would add that he did so in order to foreground the multinational changes of Europe during the nineteenth century as well as to connect Bloom with Griffith’s Hungarian Policy. Regarding the former point, Haynau was an officer in the Napoleonic Wars (“Haynau, Julius Jacob” 114; Kürti 66), massive inter-European conflicts that contributed to the formation of nineteenth century nationalism and the modern nation-state. Regarding the latter point, Griffith praised the Hungarians for their resistance to the Austrians and excoriated the latter for their domination and brutality. The possible rape in Bloom’s family history by an Austrian officer reinforces the relevance Griffith’s Hungarian appropriations have in *Ulysses*. As such, it is mentioned or hinted at a few times in the novel outside of “Ithaca” (*U-A 479*). In the trial scene of “Circe,” Bloom is asked why he is not “in uniform,” to which he responds: “When my progenitor of sainted memory wore the uniform of the Austrian despot in a dank prison where was yours?” (*U 15.1662-63*), suggesting that his “progenitor” was an Austrian soldier. For Bloom, Griffith’s Hungarian appropriations are not merely ideological or theoretical – they are personal. His family history, with its extensive migration, name changes, and variety of progenitors, exemplifies the trials and tribulations that came with Griffith’s appropriation on Hungarian history.

*The Huguenots: Foreign and Domestic Irish.* Before focusing on another aspect of Griffith’s appropriation of that history – specifically, its relationship with Zionism and Irish nationalism – I would like to discuss a historiographical aspect of inter-European migration that is relevant to the relationship between of globalization and Ireland in Joyce’s work: the migration of the Huguenots. As stated, much attention has been paid to the Blooms and the
Jewish people in Joycean scholarship. Yet another diasporic people, the Huguenots, have received relatively little. This is surprising given the considerable references to them in Joyce’s work, particularly *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake*. To Donal Manning, the “prominence of the Huguenots in [*Finnegans Wake*], and indeed in Joyce’s earlier writings, indicates that their experience accords with fundamental Joycean themes: betrayal, sectarian violence and persecution, exile, and assimilation” (60). Huguenots, French Calvinists predominately from the south of France who were prosecuted throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in continental Europe, were a marginalized minority in their own country. Joyce mentioned the Huguenots as a component of the Irish people in “Ireland: Island of Saints and Sages.” In *Ulysses*, he references them several times both as a people and prominent Hiberno-Huguenot individuals. Dublin in 1904 had quite a few streets and locations named after Huguenots, many of which still remain. Bloom, for example, recalls the Huguenot churchyard in Merrion Row in “Lotus Eaters” (*U* 5.465), just one case of the extensive property development by Huguenots and their descendants in Dublin in the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries. Many properties in St. Stephen’s Green, Wicklow Street, and Grafton Street were developed by Huguenot architects. James Gandon, the grandson of a Huguenot refugee, designed the Custom House, the Four Courts, and the King’s Inns. D’Olier Street and Digges Street were named after Huguenots (Hylton 112-35; Manning 59). The Huguenots also left architectural legacies in England, as revealed by Stephen in “Scylla and Charybdis.” When Stephen describes his *Hamlet* theory, he envisions “Shakespeare has left the huguenot’s house in Silver street and walks by the swanmews along the riverbank” (*U* 9.159-60). From 1598 to 1604, Shakespeare did in fact live on 13 Silver

45 See note 47 of the introduction of this dissertation.
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Street in a house owned by Christopher Mountjoy, a Huguenot (U-A 203-4; U-N 628). Serious migration to the British Isles began the late-seventeenth century after King Louis XIV revoked the Edict of Nantes in 1685, stripping their civil and religious liberties. Many of them were skilled poplin weavers, which Joyce emphasized. As discussed in the introduction, the Citizen bemoans in “Cyclops” the loss of “our Huguenot poplin that we have since Jacquard de Lyon” (U 12.1245-46), and as mentioned earlier in this chapter, Bloom wonders at the “bloodhued poplin” (8.622) in the titled urn on Grafton Street. This is reiterated in Finnegans Wake: “ruoulls in sulks if any popeling runs down the Huguenots” (133.20-21). “Ruolls,” or “Raoul,” is the protagonist of Meyerbeer’s Les Huguenots, an opera that Bloom references throughout Ulysses. The “popeling runs down the Huguenots” line refers to the opera’s depiction of the Saint Bartholomew’s Day Massacre of 1572 when Catholics murdered thousands of Huguenots in pogroms in Paris and throughout France (McHugh 133). Although the Huguenots continued their poplin weaving, by the early-eighteenth century they expanded not only their community but their skills, entering occupations such as craftsmen, wine merchants, property developers, financiers, and tavern and distillery owners. In 1660, Huguenots introduced the technique of goldsmithing in Cork (Foster, Modern Ireland 131). Indeed, Huguenots were known throughout Europe for their industry and thrift, establishing extensive wine and brandy trades in the continent in addition to weaving. The Huguenot community integrated into Irish society remarkably well. Although many Irish Catholics resented them for their general allegiance to the Crown and their “part-and-parcel” of the Protestant Ascendancy (many, for example, fought for William of Orange in the Battle of the Boyne) (Hylton 201), they quickly became, like other settlers before them, “more Irish than the Irish.” Chales C. Ludington notes that an interest developed
in the Huguenots in nineteenth century British and Irish historiography in part due to changing attitudes of religious Dissenters in the kingdom. As views of the Dissenters (Presbyterians, nonconformists, etc.) improved in the nineteenth century, so did those of the Huguenots, whose descendants often joined nonconformist congregations (9). Amateur Scottish historian Samuel Smiles, for example, claimed in *The Huguenots* (1867) that they left a “permanent impression . . . . in all the districts in which they settled” and followed “in the path which they undeviatingly pursued, of peaceful, contented, and honorable industry.” He did, however, claim that their impressions only existed in Ulster due to their allegiance to the dissenters there, whereas the Huguenot settlements in the heavily-Catholic south of Ireland “fell into decay” (306). In *A History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century* (1892), Irish historian W. E. H. Lecky also wrote admiringly about the Huguenots and their lasting contributions to Irish society (1:352-54). It was this wider interest in the Huguenots in British and Irish historiography during this time that perhaps led Joyce to see “the Huguenots’ Irish experience as a model of integration” (Manning 69) and used them to further his engagement with globalization and pluralism in *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake*.46

As with Bloom’s name, Joyce and his characters make much of the Huguenots’ foreign-sounding names. Neither English nor Irish, their names were Gallic, and as such they attracted attention and amusement. “And Prosper Loré’s huguenot name,” Bloom says in “Sirens” as he is walking along Wellington Quay (*U* 11.150), referring to the wholesale hat manufacturer (*U-A* 296; *U-N* 663).47 In “Lestrygonians,” he fantasizes about dining with a Miss Dubedat. “Huguenot name I expect that. A miss Dubedat lived in Killiney, I remember.

46 See Cullen 129-50; Dickson 321-32; Hylton; Ludington 1-19; Manning 56-72; and Murtagh 225-38.
47 Bloom is wrong here. Although Prosper Loré was French, he was Catholic and had actually bought advertisement space in the *Irish Catholic Directory* in 1903 (T. O’Neill 873-77).
Du de la French” (U 8.889-90). He was thinking of the famous Irish singer Marie Du Bédat, “the Irish nightingale,” although neither of the Du Bédat sisters who lived in Killiney at the time was the said singer (A. Nolan 207; Igoe 91; U-N 622). In both cases, Bloom cannot help but mention the names’ Gallic origins. In “Penelope,” Molly complains about Bloom’s political posturing, “sending me that long stroll of a song out of the Huguenots to sing in French to be more classy O beau pay de la Touraine . . . he goes about whistling every time were on the run again his huguenots or the frogs march pretending to help the men” (U 18.1188-89, 1217-19). She references Bloom’s fixation with Meyerbeer’s opera. Even “the frogs march,” which is slang for carrying a drunken person on the streets, may be a reference to it (U-A 627-28; U-N 806). Interestingly, Bloom would whistle the tune every time they moved, or migrated, to a different area of Dublin, which in a small yet noticeable way accentuates the Huguenots’ own migration. References such as these show how ubiquitous these names were and their reflexive association with France and migration. Most of the Hiberno-Huguenots lived in Dublin, although they settled throughout Ireland, including in Galway, Cork, and, understandably given their Protestantism, Ulster (Dickson 321-32; U-N 589). “Cyclops” is known for its elaborate lists and Hungarian names, yet it contains a Huguenot name that has received scant attention, which is odd given its significance and distinction among Huguenot references. The “love loves to love love” section (U 12.1493-1501) included the surname “Verschoyle”: “Old Mr Verschoyle with the ear trumpet loves old Mrs Verschoyle with the turnedin eye” (12.1496-97). Meesnóber, who is as far as I am aware the only scholar who has researched the reference besides Gifford and Seidman and Slote et al., traces the name to a Huguenot family that immigrated to Ireland in 1568, well

---

48 She may also be referring to “La Marseillaise,” although neither Gifford and Seidman nor Slote et al. attributes it to any song with certainty.
before the mass migration of the seventeenth century and for that matter the Saint Bartholomew’s Day Massacre. She also entertains the possibility of the Verschoyles immigrating either around 1620 when conflict between Catholic Spain and the Spanish Netherlands once again arose or in the 1690s accompanying William of Orange (‘‘Eastern Europe’’ 38n62). Slote et al. concurs with the former possibility, specifying that the “Verschuijl” brothers, Willem and Henrick, immigrated together. Mr. and Mrs. Verschoyle of the passage in question may have been Charles and Sarah Verschoyle of 56 Benburb Street, Stoneybatter (692). Regardless of their progenitor’s exact origins, the Verschoyles are noteworthy in several ways. Mecsnóber believes the surname “carries the memory of migration and, possibly, also of sectarian conflict” (‘‘Eastern Europe’’ 38). The Huguenots, like the Irish and the Jews, were prosecuted and faced various levels of discrimination wherever they resided. Yet these Huguenots stand out from the others referenced in _Ulysses_ in that they are Dutch, not French, which shows that the Huguenots, much like the Jews, defied standard national identification in Europe. Despite the majority hailing from France, the Huguenots came from other countries in Western Europe. Neither a nationality like the Irish (as multivalent an identity that may be) nor an ethnoreligious group like the Jews,⁴⁹ the Huguenots were simply an inter-Western European sect of Calvinists that were nonetheless treated with scorn by Catholics and as foreigners by everyone else. Given their Dutch name, it is unclear whether the Verschoyles emigrated from France to the Netherlands before settling in Ireland (the Netherlands was an escape route for many Huguenots [Manning 61]) or had always been Dutch, yet this lack of clarity only highlights the arbitrary divisions that

⁴⁹ This is, of course, debatable, yet one difference between the Huguenots and the Jews is that the former were formed by French Catholics in the sixteenth century who voluntarily converted to Calvinism, whereas the origin of the Jews is much more ethnocentric and considerably older.
underpinned their categorization as an inherently distinct people. Joyce had a number of Huguenot names to choose from. Even with their Huguenot origins established, it is unclear why Mr. and Mrs. Verschoyle were included to begin with and how they relate to the other figures mentioned in the passage. It may have been simply a way to reinforce Bloom’s “championing of love as the real substance of life against the violent and discriminative nationalism of the Citizen” (Mecsnóber, “Eastern Europe” 38). However, given the religious references both in and around the passage and indeed throughout “Cyclops,” it could also be a subtle criticism of the foolishness of subjugating the Huguenots as a people.

The passage ends with “God loves everybody” (U 12.1501). Despite their theological differences, the Huguenots were not drastically different from other Protestants in Ireland and the rest of Europe. Why they were so distinct as compared to the Irish or the Jews is questionable. It seems to justify what Bloom says in “Eumaeus”: “It is a patent absurdity on the face of it to hate people because they live round the corner and speak another vernacular, in the next house so to speak” (16.1101-3).

How Stephen responds to Bloom here, however, is indicative of Joyce’s treatment of the Huguenots, which despite Bloom’s mantra is very much rooted in their supposed distinctiveness. “Memorable bloody bridge battle and seven minutes’ war, Stephen assented, between Skinner’s alley and Ormond market” (16.1104-5). The men in the cabman’s shelter were within walking distance to the Liberties, which was purportedly the location of a prominent Huguenot settlement in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. These Huguenots, mostly weavers, constantly fought the Catholic butchers across the Liffey in Ormond Quay. Known as the “Liberty Boys” and “Ormond Boys,” respectively, they gained a notorious reputation in Dublin folklore for bloody fighting, sometimes near “Bloody
Bridge,” the nickname for the “Barracks Bridge” that Stephen alludes to (Manning 58).50

The nickname refers to a 1674 incident in which several ferry artisans were killed trying to sabotage the bridge because of its detrimental impact on the ferry business. Although the nickname had nothing to do with sectarian feuding, it soon became associated with the fights between the Liberty and Ormond Boys – another case of dubious historical consciousness in Ireland. Stephen derides the feuds as the “seven minutes’ war,” which is perhaps an allusion to the Seven Weeks’ War (or Austro-Prussian War) of 1866 and the Seven Years’ War of the eighteenth century, both of which were instrumental in the development of the European nation-state (Slote, Nietzschean Ethics 94). Its nationalist connotations aside (particularly regarding the Austro-Prussian War, which Griffith wrote about in Resurrection [49-53]), Stephen’s remark further categorizes the Huguenots as a foreign community – and surprisingly for Stephen, it is based on flimsy grounds. Despite lurid apocryphal stories about these gangs over the centuries, including those from FitzPatrick’s The Sham Squire (which, as mentioned in the previous chapter, Joyce owned a copy of), there is no conclusive documentary evidence which confirms the violence and, more importantly, that the Liberties truly contained a Huguenot enclave (Hylton 201).51

50 The various names of the bridge, as with so much else in Dublin, reflect the various nationalist upheavals surrounding it. Originally called “Barracks Bridge” in the late-seventeenth century, it was rebuilt and renamed “Victoria & Albert Bridge” in 1861 following its inaugural crossing by Queen Victoria and Prince Albert. In 1929, it was renamed “Emancipation Bridge” to commemorate the centennial of Catholic Emancipation. It was bestowed its final and current name, “Rory O’More Bridge,” in 1939, in honor one of the organizers of the 1641 Rebellion (“Rory O’More Bridge”).

51 Here is a passage from Fitzpatrick:
Between these men and the butchers of Ormond Market, both noted for turbulent prowess, a feud long subsisted. On this stronghold the Liberty boys frequently made descents; a formidable battle raged, often for days, during which time the bridges across the Liffey, from Essex Bridge to ‘Bloody Bridge,’ were taken and retaken. Upwards of a thousand men were usually engaged; business was paralysed; traffic suspended; every shop closed; the executive looked on inert; Lord Major Emerson was appealed to, but with a nervous shrug declined to interfere. The butchers, armed with huge knives and cleavers, did awful havoc; the quays were strewed with the maimed and mangled. . . . The Liberty boys drank to the dregs their bloody cup of victory. Exasperated by the ‘houghing,’ with which the butchers had disabled for life many of their opponents, the Liberty Boys rushed into the stalls and slaughter-houses, captured the
Overall, Joyce’s treatment of the Huguenots is curious, if not contradictory. Although his references designate them as a distinct group, he is generally kinder in his depictions than those of, among others, the Italians, Spanish, and Chinese. Joyce regards the Huguenots as a righteous group who, like the Irish and the Jews, suffered immense discrimination but were nevertheless able to assimilate into Ireland well. Bloom seems to hold them in higher esteem than “those italians” in that the only “characteristic” he dwells on is their Gallic names. As Molly notes in “Penelope,” he seems to admire not just the Huguenots but all the French: their language, their culture, their history. This may be a subtle linkage on Joyce’s part of the Irish and the French, a relationship that generally was shaped by their mutual enemy, the English. Even if that is not the case, no one in Ulysses or Finnegans Wake has so much as an unkind word about the Huguenots, which may show that at least some inter-European migration was tolerated if not celebrated by the Irish. It may also show a “prosecution complex” on Joyce’s part, in that the Huguenots were heavily associated with prosecution and not necessarily by accomplishment. Yet as Stephen’s remark about Bloody Bridge shows, the Huguenots were “different” than the Irish, at least initially. Like the Italians near Coombe, they supposedly lived in segregated areas of Dublin and in other parts of Ireland (at least during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries). Their Gallic names appear in streets throughout the city, something that Bloom and others just could not help but point out even though they had passed those streets thousands of times. Despite the fact that by 1904

butchers, hooked them up by the chin in lieu of their meat, and then left the unfortunate men wriggling ‘alone in their glory.’ The Liberty boys were mostly weavers, the representatives of French artisans who, after the massacre of St Bartholomew, emigrated to Ireland. The late Mr Brophy, state dentist in Dublin, to whom the students of local history are indebted for many curious traditional data, told us that in the lifetime of his mother a French patois was spoken in the Liberty quite as much as English. (Sham Squire 70-71; my emphases with the exception of “houghing”)

There is no direct evidence which suggests that Joyce was citing FitzPatrick here, although he may have known about “Bloody Bridge” and the Liberty Boys’ Huguenot origins from The Sham Squire as well as other sources, literary or otherwise.
the descendants of Huguenot settlers such as the Du Bédats and the Verschoyles had been living in Dublin for centuries and had rid of their Gallic-Calvinist characteristics, making them arguably the most assimilated “foreign” group in Ireland, they were nonetheless considered just that: foreign. Bloom simply assumes that Du Bédat is a Huguenot name. He happened to be correct: the Du Bédats emigrated from France in the early-eighteenth century, and some of their ancestors are buried in the Huguenot churchyard Bloom mentions in “Lotus Eaters” (A. Nolan 207; Simpson, “Marie Dubedat”). Yet “[t]his fact,” as Senn notes, “is of far less importance than the use her name is put to” (“Seven” 38). Joyce could not help but to compare the Huguenots to the Irish rather than incorporate them into the Irish fold, putting the Huguenots to strange use indeed.

*An Idea Behind It: Irish and Jewish National Self-Determination.* More can be written about the Huguenots in Joycean scholarship. Something that cannot be substantiated, however, is that they expressed any serious interest in national self-determination in Ireland or elsewhere. This is not so with the Jews. The copious research on Jews in Joycean scholarship has covered extensive ground, yet one area that is lacking is a discussion of the Jews in relation to Griffith’s Hungarian historiography in *Resurrection* and his other writings. Much has been said about Griffith’s relationship with the Jews, particularly the vicious anti-semitism he expressed at least earlier in his career. He is often labelled an anti-Semite and indeed the material found in his publications such as *United Irishman* and *Sinn Féin* over the years seem to confirm this. However, Griffith was first and foremost a nationalist. A staunch supporter of national self-determination, he supported the formation of a Jewish nation-state. Joyce was more ambivalent about Zionism, and he certainly was not nearly as prejudiced against
the Jews as Griffith (although as will be discussed, Joyce did entertain at least mild antisemitic views). Regardless, an interesting parallel between Jewish self-determination and Hungarian self-determination as championed by Griffith exists in Joyce’s work, which I will argue ultimately criticizes the importance of national characteristics (though not totally delegitimizing them) as well as degrades legitimate reasons for national self-determination in Ireland and elsewhere.

It should be clearly established that while the link between Irish nationalism and Zionism is tangible, the link between Hungarian nationalism and Zionism is not. *Resurrection* contains no references to Zionism. Prominent Hungarian nationalists, likewise, made no references to Zionism or the Jews in relation to their struggle outside of perhaps allusions to Moses and the “Promised Land,” which was common in nineteenth century European nationalist discourse and not necessarily intrinsic to Zionism (Bornstein, “Colors” 374).52 The reason for this is simple: Hungary achieved autonomy from Austria in 1867, before Zionism emerged as a serious nationalist movement in Europe. Arguably, this manifestation of Zionism was founded by Theodor Herzl, who only started to seriously agitate for Jewish self-determination in the 1890s after the Dreyfus Affair. Despite the fact that he was born and raised in Budapest, Herzl did not use the Hungarian example for self-determination in the way Griffith did. The reason for this is also simple: Hungarians lived in Hungary during its “occupation” by Austria, whereas the Jews mostly did not live in Palestine. By the end of the nineteenth century, they were dispersed throughout the world,

52 Ira Nadel notes, however, that after 1867 some Hungarians referenced Zionism in their efforts to “protect” their newly-founded autonomy. Hungarian politician Gyoza Istoczyz for example “declared in the Hungarian Diet in June 1878 that the only solution to the menace of the Jews who promoted social democracy, poisoned international relations and retarded the growth of Christianity, was the restoration of ‘the ancient Jewish state’” (73).
though almost entirely within Europe and the United States. The parallel between the Jewish and Irish diasporas was made by Zionists and Irish nationalists, although as with the Hungarians, millions of the Citizen’s “missing twenty millions of Irish” (U 12.1240-41) resided in their “homeland,” whereas the Jews did not.53

In letters to his brother Stanislaus in 1906, Joyce expressed both admiration and contempt for Griffith’s newspaper United Irishman, calling it “the only newspaper of any pretentions in Ireland” (L 2:157-58). He asked Stanislaus to send him copies during his stay in Rome. While ultimately supportive of Griffith and his Sinn Féin policy, he was critical of the newspaper’s indulgence in racial bigotry directed against the English and the Jews, among others. He complained to his brother about the newspaper’s incessant “old pap of racial hatred” (L 2:167), reacting specifically to an article written by Gogarty in September 15th, 1906 entitled “Ugly England.”54 Gogarty denounces the “English common man,” whom he deridingly referred to as “Sludge,”55 for tolerating the sexual immorality of the British Army. The Sludge’s “own army is rrottener and more immoral than any or all of the armies in Europe put together,” composed of “a body of men who, as their own statistics show, are already more than half leprous from venereal excess” (“Ugly England – I” 3).56 The article

53 For the sake of argument and to avoid controversy, I write of Palestine/Israel as the “homeland” of the Jewish people in the Zionist sense.
54 Though Joyce refers to United Irishman or “U.I.,” “Ugly England” was published in the newly established Sinn Féin, which replaced United Irishman after a costly libel suit in 1906. Griffith edited both newspapers, the latter until 1914 when it was suppressed by the British government. “Ugly England” was a series of articles, the first of which was published on September 15th, 1906 and the other two on November 24th and December 1st.
55 Gogarty defines the “Sludge” in a number of rambling, pejorative ways, yet the term could perhaps be best defined as “a hypocrite essentially and always.” In addition, a “Snudge,” a Sludge who resides in Ireland, is “all that is Sludge minus the money” (“Ugly England – III” 3).
56 Despite the fact that the “Ugly England” articles were published two years after the events in Ulysses, they make their way into the novel when Bloom comments on a British Army recruitment poster in “Lotus Eaters”: “Griffith’s paper is on the same tack now: an army rotten with venereal disease: overseas or halfseasover empire” (5.71-72). The context here will be discussed in the next chapter.
was also rife with anti-semitic canards, blaming Jews for the moral disintegration of Europe and for supporting the British during the Boer War:

England becoming Jewry . . . explained many things; that shopkeeping, moneying instinct, that hatred of things generous and artistic-make yet no graven images; that filthy sensuality unrelieved even by deity; that furtive and narrow timidity; and that panic-stricken, inwardly way of taking revenge – twelve Zulus murdered to intimate others and justify Jewry . . . all are explained; the Jews are among us.

Articles like “Ugly England” are often cited to corroborate Griffith’s anti-semitism, and rightly so.57 Indeed, the most vicious anti-semitic writings from Griffith’s newspapers appear in their coverage of the Dreyfus Affair and the Limerick Boycott of 1904. Writing about the former in 1899, Griffith wrote:

The Jew has at heart no country but the promised land. He forms a nation apart wherever he goes. He may be a German citizen to-day, and a British subject to-morrow. . . . Touch a Jew in Warsaw, and collections will be made to protect him in Moorish Synagogues on the edge of the Sahara and in Chinese Synagogues on the Yellow River. The French Army has sent a Jew to a convict settlement. So, woe to the French Army, if the Jews can manage it. (“Dreyfus Party” 1)58

57 Gerald Y. Goldberg, Irish barrister and the first Jewish Lord Mayor of Cork, cites Gogarty and Griffith’s articles to justify his assertion that the Citizen was loosely modeled on them in addition to Michael Cusack (5-12). See also Keogh, Jews 22-23; Reizbaum, “Empire of Good Sport” 88-89 and Judaic Other 36; Slote, Nietzschean Ethics 89; and Wynn 55-56.

58 The noxious elements of nationalism and anti-semitism culminated in the rise of the Nazis in the 1920s and 1930s. In a speech delivered in 1933, Adolf Hitler made a similar complaint against the Jews:

The struggle between the people and the hatred amongst them is being nurtured by very specific interested parties. It is a small, rootless, international clique that is turning the people against each other, that does not want them to have peace. . . . It is the people who are at home both nowhere and everywhere, who do not have anywhere a soil on which they have grown up, but who live in Berlin today, in Brussels tomorrow, Paris the day after that, and then again in Prague or Vienna or London, and who feel at home everywhere. They are the only ones who can be addressed as international, because they conduct their business everywhere, but the people cannot follow them. (qtd. in “Hitler and the Jews”; my emphases)
Griffith’s support of the anti-Dreyfusards may have had more to do with his animus toward the United Kingdom, the press and government of which largely supported Dreyfus throughout the affair despite its own treatment of Irish political prisoners and its involvement in the Boer War, than with genuine anti-semitism, something that the Irish press generally shared (Barrett 78-79). Yet Griffith’s motivations were laid bare in the United Irishman’s coverage of the Limerick Boycott. After a Catholic priest in Limerick, Father John Creagh, delivered a sermon on January 11th, 1904 in which he accused the Jews in the city of depravity, usury, and blood libel, a boycott was levied against Jewish businesses and small yet sustained violent attacks followed in the following months. On January 23rd, the United Irishman published an article laden with anti-semitic tropes: “usuriousness,” “notoriously dishonest business methods of three fourths of the Jews of Ireland,” “extortion,” “fraud,” “business knavery,” and so on. “The Jews,” it said, “should not persecute Ireland” (qtd. in Goldberg 10). In April 23rd, it published another article that accused ninety percent of Jews of being “usurers and parasites of industry.” “The Jew in Ireland is in every respect an economic evil. He produces no wealth himself – he draws it from others . . . He is an unfair competitor with the rate-paying parish shop keeper, and he remains among us, ever and always an alien” (Griffith, “All Ireland” 1). The “injustice” Bloom complained about in “Cyclops” (U 12.1474) was vigorously and unequivocally justified by Griffith. Indeed, it could be that when Bloom said “I belong to a race too . . . that is hated and persecuted. Also now. This very moment. This very instant” (12.1467-68), he was referring, at least in part, to Limerick.

Scholars sympathetic to Griffith often point out that these anti-semitic articles were not written by Griffith per se and that he was simply exercising editorial diversity of opinion.
As Colum Kenny notes, he published articles that criticized his newspaper’s coverage of the Limerick Boycott, one of which, written by journalist Fred Ryan (who appears in Ulysses) characterized them as “anti-semitic ravings” (qtd. in “Sinn Féin” 206). He was also friends with Michael Noyk, Jacob Elyan, and Eddie Lipman, prominent Jewish Dubliners (“Arthur Griffith” 39; “Sinn Féin” 206). Of course, having Jewish friends did not make Griffith incapable of anti-semitism, yet it is his later writings in Sinn Féin, particularly about Zionism, that there is a noticeable shift in opinion. He published reports of Jewish prosecution in Russia and editorials which criticized the rise of anti-semitism in England during World War I in his new newspaper Nationality (“Arthur Griffith” 40; “Sinn Féin” 210). Griffith’s grievance with the Jews, at least initially, was not so much that they existed – no one opposed the Jew “worshipping God in the manner he believes proper” (qtd. in Goldberg 10) – but that they existed in Ireland. He was a staunch Zionist at a time when Zionism was gaining serious traction. His support may have had to do with his close friendship with Noyk, who supported Griffith’s Sinn Féin policy (Kenny, “Sinn Féin” 210), yet it may have also been motivated by his Hungarian Policy. The more he cited and dwelt on the sufferings of marginalized peoples in Europe – the Irish, the Hungarians, and the Jews among others – the more solidarity he felt with their respective struggles of national self-determination. As Marilyn Reizbaum writes:

The parallel that Griffith makes between the Irish and the Hungarians – one that may in large part account for Bloom’s Hungarian background – reminds us of the parallel that was being drawn between the Hebrews and the Irish in their resistance to conquest, and in their desire to establish a homeland (the modern Zionists). These are

59 See 2.256 and 9.1082-84.
60 See F. Ryan 3 for the full article.
parallels Griffith probably could have accommodated within his paradoxical attitudes toward Jews. (Judaic Other 44)

Indeed, on March 16th, 1912, Sinn Féin published an article which praised Jews and Zionism: “The Jews have given us the finest nationalist literature in the world: they have also set the finest nationalist example . . . . Israel represents the triumph of Sinn Féin.” The author highlights the “Hebrew Language Renaissance” and cites the oft-quote canard that Ireland was “the only land in which [the Jews] had not been prosecuted,” which was crudely echoed by Deasy in “Nestor” (U 2.437-38). He complimented the Jewish nation for its “proverbial . . . business instinct” and dubbed Herzl the “Jewish [Thomas] Davis” (A de B 2). The author, “A de B,” was most likely Aodh de Blácam, a Griffith loyalist who also had a history of anti-semitic writings (Maume; Reizbaum, Judaic Other 210). The “double vision” (Reizbaum, Judaic Other 45) that Griffith and Irish nationalists like him had regarding the Jews, their “bifurcation of Jews into a historical, almost mythological people and a modern European body” (60), hinged on their allegiance to nationalism – not just Irish nationalism, but the right to national self-determination that to them was inalienable to all peoples.

Joyce had read such Zionist literature in Trieste and must have noticed the references to Ireland. In addition to owning a copy of Herzl’s Der Judenstaat [The Jewish State] (1896), he owned a collection of Zionist essays entitled Zionism and the Jewish Future (1917) (Ellmann, Consciousness 126; Nadel 72-73). Der Judenstaat “provided Joyce with a clear-cut identification and explanation of anti-semitism as an outgrowth of emancipation, a term first used for political purposed by Irish Catholics at the end of the eighteenth century” (Nadel 74). In reading Herzl, Joyce “encountered a political spirit similar to the Irish – one that sought to transform a religion and culture into a nation” (76). Although Joyce’s
engagement with Herzl’s work is not insignificant, it did not discuss Irish nationalism
directly in the same way Griffith’s *Resurrection* did not discuss Zionism directly. In contrast,
*Zionism and the Jewish Future* did reference the Irish struggle directly in three different
essays. The first reference is found in the introductory essay “Zionism and the Jewish
Problem” by Chaim Weizmann. Weizmann, who would become the president of the World
Zionist Organization and the first president of the State of Israel,\(^{61}\) makes the analogy
quickly:

> Palestine will be the country in which Jews are to be found, just as Ireland is the
country in which Irishmen are to be found, though there are more Irishmen outside
of Ireland than in it. And similarly Palestine will be the home of Judaism, not because
there will be no Judaism anywhere else, but because in Palestine the Jewish spirit will
have free play, and there the Jewish mind and character will express themselves as
they can nowhere else. (8-9)

Jews could only be truly “Jewish” with the stability and security of their own nation-state.
The sentiment is analogous to Griffith’s own beliefs that the Irish could only be truly Irish
in an independent homeland. A few sentences after this, Weizmann writes that the “ideal of
the return to the land of Palestine, as the home of the Jewish people, has begun to take
concrete shape. And concurrently with this development, and partly as a result of it, there
has gradually come about a change in the outlook of Jews – a change which can be more
easily felt by those who are in touch with Jewish affairs than it can be measured by facts and
figures” (9). Joyce notated this section in the margins of his copy, which indicates at the very
least that it caught Joyce’s attention, being an Irishman outside of his homeland whose

\(^{61}\) The latter office has a relatively unknown connection to Ireland. Chaim Herzog, Israel’s sixth president, was
the son of the Chief Rabbi of Ireland (Bornstein, “Colors” 381).
“outlook” changed living abroad (Nadel 77). If Joyce did not agree with Weizmann’s emphasis on national self-determination, he did recognize that for better or for worse, the desire for national self-determination shared by so many of his countrymen and countrywomen directly and irrevocably altered their political and cultural perceptions of themselves.

The second comparison to the Irish occurs in Moses Gaster’s “Judaism as a National Religion.” “The Jews are a nation just like the Irish,” he writes, “and still more so, because of their faith, for there can be Irish and English Catholics, but there cannot be Christian and Jewish Jews. They are either the one or the other” (94). Gaster deems religion, rather than ethnicity or culture, to be the crucial component of Jewish identity, something that Joyce and Griffith did not for Irish identity. The Gaelic-Catholic cultural nationalism championed by Moran and, to a lesser extent, the republican nationalism championed by Griffith in late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century Ireland did maintain that only Catholics could be truly Irish, yet even the most zealous nationalists typically expected some kind of ethnic homogeneity as well. Much like Joyce, Gaster criticizes the notion of ethnic homogeneity as foolish, particularly among the domineering imperial nations:

Whatever claim the nations of Europe may make to purity of race, it sounds rather strange in the mouth of nations of whom none can show such unmixed purity of blood as the Jews. To the student of history, to those who have followed up the continual migrations of peoples from East to West, the clash of nations, the forcible mixtures which have taken place continuously almost from the dawn of European history, make it evident that there is no nation in Europe which can show such purity of descent as the Jews. Modern nations are not a pure ethnical unity; they are, on the
contrary, the result of a mixture. The French are the result of a mixture of Romans and Gauls; the Spanish of Romans, Iberians, Goths, and Arabs; even the Italians – not to speak of ancient times – in later times a mixtures of Romans, Goths, Longobardians, and other Teutonic tribes; and so throughout the length and breadth of Europe. All these are called nations, and yet the Jews, who are of a much purer ethnical origin, and not the result of a fusion of races, cannot be styled a “nation” of that ground alone? (90)

Although he seems to gloat about the ethnic homogeneity of the Jews relative to Europeans, he rejects it as the main criterion for nationality. To him, faith and faith alone defines a nation: “Faith and nationality go hand in hand; nay, they are indissolubly united” (91). Gaster applies his criticism of nationalism, particularly what constitutes as criteria for a nationality, to all of Europe rather than solely to imperial Europe. In this passage, he denounces the criterion of language for defining nationality, finding it trivial and oppressive:

Among the modern criteria of a nation, unity of language is given the first place. The racial difference has been more and more neglected; nay, modern nations have gone so far as to attempt the obliterations of the racial origin by a policy of forcible unification on the basis of the same language. In Russia, Germany, and Hungary this process has been carried out, and is being carried out ruthlessly against the other nationalities who are not of Slavonic, Teutonic, or Magyar origin. The belief is that by such means the heterogeneous elements of these empires and kingdoms can be fused into one homogeneous nation. (87-88; my emphases)

The language “revivals” in nations like Hungary, something that Griffith praised, were to Gaster arbitrary and deleterious. Interestingly, he positions language and ethnicity against
each other when most European nationalists conflated the two. By discussing Hungary and its policy of linguistic standardization of those in the country who were not Magyars, such as the Croats, Moravians, Slavonians, Bohemians, and Serbians, he also establishes that the colonized, not just the colonizers, can and have been guilty of discrimination and subjugation. Compare this to the passage in *Stephen Hero* cited earlier in the chapter in which Stephen mentions the “capable aggressions of the Magyars upon the Latin and Slav and Teutonic populations” (62). The two passages are similar in principle and even in language, which is noteworthy considering *Zionism and the Jewish Future* was published in 1917, well after Joyce wrote and then abandoned *Stephen Hero*. They are also reminiscent of a passage in *Resurrection* when Griffith discusses Hungary’s refusal to join a proposed “Imperial Parliament” in 1848, although unlike Gaster and Joyce, Griffith supports Hungarian supremacy:

> [T]hen came the news that Schmerling had a policy which was infallibly to settle the Hungarian question and the *Bohemian* question and the *Croatian* question and the other questions that disturbed the Austrian Empire. Forty years later certain English statesmen [*sic*] rediscovered Schmerling’s profound policy and labelled it “Home Rule All Round.” Schmerling proposed to establish, or re-establish, local Parliaments in the different countries of the Empire, these Parliaments having control over internal affairs, but no control over Imperial taxation, military matters, foreign affairs, and soforth [*sic*]. An Imperial Parliament in Vienna was to control all such things. This Imperial Parliament was to consist of 343 members, of whom Hungary was to have 85, *Bohemia* 56, *Transylvania* 20, *Moravia* 22, *Upper and Lower Austria* 38,
Croatia and Slavonia 9, Styria 13, the Tyrol 12, and the smaller States smaller numbers. (17; my emphases)

Griffith sympathized with Hungarian nationalists’ dismissal of the proposed parliament, “the majority of whose members [would] be foreigners” (20). He was also contemptuous of the different peoples emphasized above, claiming that they sought to undermine Hungary’s autonomy: “Hungary was surrounded on all sides by people hostile or inimical to her – not alone Austrians and Russians, but the Slav hordes who had been taught by unscrupulous and cunning statesmen to regard Hungary as an enemy to them” (70). Griffith’s admiration of Hungary’s ambitions and its relationship with other peoples was misplaced. Regardless, Gaster’s overall argument that the Jews were entitled to national self-determination because of their religion may not have necessarily appealed to Joyce, yet Gaster’s unorthodox and adversarial critiques of European nationalism and his castigation of former colonized nations such as Hungary in order to buttress his support of national self-determination of another castigated people in Europe parallels Joyce’s own contrarian handling of Irish nationalism and his engagement with Griffith’s.

The third and final comparison of the Jews and the Irish in the book occurs in “The Meaning of a Hebrew University” by Bertram B. Benas. Advocating for the establishment of a Jewish university in Jerusalem (which would come to fruition in 1918 as the Hebrew University of Jerusalem), Benas references the agitation for a Celtic university as proposed by the Gaelic League and Irish Revival:

Perhaps the nearest approach to a parallel is to be found in those Celtic territories of the United Kingdom, across the Marches and across the Sea, which have either preserved or endeavoured to revive their national languages, and in which the demand
for a “nationalized” University finds expression in a form bearing some similarity to that which characterizes the project of a Jewish University in Jerusalem. (190)

Benas was referring specifically to the “nationalized” University College Dublin founded in 1880, as well as the broader attempts by revivalists such as Hyde and Pearse to preserve and reinvigorate the Irish language in the country’s education system (not to mention Moran’s demand that every true Irish person should speak Irish). University College Dublin required students to attend courses in Irish, something Joyce resented. At eighteen, Joyce attended Irish classes taught by Pearse at the university, only to give them up because Pearse “found it necessary to exalt Irish by denigrating English” (JJ 61). As discussed in the introduction, Joyce was at odds with the Irish Revival in many ways, and his own command of Irish was not nearly as strong as his command of other languages. At the same time, he revered “dead” languages such as Greek and Hebrew, and two years after dropping Pearse’s course he was fluent in four European languages (MacCabe 204-5). The revitalization of Hebrew in the Zionist movement coincided with the Irish Revival. Zionists such as Benas considered it essential to revitalize Hebrew in order to establish a Jewish nation. To do so was arguably more difficult than revitalizing Irish. Unlike Irish, Hebrew was never truly a spoken language. In fact, Hebrew is possibly the first language created by a people before it achieved national self-determination (Nadel 78-79). Yiddish, the language that the majority of European Jews spoke, was considered pedestrian and “a sign of racial indeterminacy,” whereas Hebrew, a predominately “liturgical and elite literary language, was reinvented as

---

62 All three believed Anglophonic education in Ireland was deleterious to the very character of the Irish people. Pearse was particularly gratuitous in his claim in 1912 that this education system “more wickedly does violence to the elementary human rights of Irish children than would an edict for the general castration of Irish males” (7).

63 Although as Barry McCrea points out, Joyce underwent a “youthful moment of hesitation” before renouncing the Irish Revival by indicating in the 1901 census that he spoke “Irish and English” (150). See “Residents” for a copy of the census form.
the obvious national cure” (Beatty, “Zionism” 322-23). Hobsbawm comments on the unique nature of the “Hebrew Revival,” claiming that both “the impulse which led to the creation of modern spoken Hebrew, and the circumstances which led to its successful establishment, are too unusual to set a general example” (60). The other essays in the book, such as Leon Simon’s “The Hebrew Revival,” reinforced not just the importance of Hebrew to the Jews but also to the revitalization of classical forms, which Joyce based much of his syntax, construction, and style on starting in his student days (Nadel 78-79): “Joyce found in [Simon’s] essay an analysis of the interrelation between classical and modern forms of language which emphasized evolution and change while establishing new meanings” (79). Benas’s essay also supported the notion that a Jewish University would “link” oriental and Western cultures.

Indeed, this theme, the “linkage” of oriental and Western cultures in relation to Jewish “character,” influenced Joyce’s other engagements with Jewish and Zionists texts. Jewish “character” was the focal point of four other books Joyce had read: The Source of the Christian Tradition: A Critical History of Ancient Judaism (1906) by Edouard Dujardin, Sex and Character (1903) and On Last Things (1904) by Otto Weininger, and The Jews: A Study of Race and Environment (1911) by Maurice Fishberg. Joyce only owned Dujardin’s and Fishberg’s books (Ellmann, Consciousness 107; “Other”), yet it was known early on in Joycean scholarship that he consulted Weininger’s texts (JJ 463-64). Dujardin’s book

---

64 This view is not the consensus among nationalism scholars. Beatty denies the Hebrew Revival’s uniqueness, arguing that it was similar to other European language revivals of the nineteenth century, including Ireland’s. Compare, for example, the titles of two prominent Hebrew and Irish revivalist publications (respectively): HaShachar, or “The Dawn,” and Fáinne an Lae, or “The Dawning of the Day” (“Zionism” 321-25).

65 There is some speculation as to whether Joyce actually read Sex and Character or The Jews in their entirety. The documentation Ellmann provides is less than convincing. However, it is generally thought Joyce was at least familiar with Weininger’s and Fishberg’s ideas (Reizbaum, “Weininger” 207-8; Van Mierlo 33n30). As N. Davison maintains, “Joyce need not have read either text to have recognized the prevalence of such controversies about ‘the Jew’ in fin-de-siècle Europe” as they were prevalent in European intellectual circles at
focuses on ancient Jewish history, claiming that it more than justified the establishment of a modern Jewish state. Like Gaster, Dujardin maintains that the Jewish religion in ancient times was inherently nationalistic. The Iron Age semitic tribe that worshipped Yahweh and believed to have a “covenant” with him justified the restoration of their Biblical land (Nadel 80): “The glowing nationalism of the founders of the Jewish state . . . had expressed in terms of the cult of the national god Jahweh the fierce patriotism which was to them the condition of existence; and this primitive conception had traced the path of Judaism” (qtd. in 80). Nadel claims Joyce may have been mistrustful of Dujardin’s jingoistic interpretation of Jewish history, yet his writings about the Jewish reverence of history as pivotal to their identity as well as their interaction with Hellenism during the fifth through third centuries BCE appealed to him (81-82). Jewish law to Dujardin was dependent on “the constant practice of projecting into the past, in the form of myths and legends, the institutions, laws and theories of the present time” (qtd. in 81), a practice that was ubiquitous in Irish and European nationalist discourse. It was Dujardin’s portrayal of the Jews as a humble, literate, and proud people from time immemorial who displayed impressive patriotism and fierce fighting ability only when provoked that caught Joyce’s interest, even if its jingoistic undertones undermined its legitimacy in his view. Dujardin’s characterization of the Jews was similar to Griffith’s characterization of the Hungarians as discussed earlier in the chapter.

Weininger’s and Fishberg’s characterizations of the Jews, however, were considerably less charitable. They were decidedly anti-Zionist and their analyses of Jewish culture and history refutes Herzl’s and Griffith’s assertions about the necessity and merits of the time (138). Weininger was very popular in the first few decades of the twentieth century. By the time Ulysses was published, Sex and Character was published in its twenty-second edition (Byrnes, “Weiningerian” 270). Geheber maintains more broadly that Joyce may not have read every book in his library per se but was at least familiar with the writers in his collection (Nineteenth-Century 13).
Jewish national self-determination. Born a Viennese Jew in the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Weininger denounced his Jewish origins and converted to Christianity in 1902. He devoted his short academic career (he committed suicide at the age of twenty-three due to his loathing of his Jewish heritage) to pseudo-scientific studies of gender and the Jews. His contention in Sex and Character was that “femininity” was the negation of “genius,” “the thing-in-itself,” and “morality,” and that the Jews were inherently feminine, “the new womanly man” (U 15.1798-99) that epitomizes Bloom:66

Women have no existence and no essence; they are not, they are nothing. Mankind occurs as male or female, as something or nothing. Woman has no share in ontological reality, no relation to the thing-in-itself, which, in the deepest interpretation, is the absolute, is God. . . . Woman has no relation to the idea, she neither affirms nor denies it; she is neither moral no anti-moral . . . she is purposeless, neither good nor bad, neither angel nor devil, never egoistical . . . she is as non-moral as she is non-logical. (286)

Weininger then projects these characteristics onto the Jews. Jews are meek, mild, humble, nonviolent, and unimaginative. Their only characteristic is a lack of identity, their binary opposition to the masculine, refined, dynamic Aryan:

The congruity between Jews and women further reveals itself in the extreme adaptability of the Jews, in their great talent for journalism, the “mobility” of their minds, their lack of deeply-rooted and original ideas, in fact the mode in which, like women, because they are nothing in themselves, they can become everything. The

---

66 Molly seems to concur with this at the very end of Ulysses: “that is why I liked him because I saw he understood or felt what a woman is” (18.1578-79).
Jew is an individual, not an individuality; he is in constant close relation with the lower life, and has no share in the higher metaphysical life. (320)

Yet Weininger also stresses that Jewishness, far from an ethnic or cultural predetermination, is “a state of mind or being, a psychological constitution” (Reizbaum, *Judaic Other* 57). In this sense, “Jewishness” is a choice that can be retained both personally and *en masse*:

I do not refer to a nation or to a race, to a creed or to a scripture. When I speak of the Jew I mean neither an individual nor the whole body, but mankind in general, in so far as it has a share in the platonic idea of Judaism. My purpose is to analyse this idea.

That these researches should be included in a work devoted to the characterology of the sexes may seem an undue extension of my subject. But some reflection will lead to the surprising result that Judaism is saturated with femininity, with precisely those qualities the essence of which I have shown to be in the strongest opposition to the male nature. It would not be difficult to make a case for the view that the Jew is more saturated with femininity than the Aryan, to such an extent that the most manly Jew is more feminine than the least manly Aryan. (Weininger, *Sex and Character* 306)

Unlike many anti-Semites before and after his time, Weininger argued that Jewishness was a characteristic that could be willfully expunged, as he did. He was a proponent of assimilation, the abandonment of Jewishness in favor of an Aryan or at least a broadly-European identity.

---

*67* Compare Weininger to what Arnold wrote about the Celts: “But putting all this question of chivalry and its origin on one side, no doubt the sensibility of the Celtic nature, its nervous exaltation, have something feminine in them, and the Celt is thus peculiarly disposed to feel the spell of the feminine idiosyncrasy; he has an affinity to it; he is not far from its secret” (*Celtic Literature* 108).
In contrast, Fishberg debunked the so-called racial characteristics of the Jews. In *The Jews*, he meticulously researches every facet of the Jewish people: physical, demographic, pathological, social, economic, occupational, and so forth. He draws the conclusion that the racial “purity” of the Jews is a myth: the “alleged purity of the Jewish race is visionary and not substantiated by scientific observation” (474). His analysis on Jewish assimilation and intermarriage also leads him to deny that Jewishness and nationality are incompatible. Perhaps most importantly, he categorically denies Weininger’s assessment on Jewish character as being “weak,” “effeminate,” and “amoral.” Fishberg’s work actually normalizes and humanizes Jews more than most during his time. Based on his results, he concludes that Jews should strive toward assimilation in their fight against discrimination in European society (N. Davison 146-48). Although Weininger and Fishberg disagreed about the nature of Jewishness – the former maintained there were irrefutable racial and cultural Jewish characteristics whereas the latter maintained there were none – they both attracted Joyce in their condemnation of Zionism. Weininger’s disdain for Jewishness led him to conclude that the only way for them to achieve “emancipation” was to fully integrate into Western society: “For these reasons Zionism must remain an impractical idea, *notwithstanding the fashion in which it has brought together some of the noblest qualities of the Jews.* Zionism is the negation of Judaism, for the conception of Judaism involves a world-wide distribution of the Jews. Citizenship is an un-Jewish thing, and there has never been and never will be a true Jewish state” (*Sex and Character* 307; my emphasis). His position was deeply individualistic, which is perhaps another reason why Joyce was drawn to him. Curiously, one of the only positive things he says about the Jews in the book was his remark about Zionist agitation, which contradicts his entire argument about Jews being weak, pacifistic,
and impervious to patriotism or organization. Weininger goes on to state that to “defeat Judaism, the Jew must first understand himself and war against himself. . . . the Jewish question can only be solved individually; every single Jew must try to solve it in his proper person” (312).

Likewise, Fishberg argues that Jews should assimilate into their respective countries in order to bring about genuine acceptance. The “solution of the perennial Jewish problem can be, and is being, accomplished in the countries in which they live at present. The emancipated Jew cannot and will not return to a Ghetto environment” (555). He also argues that the creation of a modern Jewish state in Palestine would only exacerbate anti-semitism in Europe and reinforce the conception that Jews are a “nation living among other nations” and a “state within a state” (474). Indeed, he seems to yield to Zionist arguments when he claims that a “study of the history of the Jews in dispersion up to the end of the eighteenth century shows that as long as religion was part and parcel of the European states the Jews were undoubtedly a nation” (475). Yet it is precisely for this reason that Jews should resist, rather than agitate, for national self-determination. Denying the legitimacy of religion as integral to nationalism as argued by Gaster would reduce rather than aggravate anti-semitism and, more generally, prejudice itself. Nationalism, much like Judaism, relied on antiquated and debunked notions of identity that should be repudiated in modern times. Fishberg’s assertions were not polemical, yet they had an aversion to nationalism based on religion or any other characteristic. As an assimilated and respected American Jew, Fishberg linked the travails of the Jewish people with the European melding of nationalism and religion. By meticulously analyzing the notion of Jewish “purity” or at least “racial” purity, he rebuffed the concept of nationalism itself. Weininger and Fishberg disagreed on several issues, yet
their antipathy to Jewishness as a concept and as a race as well as their deconstruction of religion and national identity were perhaps the most compelling reasons why Joyce, an Irishman living in Trieste and later Paris and Zurich among intellectuals across Europe, availed their work.

Much has been written about Weininger’s and Fishberg’s influence in Ulysses. Most analyses contend that Bloom’s gentle, effeminate characteristics and “degenerate” sexuality were inspired by Weininger and that his engagement with Zionism, his Jewish identity, and ethnicity were inspired by both Weininger and Fishberg. Bloom’s association with the orient throughout the novel, often in tandem with the orient’s association with otherness, is often linked to the two. Bloom’s “native place, the land of the Pharaoh,” “weak chest . . . [and] Mongolian extraction,” “oriental obeisance,” and “fetor judaicus” (Jewish stench) (U 15.946-47, 954, 960, 1796) among other descriptors, are derived from their work. The “Mongolian extraction” comment is clearly linked to them as they both discussed Mongolian Jews. Weininger was fascinated that the “Jewish race . . . appears to possess a certain anthropological relationship with both negroes and Mongolians. The readily curling hair points to the negro; admixture of Mongolian blood is suggested by the perfectly Chinese or Malay formation of face and skull which is so often to be met amongst the Jews and which is associated with a yellowish complexion” (Sex and Character 303). Fishberg devotes a section to Jews of central and eastern Asian extraction (118-21), something that Ellmann noted in his sole reference to Fishberg: Joyce “had a little book on the Jews by a man named Fishberg, which contained pictures of Chinese Jews with pigtails, Mongolian Jews with Mongolian features, and the like” (JJ 395; my emphasis).68 Ellmann’s reference by itself

---

68 Furthermore, Joyce indirectly alludes to the subject of Mongolian extraction in “Oxen of the Sun.” “Blumenbach” (U 14.1236), or Johann Friedrich Blumenbach was a nineteenth century physiologist and
may be questionable, yet Nadel also attributes this reference to Fishberg (167). Many of Bloom’s personality quirks and mundane actions – cooking for Molly in “Calypso,” paying fastidious attention to his physical appearance throughout the day, his sexual “perversions,” his transformation into a woman in “Circe,” his self-description as an “author-journalist” (U 15.8010), and even his father’s suicide – are linked to Weininger (Joly 194-98). Regardless, it is evident that Joyce had both scholars in mind in shaping Bloom’s Jewish cultural and ethnic identity.

Bloom would probably not have agreed with Weininger or Fishberg on much with perhaps the exception on their disapproval of Zionism. In “Calypso,” he reads a newspaper advertisement for a Zionist agricultural plantation near Jaffa, “Agendath Netaim” (U 4.191-92), that the “ferretyed porkbutcher” (4.152) Dlugacz used as wrapping paper for his non-kosher kidney. After reading the advertisement, Bloom muses, “Nothing doing. Still an idea behind it” (4.200). Some scholars have read Bloom’s curt thought as a dismissal of Zionism (N. Davison 145; Nadel 71). Ellmann compares it to something Joyce said in 1915 regarding the possibility of a Jewish state in Palestine: “That’s all very well, but believe me, a warship

69 Ellmann wrote immediately after that Joyce “knew little of Zionism” (JJ 395-96), which gives credence to Reizbaum’s, N. Davison’s, and Van Mierlo’s argument among others that Ellmann’s analysis of Joyce’s “reading” of Fishberg and Weininger was not quite sound. It is also worth pointing out that at approximately six hundred pages, Fishberg’s book was not “little.”

72 See Byrnes, “Bloom’s Sexual Tropes” 303-23 and “Weiningerian” 267-81; N. Davison 127-54; Joly 194-98; Nadel 139-80; Reizbaum, Judaic Other 51-117 and “Weininger” 207-13; and Rosenfeld 215-26. Furthermore, Wim Van Mierlo devotes considerable attention to Joyce’s handling of Weininger, especially On Last Things, in his Subject Notebook, yet he primarily engages with Weininger’s metaphysical and ontological ideas rather than his misogynistic and anti-semitic theories, such as attributing the “Nacheinander” and “Nebeneinander” (U 3.13, 15) concepts that Stephen contemplates in “Proteus” to Weininger (1-46). It is worth noting that Weininger devotes a chapter to Ibsen and Peer Gynt in On Last Things (A Translation 1-40), something that may have appealed to Joyce considering his own admiration of the Norwegian writer.
with a captain named Kanalgitter and his aide named Captain Afterduft would be the funniest thing the old Mediterranean has ever seen” (JJ 396). Indeed, the context behind the Agendath Netaim reference – the fact the advertisement was literally used as wrapping paper for Bloom’s non-kosher meat, Bloom’s hasty reading of it as he is walks back home, the way in which he quickly forgets it – gives credence to this interpretation, as does Bloom’s lugubrious monologue on Palestine itself:

A barren land, bare waste. Vulcanic lake, the dead sea: no fish, weedless, sunk deep in the earth. No wind could life those waves, grey metal, poisonous foggy waters. Brimstone they called it raining down: the cities of the plain: Sodom, Gomorrah, Edom. All dead names. A dead sea in a dead land, grey and old. Old now. It bore the oldest, the first race. A bent hag crossed from Cassidy’s, clutching a naggin bottle by the neck. The oldest people. Wandered far away over all the earth, captivity to captivity, multiplying, dying being born everywhere. It lay there now. Now it could bear no more. Dead: an old woman’s: the grey sunken cunt of the world.

Desolation. (U4.219-29)

Bloom’s description of Palestine is the total opposite of the one found in the Agendath Netaim advertisement, one which promises sprawling fields of melons, olives, oranges, almonds, and citrons. He recalls particularly negative geographical terrain, the Dead Sea, and the wicked Old Testament cities of the plain obliterated by a vengeful God. He compares the Jewish people to a feeble old woman and Palestine to the “grey sunken cunt of the world.” Palestine to him is not the land of milk and honey promised to the Israelites. What is peculiar about this reference to Palestine is not so much Bloom’s dreadful vision but rather its commercial aspect. Much like the advertisement for “the model farm at Kinnereth on the
lakeshore of Tiberias” (4.154-55) that Bloom also sees in Dlugacz’s, the advertisement for Agendath Netaim sought investments for the plantations. In addition to a Zionist affair, it was a commercial one; in fact, the two were intertwined. This ostensibly aligns with Bloom’s pragmatism and assimilation as well as Dlugacz’s, who was based on one of Joyce’s English students in Trieste, Moses Dlugacz, himself a Zionist but never a Dublin resident (Igoe 85). The Dlugacz in Ulysses “seems a likely representation of this kind of Jew; immigration and economics make strange bed-fellows, and kosher butchers didn’t do too well in Dublin” (N. Davison 202). In other words, the “Irish Jew” as represented by Bloom and Dlugacz viewed Jewish national self-determination in large part under economic terms. Bloom does not necessarily dismiss Zionism. He may not be a Zionist but he was not opposed to the idea of a Jewish nation-state either. There is, after all, “an idea behind it,” and Bloom is a man who relishes his ideas, however fanciful. The coupling of secular Jews in Dublin with the Zionist plantations in Palestine served as an ironic reminder of the precariousness of the Zionist proposition as well as its commercial, rather than national or religious, payoffs.

In defending his Hungarian Policy, Griffith praised Hungary’s apparent economic turnaround after Hungary gained its independence. “Since the conclusion of the Ausgleich and the restoration of the Hungarian Constitution Hungary has outstripped many of the European countries in material progress. Like a strong man long bound who regains his freedom, exulting in his reawakened strength, Hungary has used its strength to the full and will enthusiasm” (Resurrection 68). He boasts of impressive output in coal, iron, manufacturing, and agriculture, and claims Ireland would reap similar benefits once it gained independence. The “strong man” is in direct contrast with the “bent hag” Bloom associates with the Jews. Bloom carries the Agendath Netaim advertisement around with him
throughout the day, only to burn it in “Ithaca.” The description of its destruction parallels Bloom’s monologue in “Calypso”: “The truncated conical crater summit of the diminutive volcano emitted a vertical and serpentine fume redolent of aromatic oriental incense” (U 17.1331-32). The “vulcanic lake” and “brimstone” are invoked here and the “oriental incense” supplements the land’s oriental connotations. It is, despite the destruction, a somewhat fitting end for the Zionist advertisement. It is both a rebuke of Zionism as well as Griffith’s sanguine interpretation of the fruits of nationalist labor.

In Griffith’s article about the Dreyfus Affair, written before his apparent embrace of Zionism, his admonishment of the Jews contained a curious metaphor that was extended in Ulysses: “The Jew has at heart no country but the Promised Land” (“Dreyfus Party” 1). Griffith uses the Mosaic metaphor in a negative way, yet the sentiment of the metaphor underpins his support of Irish nationalism and Zionism. In “Aeolus,” MacHugh recites John F. Taylor’s speech defending the Irish Revival, a speech “that still floated . . . in urban memory in 1904” (Callanan, “United Irishman” 74). MacHugh’s rendition (U 7.828-69) is itself a palimpsest of Taylor’s actual speech, delivered on October 24th, 1901 at the Law Students Debate Society in Dublin (Bender 807). A full transcription of the speech was never produced; rather, Taylor’s speech was recirculated in various newspapers and pamphlets. Although Griffith published an account of the speech in the United Irishman in 1906, that itself was a republication of an anonymous pamphlet entitled “The Language of an Outlaw” which circulated in 1904 and is generally attributed to Casement (809; Crowley). Taylor compares “the youthful Moses” (U 7.833) to adherents of the Irish Revival who are talked down to by an Egyptian priest. The priest questions Moses as to why he and the Jews are so

73 Interestingly, McLuhan incorrectly identifies J. J. O’Molloy as the orator, not MacHugh (19).
intent on retaining their culture and language, especially when compared to Egypt’s: “we have a literature, a priesthood, an agelong history and a polity” (7.849-50). Taylor concludes his metaphor by stating that had Moses listened to the high priest, he would have never led his people to the promised land: “He would never have spoken with the Eternal amid lightnings on Sinai’s mountaintop nor ever have come down with the light of inspiration shining in his countenance and bearing in his arms the tables of the law, graven in the language of the outlaw” (7.866-69). The last phrase “language of the outlaw” does not appear in the initial report of the speech as published in the Freeman’s Journal the day after its deliverance (“The Irish Revival” 5). Rather, it seems to be an appendage created by a mysterious writer “X” that Casement would republish in his pamphlet (Bender 808).74

Although some scholars have tended to focus on the speech’s implicit comparison of Moses to Parnell (E. Duffy, “Parnellism” 187-88; Spoo, Language 122), the Mosaic parallel as related in Ulysses could also be partly attributed to Griffith. His publication of the pamphlet in 1906 notwithstanding, Griffith championed the Mosaic, if not messianic, connotations of Irish nationalism, using them to justify his Sinn Féin policy and Zionism. At the same time, he employed these justifications in denouncing and maligning the Jews in Ireland and in ignoring the plight of the non-Magyars in Hungary. Emer Nolan writes that “MacHugh actually depicts the Irish as continuously prone to being led astray by words” (Nationalism 90). The fictitious MacHugh, Joyce perhaps was cognizant of, was not the only one who perpetuated this.75

74 Yeats recalls hearing the speech in his Autobiographies. His rendition also includes the phrase “language of an outlaw” (96-97). Ellmann also claims Joyce heard the speech himself (JJ 91). Taylor was held in high regard by many in Ireland. When he passed away in 1902, one law journal’s obituary declared he was “one of the most brilliant men of his generation, and was eminent alike as a lawyer, journalist, historian, public speaker, and politician” (qtd. in D’Arcy 168).

75 For more on Taylor’s speech in Ulysses, see Bender 807-12; Callahan, “United Irishman” 73-74; Crowley; Dangerfield 7; E. Duffy, “Parnellism” 187-88; Gibson, Revenge 53-54; Keane 400-15; and Onose 46-62 among
RESURRECTION’S DOWNFALL: THE LIMITS OF COMPARATIVE NATIONALIST HISTORIOGRAPHY

I would like to conclude the chapter with an overview of responses to Griffith’s work as well as a few direct allusions found in Ulysses. Even among the plethora of Irish historical books published during the Irish Revival, Resurrection was and remains controversial. Its admirers claim the book launched Sinn Féin and was integral to the movement’s tactics that ultimately led to Ireland’s independence. Its detractors claim that the book was little more than pseudo-historical hokum that not only distorted Hungarian history but trivialized Ireland’s independence movement. In Ourselves Alone! (1959), Padraic Colum characterizes the book as an important milestone in the independence movement while also acknowledging its limitations:

The publication of The Resurrection of Hungary was an event in Irish history. To the post-Parnell generation it dramatized an alternative to Parliamentarianism with its performances that had become routine; to the generation moulded by the Gaelic League it offered a politic that befitted an integral nationalism. . . .

It would be a mistake to read The Resurrection of Hungary as history; it is a parable; it is, if one is careful not to use the word in a derogatory sense, a myth – an arousing myth. The acceptance of the myth on which an Irish policy could mould itself entailed effort and discipline. (78; my emphases)

Compared to other critics, Colum was being charitable. Foster, for instance, writes that Griffith based his book and Hungarian Policy on “misapplied historical parallels” (“History” a plethora of sources. See “‘Irish Revival’” 5 for the initial 1901 account of the speech in the Freeman’s Journal. For Casement’s 1904 pamphlet, see Casement, Language 155-58.
136). F. S. L. Lyons, while conceding its importance, was dismissive of the book and Griffith’s Hungarian Policy, a “baffling name.” He chastises Griffith for minimalizing and misinterpreting the Ausgleich and the events that led to it: “The fact that Griffith underestimated the complexity of the Ausgleich and failed to realise how the existence of common ministries of war and foreign affairs and the retention of close economic ties between the two parts of the Empire diminished Hungarian autonomy, may reflect upon him as a historian, but not as a propagandist” (251). English historian Edward Norman described the book as a feebleminded attempt to force an analogy upon the two nations:

After slight but excited readings of Austro-Hungarian history he had fallen upon what he imagined to be a close parallel to Ireland’s relationship with England. . . . It was crammed with inaccuracies and conveniently overlooked the subsequent misgovernment of Hungary by the Magyar landowning class. The book also revealed all the reverence for history which characterizes those who never quite understood historical scholarship. (242)

In 1919, Irish novelist George A. Birmingham also harped upon Griffith’s simplistic conflation of the Irish and the Hungarians. It was the ethnic Magyars, not the “Hungarians,” that led the campaign for the Ausgleich, but not for the virtuous reasons Griffith claims, and once the Magyars gained power they wielded it despotically:

The Sinn Féiner of to-day never quotes and rarely refers to Mr. Arthur Griffith’s “Resurrection of Hungary,” though that pamphlet was the earliest manifesto of the party. Perhaps he does not read it any more. Perhaps he had read it carefully enough to discover that there is no resemblance whatever between the Irish Irelander and the Magyar. The Magyars are – perhaps we should say were – members of a dominant
aristocracy, a governing race which was not native to Hungary. . . . Ever since they got the power they wanted they have been making it clear that they meant to hold in subjection the unfortunate Slav. If Mr. Griffith’s pamphlet suggests any lesson for Ireland, it is certainly not one of encouragement for our insurgent Gaels. If we must find resemblances between ourselves and the Hungarians – which seems to me unnecessary – the Magyars seem to correspond most nearly to our Anglo-Irish aristocracy. . . (186-87)

Not everyone, however, shared this critical assessment. Hungarian scholar Thomas Kabdebo, for example, offers a levelheaded critique of Resurrection, ultimately impressed with its treatment of Hungarian history and its engagement with Ireland’s:

All in all: by championing the Hungarian cause, by reflecting what Hungary, through its national historians and benevolent foreign observers wished to project, Griffith built up an authentic, if over-optimistic, picture of a country in East Central Europe – a picture Hungarians liked to see when looking into the mirror of their own history but, because it was an optimal representation of available facts, one they could never fully draw for themselves. . . .

In summary we may unequivocally state that Arthur Griffith presented and represented a clear and authoritative document to the Irish nation drawn upon facts and view of Hungarian history as chronicled by Hungarian historians and foreign observers of Hungary. His mistakes were few, his argument was valid. (41, 46)

Although Kabdebo may have overstated the accuracy of Griffith’s work (he makes a number of mistakes, some of which are egregious), Griffith’s overall argument, at least with regard to the Hungarian Policy, is indeed valid. The campaign of the Magyars against the Austrian
Empire relied on parliamentarian abstentionism, civil disobedience, and a resurgence of cultural nationalism, including a “language revival,” rather than physical force. From 1848 to the Ausgleich, the Hungarian Diet was mostly suspended and martial law was imposed upon the country. Hungarian nationalists refused to send representatives to the Austrian “Imperial” Diet in Vienna, insisting instead that the Pragmatic Sanction of 1713 established Hungary’s legal independence from Austria, much like the Act of Settlement of 1782, to Griffith, secured Ireland’s legal independence from the United Kingdom (Resurrection xxiii). Hungarian nationalists did not want to separate from the Austrian Empire entirely; rather, they wanted to maintain their diet, certain autonomous government administration, and perhaps most importantly, the nominal status of their kingdom. Griffith openly admits that a significant difference between Hungarian nationalists and Irish republicans was that the former did not want a republic (xxx). They simply wanted the Hapsburg monarch (or specifically the Hapsburg-Lorraine monarch, as the House of Hapsburgs merged with the House of Lorraine in the mid-eighteenth century), who since 1848 was Emperor Franz Joseph I, to be coronated as King of Hungary in addition to the Emperor of Austria (among his many other titles), in essence functioning as a “dual monarch.” The Kingdom of Hungary had been under Hapsburg control since 1526, and it was traditional for the monarchs since then to be coronated in Pozsony (modern-day Bratislava) with the crown of St. Stephen. Griffith emphasizes the importance of this coronation, which was technically suspended in 1848. The crown of St. Stephen is one of the few direct allusions to Resurrection in Ulysses.

The Iron Crown. In Bloom’s “coronation” scene in “Circe,” he is about to be anointed with “saint Stephen’s iron crown” (U 15.1439). This one line has produced a surprising amount
of research in Joycean scholarship. Most scholars believe that the iron crown does not exist: that in fact it was one of Griffith’s mistakes that Joyce later appropriated.\textsuperscript{76} According to Griffith, King Stephen I (St. Stephen) united the Hungarian kingdom and converted the Magyars to Christianity: a “king arose – the good King Stephen, whose Iron Crown each King of Hungary must don in Budapest before the Hungarian owes him allegiance” (xvii). Besides the fact that Stephen I, like most Hungarian kings up until the Hapsburg monarchy, was coronated in Székesfehérvár, not Budapest (itself an anachronism since the twin cities of Buda and Pest did not formally merge until 1872) (“Budapest” 734; “Székesfehérvár” 320), the “iron crown” was made of gold. Thornton is one of the few scholars who supports Griffith’s notion that the crown was iron but he relied on a \textit{New York Times} article from 1965 which clearly states it was gold (338-39).\textsuperscript{77} Griffith cites it again in his description of the coronation of Franz Joseph I in 1867, the first monarch to be crowned in what would eventually become Budapest (\textit{Resurrection} 64). Tracy speculates that Griffith may have confused the “iron crown” with the “famous iron crown of Lombardy” (532). One of the sources Griffith consulted, \textit{A History of Austro-Hungary} (1889) by Louis Leger (Kabdebo 33n46), does mention the Lombardy iron crown in his analysis of medieval Hungarian history.\textsuperscript{78} I would add on to Tracy that Griffith may have also conflated the crown with a rather gruesome story regarding György Dózsa, a Transylvanian nobleman who led a

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{76} See McCourt, “Tarry Easty” 33; Mecs nó ber, “Arthur Griffith” 345-46 and “Eastern Europe”” 31; Tracy 532; \textit{U-A} 473; \textit{U-N} 737; and Ungar, Joyce’s Ulysses 62.
\textsuperscript{77} The article in question affirms the crown’s “chains of gold” adorned with jewelry, and also mentions that it was being held as of 1965 by the United States government, which kept it after World War II at the behest of anti-communist forces in Hungary. The crown was much more important outside of Joycean scholarship, as it was used as a bargaining chip for the release of accused American spy Robert A. Vogeler who was being held in Hungary. See “Hungary’s Crown” 1-2. Manganiello also supports the “iron crown” theory but relies exclusively on Thornton (120).
\textsuperscript{78} “The empire of Austria now included five kingdoms of various origin – Bohemia; Hungary; Galicia; Illyria . . .; and the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom, whose symbol was the \textit{iron crown of Lombardy}” (Leger 463; my emphasis)
\end{footnotesize}
peasants’ revolt against the Magyar aristocracy in 1514.79 In addition to the iron crown, there are a number of small allusions to Resurrection in Bloom’s coronation scene. Bloom reveals to his subjects that he is “wearing green socks” (U 15.1521). Tracy believes Joyce appropriated this detail from Griffith, who wrote that the “faded green mantle of St. Stephen” accompanied Franz Joseph I during his procession (Resurrection 65). The royal Hungarian mantle is “mulberry,” very distinguishable from green (Tracy 532). McCourt points out that the “[t]hirtytwo workmen, wearing rosettes, from all the counties of Ireland” (U 15.1546-47) who follow Bloom in his procession resemble the representatives of the “fifty-two counties of Hungary” (Griffith, Resurrection 65) who formed Franz Joseph’s procession (“Tarry Easty” 33). It has been asserted that Bloom’s procession scene was indebted in part to Griffith’s work and, moreover, that this itself reflects Griffith’s sloppy research and nationalist sensationalism that Joyce was trying to subvert.80 These finer details regarding Joyce’s appropriation of Griffith’s mistakes are valid and show the prodigious research produced in Joycean scholarship on minutiae. They reflect the wider scholarship on Joyce’s interrogation of Griffith and his Sinn Féin policy. Yet the true grievous errors Griffith makes do not come from his description of the coronation. Rather, they come from his analysis of Hungary’s complex ethnic divisions, which will be the focus of the last section of this chapter.

79 Hungary and Its Revolutions (1854) by E. O. S. (Susan Horner) describes Dózsa’s fate following his capture: “Having taken their leader, Dózsa, alive, they determined to wreak a dreadful vengeance upon him; he was seated on a thrown of red hot iron, and a red hot crown placed upon his head, his flesh was torn from his body by pincers and thrown to his followers who had been kept without food for some days, and were forced to devour it” (95; my emphasis). This story was also covered in Vámbéry and Heilprin (272-73) and Paget (2:109). Although it describes a punishment rather than a coronation, Griffith may have thought the iron crown was common among the nobility of that region. All three sources were consulted by Griffith (Kadebo 33n44, 33n47, 34n50).

80 For more on the parallels between this scene in “Circe” and Resurrection, see Manganiello 119-21; McCourt, “Tarry Easty” 32-33; Meesnöber, “Arthur Griffith” 344-47 and “Eastern Europe”” 31; Tracy 531-34; and Ungar, Joyce’s Ulysses 62.
A Long-Suffering Minority. As mentioned, Griffith’s analysis of the Hungarian tactics of abstentionism, passive resistance, and cultural revival is generally sound. However, it is his description of Hungary’s progress after the Ausgleich, particularly the ethnic tensions between the Magyars and the Slavic races, and his comparison of which to Ireland’s that are most problematic. Griffith’s analysis of ethnic relations in Resurrection is one of its weakest aspects and lends itself to the strongest arguments against his Hungarian Policy. As Gaster and Stephen in Stephen Hero have indicated, the Hungarian Magyars arbitrarily dismissed and at times actively fought against the wishes of national self-determination of the non-Magyars, mirroring the very oppression of the Austrians they had resisted. One of the most substantial differences between Hungary and Ireland is that the latter’s sectarian tensions were relatively binary and religious in nature: that is, the sectarianism was predominately between Gaelic-Catholics and Unionist-Protestants. In Hungary, however, there were far more disparate ethnic groups that made a comparison to Ireland difficult. Although religion was a factor – Hungary contained a variety of Catholics, Protestants, and Muslims – ethnicity was the most prominent source of division, something Griffith willfully, if not irresponsibly, ignores.

Although Griffith was fond on calling German-speaking Hungarians or Hungarians of German origin as the “West-Britons of Hungary” (4) and “lion-and-unicorn shopkeepers” (8), as well as referring to the Austrian Empire’s emblem of the double-headed eagle as the “brother to the lion-and-unicorn” (59), he neglected to adequately compare Hungary’s ethnic stratification to Ireland’s and their respective implications. Specifically, he did not care to notice, as Stephen does, that Hungary’s largest ethnic population, the Magyars, wielded
power despotically once they gained power after the *Ausgleich* and that they, as Birmingham and Norman mention, are analogous to the Anglo-Irish Protestant landowning class in Ireland. Griffith simply skirts the issue. The few passages he writes about this sectarianism either ignores or downplays its prominence, and he certainly never criticizes the Magyars. “From the day the Constitution of Hungary was restored,” he writes, “the fullest equality has reigned, and sectarian intolerance is utterly unknown in the kingdom” (70). This is decidedly untrue. An examination of Hungary during this time period, including from sources that Griffith himself consulted, reveal that Hungary was, both as a partner in the Austro-Hungarian Empire and beforehand, extremely diverse and rife with sectarian tensions – tensions that would come into violent fruition in World War I.

The dichotomy Griffith established between the Austrians and the Hungarians is simplistic. Hungary was composed of the various ethnicities that Stephen cited. The Magyars were Hungary’s largest and most dominant ethnic group. Throughout Hungary’s history, the Magyars were often at odds with other ethnic groups such as the Slovaks, the Serbs, the Bohemians, the Bulgarians, the Romanians, the Bosnians, and the Croats, whom they dominated politically, economically, and militarily at various points of their history. Leger records that during the Hungarian nationalist agitations against Austria in the mid-nineteenth century, Panslavism became increasingly prominent in non-Magyar parts of the country due to Magyar agitation, much to the distress of the Magyars:

> [S]trangely enough, one of the strongest complaints against the government among the patriots was the progress of Slavism among the Croats and Slovaks; their selfishness led them to blame in others the very aspirations which they honoured among themselves. It was they who, together with the Polish refugees and the
Germans, invented the red spectre of Panslavism in order to supply themselves with a reason for fighting it, and for persecuting their Servian, Slovak, and Croat fellow-countrymen. (515-16)

For centuries, smaller areas such as Croatia and Transylvania functioned as principalities, ultimately under the jurisdiction of the Kingdom of Hungary (515-21). While the Hungarians were embroiled in the 1848 Revolution, other ethnicities were petitioning for similar autonomy from the Kingdom of Hungary but to no avail:

But, unfortunately, although the majority of the Magyars were content with the dynasty, the non-Magyar races were far from being satisfied with their position. The Croats and Servians were greatly irritated by the laws concerning the Hungarian language; and the Servians also demanded that they should be released from the interior position in which they had hitherto been kept. As early as the 8th of April they had sent a deputation to the diet, where they had in vain claimed their recognition as a nation, and the right of being admitted to public employment, and to hold synods or national congresses.

There was the same excitement at Zagreb (Agram) as at Pesth. The diet there had drawn up a programme giving the people so much self-government that only the army, finance, and foreign affairs were left in the hands of the central government.

(534)

Another one of Griffith’s sources, *The Magyars: Their Country and Institutions* (1869) by Arthur J. Patterson (Kabdebo 33n45), claims that right after the Ausgleich these ethnic enclaves, particularly Transylvania, presented a parallel to Ireland of another kind that was certainly unflattering to Griffith’s argument: “At present Transylvania is a Hungarian
Ireland, presenting many similar difficulties of pacification” (2:335; my emphasis). Efforts to suppress native languages, newspapers, and other cultural institutions were taken by the Magyars after the Ausgleich. Moreover, literature in the decade after the publication of Resurrection reveal that these ethnic tensions only increased after the Ausgleich. In The Southern Slav Question and the Habsburg Monarchy (1911), R. W. Seton-Watson outlines a pattern of Magyar subjugation, broken promises, and political and economic repression of the Croats and Serbs. He made a comparison between Ireland and Croatia explicit under the context of the impending Third Home Rule Bill:

To the student of British politics the Croatian problem should be of special interest at the present time; for Croatia supplies the sole genuine analogy upon the Continent of Europe to the position which Ireland would occupy under a system of Home Rule. . . . Those who are reluctant to learn from the past history of Ireland itself, may learn from the history of Hungary and Croatia, how Ireland should NOT be treated, and how ineffectual are repression and lack of sympathy in the solution of any national or racial question. (ix)

He documents how the Hungarian Diet kept delaying Croatian autonomy and frequently refused to consult Croatia’s own diet in managing the Kingdom’s affairs (68-77). The constitution of Croatia was even suspended by Hungary in 1908 (71). “Thus Croatia,” he writes, “cannot be said to fall under any known category of states, but rather occupies a middle position of its own, between that of pure independence and that of pure federalism” (83). In Racial Problems in Hungary (1908), Scotus Viator notes the lack of democratic freedom in non-Magyar areas of the kingdom, placing blame squarely on Magyar supremacy: “Press freedom in the proper sense of the word cannot be said to exist in Hungary – or rather
it exists for the Magyars alone of all races of the country, and even then only for those Magyars who refrain from espousing the cause of the downtrodden proletariat, and who in their criticisms of the present reactionary régime succeed in evading the ever-watchful Public Prosecutor” (293). He reports how forty percent of the kingdom’s population – that is, the non-Magyar portion – could not serve on the juries of political trials (296), how Croatian and Serbian newspapers were often subject to confiscation and censorship (298), and how editors of those newspapers had been arrested by the state (304). He concludes with another parallel Griffith would not have appreciated: that Croatia was absorbed by Hungary around the same time Ireland was absorbed by England: “The same century which saw Henry II’s expedition to Ireland saw the final union of Croatia with Hungary, whose King could assert the triple claims of conquest, inheritance, and election” (509).

The reason why Griffith decided to ignore these issues is simple: they undermined Griffith’s assertion that his Hungarian Policy and Sinn Féin would unite the Irish rather than deepen the sectarian divide. Furthermore, had he analyzed the various sectarian tensions in Hungary with more rigor, his analogy to Ireland would have been compromised. The Hungarian parallel would have been much more convincing had Hungary been divided into two, rather than several, ethnoreligious groups. Rather than rationalize or apologize for this sectarian, he decides to ignore it outright. This lends itself well to Colum’s assertion that Resurrection was more myth than property historiographical analysis. Joyce’s own interrogation of the complicated issue of national and ethnic identity and the right to self-determination is far more nuanced and critical than Griffith’s. He realized how foolhardy such determinations can be, how a “long-suffering minority” of one country can easily transform into an oppressive majority in another. Ultimately, it could be argued that Stephen
in *Stephen Hero* was indicating this kind of discrimination and prosecution within the Kingdom of Hungary, a skeptical evaluation of the so-called right to national self-determination that Griffith so passionately argued for using the Hungarian, or rather Magyar, example.

I have dedicated this chapter to the overt as well as subliminal ways in which Joyce engaged with Griffith’s particular brand of nationalism, including the latter’s engagement with the historiographies and characteristics of other nations and ethnic groups. Although details such as the “iron crown” and “green socks” are noticeable and amusing, they are rather minor. The broader implications of Griffith’s work – the precipitous if not disheveled nature of comparative historical analysis, the tension between nationalism and cultural identification in increasingly mobile and multiethnic societies, the universalizing of Ireland’s experience in a balkanized, modern world – are much more resonant. If the nationalist historiography of the 1798 Rebellion, a specific event which took place entirely within Ireland, was problematic, the extension of Ireland’s historical experiences to other areas of Europe and the world was even more so. Griffith attempted to establish a parallel between Ireland’s history and Hungary’s, and although he was not totally inaccurate, the multivalent ramifications of this attempt only complicated Ireland’s already troubled place not just within the United Kingdom but within the world – something that Joyce, who himself shifted from one empire to another, knew all too well.
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It’s Land that Produces Everything: Omission, Insertion, and Joyce’s Socialist Historiography

‘And what did you do in the Great War?’ ‘I wrote *Ulysses,*’ he said. ‘What did you do?’

–Tom Stoppard, *Travesties* (55)

In *Travesties* (1974), Tom Stoppard depicts – or rather transfigures – the Zurich of 1917, when Joyce, Vladimir Lenin, and Tristan Tzara resided in the Swiss city and were writing their respective “revolutionary” works. Narrated by an elderly Henry Carr, an official of the British consulate in Zurich who provoked Joyce’s ire and was depicted as one of the drunken English soldiers in “Circe” (*JJ* 458-59), the play shows the three men interacting with each other in various capacities in the city’s public library. Joyce was working on *Ulysses* (specifically the “Oxen of the Sun” episode) while Lenin was writing *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* (1917) and other correspondence. Near the end of the play, Tzara, one of the founders of the Dada movement, berates Joyce after having read a draft of “Oxen of the Sun.” The episode “has much in common with your dress,” he said. “As an arrangement of words it is graceless without being random; as a narrative it lacks charm or even vulgarity; as an experience it is like sharing a cell with a fanatic in search of a mania” (87). Tzara was not necessarily wrong in his assessment were it not for one thing: Tzara read

---

1 It should be noted that besides their surname, the real-life Carr and the soldier in “Circe” had nothing in common.
2 One of the many departures from reality in the play is reflected here. Joyce did not actually start writing “Oxen of the Sun” until 1919, after he had left Zurich for Paris (*JJ* 475; *L* 1:137).
3 Although *Imperialism* was published in 1917, it was composed the year before. Outside of the relative proximity of the dates, it is unclear what Lenin was actually writing in *Travesties.* One of the few specific references to his writing in the play, “Lickspittle – capitalist – lackeys – of imperialism” (7), does point toward *Imperialism,* although “lickspittle” does not appear in it. The word was a favorite pejorative of his, however, and can be found in his other writings. Interestingly, Lenin ended *Imperialism* with the date of composition, “January-July 1916” (128), much like Joyce does in *Portrait, Ulysses,* and *Finnegans Wake* (although Joyce includes the locations of composition as well).
one of Lenin’s manuscripts, mistakenly believing it was Joyce’s. The end of the play leaves the actual events unaltered: Lenin rushes off to Petrograd to lead the Bolshevik Revolution, Joyce goes on to publish Ulysses, and Tzara wanders off to Paris. Although little is known about the real-life Carr, in the play he indulges in self-pity and dubious reminiscence after having his namesake besmirched by Joyce. Stoppard based much of the play on Ellmann’s “superb biography” (ix), specifically the passage on Joyce’s quarrel with Carr regarding a theater production that would lead to two lawsuits, one over a small sum of money and the other for slander. Stoppard takes considerable liberties in the Joycean anecdote, such as having Joyce dictate Ulysses to Carr’s sister and speak in stage-Irish limericks and stock phrases; he greets Carr, for example, with “Top o’ the morning!” (20). One of the more significant liberties Stoppard takes, however, is Joyce’s conversations with Lenin. There is no evidence – from Joyce, Ellmann, Lenin, Tzara, from anyone else or any other source – to suggest that they actually met in Zurich. They may have walked past each other along the Limmat River, perhaps, or worked quietly in the public library at the same time, yet the idea of Joyce and Lenin actually speaking to one another, let alone accidently exchanging manuscripts via their secretaries only to have them excoriated by Tzara – in English no less – is purely an invention of Stoppard. Yet the play, a work of extraordinary pastiche and verve, can serve as an example of the historical revisionism (albeit a wacky and openly fictitious one) that I wish to interrogate in this chapter. Specifically, the play’s examination of the supposed responsibilities and caveats of socialistic and artistic endeavors, which to Stoppard seem to overlap, compliment the focus of this final chapter: socialist historiography in the work of Joyce.

---

4 Specifically, the lawsuit over money was over Carr’s alleged abuse of “unsold play tickets.” Though Joyce won that case, his lawsuit against Carr over slander was dismissed (JJ 427-57).
“To be an artist at all,” Carr tells Tzara, “is like living in Switzerland during a world war. To be an artist in Zurich, in 1917, implies a degree of self-absorption that would have glazed over the eyes of Narcissus” (27). Carr harangues him even further on the follies and selfishness of artists:

Carr: Revolution in art is in no way connected with class revolution. Artists are members of a privileged class. Art is absurdly overrated by artists, which is understandable, but what is strange is that it is absurdly overrated by everyone else.

Tzara: Because man cannot live by bread alone.

Carr: Yes, he can. It’s art he can’t live on. When I was at school, on certain afternoons we all had to do what was called Labour – weedings, sweeping, sawing logs for the boiler room, that kind of thing; but if you had a chit from Matron you were let off to spend the afternoon messing about in the Art Room. Labour or Art. And you’ve got a chit for life? (Passionately.) Where did you get it? Where is an artist? For every thousand people there’s nine hundred doing the work, ninety doing well, nine doing good, and one lucky bastard who’s the artist. (36-37)

Carr, who in the play and in real life was wounded in World War I and understandably annoyed by Tzara’s affluence and bohemian lifestyle, articulates a complaint levied against artists from time immemorial: that art is an indulgence of the rich and powerful. Indeed, Tzara and Lenin came from comfortable bourgeois backgrounds, and while Joyce came from a more petit-bourgeois background and had significant financial problems up to the publication of Ulysses, his relentless artistic pursuits and refusal to serve the British Empire during the Great War seemed to have deeply aggravated Carr – or so Stoppard imagines. Outside the anecdote found in Ellmann’s biography, there is little information about him.
Stoppard claims he was fortunate enough to talk to Carr’s wife but only after the premiere of the play and, more importantly, Carr’s passing (xi-xii). As mentioned earlier in the chapter, when writing Carr and Joyce as characters he relied heavily upon Ellmann (ix), and as mentioned in this dissertation before, certain Joyce scholars have questioned Ellmann’s accuracy. Although that accuracy may not be essential in an openly fictitious work like Stoppard’s, it nonetheless reflects certain oddities in historiography and, in particular, Joycean scholarship. In a similar way Stoppard envisions parts of Joyce’s life that almost certainly did not happen, some Joycean scholarship insert Joyce in historical times and works of literature where he does not belong. Likewise, this scholarship inserts historical events, people, and literature in Joyce’s life and work that do not belong. All areas of Joycean scholarship betray this to an extent – indeed, academic scholarship as a whole always wrestles with the issue of pertinence, what Mullen refers to as the “reconnaissance plaisante for the cultivated reader” (112)\(^5\) – yet it is noticeable and vexing in scholarship regarding his historical and political, especially socialist, views. This is ironic considering the revisionism found in nineteenth and early-twentieth century socialist historiography of Ireland seems to rival the revisionism of nationalist historiography – something that is evident in Joyce’s work.

Moreover, *Travesties* raises questions regarding the value of artists and artistic production. Stoppard’s Carr makes clear that art is little more than a domain of the rich, that no matter how hard a work of art attempts to aid or at least accurately portray the poor,

\(^5\) Patrick J. Ledden articulates the more constructive aspect of this, giving himself and other Joyce scholars (myself included) a rather wide attitude in intertextual analysis: “By placing so precisely in time and place, Joyce implicates all of the social and political forces at work in turn-of-the-century Dublin, including those that are not explicitly mentioned in the novel or of central concern to the events of the novel. Thus authors who lived and worked in Joyce’s Dublin . . . are valuable sources of collateral information about Joyce’s world” (209).
suffering, or powerless, it is inherently unable to affect social or political change – or, for that matter, change in everyday life. Carr would refute the notion laid out by Slote, for example, that “[l]inguistic negativity and irony,” two facets of Joyce’s work and more broadly of literature, “are not simply neat problems for writers and critics to ponder, they are . . . fundamental to daily experience and, after all is said and done, Ulysses is eminently concerned with daily experience” (“Review” 154). Whether Ulysses is “concerned with daily experience” is beside the point to Carr. This is contradicted by Tzara, who also dismisses Joyce’s work but for a different reason. Art indeed can affect social and political change, yet Joyce’s work is ineffective in that regard. Interestingly, Tzara’s conflation of Joyce’s work with Lenin’s was perhaps Stoppard’s way of indicating there is a sociopolitical revolutionary impetus in Ulysses after all. Although Stoppard’s Tzara considers Joyce to be, to borrow the real phrase Lenin uses to describe Fyodor Dostoevsky, a “superlatively bad” writer (qtd. in Pevear xiii), his criticism reflects the considerable debate Joyce has incited in socialist and other leftist circles regarding the character and effectiveness of Joyce’s depiction of fin de siècle capitalist society. I will not attempt to argue whether Joyce was a socialist or not. That is an issue which has been covered extensively and shows no signs of abatement. Rather, I will examine the accuracy of Carr and Tzara’s claims by concentrating on the aspects of Joyce’s work which I believe were influenced by socialism and socialist historiography in particular.

JAMES CONNOLLY AND ROGER CASEMENT: THE (POST-1916) IRISH NATIONALISTS
Several prominent Irish people of the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries are referenced directly or implicitly in Joyce’s work: Parnell, Griffith, Gonne, Yeats, Cusack, Russell (AE), Wilde, Shaw, Redmond, and so forth. Yet curiously, one of their contemporaries who is not mentioned anywhere in Joyce’s work (outside of a few rather peripheral exceptions in *Finnegans Wake*) is James Connolly. Connolly’s reputation as Ireland’s most prominent socialist organizer and later republican fighter was cemented by his execution after the Easter Rising, when Joyce was writing *Ulysses*. Even in 1904, Connolly was a formidable presence, no stranger to controversy, agitation, or especially publication. Despite this, Connolly never appears by name or even by inference in *Dubliners*, *Portrait*, or *Ulysses*. That has not deterred scholars, however, from identifying a latent presence of Connolly in Joyce’s work. Manganiello, Gibson, Fogarty, and Fairhall among others have devoted considerable research to Connolly’s refracted manifestations. This vein of research suggests that Connolly’s lack of presence in Joyce’s work, far from being problematic, functions as an inverted lack of absence: that is, Connolly was so engendered in Joyce’s thought that it was evident in everything but name. Likewise, another prominent Irish revolutionary figure, Roger Casement, shares what could be called an ambiguity of influence. Although Casement is referenced directly in “Cyclops,” his brief presence there was significantly different than the actual reputation he had in 1904. Joyce’s treatment of both men and the subsequent scholarship devoted to them serve as an example of the miscarriages of historiography and Joyce as well as Joyce’s engagement with socialism and other revolutionary thought of his time.

---

6 See *FW* 73.2-3, 214.18, and 303.12 for these rather scant references. See also Dick 399; Fairhall, *Question* 99; and McHugh 73, 214, and 303.
James Connolly, the Quiet Socialist. In a recent article, Maria-Daniella Dick carefully catalogues the Joycean scholarship on Connolly. She finds a problematic discrepancy between the passages studied in this scholarship and Connolly’s actual relevance to them. Although the interpretations from this scholarship are not wrong per se, Dick is not convinced that they rise above wishful conjecture. Discussing Gibson’s commentary on Connolly in Joyce’s Revenge, she deduces that this vein of scholarship, ostensibly grounded in historicism, actually obfuscates it:

What this demonstrates is not by any means that the assertions are themselves incorrect – their conjecture is bounded by reasonable inference – but that the historicising impulse is impelled by a drive to connect Connolly with Joyce that supersedes history itself, or at least direct historical evidence. One might infer that the historical method, designed to legitimise the study of fiction through a mode of inquiry that privileges empirical fact, in actuality requires literature to construct the history that appears to precede and already to ground the historical method by which it is interpreted. (401)

Gibson’s attempt to contextualize Joyce’s work through Connolly reveals more about historicization and historiography than about either Joyce or Connolly. If Gibson does not err on the side of caution when analyzing Connolly, some scholars go even further by making claims that even by historicist standards are suspect. Fairhall, for example, claims it is very likely that Joyce heard Connolly speak in 1903 when he ran for Municipal Council of the Dublin Corporation (Question 96). Joyce had “personal as well as political reasons for following the 1902 and 1903 elections” (97) in which Connolly stood for office, making it all but certain that Joyce was at least aware of Connolly. In his reading of “Ivy Day in the
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Committee Room,” Fairhall is convinced that Connolly was tacitly represented by the story’s Labour candidate, Colgan (not “Mr Colgan,” as Seamus Deane points out [“Dead Ends” 28]). “But beyond doubt,” Fairhall writes, “Connolly’s solid, historical reality underlies the vague, absent figure of the Labour candidate” (Question 103-4).

Although Colgan is only mentioned twice in the story, Fairhall, Gibson, and Fogarty among others make a compelling argument that he is indeed a representation of Connolly. “Ivy Day” takes place on October 6th, 1902, when Connolly was running for councilor of the Wood Quay Ward. Connolly was still part of the Irish Socialist Republican Party (ISRP) that he founded six years prior, yet he ran as a Labour candidate in 1902 and 1903 (D 99n1; Fairhall, Question 97; Gibson, Strong Spirit 44). Fairhall notes that Connolly was a fierce critic of the Lord Mayor of Dublin at the time, Timothy Harrington, who was referenced in the story and a friend of Joyce’s father (Question 96-97; D 109). Connolly, in turn, received fierce criticism from the political and religious establishment. One of his critics, Revered Staples, was a nominator of the Nationalist candidate in the Royal Exchange Ward, the ward in contention in “Ivy Day,” and lived next door to Connolly’s Nationalist opponent (98). Although these connections rely on the interchange of wards and persons, it could be argued that Dublin was small enough – Wood Quay and the Royal Exchange are in close proximity to each other – to render these differences negligible. In terms of Colgan’s depiction, it is easy to see the possible association with Connolly. When Old Jack calls Colgan a “tinker,” Hynes quickly cites Colgan’s working-class bona fides: “Is it because Colgan’s a workingman you say that? What’s the difference between a good honest bricklayer and a publican – eh? Hasn’t the workingman as good a right to be in the Corporation as anyone else . . . . The workingman . . . get all the kicks and no halfpence. But it’s labour [that]
produces everything” (D 102; my emphasis). Hynes’ immediate association of Colgan as a workingman lends itself well to his possible association with Connolly. Moreover, Fairhall argues that it is the themes of the story, not just the characters, that evoke Connolly’s influence. He emphasizes the constant drinking in the story, relating it to the significance alcohol consumption and selling had in local politics. It was common for candidates to distribute alcohol to constituents on election day. On the eve of the 1902 election, more than three-hundred pints of porter were served in the public house of the Wood Quay Ward by the Nationalist party. On election day itself, one of the Nationalist candidates gave away free pints in his pub. Within the jurisdiction of the Dublin Corporation, the alcohol industry – brewers, distillers, sellers – made up the single largest industry (Question 98-99; Daly, Dublin 23-31; J. O’Brien, Dear 70-80). The characters in “Ivy Day” spend considerable amount of time procuring, opening, and opining on bottles. In how this relates to Connolly, Fairhall points out that Connolly supported abstinence, finding alcohol to be a tool of the capitalist system in mollifying the workers. “There can never be,” Connolly said in his 1903 election address, “clean, healthy or honest politics in the City of Dublin, until the power of the drink-sellers is absolutely broken – they are positively the meanest and most degraded section that ever attempted to rule a city” (2:225). He opposed alcohol mostly because it stupefied voters’ sensibilities, thereby strengthening the power of the ruling class. Connolly

7 This is a historical precedent. As early as 1610, an English traveler observed that “the whole profit of the towne stands upon Ale-houses, and selling of Ale . . . there are whole streets of Tavernes, and it is as rare a thing, to finde a house in Dublin without a Taverne, as to find a Taverne without a Strumpet” (Rich 70).

8 See note 31 of the introduction of this dissertation.

9 Connolly spoke quite a lot about the corrosive effects of publican interests in his 1903 election address: Let us remember how the drink-sellers of the Wood Quay Ward combined with the slum owner and the house jobber; let us remember how Alderman Davin, Councillor McCall, and all their fellow publicans issued free drinks to whoever would accept, until on the day of election, and election day, the scenes of bestiality and drunkenness around their shops were such as brought the blush of shame to every decent man and woman who saw them. . . . [L]et us remember how the spirit of religion was prostituted to the service of the drinkseller to drive the labourer back into his degradation. (2:224)
ended up losing the elections badly. In the 1903 election, he received 243 votes compared to the Nationalist candidate’s 763. He received 188 fewer votes than he had the previous year (Collins 116; D. Lynch 125). Along with the collusion of property owners, councilors, and the “City Fathers” (D 108) and the opposition to Edward VII’s proposed state visit to Ireland (102-3), Fairhall makes a strong argument that Connolly’s presence, both his person and ideologies, is implicit in “Ivy Day” (Question 97-102).

Gibson argues along similar lines. Although he does not associate him with Colgan directly, he does read the story as a contemplation of Connolly’s beliefs: “‘Ivy Day’ is rooted in a political articulation of nationalism and socialism together, as was Connolly’s thought, but also registers a conflict between Connolly’s analysis and his programme, and political reality” (Strong Spirit 52). He identifies two divergences: first, “Ivy Day” does not subscribe to the “Marxist historical narrative” that Connolly adopted and second, the story is ultimately skeptical of the “political will and likely solidarity” of the Irish working class, something Connolly was optimistic about (50). Still, Gibson believes that the story was influenced by Connolly’s thought much more palpably than by nationalist thought or that of any other political force in Ireland. Fogarty, in addition, believes as much, although her analysis is more intertextual than Fairhall’s or Gibson’s. “Many of the key tropes of ‘Ivy Day,’” she writes, “in fact echo the primary charges that Connolly made against his opponents in his retrospective summations of the election campaigns in articles in the Workers’ Republic in March 1902 and in January 1903.” Like Fairhall, she focuses on Connolly’s disapproval of the political scheming in the committee room that “doubled as a public house” as well as a corrupt electoral system that favored bibulous bribes instead of genuine politicking,

Also, Bloom warns of “[n]o more patriotism of barspongers” (U 15.1697).
something that she claims that story does by “repeat[ing] and relay[ing] Connolly’s trenchant rhetoric and reportage” and “affecting and appropriating the style and political manner of Connolly” (“Parnellism” 117). A common interpretation of “Ivy Day” characterizes the story as an account on the demoralized state of politics in Ireland the decade after Parnell’s death. This demoralization is embodied by the anemic men in the committee room who find themselves waiting for payment and alcohol while reveling in Parnell’s former glory. However, Fairhall, Gibson, and Fogarty lay the groundwork for a more robust interpretation in which Connolly looms over the story, both in the form of Colgan and the story’s apparent relaying of Connolly’s “trenchant” activism.

Like Dick, I do not wish to refute these claims. They are grounded in strong historical evidence and sound inference. It is more than reasonable that the most political story in *Dubliners*, one of the few that does not take place in between 1904 and 1906 (Gibson, *Strong Spirit* 44) when Connolly was living in the United States, one that in fact takes place in 1902 when Connolly was seeking office in Dublin, could have been influenced by him. Yet at the same time, it is curious that Connolly is never mentioned directly whereas Parnell was. Parnell in *Dubliners*, as well as in *Portrait* and *Ulysses*, is evoked unequivocally, as are Griffith, Gonne, Nannetti, and many other local and national political figures. If Fogarty, Gibson, and Fairhall can establish that Connolly was present in the story despite his absence, it can at the same time be argued that his absence was just that: an absence. Nowhere in Joyce’s work is Connolly discussed directly, let alone with the same intensity as Parnell is in “Ivy Day” or him and Griffith are in *Ulysses*. Connolly was a formidable political figure in Ireland during Joyce’s time. Given that Joyce is argued to have at least some socialist leanings by this school of political Joycean scholarship, it is rather curious that Connolly is
not present in the same way Griffith was ridiculed by Molly, complimented by Bloom, or revered by the committee room.

Indeed, I wish to interrogate another story in *Dubliners* to highlight this absence, one that, unlike “Ivy Day,” mentions socialism directly and, therefore, would have been an opportune place to mention Connolly: “A Painful Case.” In the story, Mr Duffy tells Mrs Sinico that he attended several socialist party meetings:

> He told her that for some time he had assisted at the meetings of an Irish Socialist Party where he had felt himself a unique figure amid a score of sober workmen in a garret, he had discontinued his attendances. The workmen’s discussions, he said, were too timorous; the interest they took in the question of wages was inordinate. He felt that they were hardfeatured realists and that they resented an exactitude which was the product of a leisure not with their reach. No social revolution, he told her, would be likely to strike Dublin for some centuries. *(D 92-93; my emphasis)*

Duffy’s dismissal of the socialists is strange in a number of ways. Much of the criticism on this passage focuses on Duffy’s sense of alienation (particularly in the Marxist sense) from the workmen, as well as the workmen’s “inordinate” sense of entitlement to better wages and the lack of impetus for “social revolution” in Dublin. These issues, both in here and other parts of Joyce’s work, will be discussed later. One of the more conspicuous aspects of this passage, however, is the absence of Connolly. His absence is significant, perhaps more so than in “Ivy Day.” Not only is the most prominent Irish socialist not mentioned or even alluded to here, the way in which the party is described is suggestive. Duffy assisted at the meetings of “an” Irish Socialist Party, not the Irish Socialist Republican Party. The socialist party in the story is capitalized, which denotes some kind of official status. Because the year
of the story is not specified, there is room for speculation as to what, if anything, the story was referring to. Although there were socialist organizations before the ISRP, it was nevertheless Ireland’s first official socialist party.\textsuperscript{10} Founded by Connolly in 1896, it modeled itself after the socialist parties already active in Scotland (where Connolly was born and had participated in socialist organizing) and England. The ISRP was a legitimate political party in that that had members, organized meetings, and stood candidates for office. It was Ireland’s only socialist party from 1896 to 1904, after which it was effectively dissolved due to infighting and Connolly’s departure for the United States towards the end of 1903.\textsuperscript{11} Many former ISRP members went on to establish the Socialist Labour Party (SPL), but its brief existence from 1903 to 1904 was negligible even by the standards of Irish socialism. Unlike its predecessor, it held no regular meetings, published no newspapers or pamphlets, and stood no candidates for office. In 1904, the SPL would merge with the remains of the IRSP to form the Socialist Party of Ireland (SPI), which was the main socialist party of Ireland until Connolly’s return in 1910. Although more active than the SPL, the SPI still had a smaller membership and presence than Connolly’s organization. Even during the ISRP’s heyday, the Irish left focused on economic organization through syndicalism and trade labor unions rather than political parties (D. Lynch 124-26). The ISRP’s membership was small. It only had eighty active members, and even if one-time participants and self-proclaimed associates

\textsuperscript{10} The first true socialist organization in Ireland was the Socialist League of Ireland (SLI), which was founded in December 1885 as an offshoot of the Socialist Democratic Federation (SDF) in England (Lane, “Emergence” 20). As Fintan Lane points out, in January of that year the specter of Irish socialism, although feeble, was enough to rile certain Dublin denizens. One of those denizens, Michael Cusack, spoke out against socialism in a meeting of the “Saturday Club,” a group of leftists sympathetic to, if not socialism, the trade-unionist cause, on January 31\textsuperscript{st}. According to \textit{Freeman’s Journal}, the subject of that meeting was “How Irish Industries are Affected by Trade Unionism.” Cusack felt socialist infiltration of the meeting was so severe that rushed the platform – “but for the name of Karl Marx he would not have gone on the platform” – before eventually storming out (“The Saturday Club” 3). See Lane, “Emergence” 19-22 and \textit{Origins} 105-43; and O’Connor 62.  

\textsuperscript{11} Despite this, he apparently was treated to a “farewell banquet” by the party before he left (D. Ryan 29).
or allies could be considered members, the party at most had a few hundred members in its eight years of operation (23). Unlike Scotland, England, other nations in Europe, and the United States, Ireland never had a prominent socialist party until the very end of the nineteenth century. Therefore, the “socialists” in “A Painful Case” could have the SPL, SPI, or the ISRP. The exact year of the story being unclear notwithstanding, it could be said Joyce’s ambiguity regarding the identity of the socialist party was a commentary on how quaint socialist organizations in Ireland were, at least compared with their European and American counterparts.12

On the other hand, Joyce’s ambiguity is still curious given his participation in such socialist groups in Ireland. He attended socialist meetings in 1903 on Henry Street (JJ 142). Although Ellmann doesn’t specify whether it was the ISRP, the fact that the ISRP was the only official socialist party at the time narrows down the possibilities. In his memoir, Stanislaus Joyce recalls his attendance, connecting it directly with “A Painful Case”: “His political leanings were towards socialism, and he had frequented meetings of socialist groups in back rooms in the manner ascribed to Mr. Duffy in ‘A Painful Case.’ I sometimes accompanied him to these dimly illuminated, melancholy haunts and listened to unconvincing arguments” (169-70). Stanislaus does not specify the dates of these meetings, although Fairhall believes they took place anywhere between 1901 and 1904 (Question 50).

Assuming Joyce attended any one of these meetings from 1901 to 1903, before Connolly left Ireland, it is possible that Connolly had attended, was mentioned, or even spoke at one of these meetings. Yet Connolly, who by all accounts was a passionate orator, does not seem to

---

12 The full history of Irish socialism is too vast for the scope of this dissertation. For more on nineteenth and early-twentieth century socialism in Ireland, see Allen (particularly 13-56); W. Anderson (particularly 16-71, 107-22); Collins; Grant; Keogh, *Rise*; Lane, “Emergence” 19-22 and *Origins*; D. Lynch; C. McCarthy 1-20; and O’Connor 29-116.
fit into Stanislaus’ description of the “melancholy haunts” and “unconvincing arguments.” His “trenchant rhetoric and reportage” (Fogarty, “Parnellism” 117) is not there. Given that the “socialist community in Dublin at this time was miniscule, and Connolly and the I.S.R.P. were highly visible within it” (Fairhall, Question 96), the absence of Connolly in this passage is suspect. If Fairhall, Gibson, and Fogarty are convinced that Connolly had an indelible presence in Joyce’s work, particularly in *Dubliners*, then it is puzzling as to why Joyce did not refer to Connolly, or at the very least to the ISRP, in the most suitable place for him to do so. It could be that Joyce did not care to engage with either of them, that Connolly’s “solid, historical reality” (*Question* 104) simply was not there. This sentiment is perhaps similar to Connolly’s postmortem rehabilitation as a republican nationalist at the cusp of Irish affairs leading up to 1916, rather than the more accurate status as the obscure socialist in the margins of political society until his end. Connolly’s reconfiguration in Joycean scholarship, I believe, is reflective of the haphazard historiography, if not hagiography, of Connolly in the decades after his death.

*Roger Casement, the Irishman*. Like Connolly, Casement is another figure who has received considerable attention in Joycean scholarship. Although Casement is mentioned directly in

---

13 A biography published in 1924 by Sinn Féiner and participant of the Easter Rising Desmond Ryan describes his oratory as “John Mitchel and Karl Marx taken neat, bouquets for politicians and the millennium for the multitude, every Sunday evening outdoors in summer, inside in winter, in Foster Place, near the Bank of Ireland, a small room in Abbey Street, nearby” (19). Abbey Street is about a block away from Henry Street, where Ellmann claims Joyce attended socialist meetings. Another contemporary of Connolly’s had this to say about him:

> Connolly was an excellent speaker, because his mind was clear, and he had something definite to say. The speeches I heard from him, both in Dublin and in London, were free from hesitation and, best of all, free from rhetoric. He was never windy, cloudy, or doctrinaire. He never lost himself, or lost time in those abstract discussions that weary the very soul out of one at most Socialist meetings. Whether he was speaking on the wrongs of the works, the wrongs of women (a favourite subject with him) or the wrongs of Ireland, sentence after sentence came out clear and sharp, always striking immediate points in the actual daily life of the people. (Nevinson ix)
Ulysses, his presence is problematic both in the sense of his relevance in Joyce’s work and Joyce’s depiction of him. Casement is referred to just once in Ulysses. In “Cyclops,” the Citizen mentions him after he reads out loud an absurd article about the visit of the “Alaki of Abeakuta,” a “Zulu chief” (12.1515, 1510), to Edward VII in Manchester as reported in the United Irishman. The men of the pub discuss European “patronage” of the “dark continent”:

–That’s how it’s worked, says the citizen. Trade follows the flag.

–Well, says J. J., if they’re any worse than those Belgians in the Congo Free State they must be bad. Did you read that report by a man what’s this his name is?

–Casement, says the citizen. He’s an Irishman.

–Yes, that’s the man, says J. J. Raping the women and girls and flogging the natives on the belly to squeeze all the red rubber they can out of them.

–I know where he’s gone, says Lenehan, cracking his fingers.

–Who? says I.

–Bloom, says he. The courthouse is a blind. He had a few bob on Throwaway and he’s gone to gather in the shekels.

–Is it that whiteeyed kaffir? says the citizen, that never backed a horse in anger in his life? (12.1541-53)

Much attention has been paid to this passage, with particular focus on the phrases I emphasized. There are, of course, glaring errors, the implications of which point rather obviously to ignorance and racism. The Alaki chief, for example, was not a Zulu but from a tribe in modern-day Nigeria (Reizbaum, “Empire” 86). The bar patrons do not seem to know

14 With the exception of “Throwaway,” the emphases are mine.
of, or care about, the distinction. Indeed, there is much confusion in the passage, and throughout episode, with regard to reference and identity (Mullen 99; Reizbaum, “Empire” 88). The citizen calls Bloom the “whiteeyed kaffir,” a slur which refers to a famous minstrel performer during the early-twentieth century. A “kaffir” was a derogatory term for an African (U-A 366; U-N 693), but in this context it was levied against Bloom not just because of his dark complexion but also because of his Jewishness, conflating the African “savage” with the Jewish “miscreant” (N. Davison 218). In addition, the term was used in “Columns,” a poem about the Boer War by Rudyard Kipling, in reference to the deceitful African who would warn the Boers about nearby British soldiers (Kipling 484; Temple-Thurston 252). As sinister as these associations are, they are at least consistent with the lexicon and lack of racial sensitivity ubiquitous at the time.

That is not the case with Casement. The Citizen calls him “an Irishman.” Casement would come to be revered as one of the twentieth century’s greatest Irishmen, a bona fide Irish republican and a tireless anti-imperialist whose work laid the groundwork for not just Ireland’s independence but also the century’s concepts of human rights and international law. He was praised in Ireland in the decades after his death, so much so that in 1966 his remains were repatriated from London and given a state funeral in Dublin to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the Easter Rising (E. Duffy, Subaltern 103). However, throughout much of his life, including in 1904, Casement was not always identified as Irish. He was, given his duties in the British consular service (something Henry Carr might have appreciated) as well as his Anglo-Irish Protestant background, considered British. Although he would take upon himself larger roles in the Irish nationalist movement, culminating in his attempt to gain

---

15 See note 16 of the first chapter of this dissertation.
16 A “Britisher” (U 1.666), as Haines refers to himself.
German military aid for the Easter Rising for which he would famously be tried and executed in 1916, he was always frustrated with being identified as British rather than Irish (Mullen 99; Sawyer 121-22). Joyce himself does not reference Casement in “Ireland: Island of Saints and Sages” when he discusses “what the Belgians are doing today in the Congo Free State” (OCPW 119). As Mullen astutely discerns, the omission is not suspect in itself were it not for the fact that he painstakingly lists several illustrious Irish figures in his lecture (99): “I beg you to follow me for a moment while I show you the traces left behind in almost every country by the many Celtic apostles” (OCWP 110). This omission is conspicuous in that Casement was well-known internationally at this point in 1907, having released his report on the Congo Free State three years prior. His inclusion in the lecture, moreover, would have been consistent with its “rhetorical pattern” of cataloguing as many upright Irish figures Joyce would muster (Mullen 99). Given that Casement, had Joyce mentioned him, would have been one of the few living Irish figures in the lecture, as well as the reference to the Congo Free State being in the middle of a discussion of contemporary world events in a lecture centered on historical analysis, his omission is another case in which Joyce reveals the true status of an Irishman who would only later be praised as one after having been ignored or sidelined as something else. His identification as Irish in Ulysses betrays a “post-1916 understanding of Casement,” one that was shaped by Joyce’s engagement with the rebellion and aftermath as he was writing the novel, rather than an accurate summation of his reputation the men of 1904 would likely have had (99).17

17 Much has been written on the historiography on Casement, as it were, both in Joycean and Irish historical scholarship. See E. Duffy, “Parnellism” 189 and Subaltern 96-106; Gordon, “Joycean Heroes” 261; Mansergh 189-201; McDiarmid 178-88; Mitchell, “Evolution” 40-57 and “Riddle” 99-120; S. Murray 167-74; Mullen 76-116; Ó Siocháin, “Roger Casement’s” 1-11; Reizbaum, “Empire” 83-96; Rodstein 150-60; Sawyer; and Schwarze 79-94. Daly, Roger Casement has a number of essays on the topic, many of which, including Mansergh, McDiarmid, Mitchell, “Riddle,” S. Murray, and Ó Siocháin, “Roger Casement’s,” are listed here.
Connolly and Casement were similar in that they both fell one way or another outside of what Gaelic-Catholic nationalist sentiment would have considered truly “Irish.” Connolly was an Irish Catholic but was born and raised in Edinburgh. He did not step foot onto Ireland until he was a soldier in the British army, a role he deeply resented yet nonetheless took part in. He lived in the United States from 1903 to 1910, a time of political and economic strife in Ireland when the ISRP could certainly have used his leadership. Likewise, Casement was born in Dublin but came from an Anglo-Irish Protestant background. The son of a British army captain, Casement travelled abroad during his childhood more so than the average Irish person. In fact, he spent most of his (albeit curtailed) life outside of Ireland, and indeed outside of Europe. Up until the last few years of his life, he focused his energies on the non-Irish victims of European colonialism in Africa and South America. Yet these international experiences forged their socialist and revolutionary views. Although Casement did not call himself a socialist like Connolly, he shared many of Connolly’s views, which in themselves embodied standard socialist thought at the time. Both of them opposed imperialism and capitalism, believed in the socialist principles of class struggle and historical materialism, advocated social activism, acknowledged the British Empire’s power depended on its exploitation of labor and material resources such as rubber and coal, held British hegemony of Ireland similar to the colonial exploitation of Africa and the Americas, argued that capitalism and land ownership was exported to Ireland by the British and ran contrary to the intrinsic Irish “character” of equality and common ownership as supposedly exhibited by the pre-Norman “Brehon laws,” blamed the British and, more broadly, European imperialism for causing World War I, supported the Germans during the conflict and solicited their support – principles that were widespread among Irish socialists at the time and will be
expanded upon throughout the chapter. These beliefs did not originate from these men, nor were they necessarily their most important proponents in Ireland. Yet that has not prevented their countrymen and women in the years and decades after their executions, which occurred within three months of each other in 1916, to engage in revisionism of their legacies. This, I believe, is evident both in Joyce’s work and Joycean criticism.

Moreover, it would be inaccurate to claim that Joyce was a follower or even an admirer of either. As mentioned earlier, I will not attempt to argue whether Joyce was a socialist, and I have made clear that Joyce’s lack of engagement with Connolly and Casement in his work reflects a lack of engagement with them in his personal beliefs. Joyce, for example, never supported Germany in World War I, no matter how resentful he may have been of British imperialism. However, I do believe that the principles espoused by socialists such as them manifest most clearly in Joyce’s historiography. In other words, Joyce’s approach to historiography was remarkably similar to those of socialists at the time. I will support this claim by first evaluating the various facets of socialist thought and historiography that appear in *Ulysses*. I will then interrogate these topics in relation to the importance socialists placed on revolutionary action and social activism, as manifested in Ireland in such events as the Phoenix Park Murders of 1882, which was perpetrated by a splinter-group of the IRB, the Invincibles, who are mentioned several times in *Ulysses*. I will then evaluate a specific historical event referenced throughout *Ulysses*: the Boer War.

THE SAVIOUR WAS A SOCIALIST: REVOLUTION, ACTIVISM, AND JOYCE

*Christian Socialism*. “Mendelssohn was a jew and Karl Marx and Mercadante and Spinoza,” Bloom reminds the Citizen near the end of “Cyclops.” “And the Saviour was a jew and his
father was a jew. Your God” (*U* 12.1804-5). Bloom’s decision to refer to these particular Jews is curious. Felix Mendelssohn, Marx, and Baruch Spinoza were converts or apostates (Spinoza himself was excommunicated by his local Jewish community), and Saverio Mercadante was not Jewish at all (*U-A* 378; *U-N* 698). Many scholars have commented on Bloom’s “foggy thinking” (N. Davison 219) in listing these secular, atypical Jews to defend the Jewish people. Regardless, reminding the Citizen that Jesus and his father Joseph were Jews and that nonbiblical Jews such as Marx and Spinoza were famous and successful was enough to make the sportsman apoplectic and attack Bloom. If this basic fact infuriated the Citizen, one could only imagine how he would have reacted to Bloom’s belief about Jesus that is more open to interpretation: that the Saviour was a socialist.

According to Molly in “Penelope,” Bloom felt this way well before 1904: “we had the standup row over politics he began it not me when he said about Our Lord being a carpenter . . . and the first socialist he said He was” (*U* 18.174-78). During the late-nineteenth century a brand of socialism, Christian socialism, applied the teachings of Jesus and the New Testament to socialist thought, emphasizing Jesus’s political rather than moral impetus. One bible verse in particular, Matthew 19:21, was frequently quoted: “Jesus said unto him, If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come and follow me” (*U-A* 611; *U-N* 799). There are a number of biblical

---

18 The exception may be Mendelssohn in that Bloom might have been referring to Moses Mendelssohn, Felix’s grandfather. Moses was an advocate of Jewish cultural assimilation and religious reform (*U-A* 378; *U-N* 698). Alternatively, he may have been confusing Mercadante with Meyerbeer, who was Jewish (V. Deane, “Rossini”).

19 See Burns 245; N. Davison 218-19; Nadel 141; Reizbaum, *Judaic Other* 73 and “Grand Nationals” 199; Rodstein 174; and Ungar, *Joyce’s Ulysses* 100, among others. Manganiello (54-55) and N. Davison (151-52) claim that this passage was partially inspired by Carlo Cattaneo, a nineteenth-century liberal Italian intellectual who railed against anti-semitism and spoke highly of Mendelssohn and Spinoza.

20 See note 10 of this chapter. If Cusack, one of the models of the Citizen, was paranoid and horrified by the prospect of socialism and Judaism in Ireland, one could also only imagine how he would have reacted to the ultimate marriage of the two.
verses which Christians and radicals even before the advent of nineteenth century socialism have used to justify a more egalitarian, less capitalistic world. Christian socialist Reverend George Gilbertson, for example, cites Acts 2:44-45 in his support of socialism, and claimed that he found “tokens of sympathy with something like Socialism” in the teachings of Jesus, predicated on the notion that there “were many things the Lord Jesus Christ did not teach which I believe, were He on earth now, He would advocate” (qtd. in S. Smith 27). Indeed, “theories of a ‘collective,’ ‘community,’ or ‘group’ nature had thus deeply permeated English philosophy and jurisprudence by the 1880’s. In economics the old simplistic and abused concept of ‘individualism’ received even harder knocks” (Jones 46). The debate between Christianity and socialism was prominent in the late-nineteenth century, with some Christian socialists maintaining a hardline Marxist economic theory of collectivization and class struggle while others advocated a more accommodating socialism that did not forbid the concept of private property (Purdie 89). Although Bloom most likely would not have been familiar with Reverend Gilbertson, he seemed to have appreciated his beliefs, focusing on Jesus’s political rather than moral or dogmatic teachings. This passage in “Penelope” has received scant attention in Joycean scholarship, with perhaps of the exception of Manganiello, who claims that Joyce based Bloom’s sentiment on Ferrero’s belief that both Christianity and socialism were based on “characteristic elements of religious creations” and a “general ‘redemption’ of humanity” (57). Although this sentiment is mentioned once at the end of *Ulysses*, it does present a contrast to the more pious characters in the novel (and throughout Joyce’s work for that matter) who appear less than enthusiastic about Christian

---

21 “And all that believed were together, and had all things common; And sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need.”

22 See Humphreys 239-51; Manganiello 43-66; and Spoo, “‘Una Piccola Nuvoletta’” 401-10 for more on Ferrero’s influence on Joyce, much of which developed in Trieste.
socialism. Father Conmee in “Wandering Rocks,” for example, “reset his smooth watch in his interior pocket” and “doffed his silk hat” (10.1-2, 30) as he perambulates around Dublin, more concerned with the spiritual rather than material poverty around him. Encountering the one-legged sailor begging for alms, he “thought, not for long, of soldiers and sailors, whose legs had been shot off by cannonballs, ending their days in some pauper ward, and of cardinal Wolsey’s words: If I had served my God as I have served my king He would not have abandoned me in my old days” (12.12-16).\(^\text{23}\) Father Conmee’s apathy to the sailor’s situation and attention to sartorial and material goods are exactly the kind of attitudes socialists like Reverent Gilbertson spoke out against. Christian socialism is not a theme in *Ulysses* nor necessarily all that pertinent to Joyce’s engagement with socialism, yet Molly’s revelation about Bloom offers a glimpse into Bloom’s socialist ideals as well as Joyce’s nonconventional interrogation of socialist thought.

*Comfortable Tidysized Socialism.* Secular socialists ridiculed Christian socialism as little more than a turn to asceticism. As Marx and Friedrich Engels write, “Nothing is easier than to give Christian asceticism a Socialist tinge. . . . Christian Socialism is but the holy water with which the priest consecrates the heart-burnings of the aristocrat” (*Communist* 246-47). However, interpreting the teachings of Jesus as a precursor to modern socialism could be considered a gesture to socialist historiography. Christian or not, socialists were intent first and foremost on creating a paradise on Earth rather than beyond it. Critics of socialism would often (and continue to) accuse socialists of wanting to establish a utopia that is unrealistic, unpraiseworthy, and disastrous. Reverend Samuel Smith, a Christian opponent of socialism,

\(^{23}\) The emphasized lines are from the original and allude to Shakespeare’s *Henry VIII* (3.2.55-57) (*U-A* 260; *U-N* 649).
argues as such: “The reason why I object to Socialism . . . is – first, because it is theft; secondly, because it would be ruinous to any nation that adopted it. There never has been an instance in the world of a civilised nation compelling all its inhabitants to surrender their goods to the government, and then to be paid equal wages by said government, whatever the value of their work might be” (22). Although he is referring to an arguably vulgar interpretation of Marxist economic theory, his statement nonetheless reflects several strains of anti-socialist thought in the nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries by equating socialism with barbarism. Socialists “seem to think that social perfection can only be reached by destroying all the classes of society, who by industry, frugality and intelligence, have raised themselves about the condition of day labourers. You can find such a state of society among the Zulus of Africa or the Red Indians of America” (4). Once again, the “Red Indians of America” bear the brunt of European rhetorical condescension, yet more to the point, this “barbarism” is what Bloom has in mind for his version of socialist “utopia.” There are several passages in *Ulysses* in which Bloom expresses his desire for such a society, or at the very least his disgust with the current capitalist system. “The poor man starves,” he says in “Circe,” while capitalists are “grassing their royal mountain stags or shooting peasants and phartridges in their purbling pomp of pelf and power” (15.1394-97). His language is reminiscent of the bombastic and at times violent language socialists, most famously Marx and Engels (if not Connolly), would employ in their critiques of capitalism. Here, Bloom interrogates anti-capitalist thought in much more forceful and lucid terms than he is known for throughout the novel. What Bloom says later would likely have played right into Reverend Smith’s hands:
I stand for the reform of municipal moral and the plain ten commandments. New worlds for old. Union of all, jew, moslem, and gentile. *Three acres and a cow for all children of nature.* Saloon motor hearses. Compulsory manual labour for all. All parks open to the public day and night. *Electric dishscrubbers.* Tuberculosis, lunacy, war and mendicancy must now cease. General amnesty, weekly carnival with masked licence, bonuses for all, esperanto the universal language with universal brotherhood. No more patriotism of barspongers and dropsical impostors. Free money, free rent, free love and a free lay church in a free lay state. (15.1685-93; my emphases)

Bloom’s vision in many ways is a “ludicrous . . . mix of utopian idealism and mundane or inane specificities” (Cheng, *Race* 221). It also highlights some of the contradictions inherent in socialist economic theory: the clash between a “socialist, egalitarian, and communitarian state versus a decentralized state with minimal government intervention and free enterprise” (Goloubeva 692). Yet, as Cheng notes, the passage is also a reaction of the travails he has faced throughout the day (the “saloon motor hearses” having derived from attending the funeral procession in “Hades,” for instance) as well as an articulation of socialist ideals that were rooted in specific pragmatic proposals to ameliorate the problems of capitalism Bloom had complained about (*Race* 221; Manganiello 111; Pokhrel 23). The emphasized line about the three acres and a cow, for example, is a direct reference to the land agitations of the 1870s and 1880s (*U-A* 479; *U-N* 741). Bloom’s desire for “saloon motor hearses” and “electric dishscrubbers” reflect a concern he has for automation which many socialists shared (and will be discussed later in the chapter). The passage is lacking in tangible plans that would achieve these ends, yet Bloom nevertheless states his wish to live in a society rooted in free love and egalitarianism.
If these observations about Bloom’s utopic aspirations for society are not particularly insightful, they are done so to contextualize his more specific proposals that are arguably more problematic. In “Eumaeus” and “Ithaca,” Bloom expounds on his utopian vision for the future with more detailed plans which comprise perhaps Joyce’s greatest condemnations or at least criticism of socialism. In the former episode, Bloom tells Stephen of his belief in Universal Basic Income (UBI): “I want to see everyone, concluded he, all creeds and classes pro rata having a comfortable tidysized income, in no niggard fashion either, something in the neighbourhood of £300 per annum. That’s the vital issue at stake and it’s feasible and would be provocative of friendlier intercourse between man and man” (U 16.1133-37). The idea is not novel. UBI has been propositioned as an economic policy since Thomas More’s *Utopia* (1516) and has been debated in various versions since the sixteenth century. In the nineteenth century, economists such as Charles Fourier and John Stuart Mill entertained the idea of some kind of state-allocated income (“History of Basic Income”). Interestingly, UBI was denounced by certain socialists and particularly Marxists as catering to the wishes of the bourgeoisie. UBI did not abolish private property or private ownership of the means of production, the “[f]ree money, free rent, free love” that Bloom wanted an episode earlier. Perhaps more importantly, UBI was merely a facet of a broader “utopian” or “bourgeois” socialism that hardliners such as Marx and Engels condemned. They frequently denounced these so-called socialists for intellectually immaturity and a hesitation to embrace class

---

24 According to the Bank of England, £300 in 1904 would approximately be the equivalent of £36,000 in 2018 (“Inflation Calculator”).

25 However, UBI proposals were never simple. Early proponents such as More and Thomas Paine outlined policies that were “based on entitlement” and did not “emphasise the issue of unconditionality” (P. O’Brien 59). It was only in the nineteenth century in which unconditional UBI was flouted by the likes of Mill, and it was during the twentieth century that it was seriously considered by economists and philosophers such as Bertrand Russell (59-61). For an overview of the evolution of UBI as a serious economic policy, see “History of Basic Income” and P. O’Brien 57-70.
struggle (Yassour 222). In *The Communist Manifesto* (1848), they wrote that the “Socialist bourgeois want all the advantages of modern social conditions without the struggles and dangers necessarily resulting therefrom. They desire the existing state of society minus its revolutionary and disintegrating elements. They wish for a bourgeoisie without a proletariat” (252). They simply desired “administrative reforms, based on the continued existence of these relations” (253). They criticized Fourier directly for holding himself “far superior to all class antagonisms” (254). Lumping him with other pre-Marxist “Critical-Utopian” socialists such as Henri de Saint-Simon and Robert Owen, they summarize their grievances as such: “they reject all political, and especially all revolutionary, action; they wish to attain their ends by peaceful means, and endeavour, by small experiments, necessarily doomed to failure, and by the force of example, to pave the way for the new social Gospel. . . . The significance of Critical-Utopian Socialism and Communism bears an inverse relation to historical development” (255). Indeed, Bloom’s version of socialism, as evident by his advocacy of UBI and other administrative, non-revolutionary measures, was a far cry from the militant, revolutionary socialism of Marx, Engels, and Connolly. Connolly never supported UBI in his any of his writing, nor was it ever seriously entertained in Ireland.

It is fair to say Bloom’s “utopian” socialism would have been denounced by Connolly, and moreover reflects some of the criticism levied against Joyce himself by socialists and communists in the early-twentieth century for leading and writing about a decadent, milquetoast utopian socialist lifestyle. Soviet official and critic Karl Radek, for example, famously said in the First Soviet Writer’s Conference in 1934 that *Ulysses* was “a heap of dung, crawling with worms, photographed by a cinema apparatus thorough a microscope” (qtd. in Segall 11). Many critics, socialists or not, have noted that little labor is
actually portrayed in his work, and that his characters mostly engage in talking, brooding, drinking, eating, purchasing, and other forms of consumption (Killeen 207; West 120-21). Joyce was unamused by such assessments. He once said “[a]ll the characters in my books belong to the lower middle classes, and even the working class, and they are all quite poor” (qtd. in Jolas 91). With the exception of Blazes Boylan, Haines, Buck Mulligan, and a few others in his oeuvre, this statement proves true. The line between the lower middle class, or petit-bourgeois, and the lower class was fine, especially in 1904 Dublin. As Emer Nolan points out, “[h]is world of the commonplace is concerned with the lower middle classes, a feckless, leisurely group that exists on the edge of poverty” (“Cultural Critic” 115). None of his characters are “peasants or manual workers; almost all are rootless and lack any sense of solidarity with others who share their condition” (Delany 260). Franco Moretti bluntly states that “Joyce’s writing is not ‘revolutionary’ in any reasonable sense of the word” (189). With this mode of interpretation in mind, it is perhaps fitting that Bloom’s socialism was utopian in the pejorative sense of the term held both by the left and right, and that it was very much in harmony with Joyce’s own rather pallid approach to socialism.

The problematic theoretical implications of Bloom’s UBI proposal notwithstanding, his figure of £300 per annum was more than a “comfortable tidysized income.” The minimum weekly income for a family of five in Dublin required to meet its barest needs in the first decade of the twentieth century was 30 shillings, or £1.5, which is £78 per annum (J. O’Brien, Dear 167). In effect, Bloom’s proposal was more than three times the basic amount needed for an average Dublin family to survive on. Although it is arguable how Bloom came up with that figure (not to mention its feasibility), Bloom’s proposed amount for UBI shows a lack of nuance in socialist economic thought. Indeed, the idea that (in
socialist terms) the oppression of the workers and the abolition of class struggle could be achieved by, in essence, throwing money at the general populace was abhorrent to socialist hardliners. Bloom continues to push the notion of a “comfortable tidysized income” in “Ithaca.” In the “Flowerville” passage in which Bloom envisions his perfect household (*U* 17.1497-1633), he stipulates “servants’ apartments with separate sanitary and hygienic necessaries for cook, general and betweenmaid (salary, rising by biennial unearned increments of £2, with comprehensive fidelity insurance, annual bonus (£1) and retiring allowance (based on the 65 system) after 30 years’ service)” (17.1543-46). Bloom’s generosity is once again apparent here. This salary arrangement was considerably lavish, far exceeding the salaries an inhouse servant could expect from the period, not to mention that the bonus and retirement schemes were “positively utopian” (*U*-*A* 591). Moreover, the way in which he means to pay for Flowerville is based on unequivocal private land ownership, capitalist investment, derivates, and securities – exactly the kind of things socialists found abhorrent: “As per prospectus of the Industrious Foreign Acclimatised Nationalised Friendly Stateaided Building Society (incorporated 1874), a maximum of £60 per annum, being $\frac{1}{6}$ of an assured income, derived from gilded securities, representing at 5% simple interest on capital of £1200 (estimate of price at 20 years’ purchase), of which $2\frac{1}{2}$% interest on the same . . .” (*U* 17.1658-63). In Bloom’s defense, “Flowerville” is an elaborate pipedream, one of the many outlandish schemes Bloom cannot possibly achieve.26 Bloom’s “pragmatism”

---

26 To be fair to Bloom, however, at least one scholar argues in support of Flowerville’s feasibility. Danis Rose claims that “Joyce intended it as a perfectly realistic and realizable plan for the eventual move out of Eccles street and the beginning of a new phase of life” (129). Although Rose provides a largely convincing analysis of the Flowerville passage to support his claim (128-32), the idea that Bloom, an average Dublin layman, could afford “a tennis and fives court, a shrubbery, a glass summerhouse with tropical palms, equipped in the best botanical manner, a rockery with waterspray, a beehive arranged on humane principles . . .” (*U* 17.1552-54) that would be facilitated by a “private wireless telegraph” and the “unexpected discovery of . . . precious stone, valuable adhesive or impressed postage stamps” (17.1674, 1679-80) as well as a “Spanish prisoner’s donation of a distant treasure of valuables” (17.1687-88) is stupendous to say the least.
as described in the previous chapter of this dissertation stands in stark contrast to his heartfelt yet dubious proposals here, arguably unfeasible in economic terms and athwart to ironically not just supporters of capitalism but also their fiercest critics. As will be discussed later, the outlandishness of Flowerville is comparable to the roseate depiction of pre-Norman Irish history as held by Irish socialists during this time, a history that portrays the island as being inhabited by egalitarian tribes who eschewed notions of private property and land ownership, only to be defeated by the feudalistic English who “imported” those concepts.

*The Importance of Being Socialist.* If Bloom engages in wishful thinking with regard to UBI and Flowerville, he does mention a potential outcome of industrialization throughout the novel that capitalists and socialists alike were apprehensive of. Spotting a pointsman commandeering tramway traffic in “Hades,” Bloom wonders: “Couldn’t they invent something automatic so that the wheel itself much handier? Well but that fellow would lose his job then? Well but then another fellow would get a job making the new invention?” (6.175-79). If UBI was an ethereal proposal for utopian-socialist social amelioration during the Industrial Revolution, automation was a serious and tangible concern. As machines proliferated and became more essential to industrial production, the labor market changed drastically. Laborers became even more alienated from their labor as machines commandeered production, and as Bloom indicates, automation threatened the already tenuous job security the labor force faced. While Griffith and Connolly supported industrialization in Ireland, neither of them discussed the implications that Bloom brought up – a blindspot in economic thought. Griffith, Connolly, and other nationalists were so concerned about resisting British imperialism and, in Connolly’s case, bourgeois
domination, that they failed to consider a looming, non-national, inanimate threat to the Irish worker.

Surprisingly, one of the few Irish figures of the nineteenth century who wrote directly about the topic was none other than Oscar Wilde. Wilde, whose reputation, perhaps more so than Joyce’s, is one of an apolitical Irish popinjay uninterested in politics, nationalism, or industry, wrote candidly about the threat of automation and the larger injustices of capitalist production. In his treatise “The Soul of Man Under Socialism” (1891), published in *Fortnightly Review* just three years after the most influential English translation of *The Communist Manifesto* appeared in the United Kingdom (Van de Kamp and Leahy 141), he argues that charity and altruism created “a multitude of sins” in that they merely perpetuated rather than ameliorated “the horrible evils that result from the institution of private property.” Taking an unequivocally anti-capitalist, materialist stance, he argues that socialism, communism “or whatever one chooses to call it” would “restore society to its proper condition of a thoroughly healthy organism, and ensure the material well-being of each member of the community” (Wilde 128). His embrace of socialism was libertarian rather than authoritarian as he believed the former would simply produce “Industrial Tyrannies” even more brutal and autocratic than capitalist ones (129). He opposed “a military-industrial utopia that has no space for the individual’s spiritual emancipation and its aesthetic expression” (Beaumont 15). Integral to his argument was his belief that by fostering cooperation rather than competition and providing the basic material needs for everyone in society, socialism would promote “beautiful, healthy Individualism” that private property had irrevocably damaged (Wilde 133). As Mullen observes, Wilde “sees the transformation of the organization of property relations as crucial to the realization of the human personality,
and he links his notion of affect with a model of value production throughout which the sympathetic structure of the individual is mediated by social relations” (33). In addition to this, Wilde reframes Christian socialism by claiming that when “Jesus talks about the poor he simply means personalities, just as when he talks about the rich he simply means people who have not developed their personalities” (135) – not quite a traditional interpretation of Jesus’s teachings or socialist appropriation of them. Although nowhere near as technical or acerbic as Marx, Engels, or Connolly (he does not reference a single statistic or, for that matter, a number) nor as insistent on “Individualism” being inseparable rather than distinct from society as Marxists advocated, Wilde does interrogate issues common in their work: alienation from labor, false consciousness, and bourgeois morality. In some ways, he “echoes a young Marx of the Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844, in which he describes the utopian dimensions of humanity’s universal personality” (Mullen 32). He arguably goes a step further than Marx by speculating on the future supremacy of machines in the quest for a classless society. Wilde welcomes this supremacy as the only way for each person to reach their true “Individual” potential:

Up to the present, man has been, to a certain extent, the slave of machinery, and there is something tragic in the fact that as soon as man had invented a machine to do his work he begins to starve. This, however, is, of course, the result of our property system and our system of competition. One man owns a machine which does the work of five hundred men. Five hundred men are, in consequence, thrown out of employment, and having no work to do, become hungry and take to thieving. The one man secures the produce of the machine and keeps it, and has five hundred times as much as he should have, and probably, which is of much more importance, a great
deal more than he really wants. Were that machine the property of all, every one would benefit by it. It would be an immense advantage to the community. . . . Under proper conditions machinery will serve man. There is no doubt at all that this is the future of machinery, and just as trees grow while the country gentleman is asleep, so while Humanity will be amusing itself, or enjoying cultivated leisure. . . . The fact is, that civilization requires slaves. . . . Human slavery is wrong, insecure and demoralizing. On mechanical slavery, on the slavery of the machine, the future of the world depends. (140-41)

Although “Soul of Man” was not well-received in Europe or by British socialists in particular (Giudicelli par. 12), Joyce read the work, and his engagement with it has been documented. Joyce “found the most complete expression of the anarchistic ideal for artists” in Wilde’s essay, which “probably swayed Joyce” (Manganiello 220, 221) – perhaps more so that “any national or international program of socialism promulgated in the early years of the twentieth century” (Caraher 203). Joyce owned a copy of the essay in his Trieste library and wanted to translate it into Italian in 1901 (Ellmann, Consciousness 133; JJ 274). Although these scholars argue that the essay appealed to Joyce’s aesthetic and individualistic rather than political sensibilities – or specifically, that Wilde’s “predicat[ing] the expression of individualism through a socialized notion of labor, not as compulsion, but as freedom” (Mullen 33) appealed to him – they did not mention Wilde’s discussion of automation. This is strange considering Wilde based all his hopes for “socialist Individualism,” as it were, on it. I believe this section of Wilde’s essay resonates in Bloom’s musing about automation in “Hades” and elsewhere in the novel. Not only does he acknowledge the potential inevitability of automation, he states its benefits. This resonance is even more palpable considering it
would not be the first time “Soul of Man” is alluded to in Ulysses. As Fairhall notices, a portion of the essay makes its way into Stephen’s famous reply to Haines about being the “servant of two masters . . . an English and an Italian. . . . And a third . . . there is who wants me for odd jobs” (Question 55-56; U 1.638, 641). Wilde writes, “There are three kinds of despots. There is the despot who tyrannizes over the body. There is the despot who tyrannizes over the soul. There is the despot who tyrannizes over the soul and body alike. The first is called the Prince. The second is called the Pope. The third is called the People” (153-54). To Wilde and Joyce, the tyranny of the Prince, Pope, and People could only be overcome through the mastery of automation.27

That is not to say, however, that automation is viewed in strictly positive terms. Bloom’s observation in “Hades” is brutally transfigured in “Circe”: “Machines is their cry, their chimera, their panacea. Laboursaving apparatuses, supplanters, bugbears, manufactured monsters for mutual murder, hideous hobgoblins produced by a horde of capitalistic lusts upon our prostituted labour” (U 15.1391-94). Bloom’s and Wilde’s optimistic evaluation of machinery is countered here, which as Slote et al. notes (736) is reminiscent of Marx and Engel’s admonishment of technology in The Communist Manifesto in which they express their ambivalence about technological progress: “Owing to the extensive use of machinery and to division of labour, the work of the proletarians has lost all individual character, and, consequently, all charms for the workman. He becomes an appendage of the machine.” If Wilde felt that individualism ultimately depended on automation, Marx and Engels here claim that machines render the worker powerless: “they are daily and hourly enslaved by the

27 For more on Wilde’s socialism and its relevance to fin de siècle socialism, particularly utopian socialism, see Beaumont 13-29; Giudicelli par. 1-21; Guy and Small 277-79; Lesjak 179-204; and Van de Kamp and Leahy 141-50. His socialist beliefs have been alternatively described as “at heart a socialism of pleasure” (Lesjak 195), an “elitist socialism” (Guidicelli par. 11), and an “aristocratic socialism” (Ellmann, Oscar Wilde 116).
machine, by the overlooker, and, above all, by the individual bourgeois manufacturer himself” (227). This contradicts Bloom’s hope in “Hades” that workers would commandeer machines rather than the other way around. Ahearn suggests that the anxiety automation entails is implicit in *Ulysses*. Citing Marx’s *Grundrisse* (1857-1858), Ahearn argues that automation threatened individualism in the inverse way Wilde claimed would aid it: by hampering the production of art, particularly the “myths” and “epics” that characterized pre-printing press literature (107-9). In “Aeolus,” Bloom’s thoughts and efforts are hampered by the pounding of machinery. The constant “clanking drums,” “Thumping. Thump,” “Thump, thump, thump,” and “Clank it. Clank it” (*U* 7.74, 76, 101, 136) rattles Bloom, leading him to observe: “Machines. Smash a man to atoms if they got him caught. Rule the world today. His machineries are pegging away too. Like these, out of hand: fermenting. Working away, tearing away” (7.80-83). The individualism Wilde thought promising via automation is rendered useless here. In *Grundrisse*, Marx notes that:

> It is even recognized that certain forms of art, e.g. the epic, can no longer be produced in their world epoch-making, classical structure as soon as the production of art, as such begins; that is, that certain significant forms within the realm of the arts are possibly only at an undeveloped stage of artistic development. . . .

> All mythology overcomes and dominates and shapes the forces of nature in the imagination and by the imagination; it therefore vanishes with the advent of real mastery over them. What becomes of Fama alongside Printing House Square? (110)

---

28 Bloom’s comparison of man to atoms has a Wildean parallel: The worker “is merely the infinitesimal atom of a force that, so far from regarding him, crushed him: indeed, prefers him crushed, as in that case he is far more obedient” (Wilde 129).
Automation’s mastery of nature, in other words, cripples traditional artistic modes of expression. The printing press, typewriter, gramophone, radio, photography, and film available in 1904 (and 1922) did not hamper Joyce’s attempt to create an epic of his own, yet at the same time they produced their own set of anxieties and disadvantages that could thwart artistic expression, which was the crux of Wilde’s version of socialism. Marx’s apprehension of the printing press would be superseded by the advent of the typewriter, gramophone, radio, photography, and film in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. The printed word itself was thought to be under siege and increasingly irrelevant. McLuhan observes that “every medium of communication is a unique art form which gives salience to one set of human possibilities at the expense of another set. Each medium of expression profoundly modified human sensibility in mainly unconscious and unpredictable ways” (7). With regard to the nineteenth century, Keane notes that the rise of these technologies produced “intense social anxiety” around the medium of print’s “ability to capture accurately and reliably reproduce lived impressions. This uncertainty resulted in a media economy structured by competing forms of conserving and disseminating content” (403). It could be argued that automation, far from being humanity’s savior, becomes its master, rendering the socialist desires of Bloom moot. If automation was the key to socialism’s manifestation or its downfall, then Joyce’s engagement with it as evident in the passages in “Hades,” “Circe,” and “Aeolus” may point toward an ambivalence toward socialist thought, utopian or otherwise.

*All Skedaddled.* To conclude this section, I would like to return to a passage discussed in the first chapter of this dissertation, one that reinforces Bloom’s (and Joyce’s) reticence in
embracing socialist thought – specifically here, the socialist principle of public agitation. In “Lestrygonians,” Bloom recalls getting caught up in a protest against Joseph Chamberlain on December 17th, 1899. Chamberlain was about to receive an honorary degree from Trinity College the following day. Due to his role in defeating Home Rule and position as Secretary of State for the Colonies, he was widely unpopular in Ireland and seen as an embodiment of British imperialism and chauvinism. He was also considered responsible for British policies that started the Boer War, which was very much acknowledged by the protestors. John O’Leary, Gonne, Griffith, and Connolly led a pro-Boer rally against the ceremony across the River Liffey on Beresford Place, where they encountered fierce police resistance. They led the protest across the river to College Green, where they continued to resist the police (Foster, *Modern Ireland* 421-22; *U-A* 168; *U-N* 616-67). Although the protest was chaotic and violent by all accounts (this will be discussed later in the chapter in relation to the Boer War), Bloom seemed rather amused in his recollection:

That horsepoliceman the day Joe Chamberlain was giving his degree in Trinity he got a run for his money. My word he did! His horse’s hoofs clattering after us down Abbey street. Lucky I had the presence of mind to dive into Manning’s or I was souped. He did come a wallop, by George. Must have cracked his skull on the cobblestones. I oughtn’t to have got myself swept along with those medicals. And the Trinity jibs in their mortarboards. Looking for trouble. Still I got to know that young Dixon who dressed that sting for me in the Mater and now he’s in Holles street where Mrs Purefoy. Wheels within wheels. Police whistle in my ears still. *All skedaddled.* Why he fixed on me. Give me in charge. Right here it began.

–Up the Boers!
–Three cheers for De Wet!
–We’ll hang Joe Chamberlain on a sourapple tree.

Silly billies: mob of young cubs yelling their guts out. Vinegar hill. The Butter exchange band. Few years’ time half of them magistrates and civil servants. War comes on: into the army helterskelter: same fellows used to. Whether on the scaffold high. (*U* 8.423-40; my emphasis)

I discussed in the first chapter the allusions to the 1798 Rebellion here, yet like with so much of Joyce’s work this passage is multifaceted. What is noticeable here is that Bloom handles the protest as an afterthought, something in the peripheral of his experience rather than central to it. He was reminded of the protest, which took place five years prior, by seeing a “squad of constables debouched from College street, marching in Indian file. Goosestep. Footheated faces, sweating helmets, patting their truncheons” (8.406-8). He remarks he “can’t blame them” for handling citizens “hot and heavy in the bridewell” (8.421-22, 420). Bloom is comfortable with the rough procedures employed by the police. He was more concerned with dodging the protest, slipping away to Manning’s pub, than with participating in it. Nor does he bother to comment on the subject of the protest: the Boer War and more generally British imperialism. The most disapprobation he can muster is a wry comment on the young radicals, the “silly billies,” most of whom would eventually come into the fold of the very system they were protesting against.29 Bloom’s inaction and amusement of the

29 This interpretation, of course, hinges on Bloom’s muddled recollection of the events. Although ostensibly he was referring to the December 17th pro-Boer protest, he may have been confusing it with an anti-Boer protest led by students of Trinity College on October 19th. There were a number of pro-Boer demonstrations held in Dublin from August to December of that year (Condon 98-99). On October 19th, at least fifty Trinity students marched on College Green to counter these protests as well as the pro-Boer telegrams and images the *Irish Daily Independent* had been projecting onto the wall of its office nearby Trinity via a magic lantern (93-94; “Burlesque War” 6; “Trinity College v. Trinity Buildings” 4). “Silly billies” may be referring to the pro-Boer demonstrators of December 17th or the anti-Boer demonstrators of October 19th – if not both. The “Trinity jibs in their mortarboards” (*U* 8.428-29) may be a reference to the latter, which would also change the context of
protest is another indication of his utopian or “dinner-table” socialism, one that showcases his “sweet disposition . . . to imagine the possibility of rational and benevolent social behavior and the brotherhood of man” (Trilling 158) rather than direct action against the Althusserian repressive state apparatus that Griffith, Gonne, Connolly, Casement, and other activists would dedicate themselves to. In all, Bloom is what Marx and Engels would have called a bourgeois or utopian socialist, one that is more inclined, in their famous estimation of true communist society, to “hunt in the morning, fish in the afternoon, rear cattle in the evening, criticize after dinner . . . without ever becoming hunter, fisherman, shepherd, or critic” (German Ideology 53) – or, for that matter, without ever personally agitating to achieve a society in which that would be possible.

If Bloom has a penchant for “criticizing after dinner,” however, it would be unfair to not mention the times he at least entertains the idea of revolutionary action. A little while after the passage referenced above, he acknowledges the necessity to engage in such action – specifically, to handle “the mob.” “You must have a certain fascination: Parnell,” he thinks. “Arthur Griffith is a squareheaded fellow but he has no go in him for the mob. Or gas about our lovely land” (U 8.462-64). Referencing two leaders – one deceased, one active – who tried to rally mass public support, Bloom realizes that a hypothetical egalitarian society requires real-life social and political action. Both Parnell and Griffith failed to rally the Irish public successfully in Bloom’s mind, despite their considerable accomplishments and Parnell’s excruciatingly close success in achieving Home Rule. Excruciatingly close is not

---

Bloom’s comment about the protestors turning into magistrates and civil servants. Alternatively, Bloom may also have been thinking of the anti-Boer student demonstrators at Trinity on the day of Chamberlain’s December 18th conferral (Condon 101). Gifford and Seidman incorrectly state that the pro-Boer protest occurred on Chamberlain’s visit when the actual pro-Boer protest took place a day before (168). Indeed, many scholars make no mention of the anti-Boer protests, assuming instead that Bloom was only thinking of the December 17th pro-Boer protest. See also “Dublin and the War” 6; Gilbert 202; “Mr. Chamberlain’s Visit to Dublin” 6; and Paulin 96.
good enough, however, and Bloom expresses his pessimism in their endeavors as a mere facet of the mundanity found in College Green: “Trinity’s surly front. Trams passed one another, ingoing, outgoing, clanging. Useless words. Things go on same, day after day: squads of police marching out, back: trams in, out” (8.476-78). The banality of Irish agitation resonates in Bloom’s thoughts, but he at least is aware of the purposes and motivations behind such agitation.

In “Eumaeus,” Bloom reveals perhaps his boldest views on revolutionary action. Speculating on the rumor that Skin-the-Goat was the getaway driver in the Phoenix Park Murders, a rumor that resonates throughout the episode, Bloom expresses a flirtation in terrorist action:

Quite apart from that he disliked those careers of wrongdoing and crime on principle. Yet, though such criminal propensities had never been an inmate of his bosom in any shape or form, he certainly did feel and no denying it (while inwardly remaining what he was) a certain kind of admiration for a man who had actually brandished a knife, cold steel, with the courage of his political convictions (though, personally, he would never be a party to any such thing), off the same bat as those love vendettas of the south . . . (16.1055-61)

He articulates a romantic view of radicals such as the Skin-the-Goat and the Invincibles who commit acts of violence for their “political convictions,” which are not specified here. Much like in “Lestrygonians,” Bloom refuses to actually participate in it; rather, he is content to be a sympathetic observer. Although this could be considered a straightforward renunciation of violence as a solution to political problems (Manganiello 5), the ambiguity of the language is indicative of the larger ambiguity of Bloom’s apparent refusal to merit such violence as
legitimate – a vacillation between utopian socialism and violent radicalism (Goloubeva 698). As Karen R. Lawrence writes, “it is as if the language were refusing to maintain the boundaries to which Bloom’s conscious mind clings” (364). The Invincibles and Phoenix Park Murders as depicted in *Ulysses* will be examined in greater detail later in the chapter, yet it is fitting to end this section with what is Bloom’s greatest capitulation to the revolutionary action called for by socialists. Although this approval would still be considered tepid and reflective of a lickspittle mentality by hardliner socialists, it is also indicative of a fascination with revolutionary violence that ostensibly serves to create the society Bloom wants. I will argue that this sentiment is much more apparent in the historiography of *Ulysses*, particularly of the Phoenix Park Murders and the Boer War.

**HISTORICAL CASES: THE PHOENIX PARK MURDERS AND THE BOER WAR**

The prominence of socialism and socialist historiography during the late-nineteenth century came at a time of great disillusionment with capitalism and burgeoning imperialism. Bloom’s utopian socialism and Connolly’s more militant socialism were a product of this malaise as articulated by Matthew Beaumont:

> In the last decades of the nineteenth century there was a widespread perception that capitalism had arrived at some kind of historical impasse. The so-called ‘Great Depression’, from the mid-1870s to the mid-1890s, fissured the confidence of the middle class in the capitalist system. This effect was reinforced by the riots and industrial unrest of the later 1880s, when the ‘New Unionism’ and the nascent socialist movement were in their ascendancy. In this uncomfortable climate, there was a sense across the political spectrum that some sort of systematic social
transformation might be afoot. Utopian discourse, fictional and non-fictional alike, functioned as a means of understanding, and of influencing, this mood of impending change – at a time of frustrated hopes and, for the most part, unfulfilled fears. (14)

These “unfulfilled fears” were especially palpable in Ireland, a colonial state mostly spared the heavy industrialization and surplus capital which developed in large swaths of Europe and the United States. The failed Home Rule campaigns and Parnell’s death, moreover, fed into this discontent (Spoo, Language 124). Irish socialists tried to allay these fears, not only with audacious visions of the future but with a suspect harkening to the past – suspect in the sense that despite their claim to impasive and “scientific” methodology these historiographies rivaled those of respective republican and nationalist movements in their selective and at times dubious analyses. Yet at the same time, their dedication to historical materialism and at least an outward fidelity to impartiality appealed to Joyce. I will evaluate two historical events which occurred relatively close to 1904: the Phoenix Park Murders and the Boer War. These events were seared in the minds of the Dubliners in Ulysses. They were heavily politicized and historicized by various nationalist movements, and socialists were no exception. They claimed to be impartial and unaffected by “bourgeoisie” nationalism, yet their historiography as evident in the novel as well as its composition during the second decade of the twentieth century reveals that even an enthusiastic dedication to class struggle and proletariat liberation could not fully overcome national distinctions – at least in Ireland. Yet at the same time, this historiography inspired direct confrontations with the British imperial state and Irish bourgeoisie, something I believe Joyce appreciated and ultimately supported. These contradictions and imperfections are the closest to what can accurately characterize Joyce’s own historiography.
The Brehon Laws and Primitive Communism. Before delving into these specific events, it is important to clearly state and assess common characteristics of socialist historiography of Ireland as well as analyze what I believe to be their greatest impetuses. Socialist interpretation of Irish history during the nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries was based on what could be considered standard if not “vulgar” Marxist analysis, one based on historical materialism: that is, that material conditions lay the primary foundation of historical development. The historical works of Connolly and Casement are prime examples of this, yet it would be beneficial to examine a lesser-known work. Manganiello incorrectly states that Connolly’s Labour in Irish History (1910) was the first Marxist analysis of Irish history (128).\footnote{Manganiello does reference Connolly’s Erin’s Hope (1897), which analyzes Irish history but only in part. Labour in Irish History would be Connolly’s first comprehensive overview of Irish history. Engels intended to write a history of Ireland and compiled notes as well as a few chapters for the project but passed away before it could be completed (K. Anderson 134; Golman 18). See Marx and Engels, Ireland 171-271 for his initial notes and drafts, some of which will be referenced later in the chapter. Moreover, Connolly acknowledges his indebtedness to American anthropologist Lewis H. Morgan and his Ancient Society (1877) in composing Labour. Although Ancient Society is predominately about indigenous American civilizations, Morgan does devote a few pages to the Irish sept system and compares it to indigenous American social structures a few times in the book. As Connolly writes, Morgan’s “key will yet unlock the doors which guard the secrets of our native Celtic civilisation, and make them possible of fuller comprehension for the multitude” (1:24). There is some overlap between Morgan’s work and Engels’ Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State (1884), which Engels based in part on Marx’s notes on Ancient Society, although Engels ultimately did not cite Morgan (Beatty, “Marx” 844n138). See Morgan 357-58 as well. Finally, it should be noted that there is some disagreement as to whether Labour in Irish History is truly a historical analysis in the Marxist tradition. Kieran Allen claims, for example, that it is rather a monolithic study on the relationship between the Irish working class and nationalist movements and moreover a “marvelous piece of socialist propaganda” (83). I do not agree. Although imperfect and not nearly as meticulous as the works of Marx and Engels, Labour is ultimately a Marxist analysis, and will be considered so for the purposes of this dissertation.} Five years prior to Labour in Irish History, Brady published the pamphlet The Historical Basis of Socialism in Ireland. In just twenty pages, he succinctly evaluates Irish history, approaching
it by using a historical materialist or, as Marxists liked to boast, a “scientific” methodology. He states immediately that Ireland was no different than any other country “where the instruments of production and distribution are owned and controlled by private individuals, companies, syndicates, or trusts” in that “class struggle is apparent” (3). Clearly indebted to Marx and Engels, Brady writes that all “past history is a chronicle of successive class-struggles. Wars and revolutions have not proceeded from the heads of men, or from something not understandable, but have always been outward manifestations of material conditions underlying them” (5). There is little trace of sentimentality or exceptionalism in his analysis. He begins his exposition with the alleged invasion of the island by the Milesians in the first century CE. They came to Ireland “in the role of conquerors, and imposed their civilisation on the natives” (5). He emphasizes the Milesians’ oppression of the native or “Firbolg” clans and their attempts to dominate their primitive means of production. From the beginning, Brady contradicts the romantic portrayal of Ireland’s founding propagated by the likes of Hyde and Mitchel, focusing on the Milesians’ brutality and thirst for power rather than any innate physical or intellectual superiority. The introduction of Christianity in the fifth century CE disrupted the monarchical system imposed upon by the Milesians with “a species of cleric-feudalism” run in tandem with several competing Irish clans. These clans held land in common; clan chiefs were democratically elected and never claimed divine authority (5-6). The premise that pre-Norman Ireland did not retain the concept of private land ownership was instrumental in Brady’s argument and would be reiterated by Connolly, Casement, and other Irish socialists. Indeed, the few times in which national pride appears in the pamphlet is when Brady mentions this: “[W]e are fairly safe in assuming that if the

---

32 For more on fawning depictions of the Milesians in eighteenth and nineteenth century Irish historiography and their importance in their various nationalist movements, see Hutchinson 124 and Kidd 1197-1214.
national development proceeded on the lines then laid down, we, to-day, would be much more likely to be the citizens of a progressive and enlightened state, than the resident helots of a province of the British Empire” (5). It was only when the Cambro-Normans invaded under Henry II under the supposed auspices of Pope Adrian IV (discussed in the introduction of this dissertation) that feudalism was thrust upon Ireland, reducing the “freedom-loving Irish to serfs” (6):

These men were not the chiefs or bards, or Brehons, but the Irish clansmen – the forbears of the modern Irish proletariat. The great guiding principle of common ownership of the land was the material reason of the incessant struggle maintained by the Irish clans against the English aggressors from 1171 to 1608, and has continued, though in other forms, down to our own day. For, be it remembered, the expatriated Irishman has never yet waived his right to the land. (7)

Once the Cambro-Norman, and later British, system of landlordism was established, the Irish proletariat began to suffer along with the proletariats of other developing nations. The new Anglo-Irish ruling class, who would eventually transform into the Irish bourgeoisie, dominated the proletariat, “constantly testing their cringing loyalty and seeking only reforms.” Channeling the acerbic tone common in Marxist polemics, Brady wrote that they were “the fitting prototype of the ‘respectable constitutional nationalist,’ the ‘Cawstle Cawtholic,’ and the lick-spittle shoneen of to-day – men on whose lips patriotism means compromise, and freedom high dividends” (8). The rest of the pamphlet appraises Irish history in the same vein. The bourgeoisie took over the British state in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, which climaxed in the Glorious Revolution of 1688 and instigated the struggle between the British bourgeoisie and the “would-be” Irish bourgeoisie that would last
through the eighteenth century (7-8). The British bourgeoisie suppressed their Irish counterpart by severely limiting Irish trade and industry, particularly wool production (8-9). The resentment wrought by this would lead to Grattan’s Parliament and the Irish Volunteers, the apex of the Irish bourgeoisie. They would be supported by the Irish proletariat, which to Brady was divided between the relatively well-off and educated Ulster Protestant faction and the penury-stricken and discriminated Catholic faction who had little choice but to ally themselves with the former (9). The failure of Grattan’s Parliament – the “Irish poodle in College Green” (11) – and later the 1798 Rebellion led by Tone, the “first great Irish revolutionist” and hero of the “militant proletariat” (12), severely weakened the Irish bourgeoisie (10-12). Catholic Emancipation in the early-nineteenth century merely revitalized the fledgling Catholic bourgeoisie, which, along with its Protestant counterpart and the Catholic clergy, continued its domination of Irish landownership. The rise of bourgeoisie and clerical landlordism would spur the creation of radical groups such as the Whiteboys and the Oakboys in the mid-nineteenth century as well as the IRB. It would also encourage calls for land collectivization and the abolition of landlordism from Young Irelanders such as James Fintan Lalor. When Brady gets to the late-nineteenth century, he criticizes Home Rule as having a “middle-class character” and the Irish Revival as a tepid response to the “contamination of the sensational and rubbishy alleged literature . . . devoured by so many of our countrymen and women” (16) – a grievance reminiscent of Moran and Russell.33 Brady concludes the pamphlet with an appeal to economic protectionism, not out

33 In “Nationality and Imperialism” (1903), Russell bemoans the inundation of “lowbrow” English literature and entertainment:

We see everywhere a moral leprosy, a vulgarity of mind creeping over [the Irish]. The Police Gazettes, the penny novels, the hideous comic journals, replace the once familiar poems and the beautiful and moving memoirs of classic Ireland. The music that breathed Tir-nan-og and overcame men’s hearts with all gentle and soft emotions is heard more faintly, and the songs of the London music halls may be heard in places where the music of fairy enchanted the elder generations. The shout of the cockney tourist sounds in the
of spite for foreign workers but out of concern to avoid overproduction “impossible under
capitalistic conditions” (17). Although he expresses allegiance to the worldwide proletariat,
he pays homage to “the sad fate of the forefathers who were stricken in the famine year” –
no doubt an attempt to appeal to the sensibilities of laborers reluctant to embrace “foreign”
socialism. “Let them harken to the revolutionary teaching while they are yet an effective
force” (18).

Brady’s pamphlet is a concise archetype of socialist historiography of Ireland.
Connolly would follow the same historiographical arc, albeit in much greater detail, in
*The Re-Conquest of Ireland* (1915) (1:185-282), and various shorter newspaper articles and
pamphlets throughout his career. Integral to his interpretation were class struggle and the
dichotomy between the pre-Norman concept of common landownership, what he called
“primitive Communism” (*Erin’s Hope* 7) that was practiced in Ireland under the Brehon
laws, and the post-Norman feudalism and landlordism imposed upon the population.
Although he tended to avoid Irish nationalist exceptionalism at least earlier in his career, he
did state with pride that unlike most primitive societies, the Irish retained primitive
communism well past the Christian era (7-8). The imposition of private landownership and
its ensuing tragedies, more than any cultural, political, or racial difference, were the true
source of resentment between the Irish and the British and would set the historical trajectory
of the two nations:

---

34 See note 3 of the introduction of this dissertation.
The Irish regarded with inveterate hostility their English rulers, at all times set little
store upon promises of incorporation within the pale of the constitution, and rose with
enthusiasm under their respective rebel chiefs, because they regarded this as the all-
important question, because in their eyes English rule and Dublin parliaments were
alike identified as the introducers and upholders of the system of feudalism and
private ownership of land, as opposed to the Celtic system of clan or common
ownership, which they regarded, and, I think, rightly, as the pledge at once of their
political and social liberty. . . .

The Irish system was thus on a par with those conceptions of social rights and
duties which we find the ruling classes to-day denouncing so fiercely as “Socialistic.”

(8-9)

He reiterates his claim in Labour in Irish History, stating that the imposition of feudalism
and capitalism was “the most foreign thing in Ireland” (1:22) and the antithesis of “Gaelic
ideas of equality and democracy” (1:19). Although he admits Ireland would have eventually
gotten rid of communal landownership as every other society did, the fact it was done so by
external forces made the Irish all the more resentful, “many of whom still mix with their
dreams of liberty longings for a return in the ancient system of land tenure – now organically
impossible” (1:28). He wrote in “Socialism and Nationalism” (1897) that the “Socialists
would destroy, root and branch . . . those insidious but disastrous forms of economic
subjection – landlord tyranny, capitalist fraud and unclean usury baneful fruits of the Norman
Conquest, the unholy trinity, of which Strongbow and Diarmuid MacMurchadha – Norman
thief and Irish traitor – were the fitting precursors and apostles” (1:307). In his 1903 election
address, he told supporters:
There is only one remedy for this slavery of the working class, and that remedy is the socialist republic, a system of society in which the land and all houses, railways, factories, canals, workshops, and everything necessary for work shall be owned and operated as common property, much as the land of Ireland was owned by the clans of Ireland before England introduced the capitalist system amongst us at the point of the sword. (2:223; my emphasis)

In *The Re-Conquest of Ireland*, he excoriated not just the removal of common landownership but the introduction of primogeniture, which was also prohibited under Brehon law:

The system of private capitalist property in Ireland, as in other countries, has given birth to the law of primogeniture under which the eldest son usurps the ownership of all property to the exclusion of the females of the family. Rooted in a property system founded upon force, this iniquitous law was unknown to the older social system of ancient Erin, and, in its actual workings out in modern Erin, it has been and is responsible for the moral murder of countless virtuous Irish maidens. (1:241)

Other socialists and nationalists would focus on these aspects of Brehon laws in their critiques of Irish capitalism and British imperialism. The laws were frequently evoked by Irish activists in the nineteenth century, particularly during the land agitations of the 1870s and 1880s (Gibson, “Nobody Owns” 951-52). Casement, for example, vaguely alluded to them in *The Romance of Irish History* (1914): “When, at the dawn of the Christian era, we first hear of Ireland from external sources, we learn of it as an island harbouring free men,

35 The passage is from the “Woman” chapter of *Re-Conquest* (1:237-44). Connolly was a champion of women’s rights. He frequently spoke out against misogyny and the exploitation of female labor: “The worker is the slave of capitalist society, the female worker is the slave of that slave” (1:239). He also had a close working relationship with Gonne (Allen 40). See also “The Irish Masses in History” (1908) (1:366-68) and Ward 45-85.
whose indomitable love of freedom was hateful to the spirit of imperial exploitation” (42).

In a 1912 nationalist text *The Irish Revolution*, Michael J. F. McCarthy wrote the “primeval Irish . . . never regarded themselves as slaves. Under the Brehon laws the land was the common property of the tribe, and the Chief, or Tanist, was the elected trustee of the commune” (25). No student of the Brehon laws,” Davitt wrote in *The Fall of Feudalism*, “and of the manners and customs of ancient Ireland can fail to be convinced of the greatest regard for the educational, social, and industrial interests and regulations which obtained in those times” (445). Hyde dedicated a chapter to the laws in *A Literary History of Ireland* (1899), holding them to be the embodiment of “the very essence of democratic government with no executive authority behind it but the will of the people” (585). In *English Misrule in Ireland*, Burke claimed that pre-Norman Ireland had no slaves or, by extension, class distinctions in his discussion of the laws: “They had no idea of slavery or serfdom among them. . . . no such thing as the Chieftain looking down upon the people; no such thing as cowed, abject submission on the part of the people to every worthless decree. The Chieftain was one of themselves; and the men stood in the ranks as freeman, perfectly equal, one with another” (21-22). Although there was no political campaign to reinstate the laws in Ireland, some nationalists like Davitt proposed land nationalization or other comparable proposals (Gibson, “Nobody Owns” 959). Indeed, the laws provoked excitement among Celtic scholars when they were first fully translated into English starting in 1865 and ending in 1901, a

---

36 Joyce owned a copy of this book (Ellmann, *Consciousness* 119). Ledden argues that McCarthy is an underappreciated influence on Joyce. McCarthy’s prolific writing and fierce anticlericalism notwithstanding, perhaps the most striking piece of evidence that supports this claim is McCarthy’s use of the word “transmanfignimicanbandanduality” in one of his novels, which is remarkably similar to Stephen’s “contransmagnificandjewbangtantiality” (U 3.51). See Ledden 209-14.

37 See note 30 of the second chapter of this dissertation.

38 See D. Hyde, *Literary* 583-90.

39 See note 55 of the introduction of this dissertation.
A herculean effort that produced approximately 5,500 pages, mostly from manuscripts stored at Trinity College (R. Byrne et al. 29-30; D. Hyde, *Literary* 583).

The laws garnered the attention of writers outside of Ireland as well. Mill, for example, analyzed them in a remarkably similar vein as Connolly:

Before the Conquest, the Irish people knew nothing of absolute property in land. The land virtually belonged to the entire sept; the chief was little more than the managing member of the association. The feudal idea, which views all rights as emanating from a head landlord, came in with the conquest, was associated with foreign domination, and has never to this day been recognised by the moral sentiments of the people. (513)

Arnold remarked that the “so-called Brehon laws” (*Celtic Literature* 29) and other pre-Norman literature transcribed around this time were “a treasure-house of resources for the history of Celtic life” (30), although he chastised the “mode of dealing with these documents” as “most unsatisfactory” (31). Condescending as this may be, it is certainly an improvement of the views of the first English critics of the Brehon laws from the sixteenth century. Sir Francis Bacon, for instance, loathed the Irish’s “barbarous laws, customs, their *brehon laws*, habits of apparel, their poets or heralds that enchant them in savage manners, and sundry other dregs of barbarism and rebellion” (qtd. in Hackett 105; my emphasis). Engels held that “the land had been the common property of the clan” in Ireland (Marx and Engels, *Ireland* 340) and that “it was never the Irishman, but only the Englishman who held land as private property” (qtd. in K. Anderson 139). He also vaguely alluded to the Brehon laws in his unpublished history of Ireland, noting that the conflicts the clans incessantly engaged in

---

40 Connolly quoted this passage in *Erin’s Hope* (6-7) but did not include a formal citation. I was able to find the source, an essay entitled “England and Ireland” (1868) (505-32).
“seem to have been governed by certain customs which held the ravages within definite limits, so that the country did not suffer too much” (Marx and Engels, *Ireland* 203). There was enough confidence in this reading of the laws – the supposed system of common landownership, “democratic” elections of clan leaders, and wider egalitarianism – that gave Irish socialists the impetus to constantly reference them in their justifications of their proposal to transform the nation from a formerly primitive communist society to a modern socialist one.\footnote{For more historical writings on the Brehon laws from the nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, see G. Campbell 156-57; Hackett 105-6; MacNeill, *Phases* 206, 319-20; Moore 239-65; and O’Grady 2:179n1 among other sources.}

As compelling as this interpretation was to proponents of a classless society (or, perhaps, a pre-industrial and pre-modernist one), it is largely unfounded. Common landownership within the various fragmented tribes of Ireland simply did not exist. The Brehon laws did in fact uphold and regulate private property as well as hunting, grazing, fishing, and even mining rights (Allen 37; F. Kelly 105). There were a few reasons why the common landownership narrative was put forth. Published in six volumes as *Ancient Law and Institutes of Ireland*, the laws did not have the benefit of extensive peer review or critical analyses available to other ancient manuscripts (R. Byrne et al. 29-30) (which perhaps lends some credence to Arnold’s criticism cited earlier in the chapter). The compilers also mistranslated a key term that led otherwise astute readers such as Connolly and Mill astray. They often mistranslated the Irish word *fine* as “tribe” rather than “kingroup.” Common use of land existed within a *kingroup* rather than the tribe. Moreover, common use of land within a *tíath*, or “tribe,” did exist *de jure*, yet was severely curtailed. Rather than unfettered access to land and its resources, tribesmen were limited to minor privileges such as brief use of
fishing nets in a stream, collecting small amounts of wood, or cutting rods for a bier in another kinggroup’s land (F. Kelly 105-6). Although codification of private property rights was not quite as explicit in the Brehon laws as they were in their Cambro-Norman counterparts, there is clear evidence which shows restrictions on property ownership and common usage as well as punishments for violations thereof (Allen 37; F. Kelly 105-6). Mistranslations aside, one reason why these property laws were not quite as explicit was due to their “poetic impulse”: that is, many of the laws were written in some kind of poetic verse rather than prose, and the brehons, or judicial administrators from which the laws derive their name, had to rely on a tribe’s informal and unwritten cultural and social values in addition to written code (Kleefeld 48-53). Although common landownership technically existed, it was so limited and loosely defined that it did not function de facto – certainly not in the way as Connolly and many others described them.

Moreover, the concepts that the tribes were democratically elected with the chief functioning as, in McCarthy’s words, “an elected trustee” and that the tribes were more egalitarian than feudal societies were exaggerated. Although the chiefs were elected by vote among a select group of prominent kinsgroup leaders, Irish society was heavily stratified. Clear class distinctions existed and social status was fundamental in legal transactions. Status differences “were the corner-stone of Irish law” (Ó Síocháín, Politics 65); it is “difficult to exaggerate the importance of status and honour in early Irish society” (Mac Niocaill 42). A man’s status and honor, often quantified as “honor-price,” were mostly determined by his material wealth such as cattle. The “amount of honour-price determined the limits of one’s capacity to enter contracts or to act as surety for another” (Ó Síocháín, Politics 70). There were clear laws of inheritance that, though not identical to primogeniture, were similar in
that they were still based on a rigid kinsmen system. The system was slightly more progressive than primogeniture; the parceling of an inheritance was determined, for example, by the youngest “recognized” son, yet the eldest son got the first choice of parcel. Other “unrecognized” sons, such as those who were “conceived in the bushes,” were excluded (F. Kelly 102-3). Regardless, there were clear social stratifications ranging from the clan leader to the lowly small farmer that were similar to feudal stratifications. Contrary to the belief that all people in pre-Norman Ireland considered themselves equals, class divisions were prevalent, especially among the upper classes. A “strong sense of superiority was fostered by the aristocracy” (Ó Síocháín, Politics 72). There were even a class of lesser clans who were reduced to working as landless laborers. Up to the seventeenth century, when Brehon laws were still in place in certain parts of Ireland, prominent chiefs of clans such as the O’Briens and McCoughlins exercised demesne cultivation, requiring labor services from members of lesser clans (Allen 38; N. Patterson 43). Even Marx himself would come to denounce the system of land ownership in primitive communistic societies as “Oriental despotism,” arguing later in his life that this sort of land ownership, both in its vulgar and more nuanced interpretations, constituted a sort of primitive feudalism that extracted a surplus, which had no surplus value, at the local level (K. Anderson 155-57).

There were also, of course, slaves, who had no legal rights. As in most other societies at the time, slaves were comprised of prisoners-of-war, kidnapped foreigners, debtors, and in some cases children who were sold by their own parents (F. Kelly 95-98). This was a fact openly acknowledged by many Irish nationalists. Connolly himself criticized this system in his discussion of its whitewashing by an American newspaper article from 1908: “[D]o

---

42 See, for example, M. McCarthy 25 and Moore 239-41. Both of them admit to the existence of slavery and servitude during this time.
not ask us to believe that a princess was anything more than a type of the class to which she belonged – a predatory useless class – a class whose predatory proclivities hindered the free development of the nation and prepared the way for its subjection” (1:367). The article in question, “Colleens of Old” in *The Boston Pilot*, wrote fawningly (not so differently, arguably, than Gerty MacDowell in “Nausicaa”) of a mythical Irish “princess” attended to by dozens of servant girls: “The girl of the upper (flaith) class in ancient Erie commanded luxuries and privileges which would cause even that present empress of the world, the American girl of the 20th century, to open her eyes in admiring amaze” (Walsh 2). As misguided Connolly was regarding common landownership and the stratification of pre-Norman Irish society, even he could not redact the existence of slaves and servants, especially female ones. Although this misrepresentation of common landownership and the other aspects of the Brehon laws were common in the nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, there were a few scholars who had their doubts. For example, one scholar, George Campbell, expressed his reservations in an academic journal from 1870. Although he did not challenge the notion of common landownership *per se*, he did challenge the exceptionalism of the Brehon land laws. The laws, he claimed, were “supplemented from other sources,” and even speculated that they were a “corruption of the Roman law introduced by the early Christian priests” (qtd. in Westropp 348). Overall, landownership and class relations in pre-Norman Ireland was a slightly less formal and undeveloped version of the feudalism that was

---

43 One term found by the laws used to indicate a unit of land was *cumal*, which means “female slave” (F. Kelly 99). Although Connolly was critical of female servitude in pre-Norman Ireland in this passage, the term *cumal* is incongruous with Connolly’s argument against progeniture and its incompatibility with supposed Irish sensibilities cited earlier in *Re-Conquest*. 
supposedly “imposed” upon Ireland – a far cry from the nearly prelapsarian society Connolly, Brady, and others envisioned.44

The supposedly natural Irish inclination toward common landownership would not be exclusively extrapolated from the Brehon laws. As mentioned before, socialists such as Brady believed this concept was revived by the Young Irelander movement and its leaders such as Lalor and Mitchel. The former, whom Connolly deemed an “Irish apostle of revolutionary Socialism” (1:164), “advocated the great guiding principles of collectivism” (T. Brady 14). Ostensibly, some of his writings suggest this. Lalor wrote in “The Rights of Ireland” (1848), for example, that:

[T]he entire ownership of Ireland, moral and material, up to the sun and down to the centre, is vested of right in the people of Ireland; that they, and none but they are the land-owners and law-makers of this island; that . . . all titles to land invalid not conferred or confirmed by them; and that this full right of ownership may and ought to be asserted and enforce by any and all means which God has put in the power of man. (67)

Bloom seems to subscribe to this view in “Ithaca,” associating himself with Lalor along with other Young Irelanders and Fenians such as Mitchel, J. F. X. O’Brien, and Davitt (U 17.1645-49). However, Connolly’s and Brady’s depiction of Lalor and the Young Irelanders as a precursor to modern Irish socialism was also based on dubious conjecture. Although Lalor can be accredited with linking the issue of land ownership with the national independence movement, his specific plans did not call for the abolition of private property or even land

44 For more on the Brehon laws, particularly its land laws, and the social stratification in pre-Norman Ireland, see Allen 35-39; Bhreathnach 15-46; R. Byrne et al. 29-31; F. Kelly 1-124; Kleefeld 45-55; Mac Niocaill 42-69; Nicholls 50-76; O’Dowd 120-47; Ó Siocháin, Politics 52-82; N. Patterson 43-63; and Westropp 342-51.
collectivization. Rather, he was interested in transferring, not abolishing, the rights of ownership to the Irish people rather than to the British state (Allen 91-92; Purdie 86-88). He made clear in his writings that he believed in the necessity of private property and class inequality. He wrote in “The Rights of Labour” (1848) that:

[I]t must necessarily happen that great inequalities must exist in every society in relation to wealth; that, in fact, there must be rich and poor. This arrangement of society is just, and could not be otherwise. Although some may be born poor, and therefore inheriting no accumulated labour or capital, they cannot, therefore, justify demand that a new distribution of wealth should take place – that they property of the rich should be given to them. (115-16)

This is a direct contradiction of socialist economic thought, certainly something that Connolly and Brady would not have agreed with. Lalor believed that Ireland should be a land of small farmers rather than a dictatorship of the proletariat. He wrote very little about the laboring classes. His campaigns against the British state were grounded in a sense of agrarian redistribution – although not necessarily in common landownership that Irish socialists wanted. His criticism of capitalism would ultimately be considered of the bourgeois kind, not in the socialist vein of Connolly or Brady. These views had more in common with American political economist Henry George, whose call for the abolition of land ownership was popular in Ireland in the late-nineteenth century but fell short of socialist political economy (Gibson, “‘Let All Malthusiasts’” 68-69). Lalor’s views have more in common with the actual Brehon land laws than the Irish socialist interpretation of those laws.

These misrepresentations would find their way into Joyce’s work. Interestingly, one of the biggest admirers of the Brehon laws is referenced in Dubliners and has already been
referenced in this chapter. Father Burke, or “Father Tom” as he was affectionately known, was a popular Dominican preacher known in Ireland, Great Britain, and the United States for his nationalist sermons. In “Grace,” he was praised by Kernan and his friends: “And his voice! God! hadn’t he a voice!” Kernan recalls listening to a sermon of his on Pope Pius IX, “the late Pope” or “The Prisoner of the Vatican” (D 142). Pius IX was infamous for being confined in Vatican City and stripped of his temporal powers and possessions by King Victor Emmanuel II, the first Italian king, in 1859. His successor, Pope Leo XIII, was also known as “the prisoner of the Vatican.” Leo XIII was a staunch anti-socialist and anti-nationalist and was unsympathetic to the Irish nationalist movement (142n3; Gifford, Joyce Annotated 104-5), which is ironic considering the men’s avowed nationalism. It is fitting Burke is referenced here. Given that “Grace” revolves around the men’s errors regarding the Church’s history and rather shallow understanding of Christian theology, it is perhaps a reflection of Burke’s own at least partially skewered knowledge of his nation’s history. “Father Tom” praised Ireland’s alleged lack of slavery and serfdom during ancient times, yet both the clerical and nationalist factions he was a part of would use that history to undermine the socialist case in Ireland, one that was intent on abolishing the “wage slavery” and servitude of the proletariat endemic in modern times.

Brehon historiography resonates in Ulysses as well. In “Proteus,” Stephen recalls Kevin Egan’s “prowl[ing] with colonel Richard Burke, tanist of his sept, under the walls of Clerkenwell” (3.247-48). Burke was an Irish-American who fought in the American Civil War (he was a captain in the Union army with a colonel’s brevet) and an active Fenian. Arrested and imprisoned in England in 1867, he was one of the Fenians who was supposed to have been rescued in a gunpowder plot against the Clerkenwell Prison of London in
December of that year. The bombing did not free any prisoners, but it did result in twelve
civilian deaths and dozens of injuries, provoking public outrage against the Fenians
throughout the United Kingdom. Stephen here associates Burke with the Brehon-era tanist,
or the successor-apparent of a clan chief, of a sept, or clan (Quinlivan and Rose 9-14; U-A
52, 56; U-N 571). This brief allusion “conflates Fenian violence with a romantic aura of the
Brehon past” (Gibson, “Nobody Owns” 956). Although it conflates Fenian rather than
socialist sentiments, the two are not mutually exclusive. As I shall argue, Fenianism (and the
other manifestations of Irish republicanism) shared much in common with Irish socialism:
mainly, an advocacy of revolutionary action, an opposition to imperialism, and a general
homage to Irish exceptionalism (although this last facet was much stronger in republicanism
than in socialism). Several references to the injustices of property law and landlordism in
Ulysses – George Russell’s sardonic phrase “exploitable ground” (9.106, 272), Father
Cowley’s dispute with his Protestant landlord, Hugh C. Love (10.882-954), the latter having
a writ “not worth the paper it’s printed on” (10.945), the “Irish evicted tenants” who demand
Bloom be “[s]jambok[ed]” or whipped for his misdeeds (15.1882), among others – are
indicative of these factors, both supporting as well as criticizing their varied implications
(Gibson, “Nobody Owns” 956-58). These allusions point to something about Joyce’s work
that has been demonstrated in this dissertation several times: that Joyce understood the
underlying injustices of these problems having been caused by the British imperial state, yet
was critical of the nationalistic or otherwise questionable reactions they provoked. As Gibson
writes, “Joyce’s point seems clear enough: opposition to Irish land law did not necessarily
breed righteous anger and programs of reform. It also went hand in hand with chicanery,
vindictiveness, scapegoating, and extra-legal violence” (958) – all of which will be made abundantly clear in the sections that follow.

The Phoenix Park Murders of 1881/2. Right after Bloom reminisces about his non-involvement in the protest against Joseph Chamberlain discussed earlier in the chapter, he turns his attention to another event he took no part in: the Phoenix Park Murders. “Never know who you’re talking to. Corny Kelleher he has Harvey Duff in his eye. Like that Peter or Denis or James Carey that blew the gaff on the invincibles” (U 8.441-43). Bloom associates Corny, rumored to be a police informer, with James Carey, a member of the Invincibles who testified against his co-conspirators for their perpetration of the murders, only to be killed himself by an Fenian sympathizer. Earlier in “Lotus Eaters,” Bloom makes one of his characteristic blunders with regard to Carey, confusing him with his brother Peter as well as the unrelated Denis Carey and Peter Claver: “That fellow that turned queen’s evidence on the invincibles he used to receive the, Carey was his name, the communion every morning. This very church. Peter Carey, yes. No, Peter Claver I am thinking of. Denis Carey. And just imagine that. Wife and six children at home. And plotting that murder all the time” (5.378-82). Unlike Bloom, James was willing and able to wield cold steel for his political convictions, albeit he turned on his compatriots when he faced conviction of another sort. Although Bloom acknowledges the grotesque contrast between Carey’s family life and his violent extremism, his casual remembrance of these men presents a stark contrast of its own to the brutal acts of political terrorism they committed. The Phoenix Park Murders was one of the most shocking acts of political terrorism in Ireland in the nineteenth century (E. Nolan, Nationalism 124). It would perhaps only be surpassed thirty-four years later with the Easter
Rising. In *Ulysses*, the murders are referenced directly or implicitly in almost every episode (Hodgart 23), and are described in contradictory and incorrect ways by several of the characters, lending credence to a number of critics who have tried to establish Joyce’s support, disapproval, or ambivalence toward violent terror or other kinds of political radicalism.⁴⁵ Although I do not believe a conclusive answer can be provided with regard to this, there is one aspect to the murders that has been chronically unevaluated in Joycean scholarship: the murders’ relationship with socialism, particularly the reactions socialists and revolutionists had of them at the time and afterwards as well as their wider relevance to socialist historiography.

It should be stated clearly that the Invincibles was not a socialist group. The members were an assorted array of Fenians and nationalists. Some of them had ties with the IRB, although the organization disowned them for their radicalism. The one factor that all the members had in common outside of their nominally republican ideals was their commitment to armed struggle and extrajudicial violence, something the IRB in the late-nineteenth century was conflicted about. On May 6th, 1882 (about three months after Joyce was born), five or six men of the group stabbed to death the newly inaugurated Chief Secretary for Ireland Lord Frederick Cavendish and Undersecretary Thomas Henry Burke in Phoenix Park. The murders, getaway, and ensuing investigation, trials, and executions of the perpetrators in 1882 and 1883 were a sensation. The murders provoked outrage from all factions of the nationalist debate. Parnell, released just four days prior from prison after the Kilmainham Treaty in which he promised Prime Minster William Gladstone to moderate the campaign against Irish landlordism in return for the abatement for tenant rent-arrears, was

⁴⁵ See E. Nolan, *Nationalism* 125-28 for an engagement with these varied criticisms.
mortified after hearing about them and offered his retirement from politics (Corfe 204-5; Davitt, *Fall* 358; E. Nolan, *Nationalism* 128). Henry George, who happened to be in Dublin at the time, said (rather hyperbolically) it was “[o]ne of the worst things that has ever happened for Ireland” (qtd. in Davitt, *Fall* 357). No prominent political or cultural figure in Ireland defended the event outright. Unionists used the murders to link the IRB, Land League, and other Irish agitators with radical terrorism (Backus 35-38). Not even Engels condoned them, writing in a letter that “the ‘heroic deed’ in Phoenix Park appears if not as pure stupidity, then at least as pure Bakuninist, bagging, purposeless ‘propagande par le fait’” (Marx and Engels, *Ireland* 336).

Although few supported the murders, there were some who apologized or otherwise attempted to rationalize them. Wilde, for example, said to an audience in New York that “[w]e forget how much England is to blame. She is reaping the fruit of seven centuries of injustice” (qtd. in H. Hyde 89).\(^46\) Socialists, utopian or otherwise, reiterated the position that England was facing the unfathomable fury of Irish extremism because, and not in spite of, its colonial subjugation. The murders reshaped the debates about the legitimacy and sagacity of Home Rule, the Land League, and other constitutional efforts. Unionists and conservatives predictably used the event to highlight the foolishness of making concessions to Irish agitators, whether they were moderate or not. *The Observer* (London) even went as far as to recommend declaring martial law in Ireland (Corfe 209-12, 264). However, other nationalists such as Davitt claimed the murders aided Parnell in distancing himself from extremism and

---

\(^46\) Four years later, Wilde would express his support for the anarchists involved in the Haymarket Riot in Chicago and criticized the ensuing trial (Ellmann, *Oscar Wilde* 273-74; Van de Kamp and Leahy 148), another indication his socialist sympathies.
bolstering the concessions made in the Kilmainham Treaty, leading to the amelioration of landlordism and paving way for his near-successful goal of Home Rule:

Probably no political leader ever found himself in so dangerous a position as Mr. Parnell occupied at this time. The “treaty” had done him great harm in Ireland. Almost all the “suspects” repudiated its rumored terms. It was “a deal” with the government, and under the circumstances that condemned it in their eyes. In America it was denounced as “the sale of the Land League.” On the face of it, it wore the appearance of a bargain with the defeated coercionists to get out of Kilmainham, and as a virtual surrender of the government to its enemies. On this state of things the park murders came as a cyclonic sensation, sweeping everything else out of the path of a tragic event fraught with disastrous consequences to a movement which had a few hours previously reached almost to the goal of success. In fact, the Phoenix Park murders saved Mr. Parnell from the perils which lurked in the terms of the compact, while both events snatched from the Land League the guerdon of triumph, and literally smote it to the death which the treaty had planned for it by other means. (*Fall 362*)

Davitt’s analysis is indicative of the contradictions of radicalism. On the one hand, they did not want to engage in constitutional, parliamentarian, or otherwise “mainstream” tactics which they felt were anemic and futile. On the other hand, their efforts aided those, such as Parnell, who championed those measures. The murders absolved Parnell from the appearance of capitulating to the demands of the British and the landlords. The Invincibles inadvertently strengthened the Land League campaign rather than hindered it. The “tight sequence” of events, the “Kilmainham treaty/murders/Irish Party denunciation of the murders . . .
embody at one the close ties and the long-standing conflict between constitutional nationalism and physical-force nationalism” (Fairhall, Question 19). It was its sensationalism that furthered the group’s cause, but in the opposite way they had intended.

This sensationalism is evident in Ulysses, particularly in its portrayal in “Aeolus.” According to Spoo, this portrayal demonstrates that the “signified of the political crime is always teleologically beyond the signifier, outpacing it and beckoning to it from the as yet unrealized future. The Phoenix Park murders were, in this sense, a rhetorical gesture whose ultimate referent . . . was Irish independence, though from an ethical standpoint the signifiers in these two cases are utterly disparate” (Language 132). Crawford was not too concerned with the ethical ramifications of the murders. In describing the coverage of the event to Stephen, Crawford was ebullient in how Ignatius Gallaher managed to wire a report to the New York World. Gallaher mapped out the topographic details – the exact location of the murders, the getaway route, the layout of Phoenix Park, and so forth – by using an advertisement of “Bransome’s coffee” (U 7.654) from the March 17th edition of the Weekly Freeman. As Harald Beck outlines, there are a number of errors and anachronisms in Crawford’s recollection. He mistakenly claims the murders took place in 1881 rather than 1882 (U 7.632) – a mistake Bloom himself makes in “Eumaeus” (16.608). The advertisement he used should have been from Branson’s, not “Bransome’s,” the latter never having existed. The March 17th edition of the Weekly Freeman could not have been published in either 1882 or 1904, as March 17th of both years fell outside of the newspaper’s weekly publication day of Saturday. Beck rules out the possibility that Joyce made these errors, especially with “Bransome’s,” as Branson’s “was a household word at the turn of the century.” They are, rather, insertions by Joyce in his characterization of Crawford, who makes a number of errors
throughout the episode (as mentioned in the first chapter of this dissertation). Crawford describes Gallaher’s inversion of the advertisement as an “[i]nspiration of genius.” He “[g]ave it to them on a hot plate . . . the whole bloody history” (U 7.651, 676-77; my emphasis). “Bloody history” may be an inadvertent pun on Crawford’s part, but it is a suitable encapsulation of not only the murders themselves but their varied transfigurations in the immediate aftermath as well as decades proceeding them. Crawford does not comment on the murders themselves but rather the way in which they were reported by Gallaher across the continent. Here the events are reconstructed using a coffee advertisement, “paralys[ing] Europe” (7.628) with the most ubiquitous of texts. The coverage of the murders briefly paralyzed the constitutional efforts of the Land League and Parnell. As Gayle Backus points out, Irish nationalists after the murders were “politically neutralized and representationally discredited in the now-rabid English newspapers. The murders scuttled the Kilmainham Treaty, and this breakdown . . . was followed by an extended flurry of sometimes gruesome political theatre” (36). In 1887, The Times (London) ran a series of articles, “Parnellism and Crime,” that attempted to implicate Parnell directly with the murders and wider criminality. It claimed to have access to a number of letters Parnell wrote in which he expressed sympathy with political terrorism – letters that were later revealed to be forgeries by Richard Pigott. In one of these letters, Parnell explicitly condoned the Phoenix Park Murders (Colum 16; Hodgart 24; Mulvagh 71). Although Parnell was exonerated by a government commission in 1889, the travails he had to face only hindered his efforts, and certainly did not serve him well when he faced his ultimate downfall. The “rhetorical gestures” that Spoo wrote of had real ramifications for both the radical and constitutional traditions of Irish nationalism.
These ramifications reverberated in increasingly severe and at times bizarre ways. Crawford’s appropriation of Bransome’s coffee advertisement aside, the murders would be commemorated with greater ferocity up to and beyond 1904. In *The Illustrated Dictionary of Dublin for Tourists & Citizens* (1895), for example, the precise location of where the murders took place, across from the Viceregal Lodge opposite of Áras an Úachtaráin, was highlighted directly (Cosgrave and Strangeways 241) – a rather grim spectacle for a book devoted largely to tourists, indicative of the murders’ iconic place in Irish historical memory. Although incongruous at first, this actually was an objective of modern political terrorism. As Enda Duffy supposes, terrorism “has a specifically modernist appearance” and had “become the material of high literature” by the end of the century (*Subaltern* 10, 135). The exact location of the murders would be turned into a kind of memorial, a small cross etched into the lawn, sometimes garnished with flowers, which remains to this day. It had gained a reputation in the late-nineteenth century which it maintained well into the twentieth. In a letter to Leon Trotsky in 1938, American novelist and socialist James T. Farrell recalls seeing this cross after having been led to it by trade unionist James Larkin:

He showed me something in Ireland that few people in Dublin know about. In the Parnell days, a terrorist organization, composed almost exclusively of Dublin workingmen was formed and named the Invincibles. The Invincibles committed the famous Phoenix Park murders in front of the vice-regal lodge, and were denounced by the Church, by Parnell, and by almost the entire Irish nation. There are no monuments in Ireland to the Invincibles. They died in isolation, some of them defiant to the end in their utter isolation. At the spot across from the vice-regal lodge in Phoenix Park, where the murders were committed, there is a patch of earth alongside
of the park walk. No matter how often grass is planted over this spot the grass is torn up by the roots, and this spot of earth is left, and always, there is a cross marked into the dirt in commemoration of the Invincibles. Every week, someone – principally, I believe, one of Larkin’s boys – goes there and marks that cross. This has been going on for a long time.

Farrell correctly points out that the Invincibles were composed of Dublin laborers, which is ironic given their lack of association with socialism and their tangible effect on rural Ireland. However, Farrell may be mistaken in assuming that the cross commemorates the Invincibles rather than its victims. As recently as 2015, the memorial is thought by some to be a dedication to the latter (McNally). Not even a simple cross etched into the grass can be agreed upon with regard to the murders, with socialists holding it to be a commemoration of the perpetrators of political terror rather than its victims. This is perhaps a testament to their enduring controversy and relevance to Irish socialism and, moreover, analogous to Joyce’s own ambiguity with regard to the Invincibles. At the very least, his interest in them was evident early in his career. In his Subject Notebook, Joyce noted a book about the group in a list of Irish history books he intended to read: The Irish National Invincibles and Their Times (1894) by P. J. P. Tynan (Van Mierlo 7). Although Joyce did not own a copy in his Trieste library, it is possible he read it, at least in part.  

The book, published by the Irish National Invincible Publishing Company, is unsurprisingly sympathetic to their cause. The text pompously lauds the Invincibles in ways Crawford could appreciate. Tynan, or “Number 1” as he liked to fashion himself, was most likely a minor intermediary of the plotters. He wrote so disparagingly of Parnell, Home Rulers, Land Leaguers, and other “provincialists” while

47 See note 65 of the second chapter of this dissertation.
at the same wrote so unctuously about the Invincibles’ nobility and heroism that his book cannot be considered a fair account (Corfe 135-36), even by the standards of historiographical trepidations as evaluated in this dissertation. The ending of the chapter on the murders themselves is emblematic of Tynan’s turgid rhetorical style:

The onward march of the human race required that the heights around it should be ablaze with noble and enduring lessons of courage. Deeds of daring dazzle history, and form one of the guiding lights of man. The dawn dares when it rises. To strive, to brave all risks, to persist, to persevere, to be faithful to yourself, to grapple hand to hand with destiny, to surprise defeat with the little terror it inspires, at one time to confront unrighteous power, at another to defy intoxicated triumph, to hold fast, to hold hard – such is the example which the nations need, and the light that electrifies them. The same puissant lightning darts from the torch of Prometheus and the steel blade of Joseph Brady. (410)

The steel blade – the cold steel – of the Invincibles was forged out of smithy of republican rather than socialist radicalism, yet the passion it evoked, its dubious historiography, its perpetration by urban laborers, and appropriation by republican nationalists perhaps link the two factions in ways not frequently acknowledged. Bob Purdie claims that the republican tradition in Ireland “contained deep wells of radical ideas which would be tapped as soon as republicans were confronted by social struggles. Out of this would develop a linkage, at one level, of the national and class struggle, and at another level a ‘fusion’ between Marxism and republicanism” (79). This fusion, as it were, can be found in Joyce’s treatment in the Phoenix Park Murders – but it would come into full force in his treatment of a historical event that
only recently ended by 1904 and will be the subject of the concluding section of this chapter: the Boer War.

_The Boer War: Socialist Resistance to Imperialism and Cultural Hybridity._ When Bloom retrieves his clandestine letter from Martha Clifford in “Lotus Eaters,” he turns his attention to a nearby army recruitment poster in Westland Row:


Bloom correctly identifies the regiment of his departed father-in-law, Major Brian Tweedy, by the subtle distinctions of their uniform. The Grenadier Guards did indeed wear bearskin hats with a white hackle plum whereas the Fusiliers wore racoon hats and pointed cuffs (U-A 86; U-N 583).48 There may not be an underlying reason as to why Bloom’s command of minutiae is impressive here when he is so often mistaken on such matters. Given the rest of the passage, however, it perhaps accentuates the British army’s controversial presence in Dublin – and not for the obvious reason. At the beginning of the century, the army decided

---

48 Gifford and Seidman claim Bloom confuses the two uniforms, although this could be a misreading of their own assuming they placed the wrong emphasis on “pointed cuffs”; in other words, that Bloom thought the Grenadiers, not the Fusiliers, wore the pointed cuffs. I am willing to give Bloom the benefit of the doubt in this instance.
to permit soldiers garrisoned in Dublin to sleep outside the barracks. This was, in practice, the army commanders’ tacit approval of letting soldiers associate with prostitutes (as seen in “Circe”). This decision was primarily motivated to encourage enlistment that was sorely needed for the newly started Boer War. In other words, the conflict against the Transvaal Republic and the Orange Free State needed certain incentives that the army could not legally provide – something that was not lost on a number of Dublin denizens. Indeed, indignant Irish nationalists often accused the British Empire and its army of depending on such licentious incentivizing, as discussed in the previous chapter with regard to Gogarty’s “Ugly England” articles in *Sinn Féin* alluded to in this passage.49 Gonne would not tolerate it, and as Bloom accurately recalls she and her newly founded women’s organization *Inghinidhe na hÉireann* (or “Daughters of Ireland”) protested the measure by distributing pamphlets throughout Dublin in 1900. In her memoirs, she remembers “O’Connell Street at night used to be full of Red coats walking with their girls. We got out leaflets on the shame of Irish girls consorting with the soldiers of the enemy of their country.” The campaign, however, was not exclusive to women, nor was it solely focused on sexual immorality. The activists also targeted soldiers, recruitment officers, and potential recruits, warning them not to willfully enter an “unjust” war being waged in South Africa: “Our girls used bravely to follow the recruiting sergeants even into the public houses, distributing thousands of leaflets . . . setting forth Catholic teaching to the effect that anyone taking part in a war, knowing it to be unjust, and killing anybody, was guilty of murder” (292). The “disgrace to our Irish capital” was not merely a matter of sexual proclivities or even of national pride, as pertinent they may have been. It was also a matter of resistance to the Boer War and, by extension, to the United

49 See note 56 of the second chapter of this dissertation.
Kingdom’s “halfseasover empire.” Resistance to the Boer War in Ireland was fierce and substantial, agitating already galvanized nationalist movements (Condon 93-100). The antiwar movement benefited Irish socialists, who wanted to rise in prominence. Opposition to the war would unite for the first time previously disparate socialist and republican movements in Ireland, laying a precedent that would endure, if haphazardly, through the Easter Rising. It would provide Connolly one of his first chances to lead public agitation in Dublin. It would also prepare Casement’s transition from a dutiful civil servant of the British imperial state to an Irish dissenter. Socialists considered the war to be an egregious symptom of British (and European) imperialism, fitting comfortably within its ideological focus on historical materialism. Joyce’s treatment of the Boer War in *Ulysses* is substantial and well-documented. I believe his historiographical treatment of it is remarkably close to the socialist one. However, in a similar way in which Bloom does not mention the war by name or by inference despite the fact he was accurate on much everything else, the socialist treatment of the war, and its historical precedents, have a glaring blindspot that I wish to interrogate: its failure to properly recognize and align itself with the colonial subjects it claimed to support – not the Boers, but rather the native African population in the Boer states who received scant attention in Ireland, as well as the other non-Western societies of the European empires. I wish to argue that Joyce, although not stridently or dogmatically, made this apparent in his treatment of the war.

References to South African affairs, predominately to the war, occur at least twenty one times in eleven episodes of *Ulysses* (Parsons 77; Temple-Thurston 249). The war was not just another newsworthy foreign conflict in a distant land; it had a palpable effect on the everyday lives of people throughout the United Kingdom that would not be surpassed until
World War I. Joyce was seventeen when the war began, and by June 16th, 1904, it still resonated in the collective Irish psyche. In “Scylla and Charybdis,” Stephen associates Shakespeare with British imperialist violence, specifically by likening him to Kipling, translating the French subtitle of *Hamlet, Le Distrait*, as the “absentminded beggar” (*U* 9.125), the title of Kipling’s pro-war poem, as well as to Algernon Charles Swinburne, whose “On the Death of Colonel Benson” (1902) praises the British use of concentration camps (Parsons 78; Toker 50): “Khaki Hamlets don’t hesitate to shoot. The bloodboltered shambles in act five is a forecast of the concentration camp sung by Swinburne” (*U* 9.133-35). In “Oxen of the Sun,” Mina Purefoy names her baby “darling little Bobsy (called after our famous hero of the South African war, lord Bobs of Waterford and Candahar)” (14.1331-32) – that is, Field-Marshal Frederick Sleigh Roberts, first Earl Roberts of Kandahar, Pretoria, and Waterford, the first commander of the newly formed Irish Guards regiment, the eventual commander of the entire British forces during the war, and the pride of Dublin’s Anglo-Irish Protestant classes (Booker 100; D’Arcy 157-58). Although Bloom does not mention the war in either of his recollections in “Lotus Eaters” and “Lestrygonians,” he is reminded in “Ithaca” of a friend who died serving in the war, Percy Apjohn (*U* 17.1251-52). Despite this, he is accused of conflicting loyalty (a perennial issue for Bloom) in “Oxen of the Sun” for his ownership of Canadian government stock (14.908-12). Stephen is also accused of being “a proBoer” by Private Compton in “Circe” (15.4602), launching a series of events between Stephen and the two soldiers that did not end well for the former. Molly longingly remembers a former lover, Lieutenant Stanley Gardner, who was killed there (18.388-90). The Boer War

---

50 In “Ireland: Island of Saints and Sages,” Joyce actually praised Lord Roberts as a “genius” who, along with Field Marshal Horatio Herbert Kitchener, another Anglo-Irishman, restored “the endangered prestige” of the British campaign in South Africa (*OCPW* 117).
had not entered historical memory quite in the same way as other events discussed in this
dissertation. It had ended just two years before Bloomsday. The memories of lost loved ones,
horrifying stories of guerilla warfare and anti-insurgency tactics, including the infamous
concentration camps, and the underlying causes of the war – mainly, the expansion of the
British imperial state for resources such as gold and diamonds – were still vivid. The Irish
were keenly aware that many of their own fought for the British as well as against them,
including Gonne’s husband John MacBride, who raised the Irish Transvaal Brigade and was
executed after the Easter Rising (McCracken).

Still, the two years after the war had ended started to transform the local memories
and experiences those in *Ulysses* had of it. Molly offers a poignant example of this. She
remembers she was coldly received in the last concert she sang in due to her perceivably pro-
British sentiments: “the last concert I sang at where its over a year ago when was it St Teresas
hall Clarendon St little chits of missies they have now singing Kathleen Kearney and her like
on account of father being in the army and my singing the absentminded beggar and wearing
a brooch for Lord Roberts when I had the map of it all and Poldy not Irish enough” (18.374-79).
Although the war had ended, Molly realizes that she was not invited to perform at the
venue again for her political statement of singing Kipling’s poem and wearing the brooch,
as well as for factors she could not control, her father being an officer in the British army
and Bloom not being an “authentic” Irishman. Kathleen Kearney, from “A Mother” in
Dubliners, replaced her due to her homage to cultural nationalism as evinced in the story and
possibly pro-Boer sentiments (Gibson, *Revenge* 266-67; Toker 50). Although this is a
relatively straightforward recollection, Molly inaccurately conflates the war with her other
experiences. She seems to suggest Gardner departed for the war right after their last tryst:
“he was a lovely fellow in khaki and just the right height over me Im sure he was brave too he said I was lovely the evening we kissed goodbye at the canal lock my Irish beauty he was pale with excitement about going away or wed be seen from the road he couldn’t stand properly” \((U \ 18.390-93)\). She also remembers giving him “that clumsy Claddagh ring for luck” \((18.866-67)\), a ring with Celtic-inspired designs used in Galway since the eighteenth century \((U-A \ 623; \ U-N \ 804)\). Although he did die in the war, it was more than a decade after their affair in Gibraltar. Molly’s lack of historical precision reflects a certain impotence on her part in mounting any effective political action that would have saved the likes of Gardner (Booker 101). Unlike most Irish nationalists, she expresses contempt for the Boers, partially rooted, and understandably so, in her loss: “as I never felt they could have made their peace in the beginning or old oom Paul and the rest of the other old Krugers go and fight it out between them instead of dragging on for years killing any finelooking men there were with their fever” \((U \ 18.393-97)\). She becomes increasingly troubled when it is brought up, “where those Boers killed him with their war and fever but they were well beaten all the same” \((18.867-68; \ my \ emphasis)\).\(^{51}\) Molly does not provide political or historical exegesis to support her assertion that the Boers were at fault. It was arguably an emotional reaction, given her powerlessness, and perhaps too based in her belief in inherent female pacifism and accountability: “I dont care what anybody says itd be much better for the world to be governed by the women in it you wouldn’t see women going and killing one another and slaughtering when do you ever see women rolling around drunk like they do or gambling

\(^{51}\) Thomas Jackson Rice argues that this passage was inserted late in the writing stage, approximately September through December 1921, after Joyce read Arthur Conan Doyle’s account of the first year of the war, \textit{The Great Boer War} (1900) (212). Indeed, many of the passages referenced in this section were altered during this time. He argues that the book made Joyce “realize the possibility of threading the theme of imperialism into his portrait of Gardner, and he links Molly’s near-marital infidelity to the near-national infidelity of sleeping with the enemy” as well as enabled him to establish the “motif of anti-heroism that runs throughout \textit{Ulysses}” (209, 212) – an argument that has certain resonance with Gonne’s antiwar campaigns. See Rice 203-34.
every penny they have and losing it on horses yes because a woman whatever she does she knows where to stop” (18.1434-39). Although, as Armstrong points out, she quickly contradicts her own statement – “its some woman read to stick her knife in you I hate that in women no wonder they treat us the way they do” (18.1457-59) – which suggests that the “authority of women as dispensers of justice is no more privileged than that of men” and “the meanings of ‘feminine’ and ‘masculine’ are unstable and open to dispute” (170). Indeed, much of the opposition to the Boer War in Ireland was led by female activists such as Gonne and supported by feminist socialists such as Connolly. Molly’s haphazard recollection of the Boer War suggests that the true sense of justice in its opposition in Ireland was not rooted in Irish cultural or republican nationalism per se but rather in the more radical and socialistic activism.

Indeed, Gonne recalls in her memoir leading the 1899 protest against Chamberlain, which was the first truly largescale demonstration against the war in Ireland, along with Connolly, Griffith, and O’Leary. To her, it was “the duty of Irishmen, till Ireland was free, to fight England whenever and wherever they could and use whatever means came to hand” (298). She remembers Connolly as dedicated, gusty, and daring, not afraid to confront a belligerent police force. When they reached College Green by car and were stopped by the police, he even suggested that they ram through the blockade the constables had set up, teasingly asking her, “Shall I drive in and seize the Castle?” (302) In addition, Anne Marie D’Arcy argues that Bloom makes a circuitous reference to Gonne’s other massive demonstration from that time: the Patriotic Children’s Treat. The demonstration took place on July 1st, 1900 in Clonturk Park as a reaction to the Children’s Day event in Phoenix Park, which celebrated Queen Victoria’s visit to Dublin that April. The treat was ostensibly
organized to protest Victoria’s presence but it was also partially motivated by the opposition to the war. Bloom recalls the Children’s Day in “Lestrygonians”: “The Patriot’s banquet. Eating orangepeels in the park” (U 8.516-17). To D’Arcy, this was reflective of “an Irish child’s birthright under British rule . . . imbued with Orangism” (166). Both events received considerable food donations in the days leading up to them. The Children’s Day received more than three-thousand oranges from unionist donos. It was an oblique reference to the Patriotic Children’s Treat as well, which was organized right after the event and was reliant upon food donations. Bloom also remembers “[h]alfed enthusiasts. Penny roll and a walk with the band . . . . The not far distant day. Homerule sun rising up in the northwest” (U 8.470, 474). The food donations there were thought to be of a lesser quality than those of the other event, hence the “penny roll,” and there were reportedly six marching bands, hence the “walk with the band” (D’Arcy 167). Bloom unconsciously revealed the passionate reactions the Boer War provoked, that they were incited by the visit of a female monarch and at the behest of a female, socialist sympathizer.

Although Gonne, whom Joyce once dubbed the “Irish Joan of Arc” (L 2:85), thought fondly of Connolly, she acknowledged the issues he would have to face: “Though at that time Connolly was little known outside the labour movement, I had absolute confidence in him, but the people with whom I was working hardly knew him and distrusted all Socialists”

---

52 Gonne describes the treat as follows:

We opened a subscription list to defray expenses and all our time, for two days and nights before it, was spent in cutting up hams and making sandwiches in a big store we had secured in Talbot Street. Headed by beflagged lorries piled with casks of ginger beer and twenty-thousand paper bags containing sandwiches, buns and sweets, that wonderful procession of children carrying green branches moved off from Beresford Place, marshalled by the young men of the Celtic Literary Society and the Gaelic Athletic Association on the march to Clonturk Park . . . .

The Patriotic Children’s treat became legendary in Dublin and, even now, middle-aged men and women come up to me in the streets and say: “I was one of the patriotic children at our party when Queen Victoria was over.” (294-95)
The Boer War would give Connolly an opportunity to hone a reputation among Dublin powerbrokers and to build a rapport with socialists and the wider labor movement. On August 27th, 1899, four months before the Chamberlain protest, the ISRP, then under Connolly’s leadership, held a public meeting. Sensing that war was imminent, the party adopted a resolution expressing support for the Transvaal Republic: “this meeting denounces the internal affairs of the Transvaal Republic as an act of criminal aggression, wished long life to the Republic, and trusts that our fellow-countrymen will, if need be, take up arms in defence of their adopted country” (2:30). The meeting was the first time an organization in Ireland publicly expressed allegiance to either of the Boer states (2:31n1). In his wartime writings and speeches, Connolly would expand upon his position, holding the view that the war was based exclusively on material gain for the empire. About a week before the ISRP’s public meeting, he wrote that the impending war would be declared “ostensibly in pursuance of a chivalrous desire to obtain political concessions in their adopted country for British citizens anxious to renounce their citizenship,” yet was really “for the purpose of enabling an unscrupulous gang of capitalists to get into their hands the immense riches of the diamond fields.” It was a manufactured conflict waged by “a government of financiers upon a nation of farmers.” There was, moreover, “no pretence that the war will benefit the English people, yet it is calmly assumed the people will pay for the war, and, if necessary, fight in it” (2:27).

A comparison to Lenin’s *Imperialism* reveals Connolly held a fairly standard socialist position on the matter. Lenin argues that the British government’s rationale for the war was indicative of its attempt to evade the contradictions of imperialism – those between monopoly and free competition and between cartels and decentralized industries, among
others – by claiming it was merely defending the rights of its “subjects” and establishing a “permanent peace” (117):

After the Anglo-Boer War it was quite natural for this worthy caste to exert every effort to console the British middle class and the workers who had lost many of their relatives on the battlefields of South Africa and who were obliged to pay higher taxes in order to guarantee still higher profits for the British financiers. And what better consolation could there be than the theory that imperialism is not so bad; that it stand close to inter- (or ultra-) imperialism, which can ensure permanent peace? (117-18)

Lenin cited a claim Rhodes made in 1895 that imperial acquisition of new land, markets, and natural resources would be the only way to provide for the rising and increasingly capricious British proletariat – in effect, to maintain a “permanent peace”; “If you want to avoid civil war, you must become imperialists” (qtd. in 79). Marx himself wrote in 1859 that “India and Ireland . . . prove only that to be free at home, John Bull must enslave abroad” (Marx and Engels, Ireland 86). Lenin’s exhaustive analysis of capitalism reached a startling conclusion: that as monopolies and trusts dominated what was once a free market, mercantile based economic system, along with the merger of industrial and banking capital that itself created a new finance capital, capitalism would eventually export capital, rather than material goods, and as a result capitalism would reach its highest stage of development, what he deemed to be imperialism. The exportation of capital could not be contained in Europe, so it had to seek new markets elsewhere. Hence the “Scramble for Africa,” “The Great Game,” and the other manifestations of imperialism that came about in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. Only when the highest stage of capitalist development was

53 In The Great Boer War, Doyle called Rhodes, unironically, “a Napoleon of peace” (300).
reached would capitalism instigate its own downfall via the revolutionary proletariat. The acquisition of new territories and the development of industries and exportation of capital to such territories were prerequisites of the workers’ revolution. A proletariat in undeveloped countries had to be developed first in order to usher in this revolution. Therefore, the exploitation of non-Western peoples was considered necessary.

However, a schism developed with regard to the role non-Western or colonial workers should have in workers’ revolution, particularly alongside nationalist movements. Some socialists viewed the absorption of pre-industrial non-Western societies into capitalism and industrialization would be the only way to achieve workers’ liberation, while others held that it was possible for those countries to forgo such absorption, achieving revolutionary movements through a solidarity with the working classes of industrialized Western nations in tandem with national liberation. Marx and Engels themselves shifted their views with regard to this (K. Anderson 1-9). Ireland presented a special challenge being a non-industrialized yet Western European nation. Although initially skeptical of the Irish independence movement, they eventually came to support it. During the 1840s and 1850s, they held that the Irish proletariat had to align itself with the English proletariat in order to achieve liberation and that the dissolution of the Union was counterproductive and unfeasible. However, the Fenian movement of the 1860s led them to believe that the liberation movement was inseparable from the national question. The Fenian Rising of 1867 was the turning point for Marx. “Previously I thought Ireland’s separation from England was impossible,” he wrote to Engels shortly after the rising. “Now I think it inevitable” (Marx and Engels, Ireland 143).
It is the vein of exhaustive and contradictory thinking that Connolly would adopt. Seventeen years before Lenin wrote his thesis on imperialism as the imperialist powers were waging cataclysmic war, Connolly wrote a condensed version of it. In “Socialism and Imperialism,” he engaged the question of how socialists should approach the “barbarous or semi-civilised portions of the globe” (2:34):

Scientific revolutionary socialism teaches us that socialism can only be realised when capitalism has reached its zenith of development; that consequently the advance of nations industrially undeveloped into the capitalistic stage of industry is a thing highly to be desired, since such an advance will breed a revolutionary proletariat in such countries and force forward the socialist movement; and finally, that as colonial expansion and the conquest of new markets are necessary for the prolongation of the life of capitalism, the prevention of colonial expansion and the loss of markets to countries capitalistically developed, such as England, precipitates economic crises there and so gives an impulse to revolutionary thought and helps to shorten the period required to develop backward countries and thus prepare the economic conditions needed for our triumph . . . (2:35)

The position is contradictory. On the one hand, he supports the importation of capitalism to preindustrial nations in order to create revolutionary proletariats there that would foster the transition into socialism. On the other hand, he supports the reduction of such expansion as it would cause economic strife that would in turn hasten that transition in such nations. Connolly’s thought process is rather confusing, especially given the fact he railed against the “importation” of feudalism by the English to Ireland. In “Socialism and Irish Nationalism” (1897), he compounds this inconsistency by encouraging an alliance with the English
working class, acknowledging that their travails are identical to those of the Irish working class:

We recognise rather that during all these centuries the great mass of the British people had no political existence whatever; that England was, politically and socially, terrorized by a numerically small governing class; that the atrocities which have been perpetrated against Ireland are only imputable to the unscrupulous ambition of this class, greedy to enrich itself at the expense of defenceless men; that up to the present generation the great majority of the English people were denied a deliberate voice in the government of their own country; that it is, therefore, manifestly unjust to charge the English people with the past crimes of their Government; and that at the worst we can but charge them with a criminal apathy in submitting to slavery and allowing themselves to be made an instrument of coercion for the enslavement of others. An accusation as applicable to the present as to the past. (1:317)

He concludes by calling for solidarity with the English working class and those of the other developed nations. Connolly acknowledges the socialist belief that working class consciousness is manipulated by the bourgeoisie to aid in their own subjugation. In the United Kingdom, “English working-class consciousness was attenuated by anti-Irish prejudice” (K. Anderson 145). Engels noted in one of his earlier works, The Conditions of the Working Class in England (1845), that the competition English workers faced in the mid-nineteenth century due to the influx of Irish immigrants fostered heated animosity that was directed toward the Irish rather than the bourgeoisie: “it is easy to understand how the degrading position of the English workers, engendered by our modern history, and its immediate consequences, has been still more degraded by the presence of Irish competition”
(104-5). Overall, the animosities and prejudices caused by capitalist development, amplified during its highest stage of imperialism, presented a series of complications for socialists that were not easily surmountable.\textsuperscript{54}

These complications affected the antiwar movement in Ireland, and would give Joyce room to critique the blindspots of socialist thought. The antiwar literature and other expressions of pro-Boer sentiment of the period in Ireland (and virtually everywhere else in the developed world) seldom mentioned South Africa’s largest ethnic group, the indigenous Africans, and when they did it was usually horrifically unflattering.\textsuperscript{55} The solidarity both republicans and socialists felt they had with the Boers did not extend to the African population. In Joyce’s work, none of the characters so much as mention them in relation to the Boer War, and the references to native Africans both in and outside of South Africa were typically racist and derogatory. In the beginning of \textit{Ulysses}, Mulligan tells Stephen that Haines’ father acquired his wealth “by selling jalap to Zulus or some bloody swindle or other” (1.156-57). Besides introducing “a new level of ambivalence into the ethnographic situation” (Castle 215), Mulligan’s comment reinforces the view common in Ireland that the English was “a race of imperialists, exploiters, [and] materialists” and also “links economic exploitation with British military domination” (Temple-Thurston 250). Although Mulligan was not referring to the Boer War specifically, his sentiment would extend throughout the novel with regard to the war. Indeed, there \textit{are} no references to the indigenous Africans

\textsuperscript{54} See K. Anderson, 115-153 and Beatty, “Marx” 815-47 for more on this topic.

\textsuperscript{55} In \textit{The Boer Fight for Freedom} (1902), for example, Davitt introduced the Boers thusly:

\begin{quote}
The Boers grew and prospered in Cape Colony. They conquered the Hottentots around them, and shed far less blood in subduing the natives to their rule than did any British settlement which was ever planted among savage races. . . . The Boers were made to feel by their British governors and officials that they were a subjugated people, with few rights or privileges left to them in the land of their birth beyond those enjoyed by the Kaffirs around them.

The native races were, in fact, preferred before them, and enjoyed a greater measure of toleration from the English than was shown by these to the former rulers of the country. (2)
\end{quote}
caught up in the Boer War at all in the novel. The Irish considered themselves analogous to the Boers rather than to the Africans. Cóilín Parsons summarizes the attitude the Irish had at the time:

This analogy . . . spectacularly misreads the landscape of South Africa, writing out of existence the source of free and cheap labour that sustained the colony – a large and subjugated African population. This misreading resulted in a sometimes unproblematic identification by many Irish people with the Boers as a wholly oppressed population rather than also [an] population of oppressors – a situation in which Ireland found itself, as supplier of troops, missionaries, and administrators to the empire, but was largely unable or unwilling to recognize. (77-78)

Some of Casement’s writing reflects this. In his attempt to denigrate the British Empire, he wrote of the Irish in superlative terms, both as dogged victims and superior physical specimens. In *The Crime Against Ireland and How the War May Right It* (1914), for example, he wrote that the:

physical superiority of his countrymen was frequently referred to by O’Connell as one of the forces he relied. . . . It could no to-day be fearlessly affirmed that sixty Irishmen were more than a match for one hundred Englishmen . . . . It was on Irish soldiers that the English chiefly relied in the Boer War, and it is no exaggeration to say that could all the Irishmen in the ranks of the British army have been withdrawn, a purely British force would have failed to end the war and the Dutch would have remained masters of the field in South Africa. (29)

He would lay the blame of World War I entirely on the British, who were tireless in their “expansion of the white races,” and compares their strategy to the infamous Boer War
concentration camps: “The policy of the Boer War is being tried on a vaster scale against Europe. Just as England beat the Boers by concentration camps and not by arms, by money and not by men, so she seeks to-day to erect an armor-plate barrier around the one European people she fears to meet in the field, and to turn all Central Europe into a vast concentration camp” (36). Ironically, one of the first European champions of human rights in Africa totally ignored the plight of the indigenous African population in their own land in his indictments against the British. Ten years after the Boer War, Casement’s animus against imperialism would blind him toward the injustices the Boers had perpetrated against them – injustices that would eventually turn into the horrific policy of apartheid. In her analysis of Boer (and later Afrikaans) society, Arendt claims that the Boers were not fighting for national pride nor to retain ownership of the gold and diamond mines the likes of Rhodes wanted. The Boers actually refused to “share in the suddenly exploding activities of the country,” that is, the “gold rush” in the decade preceding the war, nor did they welcome the industrialization of the country (259). Rather, they were solely interested in maintaining their largely agrarian, preindustrial way of life and cultural identity, which included a deep hatred of the indigenous population. “When the Boers lost the war,” she claims, “they lost no more than they had already deliberately abandoned, that is, their share in the riches; but they definitely won the consent of all other European elements, including the British government, to the lawlessness of a race society” (260).\footnote{See Arendt 249-70 for her fascinating analysis of the Boers and Afrikaans in the nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries.} That is not to suggest that the Boers did not have legitimate grievances against the British in their conquest of their countries, nor does it excuse the horrific concentration camps and other counterinsurgency tactics the British imposed upon them – tactics that blatantly violated the newly formed 1899 Hague Conventions on military
engagement and would unfortunately set a precedent for future twentieth century conflicts (Boehmer 247). However, it is still hardly fitting that so many in Ireland would so readily associate themselves with these people. Yet in an inverse way, it is entirely warranted, given that the Boers exhibited astounding contradictions and hypocrisies on race and nationality and were appropriated for illegitimate ends.

Although Joyce may have been aware of the problematic contradictions this association with the Boers entailed – just as he was conscientious of such contradictions the association with the Hungarians entailed as explored in the previous chapter – he was not exactly a champion of the African national self-determination. As mentioned, they are nowhere to be found in *Ulysses* in its depiction of the Boer War, and the references to the Zulus and other indigenous African ethnicities were far from flattering. However, as George Bornstein carefully outlines, in the last stages of the composition of *Ulysses*, there is much evidence to suggest that Joyce deliberately edited text to include “various overt and covert linkages among Black, Jewish, and Irish Nationalist identities” (*Material* 127). As he writes, “An extraordinary number of the references to African, Jewish, or Oriental others that pervade the novel came into it during Joyce’s acts of expansionary revision. Sometimes they add alterities by themselves, but surprisingly often they hybridize alterity by fusing an extant textual example with a newly introduced one” (130). The comparison, for example, between the Irish and the “redskins in America” and the reference to the “Grand Turk” donating piastres during the Great Famine (*U* 12.1366-69) found in “Cyclops,” which was discussed extensively in the introduction of this dissertation, was added during this period of “expansionary revision.” Indeed, throughout the first proofs and the 1921 typescript revision of the Rosenbach text, Joyce “carefully inscribed hostile references by his Dublin pub
drinkers to imperialism, particularly to that of England” (Bornstein, Material 131). Bloom’s reference to Jewish slavery in Morocco – “sold by auction in Morocco like slaves or cattle” (U 12.1471-72) – was added by hand on the 1921 manuscript. By doing so, Joyce “participates in the Orientalizing construction of Jews in the novel” (Bornstein, Material 132). Right before Bloom wallops the Citizen with his list of apostate Jews, “a loafer with a patch over his eye starts singing If the man in the moon was a jew, jew, jew and a slut shouts out of her” (U 12.1800-1). The song is a parody of a 1905 American song “If the Man in the Moon Were a Coon” (U-A 378; U-N 698). Joyce substitutes “coon” with “jew.” Originally, the song in this passage was “The Boys of Wexford,” which was discussed in the first chapter of this dissertation. By replacing the songs as well as substituting the derogatory slur with “jew,” Joyce “suggests an interchangeability of the terms and the affinity between the two groups as victims of prejudice and caricature” (Bornstein, Material 132). There are hundreds of such substitutions throughout the novel, each one of them meant to accentuate the “alterity in the colonial archive” (139).57 Along with the substitutions Joyce added to the references to the Boer War as demonstrated by Rice,58 Joyce accentuates both the importance socialism placed in its anti-imperialist agenda and also the considerable contradictions and problems they entailed.

Joyce’s engagement with socialist historiography is perhaps his strongest engagement with socialist thought. Joyce scholars have paid considerable attention to his socialist leanings, arguing to varying degrees how intent Joyce was in imbuing socialist or otherwise radical political statements in his work. Although his engagement with socialist

57 There are far too many examples to list in this dissertation. See Bornstein, Material 118-139 for more, although he claims that his work is not exhaustive.
58 See note 51 of this chapter.
historiography does not necessarily prove that he was a socialist, it does show not only an impressive knowledge of socialism, both in Ireland and elsewhere, but also a willingness to interrogate its most unsavory aspects, which often was tainted by nationalism. Socialism and nationalism intersected in Ireland throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Despite their ideological aversions to each other, Ireland has shown that the issues of equality, freedom, and the inherent worth of an individual can obfuscate such stark distinctions. The various “insertions” and “omissions” in socialist historiography are just as prominent as they are in Joycean scholarship. In *Travesties*, Carr, himself inserted into *Ulysses*, asks Joyce what he did in World War I. The answer did not please Carr, yet the fact that he was inserted among the likes of Joyce, Lenin, and Tzara should perhaps be of some consolation for him. It is one of the many revolutionary aspects of *Ulysses*. 


Conclusion

He felt some dark presence moving irresistibly upon him from the darkness, a presence subtle and murmurous as a flood filling him wholly with itself. Its murmur besieged his ears like the murmur of some multitude in sleep; its subtle streams penetrated his being.

–P 2.1400-4

If Joyce was trying to break the paralysis he thought to be endemic in Ireland, flying by the nets of nationality, among other obstructions, much of his effort is evident in his historiography. I have argued in this dissertation that Joyce’s interrogation of nationalism was contingent on the nationalist interpretation and appropriation of history. Every nationalist strain found in Ireland during his time – Gaelic-Catholic cultural nationalism, republican Sinn Féin nationalism, socialist nationalism, unionism, and nationalisms whose ideologies are even harder to pin down – supported their stated goals and rationales by heavily evoking Ireland’s past. Nationalists reached far into the past, to both recorded and pre-written times, to justify their respective views on not only what had happened in Ireland, but what to do in the present moment and what to expect in the future. Nearly every character in Joyce’s oeuvre has some opinion or other about the Milesians, the Croppies, the Wild Geese, the Whiteboys, Cromwell, the Great Famine, the Penal Laws, Parnell, and so forth with varying degrees of relevance to their own wider beliefs and experiences – something that I believe can be extended to Joyce himself.

I argued in the introduction that although attempts to characterize Joyce’s views are problematic because he provided contradictory statements and sentiments both in his work and in personal correspondence throughout his lifetime, he evinces enough to show that he
had an ultimately distrustful and contemptuous view of nationalism. I structured the dissertation to address historiographic issues in Joyce’s work that not only betray this reaction but also have been underdeveloped in Joyce studies. In the first chapter, I provide a brief overview of the contentious historiography of the 1798 Rebellion and its aftermath during the nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. I then analyze the various references to the rebellion in Joyce’s work, which I argue highlight the corrosive historical reception the rebellion had in Ireland. The rebellion can be described as a loosely-coordinated series of small military engagements against the British army and their paramilitary allies, led by a group of mostly young, Anglo-Irish Protestant idealists in the burgeoning French republican tradition. Its interpretation, however, as a sectarian conflict between Gaelic-Catholic patriots and the English and their Anglo-Irish Protestant allies became commonplace in the late nineteenth century, fueling the sectarian tensions of the time as well as further obfuscating the actual events and motivations of the rebellion. This vicious cycle of partisanship and historical disinformation inspired by the rebellion is evident in Joyce’s work and betrays Joyce’s disdain for nationalism and its deleterious effects on historiography. In contrast to the first chapter, which focuses on a specific Irish historical event, the second chapter focuses on wider historical developments and cultural trends in Joyce’s work that were caused or affected by nationalism: the prevalence of inter-European migration during the early modern era, the emergence of capital and its resulting socioeconomic anxieties, the formation of nationalist identity in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and its conflicts with ethnic identity. I relate these broader issues to Griffith’s problematic treatment of Hungarian history in the early-twentieth century, which I argue Joyce found problematic but also an illuminating case of nationalist distortions of the issues mentioned. In the third and final
chapter, I discuss socialism and its relevance to nationalist discourse. I argue that Joyce’s own historiography most closely aligns with socialist historiography, even though the latter had its own set of follies and inconsistencies. These follies consisted of idealizing Ireland’s apparently utopian, pre-capitalist past as well as glorifying the “great men” of history despite their dubious presence and actions.

My dissertation attempted to address the various issues which concern historiographic studies that were engaged by Joyce, specifically focusing on the deluge of nationalist historical writing and general sentiment during Joyce’s time. A project of this scope inevitably produces some overlap. The 1798 Rebellion, for example, was appropriated by many socialists, including Connolly who claimed it was the first modern socialist revolution, akin to the French Revolution a decade before it.\(^1\) Griffith was doggedly pro-Boer, having written about it extensively in the *United Irishman* and even spending time in South Africa a decade before the Boer War began.\(^2\) Moran also wrote about the Boers in *The Leader*, and most likely would have found Connolly’s interpretation of Tone and the United Irishmen to be risible (although he was not an admirer of either). The following examples, moreover, regard historical topics that were covered in this dissertation. There were plenty of substantial historical events described in Joyce’s work that were not discussed, or if so briefly. For example, Thomas FitzGerald, 10\(^{th}\) Earl of Kildare, or “Silken Thomas,” who is mentioned in *Ulysses* four times (3.314, 10.407-16, 12.1861-62, 16.558), usually with regard to his 1534-1535 Rebellion against Henry VIII, was largely not discussed here.\(^3\) O’Connell is referenced even more, Bloom having, in one instance in “Hades,” passed under “the

---

1 See T. Brady 8-13 and J. Connolly 1:54-103.
3 The exception being note 37 and its corresponding sentence in the introduction.
hugecloaked Liberator’s form” (6.249), yet does not make it into the discussion. Czar Nicholas II’s “Rescript for Peace,” which Stephen contemplates yet ultimately dismisses in *Stephen Hero, Portrait,* and *Ulysses* (112-15; 5.802-3; 15.4435-36), was a *cause célèbre* upon its release in 1899, provoking heated discussion among various nationalists, socialists, and republicans both in and outside of Ireland about the merits as well as dangers of internationalism, human rights, militarism, pacifism, national sovereignty, and class struggle – topics certainly germane to my dissertation but ultimately left out.\(^4\) A significant challenge in writing this dissertation was determining which historical events and historiographic issues to focus on. It would have been foolish (not to mention impossible) to go through every single historical event found in Joyce’s work. Even through the filter of nationalism, it was still difficult to decide what history to interrogate and what, to paraphrase Walter Benjamin, to brush against the grain (392). My dissertation is not therefore a comprehensive overview of nationalist historiography in Joyce’s work, an endeavor requiring more scholarship, that I hope many others, myself included, will further.

Historical recollections and memorials often evoke poignant reactions – reactions that even the most prodigious historians and scholars cannot fully explain or rationalize. When they are of one’s own nation, this issue becomes even more poignant. When Stephen in *Portrait,* for example, walks by the “great block of Trinity” (5.212) and “came upon the droll statue of the national poet of Ireland” (5.216), he could not help but notice it was “a Firbolg in the borrowed cloak of a Milesian” (5.221) – that is, a merger of a semi-mythical people with another, in a marble form of the great nineteenth century poet Thomas Moore. Stephen “looked at it without anger: for, though sloth of the body and of the soul crept over

\(^4\) See Abbenhuis 21-31; Cooper 116-39; Cornwell 260-61; Mack 83-103; and Manganiello 36.
it like unseen vermin, over the shuffling feet and up the fold of the cloak and around the servile head, it seemed humbly conscious of its indignity” (5.216-20). Stephen’s rather melancholy analysis of the statue evokes a number of different issues: aesthetic restlessness, insufferable servitude, the mythical foundation of Ireland (itself a significant topic of the Irish Revival), and the haphazard merging of nationalism with art, “the national poet,” a figure stuck in marble and perhaps metaphorically stuck in time. In contrast, when Bloom walks past the same statue in “Lestrygonians,” his thoughts are less severe: “He crossed under Tommy Moore’s roguish finger. They did right to put him up over a urinal: meeting of the waters. Ought to be places for women” (U 8.414-16). Unlike Stephen, Bloom simply refers to one of Moore’s poems, “The Meeting of the Waters,” and makes an irreverent quip about the statue’s location. His “roguish finger,” moreover, is a reference to an accusation levied against him in a similarly irreverent article by Francis Mahony that Moore plagiarized his work from French and Latin sources (U-A 167-68; U-N 616). Bloom may or may not have been aware of this, but regardless is satisfied with his bon mot and moves on. The same figure provoked decidedly different reactions from Stephen and Bloom, as well as different narrative descriptions. If Joyce’s treatment of nationalist historiography can be neatly summarized, it could be that his ambivalence toward nationalism and Ireland’s “place” in history was matched by an astounding reverence for the travails his countrymen and countrywomen had faced over the centuries as well as an appreciation of history’s potential for not just for political, but aesthetic, ends. Joyce’s journey as artist hinged on an interrogation of the two.

As Nietzsche writes in “On the Uses and Disadvantages of History for Life,” objective historiography is illusory:
And may an illusion not creep into the word objectivity even in its highest interpretation? According to this interpretation, the word means a condition in the historian which permits him to observe an event in all its motivations and consequences so purely that it has no effect at all on his own subjectivity: it is analogous to that aesthetic phenomenon of detachment from personal interest with which a painter sees a stormy landscape with thunder and lightning, or a rolling sea, only the picture of them with him, the phenomenon of complete absorption in the things themselves: it is a superstition, however, that the picture which these things evoke in a man possessing such a disposition is a true reproduction of the empirical nature of the things themselves. Or is it supposed that at this moment the things as it were engrave, counterfeit, photograph themselves by their own action on a purely passive medium? (91)

To use Nietzsche’s analogy in the context of nationalist historiography, it is impossible to reproduce “the empirical nature of the things themselves” when the nation is placed within the picture. Joyce’s interrogation of nationalist historiography roguishly points this out in a number of ways, both critiquing and at the same time contextualizing why so many of his fellow Irish projected their national identity onto such history.

Given that Ulysses (and, I would argue, Joyce’s other work) is “eminently concerned with daily experience” (Slote, “Review” 154), I would like to conclude this dissertation by briefly discussing two passages which depict rather visceral and even ludicrous moments in Irish history as recalled in an ordinary day by two of Ireland’s residents. As Stephen walks along Sandymount Strand in “Proteus” and approaches the Dodder’s mouth near the south wall, he contemplates a number of events that happened at that very spot:
Galleys of the Lochlanns ran here to beach, in quest of prey, their bloodbeaked prows riding low on a molten pewter surf. Dane Vikings, torcs of tomahawks aglitter on their breasts when Malachi wore the collar of gold. A school of turlehide whales stranded in hot noon, spouting, hobbling in the shallows. Then from the starving cagework city a horde of jerkined dwarfs, my people, with flayers’ knives, running, scaling, hacking in green blubbery whalemeat. Famine, plague and slaughters. Their blood is in me, their lusts my waves. I moved along them on the frozen Liffey, that I, a changeling, among the spluttering resin fires. I spoke to no-one: none to me.

(3.300-9)

Stephen here presents an amalgamation of several different historical events spanning centuries. He first sees the “Locklanns,” or Danish, land on the beach, their chainmail armor engravened with an image of a tomahawk. He then imagines Malachi, the High King of Ireland who drove the Danish out of Dublin in 996 and took the golden collar of their prince, Tomar. A “school of turlehide whales” allegedly appeared on the strand in 1331 in the midst of a famine, leading hundreds of starving Dublin residents (“my people”) to storm the beach and devour them. The “[f]amine, plague and slaughters” refer to the centuries leading up to the Black Death, a time period characterized by such calamities. Stephen moves along the “frozen Liffey,” which froze over in 1338 and 1739 (U-A 58-59; U-N 572-73). In short, this small strip of beachhead causes Stephen to think of several ghastly events which transpired there hundreds of years ago, the last of which possibly in 1739. He seems resentful that he is related to these ancients, the blood and passions of half-crazed, blubber-gorging savages.

---

5 It is interesting to note that this may be an anachronism or at least an imprecise use of terminology, as “tomahawks” were an indigenous American weapon that did not come into common usage in English until the early-seventeenth century in the English colonies (“Tomahawk, n.”).
flowing through his veins. Stephen cannot escape the nightmare to which he is subject but, at the same time, he imposed upon himself. He does not need this violent imagery to go about his day. His contemplation, rather, is a disadvantage that Stephen volitionally carries with him. He cannot escape the history of his nation, not only because it is all around his physical environment but also because of his unconscious refusal to do so. His depiction of his medieval ancestors is much less roseate than that of many of Stephen’s nationalist contemporaries. It could be considered, in fact, brutal realism. Both Stephen and the nationalists of his time constructed their own realities using the memory of their forebears, and although they may have drawn different conclusions about them, their specter was just as visceral to both.

In “Eumaeus,” Skin-the-Goat tells a similarly morbid yet less gruesome urban legend. Some in the aftermath of Parnell’s death believed that Parnell was not dead: that he had faked his death and was biding his time to make his return. Skin-the-Goat tells of an even more implausible rumor: that he had escaped to South Africa and became the legendary Boer general Christian De Wit: “Dead he wasn’t. Simply absconded somewhere. The coffin they brought over was full of stones. He changed his name to De Wet, the Boer general. He made a mistake to fight the priests. And so forth and so forth” (U 16.1304-6). This peculiar rumor was circulating in Ireland at the time (U-A 553; U-N 774). Davitt himself discusses the rumor in his book about the Boer War, believed in by “some very romantic souls” (Boer Fight 165). The men who huddled in the cabman’s shelter at two in the morning represented some of Dublin’s more unsavory, downtrodden residents. Men like Corley who could not even get a job as a Hely’s sandwichboardman (U 16.200-2). Men like the sailor Murphy who, for all his boasts, may not have even stepped foot outside of Ireland. Men who had little hope for
their own futures, in a city and a country that was stuck in a state of paralysis. In their desperation, they latched onto the past in increasingly bizarre and desperate ways, imagining events that could not possibly have happened. The historiography of those like Skin-the-Goat served as a crutch to get them through their dismal, hard lives. Nationalist historiography may have produced vitriol from the likes of the Citizen, yet here it serves a less sinister purpose. Bloom and Stephen seek haven in the cabman’s shelter to escape the brutal reverie and real-life fight among the British soldiers in “Circe” – in effect, to escape the toxic effects of the British imperial state. Here, they are allowed to fraternize with a different lot, transfiguring these hallucinations in Nighttown into historical fantasies. These fantasies relied upon an all-too-real historical reality.

When Joyce told Power in the Bal Bullier dancehall that the artist must be “national” first in order for “the intensity of their own nationalism” to make them “international in the end,” the cabman’s shelter under Butt Bridge was in the middle of a warzone. Ireland was fighting for its independence and would tear itself apart thereafter. Although the physical fighting would end in a few years, the controversy and pain over what precisely happened would continue well beyond it. In the 1950s, a French Martiniquean psychiatrist would be working in an Algerian hospital during that county’s own war of independence, treating both soldiers of the French Empire and their Algerian victims of torture (Drabinski) – victims who arguably had even less hope and resources than the men in the cabman’s shelter. The experiences of this doctor, Fanon, would inspire some of the greatest literature in postcolonial theory, giving a voice to those who teetered on the brink of imperialism and freedom, of independence and self-realization. Fanon would pass away at just thirty-six years old, yet he left a body of work that would resonate in colonial and semicolonial nations.
throughout the world. He presumably had no idea what Joyce told Power that night in 1921, yet he nevertheless channeled him more than thirty years later when he wrote that “[n]ational consciousness, which is not nationalism, is the only thing that will give us an international dimension” (199). Joyce would never step foot in Ireland in the latter half of his life, yet his work about struggling Dubliners at the turn of the century who were wrestling with the legacy of their nation’s past would reverberate well beyond them and the boundaries of their own nation.
Works Cited


Alexander, James. *Some Account of the First Apparent Symptoms of the Later Rebellion in the County of Kildare and an Adjoining Part of the King’s County*. Dublin, 1800. *HathiTrust Digital Library*, hdl.handle.net/2027/nyp.33433069320145.


Brady, Ciaran. “‘Constructive and Instrumental’: The Dilemma of Ireland’s First ‘New Historians.’” *Brady, Interpreting Irish History*, pp. 3-31.


Byrne, Miles. *Memoirs of Myles Byrne*. Edited by Fanny Byrne, New York, 1863. 3 vols.

Internet Archive, archive.org/details/memoirsofmilesby00byrn.


Casement, Roger. *The Crime Against Ireland and How the War May Right It*. [No publisher], 1914. HathiTrust Digital Library, hdl.handle.net/2027/loc.ark:/13960/t2x35990d.


Clooney, Thomas. *A Personal Narrative of Those Transactions in the County Wexford, in Which the Author was Engaged During the Awful Period of 1798*. Dublin, 1832.


*Irish Newspaper Archive,*


*Google Books,*

play.google.com/books/reader?id=LN9LAAAAcAAJ&hl=en&pg=GBS.PP1.


---. “A Nation Once Again.” *The Nation* [Dublin], 13 July 1844, p. 633. *Irish Newspaper Archive,*


---. “Dead Ends: Joyce’s Finest Moments.” Attridge and Howes, pp. 21-36.

---. Introduction. Eagleton et al., pp. 3-22.


Geoghegan, Patrick M. “Egan, John.” McGuire and Quinn, dib.cambridge.org/viewReadPage.do?articleId=a2894.


Green, Alice Stopford. *The Old Irish World*. M. H. Gill & Son, 1912. *Internet Archive*,

www.archive.org/details/oldirishworld00greetuoft.


“Has Anyone Here Seen Kelly?” *Traditional Music Library*, www.traditionalmusic.co.uk/folk-song-lyrics/Has_Anybody_Seen_Kelly.htm.
books.google.com/books?id=CQUwAAAAAIAJ&source=gbs_books_hl_mylibrary&redir_esc=y.

en.wikisource.org/wiki/1911_Encyclopædia_Britannica/Haynau,_Julius_Jacob.


“Hitler and the Jews.” BBC, 2014,
www.bbc.co.uk/history/worldwars/genocide/hitler_audio.shtml#one.


Howes, Marjorie Elizabeth. “‘Goodbye Ireland I’m Going to Gort’: Geography, Scale, and Narrating the Nation.” *Attridge and Howes,* pp. 58-77.


Jameson, Fredric. “*Ulysses* in History.” McCormack and Stead, pp. 126-141.


*The King James Bible*. Collins, 2011.


MacDonagh, Oliver. “Ambiguity in Nationalism: The Case of Ireland.” C. Brady, *Interpreting Irish History*, pp. 105-121.
Works Cited


---. *Phases of Irish History*. M. H. Gill, 1919. *Internet Archive*,


HathiTrust Digital Library, hdl.handle.net/2027/wu.89060174224.


McCracken, Donal P. “MacBride, John.” McGuire and Quinn, dib.cambridge.org/viewReadPage.do?articleId=a5108


Mottolese, William C. “Traveling *Ulysses*: Reading in the Track of Bloom.” Orr, pp. 91-111.


O’Callaghan, Margaret. “‘With the Eyes of Another Race, of a People Once Hunted Themselves’: Casement, Colonialism and a Remembered Past.” Daly, Roger Casement, pp. 46-63.


archive.org/details/agw0321.0001.001.umich.edu.

doi:10.2979/jmodelite.34.2.154.


“Residents of a House 8.1 in Royal Terrace (Clontarf West, Dublin).” *Census of Ireland, 1901*, The National Archives of Ireland, 2019, www.census.nationalarchives.ie/reels/nai003676758/.


Sullivan, Alexander M. *The Story of Ireland*. Dublin, 1884.


---. Sequel to Personal Narrative of the “Irish Rebellion” of 1798. Belfast, 1832. Google Books, books.google.com/books/about/Sequel_to_Personal_Narrative_of_the_Iris.html?id=1LZXAAAAcAAJ.


Woods, C. J. “Higgins, Francis (‘Sham Squire’).” McGuire and Quinn, dib.cambridge.org/viewReadPage.do?articleId=a3999.

---. “MacNally, Leonard.” McGuire and Quinn, dib.cambridge.org/viewReadPage.do?articleId=a5274.


---. “Plowden, Francis Peter.” McGuire and Quinn, dib.cambridge.org/viewReadPage.do?articleId=a7364.

---. “Sheares, Henry.” McGuire and Quinn, dib.cambridge.org/viewReadPage.do?articleId=a8013.


