2011

Joyce's Open War: A Revolution in Exile

Michael Porter
Bard

Joyce's Open War:
A Revolution in Exile

By Michael Porter

A Senior Project Submitted to the Division of
Languages and Literature

Annandale-on-Hudson
May, 2011

Table of Contents:

With special thanks to my advisors,
Professors Justus Rosenberg,
and Nancy Leonard.

I. Introduction: The Problem of Joyce's Exile

Whether James Joyce is or is not to be considered a proper exile hardly seems to be a topic of major contention in current Joyce criticism. Most critics brush over the topic, or consider it an established reality. Others seem to treat it as a necessary concession to Joyce, who lobbied so confidently in his work for the recognition, without which critical analysis of his work might lose some of its force. Indeed, in many ways, it is Joyce's fierce contention with the existing conscience of Ireland that makes him such an irresistibly drawing figure of literary history, and exile can be treated as simply a context within which his position relative to Ireland can be understood most readily, as the nearest category into which he might be placed, regardless of how well he actually fits it's conditions. It is, in part, in response to this generally accepted ease of strictures with regard to accepting Joyce and others as exiled authors that Edward Said wrote his 1984 essay "Reflections on Exile". Said considers Joyce's particular role in terms of choice: "James Joyce *chose* to be in exile: to give force to his artistic vocation" (Said 182), but also considers his particularly conscious relationship with estrangement when he asks, "Joyce's success as an exile stresses the question lodged at its very heart: is exile so extreme and private that any instrumental use of it is ultimately a trivialization?" (Said 181). For Said, Joyce is not unlike the American and British expatriates who flocked to inter-war Paris expecting adventure, seeking exile as a romantic gesture. It is undeniable that Joyce as a young man considered exile to be a useful tool for the artist, but there is more to his experience than simply that. In Said's estimation, Choice appears to be the main distinction between who can rightfully be called an "exile" and who cannot. For him, exiles have no choice in the matter. "Exile…is the unhealable rift forced between a human and a native place, between the self and its true home" (Said 173).

The fact that Joyce initiated the rift between himself and Ireland, and continually refused to heal it excludes him, in Said's terms, from the recognition he felt he deserved.

Mary McCarthy offers a divergent view on the matter. In her discussion of the nature of exiles, expatriates, and refugees, she notes Joyce as "The great exception" among those most cleanly classified as expatriates (McCarthy 53). In her analysis, the expatriate of the era

> is a hedonist. He is usually an artist or a person who thinks he is artistic. He has no politics or, if he has any, like the Brownings he has acquired them from the country he has adopted. The average expatriate thinks about his own country rarely and with great unwillingness. He feels he has escaped from it (McCarthy 51).

Immediately Joyce stands out in opposition to this definition. While occasionally a hedonist of sorts in his personal life, he was engaged in illicit acts in Dublin long before he even considered going abroad, and so the pull he may have felt in this regard is diminished in importance. Additionally, while he did consider himself an artist at the time of his departure, despite having published very little and mostly without success, his opinions were far from lacking in material when it came to politics, particularly the politics of Dublin. In exile he kept up with Griffith's *United Irishman*, and though he rarely, if ever, agreed with the political movements of his time, he was certainly well versed in their intentions and rhetoric, as shows in the spectacularly satirical treatment his gives them in *Ulysses*. Finally, far from distancing his thoughts from Ireland, his focus became even more concentrated on the island. Indeed, it is well-observed that his expressed purpose in departure was to create "the conscience of [his] race" (*P*276). While his intention was no doubt to Europeanize Irish culture, what he created would also be particular to Ireland, built on the essential character of the people as he observed it.

McCarthy grapples with Joyce's particular quality of estrangement in a concise iteration of the apparent inconsistencies in his lived experience versus the actual conditions of his experience:

> The great exception is Joyce. But he considered himself an exile, not an expatriate…He proclaimed it in the title of his single play, *Exiles,* and in Stephen Dedalus's famous vow of silence, exile, and cunning. Of course, this was rhetoric: it was only in his own mind that Joyce was driven into exile by the tyranny at home. He could have come back without risk whenever he wanted and did several times. Yet he willed his rhetoric so fiercely that it commands belief, particularly since the difficulties of publication pitted him against the forces of order in the shape of censors wherever his native language was spoken. He was able to go home freely, but his books could not. (McCarthy 53)

She comes close to a resolution here with the recognition that Joyce's art would not be accepted in his homeland. Indeed, his final departure from Ireland in 1912, after which he would never again return, was punctuated by the long-in-coming refusal of *Dubliners* for publication, over disagreements concerning the incendiary content of the stories. Joyce had intended to expose and, in so doing, lead the charge in defeating the spiritual "paralysis" he perceived in Dublin, which had such a crippling effect on the city's political and cultural environment. His stories were an outright attack on the stifling conditions of Dublin life, and the institutions that he blamed for perpetuating them. In light of Joyce's conscious effort to overturn common modes of art and perception in Dublin, McCarthy establishes Joyce as a revolutionary, rather than a simple malcontent artist: "He was engaging himself in a conspiracy against the ruling forces of Ireland, and the infernal machine was to be his literary work. It was a plot, to be executed with the typical methods of the revolutionary: silence (i.e., secrecy) and cunning" (McCarthy 53). To McCarthy, Joyce is more than a disaffected youth seeking to express his rebellion by disowning his country in favor of the hedonist lifestyle of Paris. He is, or at any rate becomes, a serious and active challenge to his homeland's accepted way of life.

It is in this way that Joyce's choice of departure becomes, in opposition to Said's view of choice in this matter, supportive of the notion that he was in fact in a state of exile following his departure. He never ceased to think of his country of origin, and as his work shows, his concern with it became ever more intimate, detailed, and invasive in nature. Yet, as McCarthy points out,

his work could never return in its true form. It seems reasonable, then, to qualify Joyce's condition of exile by saying that he had been definitively obliged to leave his place of origin for the sake of his development as an artist. In other words, Ireland would not allow Joyce to become "a whole being" as McCarthy puts it in one of her definitions of exile: "A person who cannot return home without facing death or jail for acts committed against the government is an exile…Or for acts he may commit if he remains true to himself, a whole being" (McCarthy 50). It is highly unlikely that Joyce would ever commit acts against the Irish political bodies or even the Church that would result in his imprisonment, particularly in light of his famous adherence to pacifism. There must, then, be a heavy weight attached to remaining "true to himself, a whole being" for McCarthy's position to remain consistent with regard to Joyce's person. For his literary work, however, rejection from Irish and English publishing houses is easily comparable to imprisonment, death, and restriction of being "whole", since publication is analogous to birth for a work of literature and for a literary career. A text written yet unpublished is tantamount to miscarriage. Joyce's exile becomes justifiable as such only with reference to his literary output.

Joyce's uniqueness as an artist-in-exile can be illuminated more fully with a comparison to the writing of an earlier author who experienced a more classical variety of exile, Victor Hugo. Hugo, unlike Joyce, experienced exile as a result of the power of the political nation-state of France. With the ascent of Napoleon III he was forced to flee with his family because of his public political statements, and could not return without facing persecution. In "What Exile Is" he speaks of it in terms of the classical exile mentioned by both Said and McCarthy. The common theme is that of banishment. McCarthy describes classical exile as "punishment decreed from above, like the original banishment of Adam and Eve" (McCarthy 50). Hugo's description is simpler: "Exile is law laid bare" (Hugo 67). Classical exile, for both, is the

exercise of the state's right to refuse and to discard its undesirable citizens. Hugo prefigures Joyce, however, with his observation that "Law incarnate is the citizen; law crowned is the lawmaker" (Hugo 67). The important observation to make in this comparison, however, is Joyce's reversal of certain aspects of exile as it was experienced by Hugo and most other politically-active artists. Hugo describes his continued relationship with French authority: "You are flung away, but you are not set free. The banisher is curious and he will cast many eyes over you…exile is openwork;…you are isolated and watched" (Hugo 69). Joyce, in establishing himself far from Dublin's continued influence over his aesthetic life, became an observer of the land he left. For Joyce's experience, Hugo's words might be rearranged to read "you are isolated, and you watch". Joyce, in effect, takes the role of the "banisher" who casts his eyes on the city he refused to accept as his home. He departs in an effort to cast off forever those "nets" which he claims are thrown at him by the institutions of power in Ireland, and to be able to exercise his artistic vocation freely. Furthermore, we see marked difference between Hugo's assessment of the exile having "two souls, one's own and one's country," an observation echoed in Said's essay (Hugo 74). To say that Joyce had two distinct, competing souls like Hugo claims, or even to have a soul divided between the homeland and the present condition as Said suggests, is to miss an essential feature of Joyce's estrangement from Ireland. In that famous quotation which ends *Portrait*, Joyce professes his intent to create the conscience of his race not alongside his work, nor even within his work, but rather "within the smithy of [his] soul" (*P*276*)*. The new conscience will be built out of Joyce's own development as an individual in the world and as an artist. Instead of retaining two souls, Joyce intends to develop the soul of his country out of his own soul, once it has developed into that of a mature artist. Indeed, he does not set Ireland "free", as he could with a full disavowing of his nationality. He instead holds onto it,

both in terms of his memories of specific experiences and in a continuing watchful presence of its development over time, in order to place it in sharper relief, such that he might reshape it to a more pleasing form. In Hugo's terms, Joyce attempted to exercise with even more individual authority his power as "law incarnate", an essentially creative force, to establish a new structure of aesthetic discourse in his homeland, which had yet to have its own sovereign version of "law crowned". Joyce was therefore in a peculiar position: the crowned law against which he worked was not *essentially* of the land for which he wrote. As he himself said many times, Ireland had two rulers: the British crown and the Holy See, the latter being the most potent. As he fought the "paralyzing" influence of the Catholic hierarchy, Irish nationalists fought the British Crown for their rights to self-governance. On both fronts was a fight for sovereignty, and due to the relative vacuum of a centralized Irish crowned law, Joyce had wide berth for his exercise of "law incarnate". He is often criticized for manufacturing artificial conflict with Ireland, but for him it was necessary for the development of a new Irish "conscience" within him to have an opposing Irish force, and not a foreign one. If he had to continually reconstruct a centralized power, it was because Ireland had none of its own. The important transformation he hoped to effect in Irish relations to the Church or to the British Crown could not be encouraged by flailing against such enormous institutions. They could always recover, or redirect public attention. The transformation had to be within the Irish people's perception of themselves.

To flesh out our understanding of Joyce as exile, we must consider what precisely led him to decide that remaining in Dublin would prevent him from developing his "whole being". Edward Said describes the sense of adversity he perceives in exiles:

> No matter how well they may do, exiles are always eccentrics who *feel* their difference (even as they frequently exploit it) as a kind of orphanhood….Clutching difference like a weapon to be used with stiffened will, the exile jealously insists on his or her right to refuse to belong. (Said 182)

Following Joyce's tendency to reverse the normally accepted conditions of exile, he seems also to operate on a particular inversion of the logic expressed here. For Said, the difference that exiles feel is the result of a cataclysmic event of estrangement. Joyce, however, felt his difference before leaving. There was an innate difference between his nature and that characteristic of his homeland. By no means should it be assumed that Joyce was the only Irishman who felt adverse to Ireland as his homeland. However, the acuteness with which he felt his difference allowed for him to "fly by those nets" which held others to the ground. Said's observation above sounds more like a description of the characteristics of a particular species of human of which Joyce was a member, a particular species brought about by the social and cultural conditions of the modern age.

Of course, "clutching difference" is something that most adolescents do around the same age as Joyce when his disenchantment began in earnest. Joyce did it with such fervor, however, as to set himself apart from the others. He took his difference to each extreme he could find. It was his personal quest to challenge and, if possible, to pervert every institution he found offensive to his aesthetic sensibility. The difference that struck the exiles of Said's description passively was very much a difference actively sought out by the young Joyce, as if it were a medication without which he could not continue to live as a "whole being". As he wrote to Nora concerning his leaving the Catholic Church: "I found it impossible for me to remain in it on account of the impulses of my nature" (*Letters II* 48). If we cannot assume the presence of a genetic disposition toward Joyce's "nature" (and indeed we can't, for we see that as a youth he did not always have quarrel with his surroundings), then we must consider him a logical product of Irish society. This is what Andras Ungar alludes to when he says of Stephen's goals, "Whereas Stephen had proposed to make his self-fashioning the touchstone of national

experience, *Ulysses* depicts him as already an effect of a different kind of totalization" (Ungar 27). Indeed it is in *Ulysses* that we see a Stephen in danger of being dragged down by those "nets" past which he had hoped to fly. The influence of Ireland's particular maladies of the soul, as he perceives them to be, is obvious, and in writing it, Joyce is aware of their influence on his own development in youth. Even his rebellion against the institutions behind the "nets" suffers from a certain amount of preordination: "Proudly walking. Whom were you trying to walk like? Forget: a dispossessed" (*U* 3.184-5). At root, it is this preordination as a person dispossessed of culture and spirit that Joyce must resist in his exile in order to be successful in his revolutionary intentions, and he is aware of it. It is in composing his literary work that he identifies and escapes such traps, such well-trodden paths of opposition.

The intention of this project is to trace the roots of Joyce's resistance to the cultural and social institutions of Dublin from their inception to their ultimate remobilizing in the form of major themes in his literary and critical works. To this end, I will explore the nationalist, spiritual, and aesthetic institutions that were most active in young Joyce's Ireland through accounts of his experience and through analysis of representations of them in his work. Further, these observations will inform our reading of McCarthy's take on Joyce as taking a revolutionary role in his relationship with Ireland, and what this role means for the artist in exile.

II. Irish Nationalism

Since both the major political entity and the dominant religious power of Ireland are external forces, the strongest institution produced by Ireland itself in Joyce's youth is the movement toward Irish national independence. Nationalist dynamism reached a peak during Joyce's youngest years under the banner of Charles Stewart Parnell. The Anglo-Irish Protestant leader was able to unite widely varied political interests, and he seemed destined to lead Ireland to sovereignty after 700 years of British colonial rule. The Joyce family was part of the Catholic urban middle class that formed one of Parnell's principal support bases. Looking back from Trieste many years later, Joyce recorded in "The Shade of Parnell" a reflection that seems to have accurately captured public sentiment surrounding the leader: "like another Moses, [he] led a turbulent and unstable people from the house of shame to the verge of the Promised Land" (*CW*225). In the same essay, Joyce tries to come to terms with the contradictions in Parnell's success:

> The influence exerted on the Irish people by Parnell defies critical analysis. He had a speech defect and a delicate physique; he was ignorant of the history of his native land; his short and fragmentary speeches lacked eloquence, poetry, and humor; his cold and formal bearing separated him from his own colleagues; he was a Protestant, a descendant of an aristocratic family, and, as a crowning disgrace, he spoke with a distinct English accent. He would often come to meeting an hour or an hour and a half late without apologizing. He would neglect his correspondence for weeks on end. The applause and anger of the crowd, the abuse and praise of the press, the denunciations and defense of the British ministers never disturbed the melancholy serenity of his character. It is even said that he did not know by sight many of those who sat with him on the Irish benches. (*CW*225)

The man's estrangement is even more coherently fleshed out as Joyce continues: "When the Irish people presented him with a national gratuity of 40,000 pounds sterling in 1887, he put the cheque into his billfold, and in the speech which he delivered to the immense gathering made not

the slightest reference to the gift which he had received" (*CW*225). By all accounts, he should have been set for failure in the eyes of nationalist Ireland from the beginning. While impossible to say for certain, the quality that saved him and made him so appealing, is the very same one that led him to behave so strangely: his self-reliance. In no way was his behavior calculated for dependence on others. By Joyce's account, he acted as if he owed nothing to anybody, and they owed nothing to him. Surely this was attractive to the liberal urban Irish as well as the Catholic rural folk, both groups tired of their dependence on the British Crown.

For the Joyce family, he had a special significance, for Joyce's father, John, believed that with Parnell's rise and Ireland's ascendancy, his personal fortune would finally improve: "In the Joyce family…Parnellism was not an abstract exercise in ethics, but one of those realities that politicians call 'a gut issue,' old John Joyce's last hope for rescue from his dismal downward journey in life" (Brown 385). Richard Ellmann relates the effect of the high hopes of "Parnellism" on the young Joyce, saying, "Most young men fancy themselves as Hamlets; Joyce, as later hints make clear, fancied himself as a Parnell" (Ellmann 32). The situation standing as such, the devastating effect of Parnell's fall from grace, beginning with the exposure of an extra-marital affair with the wife of a fellow member of parliament, on the young Joyce cannot be overstated. Along with the quick collapse of the political messiah under the weight of ridicule and abandonment, and his soon-to-follow death, seemed to go the fortunes of the Joyce family. Joyce attempted to sublimate the deep disappointment he witnessed around him in a poem, "Et Tu Healy", which his father had printed privately and then distributed amongst his nationalist friends. Even in this poem, notable characteristics of his later work was present. According to Ellmann it was:

> [his] first use of an antique prototype for a modern instance…..and while this equation may be discounted as merely a schoolboy's, it

> persists in Stephen as Dedalus and Bloom as Ulysses. The final portrait of Parnell as a lofty eagle on the crags is automatic enough, but still seems faintly premonitory of Joyce's description of himself in 'The Holy Office' as a stag on the highest mountain ridges (Ellmann 33).

Joyce's first literary success, albeit small and amateur, therefore came in the wake of the great political failure of Ireland's nationalist dream. He was not to continue a constructive interest in politics though, for as Ellmann points out, "for the Joyces, father and son, all was bathos now in Ireland; no politician and no politics were worth working for" (Ellmann 34). The messiah-figure had been pulled down from his pedestal, and nothing could follow, for the Joyce family, other than disappointing compromise. For the 9-year-old Joyce, at least, this sentiment stayed with him for the rest of his life.

Accompanying this aversion to political enthusiasm, his admiration of Parnell continued. The disconnect between his longstanding and often-articulated respect for Parnell's politics and personality, and his aversion to the divisive character of Irish politics that followed Parnell's fall is observed by Malcolm Brown:

> To remain a pious Parnellite and yet to be neither Redmondite nor Fenian was not easy. Joyce's expatriation undoubtedly made it simpler. He accomplished the feat intellectually by freezing history at the instant of the Parnellite disaster…He cherished and savored the rancors of the Split forever….Some might think he was living in the past (Brown 386).

Thus Joyce created a political consciousness in which he could look upon the progression of Irish politics with a stabilized eye. He established for himself a constant, if at times inaccurate, point of reference by which he could assess the fragmentary politics of Ireland's final march towards sovereignty.

In practical terms, of course, Joyce's position was not particularly constructive. The foundation to it was questionable from the beginning. As Andrew Gibson points out, the myth of

Parnell created by the most popular biography of him at the time, R. Barry O'Brien's *The Life of Charles Stewart Parnell*, which Joyce was known to have owned, was appealing, but inaccurate when it came to a few of the man's more controversial platforms:

> "the Parnell myth did not give the whole picture: it ignored the Parnell who defended the Empire, for example, the Parnell at ease with the idea of dominion status for Ireland. But the myth was pervasive. Joyce's work partly represents a continuation in the cultural sphere of the mythic Parnell's political project." (Gibson 5)

Joyce's stance thereby echoes a line from Hugo's "What Exile Is", in which the author describes the politics of the exiled man: "He practices good philosophy and bad politics...Principles make him right, but facts make him wrong" (Hugo 77). This was enough for Joyce, however, because it allowed him a sense of righteous claim over one of Ireland's most tragic characters, as well as further evidence that those rare souls of Irish birth who have a real capability to transcend its "paralysis" are nevertheless ultimately and necessarily destroyed by something rotten in the heart of the existing conscience, or lack thereof depending on how one interprets the last lines of *Portrait*, of the island's people, and that the most responsible thing for those rare people to do is to escape its grasp once and for all. If any change is to come in the Irish character, it must come from the continent, as Joyce suggested many times over in his youth, for Ireland has a habit of suffocating its own progeny; she is the "sow that eats her farrow." This anecdotal observation on the nature of Ireland's treatment of progressive figures is at the root of understanding the value of the Parnell myth to Joyce's development of the ideological high-ground from which he would be able to create his later works. With this figure, so lodged in the general Irish consciousness as well as Joyce's, the author is able to lay claim to a point of departure in recent Irish history, from which could reasonably develop an essential and "unhealable" estrangement between the author and the rest of the country. Joyce was able to make the betrayal of Parnell an instance of greater

betrayal that extended its effects to the true believers of Parnell's myth and mission. Because Joyce never himself firmly sided with another political party, he becomes, following this estimation of ideological purity, the last remaining true Parnellite, as the rest of Ireland moves on to one or another, or several, of the splinter parties that emerged from Parnell's collapse. He fashions himself as Parnell's torch-bearer in a time of obscurity and darkness: he who will bring to Ireland the means of illuminating its national character, as well as a conscience "forged" in the relative purity of his soul. What exactly this role means for Joyce is essential to understanding him as an artist in revolutionary exile. In pursuit of this understanding we will move on to an examination of Parnell's presence in Joyce's work in the time following his departure of 1904.

Joyce's observation of Parnell is his Triestine essay "The Shade of Parnell" constructs essentially a dualistic nature within which he expects his Italian audience to perceive Ireland's fallen hero. Anne Fogarty sums up Joyce's position well in "Parnellism and the Politics of Memory" when she says:

> Joyce variously conceives of him as a sacrificial scapegoat and a Messianic guide; he is both a Moses who sets out to save his people and a broken-hearted lover who suffers the ignominy of betrayal. Ultimately, in this journalistic summation designed for a Triestine audience, Parnell is described as a compound of various contrary myths, including the deserted lover, the charismatic leader, the inspirational revenant, and a guilt-inducing specter (Fogarty 110).

Joyce's writing makes very clear the special place held by Parnell in the author's aesthetic development. It seems that the political superstar who so firmly held the young artist's devotion also provided the first secular inspiration for several of Joyce's favorite themes: sacrifice and scapegoating, Messianic figures of renewal or establishment, and betrayal. He was also not shy about his own efforts to perpetuate and elaborate upon the Parnell myth. Whether the myth inspired his mission, or his treatment of the myth was intended to justify his artistic purpose is

unimportant in this case. What is important to note is that the dialogue in which he begins to engage is fully a mythic one. Parnell is placed into categorically mythic and archetypal roles, many of them romantic in nature and emphatically ephemeral. The notable quality of Joyce's portrayal is the persistence of Parnell's spirit, which is best typified when Joyce writes for the future Ireland: "The ghost of the 'uncrowned king' will weigh on the hearts of those who remember him when the new Ireland in the near future enters into the palace…but it will not be a vindictive ghost" (*CW* 228). Denying the possibility of vindication on the part of the ghost is highly suggestive of a very interesting quality of Joyce's estimation of Parnell. He is thus portrayed as a man devoted to his cause so resolutely that he will accept his own destruction on the path towards its realization. He becomes even more fully in this depiction the Moses-figure popular in the nationalist symbolism during Parnell's time. There is also the hint of a Christ-like forgiveness, but it is only partly implied, for there is a great distance between not exercising vindication for oneself and granting forgiveness to one's assailants. The Moses image alone is most salient for the poetic justice it does to the figure of Parnell. The "uncrowned king" of Ireland, like the disenfranchised Hebraic leader, must suffer for his sin of passion by never himself entering the Holy Land to which he promised to lead his people. He, like Moses, will be resigned to looking on from afar as a passive spirit, never able to join his flock. Unlike Moses, he was condemned to this fate not by omnipotent God, but by his own followers, who were guided to this, in the eyes of many ardent Parnellites as well as Joyce, by God's earthly presence on the island, the Irish Catholic Church.

By thus depicting Parnell's fall, Joyce suggests a parallel between Ireland's historical tendency to betray its brightest men and the Catholic insistence on humbling the proud. The correlation between the two figures, Parnell and Moses, in light of Ireland's historical precedent,

may even go so far as to imply that the presence of the Catholic Church invites into the Irish consciousness a pathological inclination toward recreating biblical paradigms in public life. Whether or not it is so severe as that, the parallel in this instance is undeniable, and Joyce could not but have been aware of its implications. Certainly, the religious strictures will continue to punish the same types of people. For Joyce, this predictable conflict is at the heart of the Irish condition. When the very people Ireland needs most, in the liberal estimation, are those who do not conform to the dominant spiritual power of the island, the Church's presence becomes irreparably one of oppression and, indeed, of paralysis.

Joyce exercises his literary rebellion by co-opting the biblical story of the Pentecost for his "Ivy Day in the Committee Room" for its value in presenting the state of Irish politics-in-paralysis following Parnell's fall. In this piece the author observes qualities of political fealty in a context of splintering factions, ideologically-motivated aesthetics, and of the Catholic presence in politics, as he perceived them to exist in turn of the century Dublin. Old Jack's line, "There was some life in it then," referring to the Parnell years echoes themes of worthwhile commitment to an ideal in contrast to the ambiguity of proper response by nationalists to King George's impending visit to the island (*D* 110). This sense of vivacity and purpose, having devolved into ambiguity and sentimentalism, is expressed clearly by the poem recited at the end of the story by Joe Hynes, the only man who could be in any way said to be the heir to the authenticity of the Parnell era (Horowitz 146). Thus the tone of "Ivy Day" strikes the chords of isolation, division, and of abandonment that also affected the apostles at Pentecost. Horowitz observes the allegory: "The men in the Committee Room are like the apostles in their upper room, but…, they betray their god and view with suspicion the only one among them (Hynes) who remains loyal to Parnell" (Horowitz 145). This suspicion could originate from several sources, perhaps the most

salient being guilt for having moved on from their respective degrees of support for Parnell to less genuine support of other, less inspiring candidates, a guilt which is only brought on by the recognition of one whose politics resemble those of Joyce, and who therefore represents the purest figure, the one who can stand to condemn them all on the most absolutely defined terms. Out of this guilt and awareness of fault, the Committee Room becomes a purgatorial space. Fogarty's description of Joyce's choosing Ivy Day for the setting of his story further reflects the idea of a liminal space set apart for reflection, and for coming to terms with the sins, both Parnell's and their's, of the past:

> ...it served a stimulus for the mobilization of fresh nationalist objectives and as a means of spearheading new modes of solidarity and of resistance. Above all, fittingly, Joyce has chosen as the setting for 'Ivy Day in the Committee Room' a day of commemoration the vectors of which constantly changed and which acted severally as an expression of Parnellite pieties, a ritual performance of collective shame and sorrow, and a crucible in which the legacy of this dead nationalist idol might be reformulated (Fogarty 113).

By selecting a day filled with such dynamic energies, Joyce is able to engage with the state of Irish politics in a context within which he can feel comfortably assured of his correctness of thought. In the day-to-day of Irish life, the advancement of politics after Parnell is clearly a practical necessity, and Joyce's policy would never be considered a viable option for the rest of Ireland to assume. However, on Ivy Day, the power of Joyce's position is briefly returned, as the political world reengages in discourse with the past, in varying degrees of eulogy to, or proclaimed detachment from, the dead Parnell. Indeed, Joyce takes pains to produce such a spectrum in the fictional committee room.

The renewed reflection encouraged by Ivy Day and mobilized by Joyce in the story, introduces as a major theme the duality of presence and absence. Three main figures exist in the

story only in their absence: Parnell, Tierney, and King George. The ghost of Parnell seems to hover over every word of the proceedings in the committee room, where the men await payment for canvassing duties performed in support of the liberal nationalist candidate, Tierney, for whom none of the men seem to have genuinely positive feelings. All of this occurs with the knowledge of the impending visit of King George to the island, the first visit by British royalty, apparently, in decades.

The curious thing about Parnell's quality of absent presence in Joyce's story is the pervasive variety of myths during the years following Parnell's death that he was not altogether lost to life, and would return to Ireland, in a vein similarly occupied by the King Arthur and Christ myths. The vitality of his presence in the thoughts and words of the canvassers is strong enough to warrant Henchy's reiteration, "Parnell...is dead" (*D* 118). However, the ideas of Parnell's absence or presence are indeed ambivalent. Repeatedly he is portrayed in Joyce's work as someone who will return to lead Ireland to a prosperous, sovereign future. We've already noted Joyce's own take on the ghostly presence of Parnell, as stated in "The Shade of Parnell", in which remembrance of the man will grow heavier with the founding of a "new Ireland." A similar theme is suggested in Hynes' poem, in the lines: "But Erin, list, his spirit may/Rise, like the Phoenix from the flames,/When breaks the dawning of the day,//The day that brings us Freedom's reign" (*D* 112). In this, the spirit of Parnell is also said to regain some of its presence with the founding of a new Irish state, but it is still here a ghostly presence, and more importantly, one that seems to be expected to lend active inspiration to the political life of the *nova Hibernia*. In these terms, Parnell's spirit will remain dormant until the Irish people complete what was perceived to be his ultimate goal. Until that time, they must struggle onward through insincere politics, which seem to be a sort of purgatorial sentence to the speaker of this

poem. The canvassers wait in the upper room of their building for their immediate goal, payment, but ultimately each one of them is awaiting the coming of the Irish Free State, which Hynes connects with the return of Parnellian sincerity and optimism.

Further, Thomas O'Grady introduces his discussion of Joyce's Parnell by saying: "there actually existed in Ireland a rumor that Parnell had not died and that he would indeed return to lead Ireland to independence" (O'Grady 133). In this case, a very-much alive Parnell was simply biding his time until Ireland was ready to accept him. We see this in the 'Hades' episode of *Ulysses* when the group of men decide to visit Parnell's grave:

> They turned to the right, following their slow thoughts. With awe Mr. Power's blank voice spoke:
> —Some say he is not in that grave at all. That the coffin was filled with stones. That one day he will come again.
> Hynes shook his head.
> —Parnell will never come again, he said. He's there, all that was mortal of him. Peace to his ashes. (*U* 6.920-927)

That Hynes, "The only self-redeeming character in ['Ivy Day']" (O'Grady 138), reappears in *Ulysses* as a more resigned echo of "Ivy Day's" quasi-villain Mr. Henchy is not a detail to be glossed over. Indeed, it reveals ever more acutely the increasing absence of hope over time of a Parnellian future. The sense of Parnell's spirit carrying on is still present, however, years after the late 1890s, when "Ivy Day" is meant to have taken place (Fogarty 114). Furthermore, in this iteration, the possibility of Parnell's return is framed in a significantly more Christ-like paradigm. Jesus' tomb was obscured by rocks, like those supposed to be in Parnell's casket, in the form of the boulder covering the entrance, and within that tomb no body was to be found. Following the discovery of this, Jesus revealed himself to his followers—a moment recognized in the celebration of Easter—not so much as a spirit, but as a corporeal form that then ascended into heaven. The common Christian idea of Jesus' return is such that when the world has

become cruel and evil enough, he will return to establish “his kingdom” on earth. So it is clear that Parnell’s absence was by no means defined by absolute terms, but in each case his return was directly associated with the establishment of the sovereign Irish state. We can perhaps add that such myths continued so long past his death because of widespread lack of faith in the ability of the movements that arose to fill the void he left behind to achieve lasting Irish independence.

Thus, the place of Tierney’s absence can be formulated in a quite different way than Parnell’s. The canvassers wait for Tierney’s return because its promise is payment for their day’s work. He seems to carry no lasting interest for the men, and supporting him represents just a day’s work. However, Tierney’s immediate role challenges Parnell’s place as the savior character. Following the allegory of Pentecost, Sylvia Horowitz comments:

> "Christ-like Parnell may live anew in the glossy green of the ivy sprigs in Joe's and Mat's lapels and in Joe's poem, but he has little power to inspire his followers with his holy spirit, through some miracle to give them the gift of persuasion that will enable them to win people over to his love” (Horowitz 146).

Truly, in Joyce’s text, the men’s inspiration comes from other sources, most notably Tierney, and the trick that Henchy learned from Tierney’s father for opening corked bottles of stout over a fireplace. Horowitz describes Tierney’s spirit acting in the room in the form of the stout: "The Pentecostal miracle of air, fire, glorious courage, and the ability to speak foreign languages, is a miracle performed not by the dead chief, Parnell, but by the spirit of Richard J. Tierney" (Horowitz 148). Parnell may still exist as if in the air around them, but if he is a Christ-figure, he is an impotent one. His presence is often seen to be marked by the lighting of candles in the story, and the light they then afford, but there is some critical debate over what the candles’ revelation actually represents. In the text Joyce describes: “A denuded room came into view and

the fire lost all its cheerful colour. The walls of the room were bare except for a copy of an election address. In the middle of the room was a small table on which papers were heaped" (*D* 108). Horowitz takes the candles as a sign of Parnell's fading influence:

> ...they expose the bareness of the room and take the cheerful color away from the fire...Thus the candle flames present the barest, emptiest suggestion of salvation and peace on earth—not much of a miracle sent by a god-like chief to suffuse his workers with power and persuasion (Horowitz 147).

Alternatively, O'Grady takes an opposing view: "Throughout the story, the darkness is obviously symbolic of the condition of Irish politics without Parnell; the brief glimpses of light reflect only the past glory of Parnell…In fact, when the room is finally candlelit, the decadence of Irish politics is suddenly revealed" (O'Grady 132). With both, the darkness of the room represents a force which Parnell's spirit is meant to combat, but Horowitz's observation also seems to blame Parnell in part for what the light of his spirit reveals, in the same way the canvassers may blame Hynes for their sense of guilt or petty betrayals due to his relative purity. In her terms, the room which Parnell's light illuminates stands in for the debased quality of Irish politics, which his presence had once promised to rectify. Thus, the light from Horowitz's candles is supposed to reveal Parnell's ultimately disappointing political presence in Ireland, overall. His presence is perhaps even seen as a detrimental one, as it takes "the cheerful color away from the fire." Horowitz's handling of this representation appears problematic, for her treatment of Parnell is overall very positive. It seems that for Horowitz, Parnell is impotent not because of a lack of faith among the men, but instead due to his spirit's relative powerlessness to impose itself more forcefully in the room.

For the men, Tierney, though less inspiring politically, promises immediate reward for their support, as opposed to the now-seeming false hopes of the Parnell years. Disenchantment

runs strong in most of these men, excepting Joe Hynes, who still seems to carry some of the idealism of the time. It is he, after all, who requests the candles. It is his subtly threatening presence that reflects O'Grady's take on the candlelight as the observational force that can put in relief the actions of the disenchanted canvassers. This view acts from Joyce's platform, using Parnell as an absolute point by which all others are judged. If the darkness is analogous to the men's unwillingness to accept negative responsibility for supporting Tierney despite the lack of sincere approval and genuine political feeling for him, then the light, however dim, of the candles is the force of revealing, in the shabbiness of the room's condition, the decadence of Irish politics that allows for the men to take this role. The candles do not so much condemn the individual men as attempt to expose the Irish political climate as one that is highly insincere and disingenuous, and one that inspires such behavior in others. The men are not necessarily of themselves to blame for their actions. They are simply the products of their social context, which, to Joyce, is one of the sharpest accusations of petty complicity to a self-destructive social order. The decadence brought to light by the candlelight is thus the fault of the men and their social context, as a matter of lost faith, rather than the fault of Parnell or his spirit. Horowitz's conception of Parnell's spirit is flawed in that it follows the logic of the myths surrounding Parnell's corporeal return, laying the responsibility for action on his terms, and seeming to blame him for taking so long to return. O'Grady's treatment is more realistic, treating the power of Parnell's spirit as a function of the extent to which faith in his political ideals persists in the Irish conscience.

In other respects, Horowitz's position is quite clear. For her, Tierney represents an anti-Christ figure whose absent place in the story is able to compete with Parnell's through tangible forms. It is his spirit that completes the Pentecostal allegory: "The election canvassers gathered

in an upper room in Dublin on the anniversary of Parnell's death similarly receive twelve influxes of spirit, bottles of stout opened by means of a trick using fire and air" (Horowitz 146). However, the means by which the spirit is infused among the men are decidedly not Christ-like. His spirit creates satanic inversions of the positive hope and sincerity of the Parnell years, based around the traditionally sinful occupations of monetary accumulation and alcohol consumption: "The arrival of the dozen of stout is payment from Tierney in a form that makes all of his canvassers feel more loyal, powerful, expansive, and generous. It restores their faith in worldly power and money" (Horowitz 152). The difference between the faithful Hynes and the other men is that, Horowitz notes, "Joe Hynes...does not need a satanic miracle to permit him to speak. Getting his power and eloquence from Parnell, he recites his poem to the assembly without benefit of Tierney's stout" (Horowitz 148). That this poem affects all of the men present, including the conservative among them on a sentimentally-driven aesthetic level, if not on an idealistic level, demonstrates Joyce's interest in portraying these as men who acknowledge their own divergence from what is perceived to be a more sincere past, and therefore their knowing complicity in the institutions that slow, or even block true movement forward.

The relationship between the men and their two absent, Irish, leaders is certainly revealing of certain of Joyce's intentions, but the matter is driven home by the question of the third absent party, the English monarch, King George. The men discuss the likelihood of Tierney voting to formally welcome the regent, and doubt lingers in the air, supported mainly by Hynes. Tierney is early-on portrayed as untrustworthy: "Tricky Dicky Tierney" (*D* 109); and this doubt over his willingness to welcome physical English royal presence first instigates this name-calling. There is a sense, verbalized by Hynes, that "If [Parnell] was alive...we'd have no talk of an address of welcome" (*D* 110). The return of the royal presence to an official welcome

after decades of absence parallels ironically the absence of hope once aroused by Ireland's "uncrowned king," and parodies the myths of his messianic return. Hynes' words imply that it is in this gesture of welcome that Irish politics would actively submit to its uninspired, dependent, and paralytic condition without Parnell:

> The conversation focuses on King Edward VII (an anti-Christ like Tierney, a charismatic leader whose coming will make a difference), and on Parnell. Parnell is dead, and his spirit—a yearning for freedom, for Irish independence, for equality—is really dead. (Horowitz 152)

The death of Parnell, in form and in spirit, seems to be the particular theme for this Ivy Day's reconciliation with the past. O'Grady notes that in Mat O'Connor's statement, "We all respect him now that he's dead and gone" (*D* 119), "it is in fact this comfortable 'respect' for Parnell which is the 'paralyzing' element in Irish politics, as this contemplation of Parnell releases the individuals from any sense of concern for contemporary political integrity" (O'Grady 140). The debate over Parnell's rightness or wrongness, his ability or inability to lead is no longer one that people want to discuss, nor does it seem worthwhile to pursue, for all it does is stir up "bad blood" (*D* 119). In death, Parnell can be treated with a blanket form of routinized respect, and not a second thought on the matter required. That this is Joyce's ultimate point, in presenting this scene as a perversely simplistic eulogy is argued by Horowitz who closes her essay speaking of Henchy's confidence in his own way of life: "Henchy welcomes Joe because his own world is in order—the values are perfectly straight: money and power" (Horowitz 152). Even the comparison between the sinful deeds of Parnell with Tierney's does not find an open ear, much less one comparing Tierney negatively to Parnell's ability to inspire sincere devotion. With the debate effectively ended, optimism like Hynes' eventually fades, as we witnessed above in the gravesite scene from 'Hades'. The apparent relativism of the politicians' messiah-figures is an

excellent symptom of their desire to put the past behind them and refrain from comparing it to their present, as well as an example of the chronic reemergence of Christian constructs in Irish life. This, indeed, is Joyce's estimation of the political condition of his Dublin, and therein lies his conception of the role he must play to revive not necessarily nationalist feeling, but at the least a functional attitude of non-complicity in those who might be active in politics: he must keep up the debate about Parnell in order to continually hold the political currents of Ireland accountable to his absolutist scale. It is in this way that he manages to continue on as Parnell's torch-bearer.

By ending "Ivy Day" with Hynes' poem, Joyce sets in high relief the self-awareness among the canvassers of their pale reflection of the power of Parnell's politics. This elucidates the nature of their paralysis: knowing that their current situation is not genuine, yet still working for it for personal gain while passively longing for a past full of sincere national ambitions. Apparent here is the difference between Ireland's post-Parnell nationalists and Joyce, as he represents himself in his work. That is, while the nationalists recognize the general insincerity of their work in light of the passions of the Parnell years, yet continue to push their current platforms into the future while mourning the past (though often only as lip-service), Joyce has forsaken the possibility that politics will change the heart of Ireland, choosing instead to work entirely in another realm that still can: that of aesthetics. Joyce commands literature as the only genuine means by which the conscience of Ireland can be freed. With the poem and its collective reaction, he portrays the canvassers of "Ivy Day" as trapped within the disingenuous political machinations of their time, and offered no route out by ideologically-driven literature, best represented in the proliferation of sentimental, backwards-looking poetry, like Hynes'. It is worth noting that despite the harsh language of the poem, none of the men feel that its

condemnations are directed at them. Left to themselves, they will not find liberation, so this must come from someone detached from the immediate contexts and expectations of Irish society—one who can judge on an externally-weighted scale.

In order to attempt to extricate himself from the cycle of cultural determination along Christianity-inspired mechanisms, Joyce employed a vicious brand of anti-clericalism. By doing so, however, he inadvertently aligned himself with certain aspects of the secular nationalist ideology, as published in such newspapers as *The United Irishman* and *Dana*. An exploration of where Joyce's goals overlap with those of the secular nationalists, and where he makes his point of divergence, will further elucidate the dynamic of the role he intended to play in Ireland's future.

Paralysis was a term used not by Joyce alone in describing the Church's effect on Ireland's people, culture and politics. However he might lay claim to it, the word was consistently used in the nationalist publications *The United Irishman*, and *Dana* to describe conditions similar to those observed by Joyce. In Douglas Kanter's observations, "Some of them propounded a secular ethic that was explicitly anticlerical, challenging the privileged political, social, and cultural position of the Catholic Church in Irish life" (Kanter 381). According to his evidence, Joyce's early perspective was heavily influenced by these writers, and Kanter traces this influence through their respective uses of "paralysis" as an anticlerical descriptor, and the development of the term's connotation over the history of the liberal Irish media. Kanter makes the continuity of thought between these journalists and Joyce sharply apparent in his description of the typical anticlerical journalist's perspective of Catholicism in a nationalist setting:

> These anticlerical journalists did not subscribe to the Catholic-Gaelic vision of Irish nationalism propounded by the more orthodox adherents of Irish Ireland. Instead, they anticipated a radical revision of the national character, accomplished through

> literature and culture, that would make the Irish Ireland movement irrelevant. In any case, the anticlerical nationalists deemed the promise of a Catholic-Gaelic nation to be illusory, because Catholicism and nationalism were irreconcilable (Kanter 388).

While Joyce's criticism of Catholicism's negating influence, as set out above, is of the grander, more aesthetically appreciable variety, dipping into time-worn, universally mythological parallels as it does, its basic sentiment is the same as that held by the anticlerical nationalists, and their intentions diverged only on the subtlest of terms. While the anticlerical journalists understood the powerful role that literature must play in the "revision of the national character", Joyce remained distant from them, "for he believed that artistic creation also required a complete independence from the priorities of Irish nationalists who often employed non-aesthetic criteria in the evaluation of literature" (Kanter 392). For Joyce, aesthetics trumped political value, and the essential difference between his perspective and that of the secular nationalists is just barely evident in Kanter's text:

> Literature, for the secular nationalists, emerged as a form of cultural activity least susceptible to clerical influence, because Catholicism and high art were essentially incompatible. But the hope for a secular cultural revival accomplished through literature transformed the artist into a messiah, capable of transmuting the Irish character through the production of imaginative literature (Kanter 388).

For the secular nationalists, literature had an ideological role to play. Joyce viewed this as implying a dependence of the artist on the nationalist perspective, which appears to contradict what, in practical terms, his own work suggests: that the nation is dependent on the literature, and on the cultural messiah, and not the other way around. According to Joyce, the nationalists would turn him into a messiah. He would prefer to do it himself, and to be revealed as such to the people of Ireland only after his figurative forty years of wandering in the desert. As Kanter summarizes, "Joyce, at least as a young man, believed that the artist, through personal experience

and self-expression, could contribute to the formation of a new national consciousness, inventing through literature an identity capable of unifying and liberating the polity" (Kanter 391). Indeed, it would seem that much of Joyce's concerted effort to distance himself intellectually, emotionally, and politically from Ireland, despite his frequent implicit ideological alignments with nationalists, was an attempt to ensure, in whatever way he could, that he could forever see himself as the sovereign figure in his relationship to Ireland. He must be the one to initiate exile, to "lay bare" the relationship between nation and individual, and must take steps so as to not be imagined as solely a product of an Irish upbringing. In his estimation, we can figure, he perceived himself as one who managed to *escape* becoming a true product of Ireland. That is, he flew "by those nets", and outran the "old sow" before its lips could fully part to devour him or his spirit.

For Joyce's mythic self-fashioning, the idea of the artist as sovereign is inescapably important, at least in his early writing. The Stephen we see in *Ulysses* represents a doubting of this sovereignty, as he has been pulled back to his homeland after an ill-fated sojourn to Paris and cannot thus seem to make his departure firmly enough with the means at his disposal. In the correlative time in Joyce's life, according to Ellmann's biography, the young man found much time for despair. The perceived danger of directly aligning himself in practice with the ideology of anticlerical journalists became very real when he confessed to his aunt that he considered:

> for the moment, in the year's doldrums, his expectations everywhere checked, it was emollient to think of himself as a superman, and he meditated a descent from the mountain to bring his gospel of churchless freedom to the unreceptive rabblement. To his Aunt Josephine Murray he confided, 'I want to be famous while I am alive' (Ellmann 142)

Following this moment of doubt, Joyce apparently threw himself into the creation of *Stephen Hero*, his first long work, an occupation which he undertook as if in direct opposition to the role

that Ireland's own would have set aside for him. The pseudo-violence of Joyce's reaction explicitly reveals the fervor with which he resisted the call of the secular nationalists for a messianic figurehead to advance their cause. The Stephen of this early text directly responds to a request to write for a nationalist, though notably not anticlerical, paper by saying: "<<Words, he said, have a certain value in the literary tradition and a certain value in the market-place—a debased value.>> Words are simply receptacles for human thought: in the literary tradition they receive more valuable thoughts than they receive in the market-place" (*SH*27). Thus, if the literary tradition were to be co-opted to the purposes of a nationalist agenda, it would become a work of the "market-place." The ideal for Joyce is represented in a letter of his own hand wherein he implies the importance of retaining his absolute control over his work: "In composing my chapter of moral history in exactly the way I have composed it I have taken the first step towards the spiritual liberation of my country" (*LettersI* 63). This is summed up by Kanter, who says, "he believed that artistic creation also required a complete independence from the priorities of Irish nationalists who often employed non-aesthetic criteria in the evaluation of literature" (Kanter 392). Furthermore, the Stephen of *Ulysses,* a Stephen comparable to that of *Stephen Hero* in that he is written as the double of Joyce himself as he was during the period of writing the earlier work, has the following encounter with liberal newsmen:

> The editor laid a nervous hand on Stephen's shoulder.
> —I want you to write something for me, he said. Something with a bite in it. You can do it. I see it in your face. *In the lexicon of youth...*
> See it in your face. See it in your eye. Lazy idle little schemer.
>
> (*U* 7.615-618)

The request for newspaper content is laden with enough expectation of a particular result to draw suspicion from Stephen, who immediately relates the event to his encounter in *Portrait* with the

Prefect who insisted on punishing young Stephen for not wearing his glasses, which of course were truthfully broken by accident. This is the first recorded instance of clerical injustice in Stephen's life, and that Joyce brings him to this so quickly in this scene is quite meaningful. On the one hand, we see the secular newspaper crowd associated with the young Stephen's clerical upbringing. On the other, we see writing for them as an act of imposed shame. Such an act would be nothing less than to fly straight towards those "nets" cast around him, and be drawn into the routine, uninspiring life of Dublin. This reading echoes two sentiments uttered by the Stephen of *Stephen Hero*, the first being in response to Madden's challenges concerning the root of Stephen's disliking the rabblement, to which Stephen replies in his defense: "Yes, a life of dull routine—the calculation of coppers, the weepy debauch and the weekly piety—a life lived in cunning and fear between the shadows of the parish chapel and the asylum!" (*SH* 55). The second, even more salient to the point, concerns the theme of Ireland's societal pressures on those born to it: "It was natural that the more the youth sought solitude for himself the more his society sought to prevent his purpose" (*SH* 38). His purpose was art, and the creation of art that would draw Ireland up from its paralytic morass. Thus, the difference between Joyce's perspective and that of the published anticlerical nationalist agenda is to be measured not on a scale of objective similarity, but on a scale of aesthetic value.

The distance between high art and politically-motivated art was so important for him to maintain that, in response to pressures he felt from society to begin contributing his own tongue to nationalist rhetoric, he threw off the idea of political influence entirely in his work, so as to give no formally recognized credit whatsoever to the nationalist movement for whatever influence it may have had over the young writer, Stephen, despite the definite correlations. Thus, it was possible for Joyce to establish a rhetorical situation of his own capable of sustaining

the myth that his opinions were borne solely from his own observation, and were not sullied by the rhetorical influence of any ideological body outside his own. Kanter traces the incongruity between the obvious influence and the ultimate artistic, mythic product:

> Despite the existence of a small group of anticlerical nationalists, Joyce remained very seriously estranged from much of the conservative cultural program of Irish nationalism, and his suspicion of this agenda may have prevented him from acknowledging his debt to the Irish secular ethic, which, after all, had its roots in nationalist politics. Joyce could only claim a complete independence from both Catholicism and nationalism by depicting himself as entirely isolated from an Ireland both pietistic and nationalistic, even though this failed to account for the significant nuances and tensions in the relationship between church and nation after the fall of Parnell. (Kanter 392)

In this summation, Joyce's appreciation of the secular nationalists is such that they appear as a reactionary offshoot of the far more powerful conservative strain of nationalism typified by the goals of the Irish Ireland program, which, Kanter says, "identified the Catholic faith and the Gaelic heritage as the twin pillars of Irish identity"(Kanter 381). Entering actively into the discourse of nationalism, on the side of the anticlerical nationalist, was a lost cause from the start, or at least would have seemed that way, since the minority presence could hardly expect to achieve much success in the necessarily reductive process of nation-forming. One is reminded of the passage in the 'Aeolus' episode in which the professor describes the Irish tendency toward lost causes: "We were always loyal to lost causes...Success for us is the death of the intellect and of the imagination. We were never loyal to the successful. We serve them" (*U* 7.553-4). Allegiance to such a platform, even in the form of printed discourse, was too much of an obligation for the young Joyce, if Stephen's words from a conversation with Madden (*Portrait*'s Davin) are any reflection:

> —But surely you have some political opinions, man!

> —I am going to think them out. I am an artist, don't you see? Do you believe that I am?
> —O, yes, I know you are.
> —Very well then, how the devil can you expect me to settle everything all at once? Give me time. (*SH* 55-6)

The limitations of political discourse, dependent as it is on chasing themes of, so often insincere, controversy for success, also make such engagement problematic for Joyce. While some may read Joyce's work as in some degree journalistic, owing to the factual context created by presenting real people as characters in real, physically accessible locations (such as the Revivalists in the National Library in episode nine of *Ulysses*), as well as the specificity of minute detail in his later works relating to life in Dublin, and especially the diagnostic reportage on 'paralysis' in *Dubliners*, his scope was too wide to fit onto the pages of a weekly journal as political writing. To return to Stephen's announcement at the end of *Portrait*, if one is to forge the conscience of one's race within one's own soul, then there will be much to report that is not journalistic in nature, and even not prescriptive. There will be portrayals of doubt, backtracking, and reversals, each intended to fully reveal the conflicts at the heart of being Irish, in productive terms. In many regards, Joyce's subject was not Ireland; it was himself, Joyce the Irishman, and by purifying himself of the myriad influences that plague the island, he could eventually work to purify the culture from which he came through aesthetic representations of its ailments. In this case, then, to focus on day-to-day political events as the source of one's literary produce is nothing more than a distraction, or, at the most, something to be observed as merely symptomatic of greater processes, and therefore something that must make up the bulk of neither one's work nor one's livelihood as an artist.

To remove this distraction from his early work, he removes all political and aesthetic discourse that is not directly related to Stephen's opinions (or the development thereof as in the

case of the Christmas dinner scene of *Portrait*) and allows Stephen to operate in a vacuum of intellectual debate:

> Joyce portrayed himself (one might even claim, mythologized himself) as a lonely voice exiled from a confessional Irish nation. The depiction of a paralyzed Irish society in *Stephen Hero*, *Dubliners*, and *A Portrait*, essentially devoid of serious secular challengers to the Catholic Church except for Stephen Dedalus, was artistically and personally self-serving (Kanter 392).

Through Stephen's apparently unique perspective, which is mobilized in his systematic deconstruction of all major opposing opinions extant in Ireland during Joyce's college years in the final chapter of *Portrait*, Stephen becomes a messiah-prophet figure for Ireland's intellectual recovery by denouncing false prophets and casting the Irish correlatives of Jesus' thieves and traders from the temple of his mind. By the terms outlined above concerning Joyce's establishment of an absolute point of reference for the observation of Irish politics, with Parnell as the unattainable and incontrovertible peak towards which all should strive, very few people who continued in politics would have escaped negative judgment, this being the inevitable result of the need for compromise in new political conditions. Kanter notes, "the conjunction of a cultural nationalist discourse with the Parnellite motifs in Joyce's anticlerical critique simply underscored the extent to which Irish cultural nationalism and anticlericalism both derived from the traumatic experience of the fall of Parnell" (Kanter 390). For Joyce, Parnell's fall was akin to the biblical Fall, after which all established ideological movements were equal in that none could claim innocence, or authenticity of intention. The Original Sin of Ireland, deduced from Joyce's perception of post-Parnell nationalist movements and from his own anticlerical strain, is betrayal. All parties that tried to pick up the nationalist movement after Parnell were stained by the conditions of his fall, and were implicitly connected from the start with the cultural revival movement by the fact that both were reactionary to the same point of departure, and must

necessarily carry similar qualities, even if they happen to manifest in contradictory ways. Only by rejecting all direct reactionary strains of ideology, even by occasionally conflating them in his work, could Joyce remove himself from the perceived inauthenticity of Irish politics post-Parnell. For Joyce, his alignment with the Parnellian ideal was not in itself a reaction to his distaste for the state of post-Parnell politics, but was rather a continuation of the ideal that must be safeguarded against contamination by other political movements.

This resulted in a desperate unwillingness to live within Irish society, and a near-compulsion to reiterate in his written work what he viewed as the continual betrayal of Ireland's heroes by the very people they would serve, and in so doing, to subvert the mechanisms that perpetuated that particular implicit structure of oppression. It was not mere self-reflection that he hoped to bring to his Irish readers, it was self-reflection with a dose of self-criticism beyond simply recognizing the foes. To accomplish this required attacking the seats of traditional power, as well as actively recognizing and identifying the long-term effects present in the Irish population. The essential quality that seems to emerge in Joyce's work, through his demonstrations with the canvassers of "Ivy Day" and his literary responses to anticlerical journalism is a brand of self-reflective criticism that not only identifies the sources of oppression, but that also tracks their long-term influences on the individual and attempts to eradicate them entirely from the individual's perspective. This is one of the major processes we see in action in the progression from Joyce's self-lauding portrayal of Stephen *Stephen Hero* to the more ironical portrayal in *Portrait*, and finally to the heavy irony, even satire, of the Stephen of *Ulysses*. This is Joyce employing a literary method of de-socializing oneself from the influences of one's native country. In this, we locate the root of Joyce's rebellion. His need to separate fully was at times self-serving, but it was essentially the framework for an attack on the dominant power

structures operating in his experience of Ireland. Joyce's mission was the mission of an individual against the conditions of living in his nation, and even more, the assertion of the individual's right to try and repair the nation's "conscience," against the wishes of the dominant powers, but for the sake of its citizens. If Joyce had stayed in Ireland, he would have continued to work within the context established by the ideological systems of the country; having left, he gave himself the ability to forge new means with which he could engage actively in reevaluating the relationship between individual and nation. It is in this act that Joyce creates of himself a revolutionary artist.

III. The Literary Revival

Joyce's obvious concern for the cultural health of Ireland mirrored in some distinct ways the stance occupied by W. B. Yeats and the Irish Literary Revival. However, in much the same way that he distanced himself from anticlerical nationalist journalism, Joyce formed a resistance to the machinations of the Revival and its effects that was, once established, firmly grounded in its self-righteous opposition. Richard Ellmann suggests that Joyce's resistance to the Revival's ideology was born quite early in life: "The second propaganda he resisted was that of national revival, which had filtered down from various organizations like the Gaelic League into the school. He was not ready to accept all his nation; as a Parnellite he was suspicious of attempts to ignore old wounds, preferring to cherish them" (Ellmann 55). We do see this resistance demonstrated throughout Joyce's work, but Clare Hutton recognizes a period in the later part of Joyce's time in Ireland where he "regarded himself—however momentarily—as part of [the Literary Revival]" (Hutton 196), referring to a letter in which he told Nora, "You have a right to be there because you are my bride: and I am one of the writers of this generation who are perhaps creating at last a conscience in the soul of this wretched race" (*LII* 311), referring to their attending a piece of theatre in Dublin. Hutton continues: "The picture which emerges is one of a writer who is certainly more viscerally engaged by revivalist culture than the artist constructed in fiction, Stephen Dedalus, who remains tacitly aloof, determined not to 'serve' 'home', 'fatherland' or 'church' (Hutton 196). Hutton is certainly correct in noting that Joyce was directly involved with the Revival in a way that Stephen was not, but it was through this involvement that Joyce managed to perfect his model for estrangement and independence in the literary world. In the case of the Revival there is a pointed reversal in the typical relationship between Joyce and his literary avatar Stephen: whereas Stephen is typically portrayed as the young man who, after

confronting an increasingly complex series of obstacles and opponents, is ultimately able to become a Joycean artist, in the case of their respective relationships with the Revival, Joyce portrayed Stephen as the young man he perhaps wished he himself could have been, insofar as noting Stephen's greater detachment and independence of opinion.

While so many pivotal experiences from Joyce's own development as an artist in Ireland are included in *Stephen Hero*, *Portrait*, and *Ulysses*, the notable absence of influential Revivalist figures in the first two texts is curious when so much of Joyce's beginnings as an artist were dependent on the aid and interest of prominent Revivalists like Yeats, Russell, and Lady Gregory. Yeats appears by implication for a brief moment in Chapter Five of *Portrait* when Stephen remembers an experience at the theatre analogous to the *Countess Cathleen* incident, but is otherwise absent. That several of these figures appear by direct reference, if not interactive literary presence, in *Ulysses* suggests indeed a change of perspective in Joyce. It is likely that, upon reaching a comfortable distance from their work, he was confident enough to finally engage them directly with Stephen in his text. On the other hand, what Hutton seems to suggest is that Joyce's dependence on them prevented him from engaging them thus prior to his decision in 1912 to leave Ireland for good, a decision founded on the repeated failure to find an Irish publisher willing to publish *Dubliners*. He understood the need to publish through typical Revivalist channels in order to achieve recognition in Ireland, and, as Hutton notes, he greatly desired this recognition: "Joyce's letters of the period make it clear that he associated potential publication in Ireland with a profound desire to gain literary recognition in Ireland" (Hutton 200). As long as he hoped it could still serve him, he could not fully make his departure from it.

This chapter will attempt to elucidate the steps leading up to Joyce's definitive departure from Ireland in 1912 as primarily a function of his relationship to the Literary Revivalist

movement, and from there to follow the particular quality of his aesthetic rebellion as it reveals itself in his work. As Mary McCarthy put it, “He was able to go home freely, but his books could not" (McCarthy 53). Where his books could not go, his preferred way of life could not flourish, and it was only with the confirmation that his work would meet only opposition in Ireland that he decided never to return and to make his exile complete. In this way, his exile was justified yet again as his only recourse in a society that seemed bent on corrupting his spirit and through compromising his creative energy.

Ellmann’s observation, as stated above, that Joyce was not ready to accept all of Ireland is particularly salient to our objective, and the recognition of the influence of his Parnellite roots on this condition forever exalts the effect Parnell’s fall had on all aspects of Joyce’s life, even his aesthetic and ideological relationship with the Revival. In particular, Joyce was sharply adverse to the rural Irish population he referred to as “the rabblement,” which, coincidentally, was also one of the groups blamed most roundly for “the chief’s” downfall, due to their essentially Catholic outlook and resulting trust in the allegedly infallible opinions of the Church hierarchy. Perhaps the first ideological division between Joyce and Yeats occurred over their different perceptions of the rural population. Indeed, Ellmann recounts that when Joyce visited George Russell for the first time, he "complained that Yeats had gone over to the rabblement" (Ellmann 99). In a sense, this was yet another betrayal in Joyce’s early development as an artist. If the artists on whom he must depend for exposure and aesthetic guidance are engaged in ideology that he can not approve of for himself, he must look on this as a disruption of his artistic career, especially as he had earlier held considerable respect for Yeats’ work. That Yeats’ Revivalist mission focused so heavily on engaging this reviled, rural, demographic in the (re-)construction of an authentic Irish culture implicitly aligned the author’s goals with the socio-economic group

most representative to Joyce of the essential cultural depravity and complacency of Irish society. His feelings on this group are represented in *Stephen Hero* in an exchange between the young man and his friend Madden (later Davin), who was sympathetic to the rural folk:

> —Of course you despise the peasant because you live in the city.
> —I don't despise his office in the least.
> —But you despise him—he's not clever enough for you.
> —Now, you know, Madden that's nonsense. To begin with he's as cute as a fox—try to pass a false coin on him and you'll see. But his cleverness is all of a low order. I really don't think that the Irish peasant <<represents>> a very admirable type of culture.
> —That's you all out! Of course you sneer at him because he's not up-to-date and lives a simple life.
> —Yes, a life of dull routine—the calculation of coppers, the weepy debauch and the weekly piety—a life lived in cunning and fear between the shadows of the parish chapel and the asylum! (*SH* 54-5)

Where Yeats would try to engage them, Joyce would prefer to exclude them altogether from the development of an Irish literary culture. Stephen's words here are mild in comparison to the opinions expressed in Joyce's passionate 1901 essay, "Day of the Rabblement," in which he railed against Yeats' supposed conversion to the side of ignorant popular culture, a move that, Joyce seems to imply, even throws question on Yeats' artistic authority: "It is equally unsafe at present to say of Mr. Yeats that he has or has not genius…But an aesthete has a floating will, and Mr. Yeats' treacherous instinct of adaptability must be blamed for his recent association with a platform from which even self-respect should have urged him to refrain" (*CW* 71).

These lines, written in response to the staging at Yeats' Literary Theatre in Dublin of an Irish-language play, come from Joyce as reaction against what he saw as a form of cultural betrayal. The theatre had initially expressed the intention of producing plays from the continent alongside Irish plays, but was clearly moving in an Irish-dominated direction. According to the events described in Ellmann biography, Joyce was affected by this in two ways. The most

pressing was the fact that he had been working on a translation of a non-Irish play that he had likely hoped to have produced at the Theatre, but under the observed conditions had become increasingly unlikely (Ellmann 88). Thus we can observe the ideological movements of the Revival blocking, not for the last time, Joyce's potential for exposure. The second effect concerns Joyce's appreciation of Yeats' play *The Countess Cathleen* which had been performed two years earlier in the Literary Theatre. Many in the audience, included Joyce's friends, deemed the play anti-Irish, which conversely appealed to Joyce who was drawn to its themes:

> The theme of a Faustlike scapegoat for the race appealed to him; the countess' 'sacrificial exhalation' was like his Stephen's, who would contract to suffer like her, or like Lucifer, for his race. Joyce was also moved by the lyric, 'Who Goes with Fergus?', which Florence Farr sang; its feverish discontent and promise of carefree exile were to enter his own thought. (Ellmann 67)

All of the themes identified here by Ellmann would go on to carry enormous weight for Joyce's perception of himself and his role in Ireland, influencing his ultimate decisions to go abroad, and encouraging his iconoclastic tendencies toward traditional aesthetics. For a brief time, Yeats perhaps seemed like a possible role model for the young artist, but the former's later divergence from such themes and toward Irish-language plays represented to Joyce a severe departure from the role of the artist as he perceived it necessarily to be, and a movement toward monetary prosperity over artistic integrity. In so doing, Joyce no doubt felt, Yeats' revival had once again short-changed him in terms of providing adequate material to which he could positively align his artistic development. Joyce's resentment is barely concealed when he describes the disappointing lack of inspiring models for Irish art: "A nation which never advanced so far as a miracle-play affords no literary model to the artist, and he must look abroad" (*CW* 70).

The Literary Theatre's decision to reduce or end its attempts to bring in art from abroad was thus unforgivable for the young Joyce. He describes the risk faced by the artist who has the

"rabblement" for his audience, and implies the resulting risk that the Literary Theatre, by not bringing in European plays, imposes on the state of artistic development in Ireland in his essay: "If an artist courts the favor 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" (*CW* 71). He continues, directing his criticism to the Literary Theatre:

> 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. But his true servitude is that he inherits a will broken by doubt and a soul that yields up all its hate to a caress; and the most seeming-independent are those who are the first to reassume their bonds. (*CW* 71-2)

The final lines are essential to understanding the totality of Joyce's aversion to the Revival's practices. By engaging positively with the rabblement, they must engage with their perspective in a way that is more laudatory than critical. Therefore, the negative aspects of the culture will leak into the work of the very people capable of creating high art for Ireland's "advancement". Among these negative qualities is a "soul that yields up all its hate to a caress," or, in other words, a soul that is more willing to collaborate with the forces oppressing it than to express distaste or disinterest towards it. If we follow Joyce's expressed opinions of the rural perspective, then the "will broken by doubt" seems to be the independent will of the individual, and even of the community, that is broken down by Catholic insistence on guilt and dependence on the continual receipt of God's grace, along with an intellectually-crippling tendency toward superstition. In this view, then, rather than improving the state of Irish culture by invoking traditional stories of a dead Gaelic culture, the Revival is doomed to slowly succumb to the same paralysis that for Joyce emanates out of the existing culture of the "rabblement". By depending on Irish myth for source material, and the rural poor for audience, the Literary Theatre had sold

out not only its own free artistic spirit, but perhaps also the artistic conscience of all of Ireland. Again, Joyce was presented with a situation in which the only ideological solution was detachment. However, in this case, for practical reasons he was obliged to remain connected to the Revivalist movement. Thus the only difference in these terms from his detachment from the nationalist movements is that he did not need political nationalists for furthering his career as an artist. He needed the influence of the Revival on his side, at least in the early years. Still, Joyce's relationship with the Revival, at least in his writing, seemed to travel a narrow line between utilization of its institutions for his own ends and pointed criticism of the Revivalist perspective in general.

One of Joyce's earliest engagements with the aesthetic ambitions of the Literary Revival was with the Gaelic League, which his friend, George Clancy, had brought to University College to teach a course in the Irish language. The experience was strong enough to find representation in both *Stephen Hero* and *Portrait* as a major moment of divergence between Stephen and his friend, and consequently the movement towards cultural nationalism. As it was portrayed in the earlier work, Stephen only sought to take the course in order to spend more time closer to the girl of his desire, one Emma Clery:

> Stephen had decided to address himself to Madden to [find out] ascertain where Miss Clery was to be found. He set about this task carefully...Madden who had previously tried in vain to infect Stephen with nationalistic fever was surprised to hear these overtures of his friend. He was delighted at the prospect of making such a convert and he began to appeal eloquently to the sense of justice. Stephen allowed his critical faculty a rest. (*SH* 52-3)

The attendance of the young woman Emma is the only cause for Stephen's attraction to learning Gaelic, and in the pursuit of her he acknowledges that he must give up some of the fire of his discontent. He must submit, for a brief time, to the rhetorical claims of his ardent friend without responding negatively in turn as he normally would. Curiously, neither *Portrait* nor Ellmann's

biography suggest that it was Joyce's imperative that led him to join the class. In both cases, Stephen was persuaded by Clancy/Davin to join. Perhaps this is some bit of insight into the change in Joyce's attitude toward the Revival movement. His intended use of the Gaelic course to get closer to Clery reflects his perceived involvement in the mechanism of Revivalism, and his attempts to use its influence to support his own advancement before his final disenchantment with the program.

In the later work, *Portrait*, Stephen's reason for joining the class is not discussed openly, but that his reason for leaving is attributed to the suspected relationship between his desired companion and the priest who taught the class suggests that his interest was in some way influenced by her attendance. A notable change in the conditions of his leaving the course occurs between *Stephen Hero* and *Portrait* as well. In the earlier work, Stephen refers to the teacher, who is in this case secular, in a way that coincides with his actual experience with the class, which he allegedly dropped "because Patrick Pearse, the instructor, found it necessary to exalt Irish by denigrating English, and in particular denounced the world 'Thunder'—a favorite of Joyce's—as an example of verbal inadequacy" (Ellmann 61). Thus it was in *Stephen Hero* that Stephen's main complaint with the course was ideological in terms of linguistic preference:

> The teacher was a young man in spectacles with a very sick-looking face and a very crooked mouth. He spoke in a high-pitched voice and with a cutting Northern accent. He never lost an opportunity of sneering at seonism and at those who would not learn their native tongue. He said that Beurla was the language of commerce and Irish the speech of the soul… (*SH* 59)

The Emma's suspected relationship with the priest is handled several pages later in this text, when Stephen attends a weekly nationalist meeting and observes her interaction with a young priest, "a great favorite with the ladies" (*SH* 66). For *Portrait*, Joyce obviously thought it more useful to conflate these two scenes, making the young priest the teacher, and thereby linking the

project to spread Gaelic in Ireland with clerical infidelity and the young man's sexual disappointment. In fact, this echoes a description of Stephen given when he is probing Madden for information about Emma's attendance to the course, and indeed, a sentiment that Stephen reiterates throughout his presence in Joyce's work: "The Roman, not the Sassenach, was for him the tyrant of the islanders" (*SH* 53).

Thus, one of the major points of contention between Joyce and the Gaelic League in particular is a disagreement about which is the greatest adversary. It is not difficult to trace the reasons for Joyce's feeling: with the denigration of the English language, Ireland stood to lose its deepest connection to the progressive culture of the rest of Europe. Further, the strongest supporter of the Gaelic League in Joyce's work, Madden/Davin, is also associated strongly with the rural poor through expressions of sympathy, his challenges to Stephen's distaste for their culture, and through the very name "Davin", which calls to mind Davitt, the Land League chair who fought for rural property rights. If Gaelic were to become the standard language for artistic output in Ireland, the nation's culture would continue to look inward upon itself while simultaneously forging deeper connections between the artists and the rural poor, a death sentence to aesthetic integrity for Joyce, as we've noted in his other writing. That he further compacted the issue by involving a priest in the active spreading of the Irish language reflects an opinion recorded by Ellmann concerning clerical involvement in the arts: "If Ireland was not to be 'an afterthought of Europe'—a phrase he devised for it about this time—it would have to allow the artist his freedom and would have to muffle the priest" (Ellmann 67). In *Portrait* Joyce seems to have resolved the doubts attributed to the earlier Stephen in his conversation with Madden:

> —So you admit you are an Irishman after all and not one of the red garrison.

> —Of course I do.
> —And don't you think that every Irishman worthy of the name should be able to speak his native tongue?
> —I really don't know.
> —And don't you think that we as a race have a right to be free?
> —O, don't ask me such questions, Madden. You can use these phrases of the platform but I can't. (*SH* 56)

If in this time it seemed to him that the Revival-inspired institutions were ultimately inseparable from clerical involvement then the immanent nature of Joyce's complete divergence from their project was clear. He could not hope to publish his anti-clerical stories in such a climate without engaging directly with native anti-clerical discourse, and perhaps even becoming known as a writer in the employ of this particular secular nationalist ideology.

Ultimately, Joyce appears to conflate in *Portrait* his experience with the Revivalist program with the "Irish Ireland" movement, which, Kanter notes, recognized "the Catholic faith and the Gaelic heritage as the twin pillars of Irish identity" (Kanter 381). Davin becomes the unequivocal champion, and locus for Joyce's criticism, of this movement:

> His nurse had taught him Irish and shaped his rude imagination by the broken lights of Irish myth. He stood towards this myth upon which no individual mind had ever drawn out a line of beauty and to its unwieldy tales that divided themselves as they moved down the cycles in the same attitude as towards the Roman catholic religion, the attitude of a dullwitted loyal serf. Whatsoever of thought or of feeling came to him from England or by way of English culture his mind stood armed against in obedience to a password (*P* 195-196)

Yet, the ambivalence noted by Hutton is present in Stephen's relationship with Davin: "The homely version of his christian name on the lips of his friend had touched Stephen pleasantly when first heard for he was as formal in speech with the others as they were with him" (*P* 195). Davin carries also a rustic charm of familiarity for Stephen, being the only one among his friends to refer to Joyce's avatar by his first name. There is something comforting to Stephen in this, but

in the ideology his friend espouses lies a sinister danger: “No honorable or sincere man...has given up to you his life and his youth and his affections from the days of Tone to those of Parnell but you sold him to the enemy or failed him in need or reviled him and left him for another. And you invite me to be one of you. I’d see you damned first” (*P* 220). Perhaps surprisingly, this connection between social reference to one’s first name had occurred as well in *Stephen Hero* in the scene discussed above, wherein Stephen observes Emma Clery engaging with Father Moran: "Every Friday evening he met Miss Clery, or, as he had now returned to the Christian name, Emma. She lived near Portobello and any evening that the meeting was over early she walked home,” (*SH* 65). Occasionally, he describes, Emma was held up talking to the priest, who is characterized by Joyce’s narrator as “such a pleasant tender-hearted vulgarian that Stephen felt inclined to slap him on the back admiringly" (*SH* 65-6). Again, a friendly familiarity that rests atop an undercurrent of possible betrayal or usurpation.

This type of relationship seems to accurately describe Joyce’s perception of the Revivalist presence in Ireland. Under auspices of reviving a “true” Irish culture, based on genuine interest and appreciation for Irish myth, perhaps they also represented a threat to Irish culture and self-identity through expression of their own self-interest. Joyce addressed what he saw as the inconsistencies and ideological shortcomings of Revivalism in a series of critical works, the first being the essay he wrote for the Literary Historical Society of Dublin on the mid-century poet James Clarence Mangan. Ellmann describes Joyce’s choice:

> By choosing Mangan, Joyce implied that, however widely he might range in European literature, he was altogether ready to discover merit in his countrymen when it existed. The burden of his talk was that Mangan, though a nationalist poet, had been neglected and maligned by the nationalists. It was left to an Irishman with European standards to recover him. (Ellmann 94)

Not only was Joyce exalting his own aesthetic sensibility, he was criticizing the Revivalist perspective for missing the value of one of Ireland's own noteworthy poets while caught up in their own project. While, as Ellmann points out, Joyce was not as original as he thought he had been in "discovering" Mangan, the purpose of the essay is quite clearly "to develop a theory of the artistic needs of Ireland," which Ellmann derives: "The literature to come must be a fusing of Mangan's intense romantic imagination with a classical strength and serenity" (Ellmann 95). Here we see, therefore, another example in which Joyce attempts to create his idea of Ireland's aesthetic in direct and conscious opposition to the one simultaneously being created by the Revival, which he viewed as inadequate for accounting for Ireland's needs. This was not an attempt to directly contribute to Revivalist theory, this was an attempt to establish himself as an outspoken critic of the movement itself. Thus he claims Mangan for his own, while also removing Mangan from potential labeling as essentially an "Irish Ireland" poet, Catholic and nationalist though he was, by his appropriation of the qualities he saw expressed in Mangan's work and biography for his own aesthetic and personal project in opposition to the Revival.

As Ellmann noted, Joyce was far from the first to discover Mangan as a poet. However, while Mangan's troubled biography did not suit the ideologies of Yeats and others of the literary circle, the poet became a definite source of inspiration for the young Joyce. Yeats did not feel the poet had a great place reserved in the history of Irish poets: "The manly combative vigor which Yeats thought so typical of the O'Grady and Ferguson strain of Gaelicism is absent in Mangan, whose trademark becomes an intense, but essentially feeble, introspection" (Platt 263). He would be no warrior for the Gaelic cause, but this was not of great importance of Joyce. What was important to him was that Mangan had suffered, and had then been roundly ignored or, at best, considered briefly before being then cast off by the Irish intellectual community. He

makes a point of beginning his first public consideration of Mangan with a description of what he perceived to be the quality of recognition the poet received in contemporary Irish literary circles: “his countrymen lament that such poetic faculty was mated with so little rectitude of conduct, surprised to find this faculty in a man whose vices were exotic and who was little of a patriot” (*CW* 76). Thus Joyce makes an observation that could easily be made also of Parnell: that Mangan was a man of great ability and value to Ireland who was nevertheless degraded by a social focus on heavy condemnation of his personal vices. Mangan, in this first essay, is only one in a long line of Irish notables sacrificed as a scapegoat to the “priest-ridden” Irish society. He is connected firmly to the tradition in the following phrase from the essay as Joyce attempts to describe the injustice of Ireland’s dismissal or ignorance of the poet:

> In logical and serious countries, it is customary to finish the monument in a decent manner, and have the sculptor, the city officials, orators, and a great crowd of people attend the unveiling. But in Ireland, a country destined by God to be the eternal caricature of the serious world, even when the monuments are for the most popular men, whose character is most amenable to the will of the people, they rarely get beyond the laying of the foundation stone. (*CW*176)

The victimized Mangan is further elucidated by Joyce: "Mangan is the type of his race. History encloses him so straitly that even his fiery moments do not set him free from it" (*CW*81). For Joyce, Mangan was the Irish archetype in literature on whom he might draw for inspiration. His sentiments toward his own sense of intellectual isolation in Ireland are reflected in his description of Mangan’s: "Mangan, it must be remembered, wrote with no native literary tradition to guide him” (*CW*78). Simultaneously, the path of Mangan’s life provided even further example for Joyce that life as an artist of worth in Ireland is difficult, if not ultimately dangerous, coming with no guarantee of positive recognition, regardless of true talent and produce.

Joyce no doubt found much of himself in Mangan's biography. As he describes it, "He had always been a child of quiet and unresponsive nature, secretly given to the study of various languages, retiring, silent, preoccupied with religious matters, without friends or acquaintances" (*CW* 177). The final phrase concerning Mangan's intellectual isolation echoes Joyce's recognition of the risks of exile, as he went off to be "alone and friendless" in Europe (*LettersI* 53), and the man's silence finds a double in Joyce/Stephen's triple maxim of "silence, exile, and cunning." Thus, while the person of Mangan was troublesome to Yeats and the Revivalists, Joyce found in it something inspiring, and in this difference one of the more important distinctions between the two perspectives becomes clear: the Ireland that the Revival was attempting to resurrect was essentially incongruous with the history of Irish culture as Joyce perceived it to have occurred. This became the topic of the first of a series of lectures he gave in Trieste in 1907: "Ireland, Island of Saints and Sages."

The differences over Mangan can serve for our introduction to the themes of Joyce's essay: "The 'landless landowner' regarded the one Catholic poet of any significance from this period as a rootless, self-destructive figure outside the mainstream of Gaelic culture; the churchless Catholic presented Mangan as summing up Celtic dispossession, the last representative of a dead culture" (Platt 264). For Yeats, Mangan was writing in a context of Gaelic artistic output and could thus be measured, and ultimately devalued, in terms of those others more suited to his program. For Joyce, Mangan was operating in complete isolation, not by his own machination, but because the tradition that he carried on had already effectively died out, and derived much of his importance from this fact. Joyce discusses briefly Mangan's place in Irish cultural history in "Ireland, Island of Saints and Sages" as if it were a eulogy for the whole tradition, saying, "The old national soul that spoke during the centuries through the

mouths of fabulous seers, wandering minstrels, and Jacobite poets disappeared from the world with the death of James Clarence Mangan," and continues his attack on the Revival's failure to properly acknowledge him: "With him, the long tradition of the triple order of the old Celtic bards ended; and today other bards, animated by other ideals, have the cry" (*CW*173-4).

In the essay, Joyce speaks at length about Irish cultural history to a Triestine audience, challenging throughout the preconceptions at the root of the Revivalist perspective of this history and their place in it. L.H. Platt outlines the major contentions as follows:

> The lectures challenge the Revivalist consensus on three main grounds. First, there is the charge that the Revival's indifference to the achievements of the early Irish Church produces a false historiography of Irish culture. Second, Joyce makes a clear distinction between national culture and Anglo-Irish culture, thus refuting the Revival's enunciation of its own ancestry. Finally, and perhaps most radically, Joyce refuses to accept the view that an authentic national culture, protected and cultivated by an Anglo-Irish intelligentsia had managed to survive and even flourish in adversity beyond the eighteenth century. For Joyce the Gael was dead and beyond resurrection, except on Joyce's own terms. In these respects, the Triestine lectures represent the response of a Catholic dispossessed writing in the context of a cultural history usurped by the Anglo-Irish. (Platt 259)

In this light, the Revivalist program loses validity as a natural continuation of native Irish culture, and becomes a contrivance with definite ideological ends rooted more in the individuals of the Revival than in the artists and Gaelic culture from which they claim inspiration. At best, Joyce portrays the Revivalists as confused and misinformed, operating on a false understanding of what the true Gaelic culture is. At worst, they become self-serving ideologues passing their condescending version of what Irish culture should be onto the Irish people, powered onward not by interest in reviving an ancient culture, but rather occupy themselves with co-opting signifiers of that culture for their own purposes. As we will see, Joyce outrightly assumes the latter position in *Ulysses*, but for the current piece, his condemnation is more implicit. In Platt's

words, he saw that "The Revival was a culmination of Anglo-Irish attempts to secure for itself a remnant of the one-time hegemony it had over Ireland" (Platt 264). Thus, the Revival was hardly a purely-Irish movement to begin with. It was yet another force of essentially external power staking its claim on Irish cultural resources for its own benefit.

Additionally, Joyce deals with the recurring problem of Ireland's treatment of her people. He describes the Irish presence abroad: "when the Irishman is found outside of Ireland in another environment, he very often becomes a respected man. The economic and intellectual conditions that prevail in his own country do not permit the development of individuality" (*CW* 162). The problem is not the Irish people, it is the country that does not properly provide for them. In the terms of the "old sow", it is a nation that erases the possibility of future improvement by destroying its youth, either by the paralyzing indoctrination of the Church or by casting them abroad to make their own way. He continues, "No one who has any self-respect stays in Ireland, but flees afar as though from a country that has undergone the visitation of an angered Jove" (*CW*171). As a result, the remaining population is composed of those people who were not bright enough to get out, or who were irreversibly indoctrinated too early in life to realize their fate: "The old men, the corrupt, the children, and the poor stay at home, where the double yoke wears another groove in the tamed neck; and around the death bed where the poor, anaemic, almost lifeless, body lies in agony, the rulers give orders and the priests administer last rights" (*CW*172). Ireland is a place of spiritual and cultural death not because it does not produce clever people, but because it is necessary for them to leave before they can truly develop that potential. By the description just offered, to be stuck in Ireland and be clever is to consent to one's own intellectual death sentence, which may naturally come only after years of disenchantment and spiritual oppression.

Notably Ireland is also depicted as a place maligned by the Church to which it offers such devotion, and in this relationship Joyce does elucidate certain aspects of the self-defeating Ireland he recognized in his youth. Not only in this instance, but in describing the primary role of the Church in the initial entrance of the English: "Well, the Holy See has repaid this fidelity in its own way. First, by means of a papal bull and a ring, it gave Ireland to Henry II of England," (*CW* 170). The relationship between the Irish and the powers to which they either devote themselves spiritually or depend on reluctantly for political or practical matters is a poisonous one that causes detriment to Ireland. These external forces act as if they were the tapeworms inhabiting the belly of the metaphorical old sow: "Now, what has Ireland gained by its fidelity to the papacy and its infidelity to the British crown? It has gained a great deal, but not for itself" (*CW*170). Irish artists have contributed a great service to the English language by their produce, and in so working, they have supported the culture of the oppressing power rather than their own. They are a confused people, perhaps, in how they accept the British culture before their own, while receiving little for themselves or for their country. Ireland is portrayed as a country that has continually offered up its own death certificate for the signing. The initial entrance of the English is even depicted by Joyce in a queer manner so as to elucidate this almost pathological drive toward self-destruction: "the fact is that the English came to Ireland at the repeated desire of a native king, without, needless to say, any great desire on their part, and without the consent of their own king, but armed with the papal bull of Adrian IV and a papal letter of Alexander" (*CW*162).

The drive toward self-destruction leaves few options for the bright young folk of Ireland that does not result in their own demise. The possibilities offered by expatriation are many, however, and according to Joyce's paper, seem to be the only way by which Ireland might

resurrect itself, at least as an ideal. "Today these Irish emigrants in the United States number sixteen million, a rich, powerful, and industrious settlement. Maybe this does not prove that the Irish dream of a revival is not entirely an illusion!" (*CW*171-2). The illusions of the Revival exist only so long as the major players are tied to the land and institutions of Ireland, and within the same operational sphere as the "old men, the corrupt, the children, and the poor". Joyce, hoping to avoid such illusions, as well as the paralyzing Irish condition, thus defends his exilic tendencies while placing himself in a historical context through which he can become a recognized part of an opposing revivalist movement. It was no secret, of course, that Joyce planned to deeply affect the Irish conscience and instigate thereby a sort of revival of Irish involvement in the European world as well as in national self-perception. Thus he could not be aligned with the Revival either, ultimately, any more than he could be tied to the landed politics of Irish nationalism without sacrificing his idea of the form the revival must take to an array of questionable ideological underpinnings and institutionalized illusions.

The content of "Ireland, Island of Saints and Sages" was not the final point of divergence between Joyce and the Revival, for he was still operating in their terms, albeit in a negative manner. However, it does establish for him the historical precedent for his legitimate resistance to the program. In addition, some of his less-discussed thematic additions signal the essential differences between his perspective and that of the Revivalist program. Most particularly, he took some slight issue at the insular nature of the Revival's goals: "even a superficial consideration will show us that the Irish nation's insistence on developing its own culture by itself is not so much the demand of a young nation that wants to make good in the European concert as the demand of a very old nation to renew under new forms the glories of a past civilization" (*CW*157). Working, as he was, at creating for Ireland through his work a place in

the wider European cultural context, this particular directive of the Revival seemed backwards-looking and anti-constructive. Surely it seemed for Joyce to be incompatible with his program, reliant as it was on the guttural and little-known, even in Ireland, Gaelic tongue, and on glorification of Irish history without much of the criticism that Joyce clearly felt was necessary.

In addition, and perhaps most importantly, he briefly discusses the impracticality of a Revival that railed against the English presence more than the Roman: "But in anticipation of such a revival, I confess that I do not see what good it does to fulminate against the English tyranny while the Roman tyranny occupies the palace of the soul" (*CW*173). If the soul is damaged, the words of the Revivalists will carry less weight than those from an undamaged soul, following Joyce/Stephen's logic concerning his rejection of the offer to write for the nationalist paper in *Stephen Hero*, and echoing Stephen's retort to Madden's pressures: "It seems to me you do not care what banality a man expresses so long as he expresses it in Irish" (*SH* 54). Again and again, Joyce reveals his belief that it is not the words themselves that matter first in the composition of literature, but the soul or spirit behind the words. He finds in the Revivalist program enough inconsistency between the ideology and the observed reality of Ireland and Irish history to throw into question the validity of the soul of the Revivalist project for reconstructing a stronger Irish culture, at least so long as the Gaelic Language, for instance, was lauded over the actual ideas being expressed. Such perspective suggests inattention to detail and actual content in favor of meeting ideological needs, a reversal of what Joyce perceived necessary for true artistic output. If nothing else, this essay of Joyce's proves that his final departure from direct involvement in the Revival context was not spurred onward only by his blocked attempts at publishing. Such problems were merely symptomatic of the processes which he had begun observing many years earlier, as part of his increasing realization that such departure from that

context was necessary for the free exploration of his own themes. The arguments of his essay prove that he understood the terms of his departure, and its connotation in the context of Irish cultural history, long before it actually occurred in 1912.

Ulysses, which is the only prose work of Joyce's other than Finnegans Wake written entirely after his 1912 departure, is also the only text that places Stephen in direct communication with Joyce's fictional versions of real Revivalists. Perhaps he felt confident enough at this point to put his ideals in direct dialogue with those expressed by the Revival, or perhaps it was just that he had finally gotten far enough away in spirit and body to avoid the directly damaging influence of engaging in Revivalist discourse within an immediately Irish context to be able to do just that. He himself had fought his battles with the Revival, both on the page and in the publishing house, so it was time to send Stephen into the ring. The ideological battle here is more focused than at any other time in Joyce's earlier work, and tends to carry more weight, as Stephen grapples with themes of usurpation and historical predetermination. The most central encounter occurs in the 'Scylla and Charybdis' episode, where Stephen meets with the Revivalists and expounds a theory on the life and works of Shakespeare. The setting of this scene is of primary importance, since Stephen finds himself in "The National Library of the nation which, in 1904, had no legal existence, [and had] evolved from Anglo-Irish institutions" (Platt 740). The library has further relevance for its distinctly Protestant qualities, having been known, as Platt points out, to refuse membership to members of the Catholic hierarchy (Platt 740). Stephen's perspective is of course less dramatic than that, but the sense of alienation still persists: "Stephen's sense of the National Library as alien ground, of himself as an Irish-Jew in a colonized Egypt-Ireland reflects a Catholic sensibility" (Platt 740). Already having given up the Church, it is strange that Stephen feels this alienation as a Catholic. The Protestant, decidedly

Anglo-Irish setting seems to draw him back in, like the other “nets” he experiences during this return to the island, to older forms of identification which are more recognizably Irish. Immediately, the Library is an offensive place because it makes Stephen re-enter relationships that he has no interest in continuing, and is therefore aligned with other “nets” like religion, familial expectation, and nationalism.

That the Revivalists inhabit the Library space more comfortably, immediately draws them as well into the category of “nets,” insofar as they do not support Stephen’s perspective, and attempt to either tear it down completely or condense it into accepted Revivalist ideology. It is perhaps in the condensation of intellectual work that their project appears most insidious in this chapter. Platt recognizes that their treatment of Stephen relates to Yeats’ treatment of Mangan, referring to their observing “Stephen's uncouthness of mind" (Platt 740). Thus there is the assumption that Stephen’s exclusion from the group is in part due to his not fitting a particular moral norm that the Revivalists see as congruous with the ideal Irish conscience, a prescription which condenses Irish history beyond the point of recognition, at least according to Joyce’s opinions in the works discussed above. Indeed, his exclusion from participating in the group in any real terms is heavily laced with a condescension that extends to the wider Irish race: " 'All smiled their smiles' is not innocuous: it is a bitter narrative intervention and marks the racial gap between Stephen and the rest" (Platt 741). About the Revivalists hangs the assumption that they, the Anglo-Irish intelligentsia know better than the native Irishman. The pronouncement of the “racial gap” in this chapter allows Joyce to examine the Revival’s relationship to the history of Irish culture in terms of what we have seen is a common theme: cultural usurpation. Platt argues, "The fundamental issue at question in this episode...is the legitimacy of Anglo-Ireland's claim to be in the process of forging from nothing more than an

appropriation of Irish myth and folktale nothing less than the consciousness of the nation" (Platt 737-8). Of course, since Joyce/Stephen sees the Revival as yet another ubiquitous and limiting institution in the Irish landscape, the national conscience that comes of it will be more isolating and entrapping than liberating, as his would be.

One way in which Joyce presents the Revival's project in this harsh light is by accentuating the contrivance that accompanies their means. Ellmann describes a perspective carried by Joyce, at least for a time: "One could meet these writers of the 'revival' and read their works without suspecting that the writers were made of flesh and bone" (Ellmann 166). Indeed, this is perhaps how some of them preferred to be imagined: as merely the receptacles of ancient Gaelic lore. What it comes down to, however, is that without the apparent "flesh and bone," the ideal perspective carries more weight than the actual, corporeal experience. Indeed, the means are projected in the brief discussion of the yet-to-be-written Irish national epic:

> Our national epic has yet to be written, Dr. Sigerson says. Moore is the man for it. A knight of the rueful countenance here in Dublin. With a saffron kilt? O'Neill Russell? O, yes, he must speak the grand old tongue. And his Dulcinea? James Stephens is doing some clever sketches. We are becoming important, it seems. (*U* 9.309-313)

There is a sense of communal labor that implies that the blueprints already exist somewhere in the ideology that the Revivalists themselves have constructed. The national epic will serve a distinct purpose, and all involved will agree upon them. It will be an ideological text, like all national epics must be, but to Joyce, it will be one that is too much connected to the same, ideologically usurped ground that had held Ireland back for so many centuries, and would be worse still, little more than the continued extension of external dominance of Irish life: "Historically predetermined to stand on usurped ground, [Stephen] reads his exclusion from the mapping of Ireland's literary future as a form of cultural apartheid and his contemporaries' claim

to be articulating the voice of the nation as a form of cultural dispossession…" (Platt 741). Stephen's silent response, "Cordelia. *Cordoglio*. Lir's loneliest daughter"(*U* 9.314), connects this feeling to the sentiments surrounding his personal associations to the Revivals' dismissal of Mangan's personality as incongruous with artistic talent. Because he is honest, like Cordelia, and prefers to engage with the world relatively without contrivance, he has been dispossessed by the ruling elite of the Irish literary world. It is clear, to Stephen at least, that the cultural aspirations of the Revival reflect a certain injustice, as if they were the mad king Lear, acting more for self-flattery than for proper governance of his realm.

The contrivance and implicit predictability of Revivalist creative output is further placed in relief to Stephen's apparently honest approach to the world as the chapter closes, when Mulligan grills him over the review he had recently given Lady Gregory's work, while working as a reviewer, a position which he had gotten only by the influence of Gregory herself. Mulligan fusses, "O you inquisitional drunken jewjesuit! She gets you a job on the paper and then you go and slate her drivel to Jaysus. Couldn't you do the Yeats touch?" (*U* 9.1159-1161). Joyce has Stephen recall some lines of the particular real-life review by Yeats that Mulligan is referencing: "The most beautiful book that has come out of our country in my time. One thinks of Homer" (*U* 9.1164-5). Joyce is surely hoping for irony, knowing that he has indeed written a book recalling the epic scale of Homer in a way that a Revivalist could not. All the same, Stephen is just as distant from the Irish literary circles so essential for gaining recognition as a young artist; his dispossession has been cured very little, if at all, by his engagement with the Revival figures, and he remains empty-handed: "a dispossessed Catholic, ill at ease in his country's National Library, addressing the luminaries of the Anglo-Irish intelligentsia who are shaping Ireland's literary resurgence…..It is this set of circumstances which produces the 'voice of Esau' (*U9*.281)

and an instinct for revenge" (Platt 265). Bubbling under Stephen's dialogue with them are the same sentiments that led Joyce to compose "Gas From A Burner" in 1912, following the rejection of *Dubliners* by well-known Revivalist-leaning Dublin publishing-house, Maunsel and Co.

"Gas From a Burner" satirizes the self-congratulatory publishing circles of the Revival, particularly in terms of their apparent moral sensibility. The speaker of the poem, George Roberts, manager of the publishing firm, lauds himself for accepting the crude subject matter of a variety of Revival-minded poets, while simultaneously defending his decision to not publish Joyce's scathing work, the collection of stories meant to diagnose and elucidate the cause and symptoms of Ireland's national problem: paralysis. Once again, the common themes of betrayal, and complicity in betrayal appear in this text:

> But I owe a duty to Ireland;
> I hold her honor in my hand,
> This lovely land that always sent
> Her writers and artists to banishment
> And in the spirit of Irish fun
> Betrayed her own leaders, one by one.
> 'Twas Irish humor, wet and dry,
> Flung quicklime into Parnell's eye; (*CW* 243)

There is recognition by the speaker of the harm that Ireland no doubt does to its great artists and leaders, however, this recognition is noted in terms of inevitability. Joyce's Roberts aligns himself with the very spirit of Irish conscience that Joyce detested and feared so greatly. In addition are suggestions of xenophobic effects of Irish cultural isolation in Roberts' description of his rejection of Joyce:

> But I draw the line at that bloody fellow,
> That was over here dressed in Austrian yellow,
> Spouting Italian by the hour
> To O'Leary Curtis and John Wyse Power
> And writing of Dublin, dirty and dear,

In a manner no blackamoor printer could bear. (*CW* 244)

Roberts' patriotism, which accepts only what fits the ideological bill, is his failing point in Joyce's representation. Nothing that he blames Joyce of doing in the space of this poem does not appear elsewhere in the poem, either in his expression of his convictions or in the descriptions of the other writers' subject matter, except for the "Austrian yellow," and speaking in Italian. In Joyce's take on the matter, what was being persecuted was not his writing necessarily but his European influences and attitude.

Of course, this poem must be taken only conditionally, written with frustrated passion as it was, but within it we can observe Joyce expressing to some degree the implied alignments with wider issues that the Revival's ideological machinery carried. The reference to Parnell and the Austrian clothing, for instance, attribute to the Revival an implicit alignment with all that is devastating to Irish culture, most explicitly a tendency toward betrayal and an inward-looking xenophobia. This poem, whatever its objective value might be with regard to characterizing either the explicit or implicit relationships of the Revival, grants us a clear picture of Joyce's mind on the verge of his final self-expulsion, his final dismissal of the Irish way of life, on Irish soil at any rate. He had had enough of the complicity of Irish institutions with the dominant external powers whether they be English or Roman:

In the porch of my printing institute
The poor and deserving prostitute
Plays every night at catch-as-catch-can
With her tight-breeched British artilleryman (*CW* 245)

If his work was not to be compromised by becoming a prostitute in its own right, he would have to leave and develop himself elsewhere. Hardly a moralist himself, Joyce no doubt found issue with the Revivalist perspective, a sentiment described by Ellmann: "For the moment the whole literary movement seemed to him as much a fraud as the Irish virtues, among which cruelty

masqueraded as high-minded moralism, and timid onanism masqueraded as purity" (Ellmann 166). To him, they would always be trapped by their conscious imitation of their elected artistic inspirations, and would not move on to true, valuable contributions of their own—a value that, to Joyce, begins developing in the work of the creative individual who chooses to work from his own soul, and not as the produce of an ideological circuitry bent on a relatively unified and ultimately harmful goal.

IV. Forging an Exile

We have thus far observed Joyce as he was in relation to the major social movements produced by Ireland around the turn of the 20th-century: the movement toward national sovereignty, and the artistic revival program intent on restoring a native Irish culture to the island. Further, we have noted several of Joyce's stated reasons for the need to depart and how such departure might help him attain his personal, which are almost by definition also his artistic, goals, as well as definitive moments that mark to totality Joyce's physical and intellectual departure from the island and its culture. What remains for us is an examination of the means by which Joyce constructed his sense of exile and the conditions under which he fashioned a mode of estrangement whose qualities still prove troublesome to theorists and critics a century later. We will do this through an examination of specific interactions carried out by Joyce in his interpersonal affairs that reflect on his relationship with the wider Irish context. Additionally, we will in this chapter attempt to construct an understanding of Joyce's relationship to his home country through observing his departure in relation to the massive emigration experienced by Ireland following the Famine. A discussion of the theme of betrayal, mentioned several times already in the text, in which we will place the theme more concretely and systematically into this discourse, will assist us in the ensuing analysis.

For Joyce, betrayal became a defining quality of Irish life, and one with which he would grapple throughout his life. Already noted is the great impact that Parnell's fall had on Joyce as a young boy. This event introduced betrayal as a theme of Irish life to Joyce largely through the institution of the church. Though he did write his poem "E Tu, Healy" in reference to the political response, the presentation of the Christmas dinner argument scene in *Portrait* as primarily the fault of the Church's actions and the loyal acceptance of these by the faithful is a

sign of Joyce's preferred means of reflecting on the rhetorical turmoil of the time. Rather than focus on the political machinations, he implicates most strongly the Church's role, a stance which was staunchly held in Joyce's own home. Where the intricacies of political maneuvering would be largely over the young man's head, the dynamic of the Church's relationship to the Parnellite crisis was straight-forward and salient enough for even the uninitiated to grasp, and therefore more likely to influence the young Stephen's social development.

Young Stephen recognizes the initial union of Church and Parnell's nationalism in Dante's two brushes: "Dante had two brushes in her press. The brush with the maroon velvet back was for Michael Davitt and the brush with the green velvet back was for Parnell" (*P* 3-4). The conjunction with the Church comes from the basic fact of her religious conviction. That she represents embodied Irish Catholicism throughout the first chapter creates a first relief for understanding Joyce's presentation of Church and Parnellian politics. She, the embodiment of religiosity, has two brushes, two accessories that can be easily tossed off, and have no great significance when considered with the totality of the picture, including the fervor of Dante's spirit. The tie between the two forces is therefore loose to begin with, and what follows in the dinner scene is nothing more than a disintegration of this connection, that takes with it the stability of the household, which, in this chapter, as Simon Dedalus and Uncle Charles clearly embody the Parnellite perspective, and Dante the Catholic one, is also a reflection on the perceived disintegration of the relative stability of Ireland brought about by Parnell and his gift for constructing unity between disparate forces. Despite this power, the accessory nature of his representation in Dante's intimate world of hair-care concretely establishes him as the victim, powerless against such a foe, who uses him for the sake of her own appearances. He was taken up and set down by the Church as one might pick up and set down a hairbrush.

Thus it is Dante's position, loyal to the Catholic platform, and representative of omnipotent power, that is ultimately responsible for the disruption of the Dedalus home. The betrayal of the Church is powerful enough to bring the dynamic emotions and incendiary rhetoric of the public sphere indoors, where it has an adverse effect on the peace of the home, that most intimate of spaces, within which children are raised according to the beliefs of the parents. It can thus be considered a personal affront to the young Stephen, neither wanting confrontation at this age, nor understanding the intricate root of such disruption, that the argument at the table destroyed any semblance of a childhood home built on a unified ground. If the early home is the child's microcosm for greater society, this event effectively relates to an irreparable schism, a civil war between religious and national interests, following which, for at least some time, neither is capable of holding the boy's attention for long. The Church loses credibility as an institution of stability, and the nationalist movement following Parnell's death, as we've already noted, lacked the same motivating spirit that had inspired so many followers, including the young Stephen. Excepting his brief conversion in Chapter 3, Joyce's avatar remains both distant from wider society and skeptical of its machinations, as a result of this schismatic scene of betrayal, setting him up for an inevitable departure, whether it ended being physical or purely intellectual.

In the preceding example, we see betrayal formulated by Joyce as a primary formative element in the life of the character who would, upon reaching full maturity, become an artist analogous to Joyce. The disappointment of Parnell's fall affected Joyce and Stephen in perhaps different ways: Joyce attached his interest to the betrayal of Healy, relating it directly to the classical example of Caesar's betrayal by Brutus. Stephen, on the other hand, remains passive, the object of concern whenever the argument got too heated, and recipient of the blank face of

the tension between Parnellites and the Church following the Fall. Stephen is one who is made only of imprints only for the first several pages, at least, and arguably, signified through the use of the third person until the final pages, remains similarly passive until the end when he decides to make his own life, as well as the new Irish conscience. Joyce, as a 9-year-old writing his poem, contributes his voice as well. The betrayal struck him powerfully, but he was not struck dumb, nor was he without recourse to comment. In this light, the construction of the Christmas dinner scene reveals in Joyce's re-appropriation of history, both his own and that of wider Ireland, the desire to condense even further the perceived assault on the Irish dream of independence, self-sufficiency, and prosperity in sovereignty by the Church, effected in real life in any number of small but pervasive ways (as presented later with more definition in *Dubliners*), into the assault on the formation of the social consciousness of a single Irish child. Joyce, through his literary avatar Stephen, begins to portray himself as a receptacle of the betrayal of all Ireland. Stephen's development into a Moses-like artist who will lead the Irish people out of their intellectual Egypt into a *nova Hibernia* is a development in terms of the long-term effects of a deep immersion in betrayal.

The precedent for this sort of savior-artist becomes apparent, in Joyce's conception, throughout his later work. In the 'Cyclops' episode of *Ulysses*, among the parodic interludes are dense populations of Irish heroes of centuries past, meant to underline the statements of the Citizen with historical weight. Naturally, Joyce's mechanisms ultimately undermine the Citizen's bragging and indeed, reflect satirically on any claim made by an Irishman that the history of Ireland is in fact one worth resurrecting, or further, one that in itself provides a lens through which they might see the island's sovereign future. In the list that extends itself in the early part of the section, a large portion of the names listed are those of men who, albeit known

as prominent historical figures, were either failures at achieving their intended goals, betrayed by poison and other deceit or treachery, or were otherwise made by history to look like fools (*U* 12.176-199). Indeed, one of the effects of this construction is evident in the juxtaposing of more contemporary figures with historically-notable figures of centuries past. For instance, Red Jim MacDermott, who was "An associate (and in 1868, a betrayer) of Michael Davitt", is placed among the betrayed figureheads of Irish past like Red Hugh O'Donnell, who was poisoned by agents of Queen Elizabeth I, and Owen Roe, who "was supposedly poisoned by one of his own supporters" (Gifford 321). Clearly MacDermott's connection does not derive directly, since he was the betrayer, not the one betrayed, but the conjunction is striking enough that it places him in a genealogy in which he is clearly the one in the wrong: the weight of betrayal is magnified on a historic scale, and used to implicitly judge him. Coming out of a society with such a long history of betrayal, the savior artist figure is the one who can properly sublimate all of that history into his creative work, and in so doing purge, by revelation, the conscience of the people of the structures that continue to propagate the tendency toward betrayal. Joyce to some extent fits into this category, and Stephen fits even more cleanly.

For contrast, we can take Joyce's perception of the Literary Theatre's transition from the promises of productions from the continent and other non-Irish writers to predominantly Irish-centered seasons. This transition, as we have already noted, was taken by Joyce as an act of personal betrayal. Not only had he been hoping to finally witness non-paralytic culture in Dublin and perhaps to find inspiration within it, but he had also been crafting his own translation of a continental play that perhaps he had hoped to have performed at the Theater (Ellmann 88). Thus it was not only an indirect betrayal of the cultural state of Ireland, but yet another speed-bump

for Joyce's career. To him, this was but one further execution of the passive betrayal implicit in the structure of the Irish society, and the properly socialized Irish mind.

By engaging with the root of the Irish tendency toward betrayal and self-destruction while he was in exile, Joyce was able to act as one who knows and understands the conditions while not being one who is still so firmly held by them. He stated many times in his letters that with exile he would be able to look upon Ireland with clearer vision (Ellmann 110), yet he understood also that he would thereby continue to be a part of the Irish heritage, as only one of roughly seven million Irishmen who left their country between 1850 and 1921 (Mierlo 181). As we can see in his life and text, he was quite aware that while he was able to escape the day-to-day pressures and limitations of Irish society, he was still very much a part of the dialogue of betrayal, and that this dialogue was practically inescapable. Wim Van Mierlo covers the intricacies of Joyce's place in this aspect of Irish life in his essay "The Greater Ireland Beyond the Sea": "He was…wholly self-conscious about his sense of betrayal...Looking for ways to rationalize his departure, he was decided upon calling himself an exile" (Mierlo 179). Joyce was involved in a duality with betrayal forming both of its constituent parts. On the one hand, Ireland did not provide for her children to prosper, in part because of the influence of British and Catholic institutional regimens, but also due in part to a seeming pathological inclination to self-sabotage. On the other, those who left deprived Ireland, by their action, of her promising and industrious youth. As we noted from Joyce's Triestine lectures, many of these Wild Geese found great prosperity in other national settings, that provided them with opportunities for individual advancement while leaving Ireland to herself. This is one of the main tensions playing on Joyce in his place in the duality: the benefit of the Irish individual is typically removed from the benefit of the greater Ireland, and so one must choose between one's own intellectual, cultural, and

economic advancement and the alternate possibility of working within Ireland for its advancement as a prosperous nation. To Joyce, the latter may have seemed a lost cause, but all the same, he found a middle route.

He viewed the movements that came out of Ireland, the post-Parnell nationalist movement and the Literary Revival, as in some way corrupted by the paralyzing presence of the Church and the British state, and the potential for such corruption by these institutions to be nearly infinite. As a result, escape was necessary for preserving the freedom of the young man's mind, which would in turn "forge the...conscience of [his] race" (*P* 276). To Joyce, what Ireland needed most was a diagnosis from a cosmopolitan European perspective, not homegrown cultural programs or ideologically-based nation-building initiatives. What was needed was an in-depth re-evaluation of the Irish consciousness. Hence, for instance, the ultra-detailed portrayal of Bloom and Stephen in *Ulysses*. Joyce would act as physician, diagnosing a sick and self-destructive patient, and later prescribing medication. His intentions are clearly stated with the production of *Dubliners*, and Ellmann describes him as "The writer, who had Ireland for patient, to anatomize and purge" (Ellmann 97). This position is argued in Mierlo's treatment of *Exiles*: "Ultimately Robert argues that, for the artist, exile is not a question of dislocation, as it was in the experience of the many economic migrants, but just a temporary relocation in search of new materials to stimulate the nation's spiritual growth" (Mierlo 186). Joyce's exile was certainly not temporary, but his connection to the island remained strong throughout his life, and though his body did not return, his mind was constantly returning as he composed his works. Joyce would not return, and his works could not return, but his mind, while creating them, returned constantly. Mierlo points out how Joyce's efforts are similar to the means by which other emigrants remembered their homeland, "Where the emigrant borrowed images from a rich

historical and literary tradition of exilic lore to lend dignity to his state, so Joyce created his image of the involuntary exile, modeling himself after other exiled writers from the past" (Mierlo 180). But we must note Joyce's departure from these other emigrants. Whereas other emigrants chose to remember their roots through patriotic songs and parades, and otherwise engage in "indulging in melancholic backward glances" (Mierlo 180), Joyce insisted on collecting nationally-definitive cultural artifacts and utilizing them in his works to reveal essential characteristics of his vision of the existing Irish consciousness. Rather than looking to such signifiers of a national belonging for comfort and reassurance that such belonging would continue in exile, at least in spiritual form, as the typical Wild Goose would according to Mierlo, Joyce took these signifiers and used them as part of the building material for his new Irish conscience. In these terms, then, Joyce's exilic longing toward Ireland was not intended necessarily for the Ireland that he left, but the Ireland that he perhaps hoped to enter after his time in the metaphorical desert, a changed Ireland. The typical emigrant lamented having to leave, yet Joyce recognized the opportunity presented by exile to develop not only himself, but also a literary treatment of the conditions of Ireland that might serve to develop a new, progressive Irish national conscience.

Yet, the conditions established by a relationship based on mutual betrayal still existed between Joyce and Ireland. Mierlo notes that one of the ways by which Joyce justified his departure was by "exaggerating the wrongs done to him, deliberately alienating people who could have helped him with his early career" (Mierlo 179). He recognized that by leaving, he was depriving Ireland of yet another of its brightest children, and so he took great pains to ensure that the record placed him as the continual victim. And who could say that he was not in some way to become a victim of the paralyzing conditions of Irish discourse, or had not already

become one in some degree? The constricting influence of the major institutions has already been well noted, and Joyce was certainly not poised to take up progressive arms against them. Perhaps because of the immensity and general impervious nature of these institutions, Joyce decided upon the necessity of making betrayers out of his personal acquaintances and friends as well, to distribute the possible focus points for the accusation of betrayal, and as further proof perhaps that none in Ireland would be able to help him, that he must escape with Nora, as if he were a second Noah fleeing the flood of paralysis that encroached upon his mind.

Stephen's systematic encounters with representative figures is not a mere fabrication, though they were condensations of Joyce's experiences with his schoolfellows that he no doubt took an amount of license with in forging his stance. They became to him figures of Judas, those who would in some manner pose a threat to the success of his mission, a threat that becomes all the more sinister by their proximity to him. Although each is attributed different flaws, together they create an image of Joyce's contemporaries that does not support the idea that they are ready for the nature of his eventual artistic output, and furthers the idea that Ireland would not know what to do with him apart from trying to alter his perspective.

Stephen's Cranly is Joyce's Byrne, who represents a certain form of ignorance that at first seemed to interest the young artist. He was known for his silences, which fascinated Joyce, "who felt the power of silence to be limitless if one assumes that it hides words" (Cixous 455-6). But this was the problem with Byrne, according to Cixous: "The intensity is simply a mask for complete lack of thought, for thought that has been replaced by ready-made dogma" (Cixous 456). Byrne's apparent meditative nature had drawn in the young Joyce, curious to see what might be lurking inside. Brought close enough to catch a glimpse, however, Joyce discovered that what lay in that mind was nothing that had not been told to it: "Cranly-Byrne has submitted

to the Church's imperatives because he has nothing of his own to say; he is nothing but an empty mind, unable to make any response to the excitements and demands of others' thoughts. He can only receive and list" (Cixous 456). In other words, Byrne represents a promise of great intelligence or wisdom, or of meditative contemplation, yet in actuality carries none of these traits. He is the empty shell into which the Church looks to pour its doctrine, and from which nothing original can emit. Cranly thus becomes the symbol of deception in Irish culture. He is further recognized, albeit subtly by Joyce, as being of peasant-birth, from Wicklow, a fact that Cixous uses in her analysis of the character: "The fact that Cranly is a peasant is very suitable for one who is to play the part of the defender of the faith; the superstition and materialism of country life are in themselves an indication of the little worth Stephen sees in his adversary" (Cixous 457-8). Even worse than if he had been of urban birth and had the same mentality, to Joyce his peasant roots seem to signify even further the infiltration of rabblement influence in Dublin society, that one of that clan might pass for a meditative student rather than a superstitious farmer.

Such absence in terms of intellectual compatibility with Joyce was not unique to just Cranly-Byrne. Indeed, Cixous notes that Joyce appears to have chosen his friends based on how susceptible they might be to hearing his ideas, or at the very least, on how ineffectual their responses might be in actually challenging his thoughts: "And why did Stephen choose such companions?...partly because Joyce was attracted by mediocre people who would be passive and easy to subjugate, because his wish was to expound his ideas rather than to discuss them" (Cixous 463). He was not looking to refine his ideas through debate; he did not seem to see the need. Rather, he would be as a prophet, spreading his word, and in these terms the idea of his schoolfellows as Judases makes a great amount of sense.

In the case of Cosgrave-Lynch Joyce took exceptional offense to his friend's contrary nature. According to Cixous, at root their relationship was ideal for Joyce: "he…was an indefatigable disciple, always free and easy, always available, intelligent, and…always conscious of himself as a failure" (Cixous 469). However, as Cixous goes on to say, "He is both pitiful and dangerous, playing the part of the small traitor in both Joyce's and Stephen's life More masochistic than sadistic" (Cixous 469). She describes him as one "unable to overcome his own weakness" (Cixous 469), and therefore as one who is incapable of change. While at first he appears to be a willing slate upon which Joyce can iterate his ideas, he ultimately proves, to Joyce's mind, to not only be incapable of freeing himself spiritually, but to also be the source of a great deal of resentment directed toward one who feels that he has thus freed himself: Joyce himself. The characterization of Cosgrave as Lynch continues the idea that the Irishman, toward the artist, will exist deceptively: presenting an apparent willingness by implication of an awareness of his own shortcomings, while ultimately lashing out against those who might change it with more refined ideas. He becomes, for Cixous' argument, the "anti-artist":

> Lynch is the champion of pornography, of the aesthetic of the ugly. his vocabulary is dirty, his habits betraying inhibition and pointless revolt. To him Stephen expounds his aesthetic theory, choosing as though to please himself an audience with sufficient sensibility to understand him, but one who is too materialistic and unhappy to be convinced. (Cixous 471)

She goes on to say, "it is clear that he is imprisoned irremediably in his Irish soul" (Cixous 472), suggesting that the reasons behind his inability or unwillingness to follow Joyce's scripture too closely are not ultimately his own fault, but rather the residue of the society that raised him to be "materialistic and unhappy".

The case of Davin, modeled on Joyce's friend George Clancy, is particularly telling of the conditions under which Joyce accused his friends of betrayal. As Cixous states, Clancy was

"one of the few friends Joyce had at University College and who did not betray him—perhaps because, as chance would have it, he never met him again after college" (Cixous 463), but even so he finds himself replicated among the series of representative figures at the end of *Portrait* as one in a line of ideologies demolished by Stephen's rejection of them. The peculiar nature of Davin's place in the text is described by Cixous: "Davin is the only person for whom Stephen feels affection without any mistrust; ...Unlike Lynch and Cranly, Davin also confides in Stephen, and it seems that at last this may be a real and happy friendship" (Cixous 463-4). Unfortunately, as Cixous demonstrates, Davin represented a figure similar to that of Cranly, the pure receptacle of Church information. Similarly, Davin conforms to the mainstream norm of young Irish life. The difference is, however, that while Cranly only receives, Davin also attempts to spread. To Joyce, he represents "a ridiculous or shameful Irishman," one who "is completely brainwashed by the vague mental forms of University College" (Cixous 464-5). Notably, however, Davin seems to be the most genuine in his belief. He is himself quite active in the spheres that he supports intellectually, and therefore knows them personally, which is not something that Cranly can say for his allegiance to Catholic norms. Davin's social conditioning is no fault of his own, but he at least has the independent agency to call Stephen by his first name when no one else does. The rivalry between the two, in the terms laid out by Cixous at least, is the most direct and genuine on both sides. However congenial the two characters might be, or Joyce and Clancy may have been, Joyce could not accept, nor have his literary avatar fully accept, a person to be so close to him who is so steeped in the rhetoric and conditioning of Ireland's major nationalist institutions, not to mention that of the Church. Davin is the figure of the future Ireland envisioned by many within the national movements, no doubt, due to his strong form and

adherence to the movements' goals, and therefore must be avoided by the artist who would forge the conscience of a different new Ireland.

Perhaps the final instance worth examining in this vein concerns Nora Barnacle, and her place in Joyce's experience with love, with women, and with the politics of interpersonal relationships in general. In *Stephen Hero* we are introduced to Emma Clery, an attractive young woman known for her active presence in the nationalist and Revivalist institutions of the time. As we've said, it is with her that Joyce first presents the idea of clerical infidelity in relation to his own frustration as a sexual being. The situation returns in *Portrait*, with a far more obscure female perpetrator, not entirely clear whether she is an Eileen Vance who has aged along with Stephen, or the Emma who may or may not be the same Clery, and who Stephen refers to by her first name only preceding the retreat in Chapter 3. Her precise identity is not the most important thing for this analysis, however. In all cases of female presence in young Stephen's life in which there could be connoted a direct sexual implication (that of course does not occur), Stephen is left feeling abandoned, foolish, or guilty. The prime example of this is to be found in Stephen's contemplating on the young girl's hands:

> Eileen had long thin cool white hands too because she was a girl. They were like ivory; only soft. That was the meaning of *Tower of Ivory* but protestants could not understand it and made fun of it. One day he had stood beside her looking into the hotel grounds. A waiter was running up a trail of bunting on the flagstaff and a fox terrier was scampering to and fro on the sunny lawn. She had put her hand into his pocket where his hand was and he had felt how cool and thin and soft her hand was. She had said that pockets were funny things to have: and then all of a sudden she had broken away and had run laughing down the sloping curve of the path. Her fair hair had streamed out behind her like gold in the sun. *Tower of Ivory*. *House of Gold*. By thinking of things you could understand them. (*P* 33)

What brought to Stephen visions of apparently clarity, and reinforcement of the power of meditative thought inspired in Eileen only a passing consideration of what "funny" things pockets are. This departure of Eileen's, both apparent in its physicality and implicit in its spirituality, set the young Stephen up for the impermanence of inspiring women in his life. They would evade his grasp, finding themselves instead drawn to symbolic figures like the Gaelic-League priest for comfort. Stephen's extra-social perspective, and his later iconoclasm would not attract them. Hands return to Stephen's thought preceding the retreat in Chapter 3 of *Portrait*, as he imagines the rector presiding over his illusory marriage to Emma: "Take hands, Stephen and Emma. It is a beautiful evening now in heaven. You have erred but you are always my children. It is one heart that loves another heart. Take hands together, my dear children, and you will be happy together and your hearts will love each other (*P* 125). This moment combines union with Emma and a much-desired forgiveness by super-human figures, and so the appearance of hands again at the beginning of this vision is testament to the importance of the symbolic gesture to Stephen. It is a reconciling of the breaking of hands initiated much earlier by Eileen, as well as of the only prior mentioning of Emma by name in the text, only a few lines prior to the above line, when Stephen's hands are again implicitly recalled, as he recounts his shame for having entertained erotic thoughts of Emma for his self-pleasure (*P* 126). Hands, thus sullied by sexual abandonment as well as sinful sexual self-fulfillment, are returned to a positive light, but only in Stephen's fantasy.

That the false reconciliation of guilt and abandonment with women came from the rector prefigures the three-point relationship Stephen begins to develop for understanding women: a situation explored in depth in Cixous' extended study on Joyce's exile. Stephen reflects on his admired lady at the end of *Portrait*: "He had told himself bitterly as he walked through the

streets that she was a figure of the womanhood of her country, a bat-like soul waking to the consciousness of itself in darkness and secrecy and loneliness, tarrying awhile, loveless and sinless, with her mild lover and leaving him to whisper of innocent transgressions in the latticed ear of a priest" (*P* 239-40). In these lines we perceive a particular quality to Stephen's understanding of interpersonal relationships: there is always an implicit intermediary between the two active parties, and his intimacy with a woman will always be invaded by some other observing ear. As Cixous puts it, "E.C. becomes the charming and refined fitter of Irish womanhood, incapable of embracing except in the sight of the priest, loveless and sinless, sharing her mystery between the timid lover and the hidden priest, loaning (after the contract has been duly drawn up) to the one her body and to the other opening her soul" (Cixous 501). With union between man and woman, the woman is effectively split into two halves, and thus the man's experience of the woman will never be with her fully. Effectively, one can read this as a suggestion that any love felt will not be entirely genuine, as there will always be a part missing, a part withheld, as if it were a tax, by the dominant spiritual institution of Ireland. According to Cixous, this was a feeling shared by Joyce himself: "In real life, Joyce always wished to be both the lover and the confessor, and to have no watcher other than himself; but there must always be a watcher" (Cixous 501). She continues, describing the importance of this state of affairs to Joyce throughout his life, calling it "a subtle and sacrilegious adultery, a pattern of the relationship between the man and the woman which becomes indispensable to Joyce and which he uses in all the imaginary conjugal situations in his work. Between man and woman a third person always insinuates" (Cixous 501). In Cixous's description of the nature of this rival third party, we begin to see direct connections with Joyce's relationship with Ireland: "Joyce both needed and feared a rival; and this rival is all the more dangerous because his lack of real

presence in the flesh makes him somehow holy to the woman, and his insubstantial nature permits him to insinuate himself into her very 'soul' "(Cixous 501). Two things resonate from this statement, the first being the oft-quoted line from Ellmann's biography, "Whenever his relations with his native land were in danger of improving, he was to find a new incident to solidify his intransigence and to reaffirm the rightness of his voluntary absence," (Ellmann 109), and the second being Joyce's belief that the dominant institutions of Ireland were a force of paralytic corruption on the very soul of Ireland and its people. To compensate, perhaps, Joyce relied on confession, as the "sharing of sin" (Cixous 483), as a means of laying claim to some of the spiritual energy seemingly kept from the male lover by the insistence of the Church. Such sentiments are echoed to some degree in Cixous's text: "Joyce's art was an attempt to recover possessions, such as life, woman as wife or companion, freedom of his own speech, independence, and the wherewithal to write, which he felt he had been deprived of in the theological world from the very beginning" (Cixous 484). If Joyce set out to "recover possessions," then the appearance of Nora Barnacle in his life offered him a chance at recovering some degree of the pure intimacy expected to occur between lovers. His private letters to her, those infamous letters published decades after their respective deaths, reveal an obsession with drawing out confessions from her (Joyce, *Selected Letters*). Their scatology and general tone of masochistic excitement reveal a Joyce intent on becoming her reciprocal confessor. If he knows all, and she knows all, then the power that would be held by an institutional "watcher" is precluded within their intimate relationship to one another.

Thus, we are permitted to consider that perhaps Nora's arrival provided a resolution to some of Joyce's particular disappointments with women, and the qualities of the relationship he felt doomed to have with them as a result of the institutional meddling of the Church. Indeed,

Ellmann points out the power she had to inspire in Joyce the confidence necessary to make his departure from Ireland a solid one: "Fortified by the conviction of Nora Barnacle's love for him, Joyce could afford to be severe with the world" (Ellmann 167). Having seemingly wrenched away from the Church their power to subvert his intimacy with Nora, and apparently in some greater degree of control over his relationships, Joyce gains the confidence to set out to constructing his own sense of the Irish national conscience. Nora, in the potential for departure from Joyce's expected relations to women, presented Joyce with the stability to know his own world more fully, and more independently of institutional "watchers," and it is only with this development that he is capable of realizing his artistic goals.

For the first time, there was a possibility for reciprocal confession between only two parties. The effect of Nora's role is evident as Cixous goes deeper into the implications of confession for Joyce: "Until 1914, Joyce-Stephen used to insist upon the delightful necessity of *sharing the sin*, because he felt afraid and ashamed, and needed to be punished for his sin, and also because he felt the need to make another person feel fear and shame—to punish another as well as himself" (Cixous 483). In these terms, Joyce saw himself as a perpetrator whose sinful thoughts and deeds could not be confined simply to himself if he were to feel relief from them in confession. Confession appears to have to sides for Joyce at this time in his life: on the one side was Joyce's sense of the necessity of his own punishment for sinful behavior, and on the other is a desire to contaminate the confessor through hearing his sins. The sins of one become the sins of all, if this is to be expanded. This changed after 1914, as Cixous notes: "But after a serious crisis which was to find expression in *Exiles* Joyce found that he no longer needed any witness or accomplice in sin other than himself, and decided to perform his transgressions alone in order to reap all their benefits alone" (Cixous 483). Before, Joyce's sinful transgressions were laid in

turn upon the conscience of those who heard them, which would be, if he had had his way, the whole of literate Ireland. Following this crisis, he was content to save such confessions up for himself. His transition to a self-sufficient artist-microcosm of a nation's conscience took another important step, and the theme of adultery, so important to the theme of *Exiles*, gains momentum as a powerful representative force of the impossibility of constructively sharing sin in the overt way that Joyce had been doing, as well as of the necessary and unsurpassable intellectual and spiritual divide between people on either side of a relationship. The effect that this had on Joyce's overall perspective and treatment of his relationship with Ireland must have been tremendous. He was finally free to begin writing as one detached enough from Ireland to begin diagnosing constructively its paralytic condition. This "crisis" was the final step needed to complete the development of his self-exile from Ireland following the rejection of his *Dubliners* work in 1912. From 1914 onward, Joyce's literary output becomes noticeably more focused, and his great project of *Ulysses* soon begins.

What becomes clear is that Joyce's exile was not solely framed as the condemnation by an individual of a society or it institutions, but was also made in large part by the assertion of the right of the individual to forego or escape relationships in which these social institutions existed as an implicit third party. When he attempted to balance the degrees of betrayal on his and on Ireland's part by casting off his friends as inherently in conflict with his ideological goals, he was not blaming them so much for their own faults of personality as such as he was for the effects that Ireland's major institutions had already had on them, and for their potential capacity to be carriers of a contagious paralysis. The relation thus expressed is most evident in the relationship depicted in *Portrait* and *Stephen Hero* between Stephen and Madden/Davin, wherein Stephen notes with gentle appreciation and supportive tenderness Davin's familiarity with him,

and even his good intentions, yet rejects him when it comes to talk of Revival and nationalism, where Davin becomes the representative of such policies, and their allegedly short-sighted good intentions for Irish society. Joyce's problems may have been with the great institutions, and with his own relationship with them in terms of betrayal, but in forging the conditions for his exile the ideological battles were fought not on the scale of an individual versus his nation, but of an individual (Joyce) versus an expectedly socialized citizen, who can be, for Joyce, representative of the nation responsible for the conditioning during instances of debate like those in Chapter 5 of *Portrait*, as well as a convenient point at which Joyce could concretely cute ties from society. Joyce thus first separated himself from the embodied representatives of the socializing effects of the nation's institutions before launching his "open war" against the institutions themselves in his exilic literature.

V. Conclusion

We have traced the development of Joyce's relationships with the major institutions of his native Ireland in an attempt to locate particular qualities to his exile that will clarify the terms of his condition of exile, in response to Said's questions concerning Joyce's utilization of exile for his artistic purpose. It is true that, in contrast to the mass migrations of the 20th-century or the exiles brought about by more overt violence on the exiling nation's part, Joyce's exile is extremely mild. However, as we have seen, for Joyce, the implicit threats of Ireland against the progressive development of its inhabitants begins with the Irish child's birth, and manifests itself as an array of "nets" that serve to limit his potential and to distract the critical eye. Joyce took this as an immensely unjust offense against the individual citizen, and one that was imposed from two general spheres: the general, external, original sources of England and Rome, and the local, internal, and imitative sources in the character of Irish society, which had, due to centuries of British and Roman rule, been corrupted and forged into a self-defeating system with little constructive self-reflective acknowledgment of its condition. If Joyce had to leave Ireland in order to develop his artistic perspective, he was only extending the pre-existing dynamic between Ireland and her children to the next logical step. If Ireland was the "old sow who eats her farrow", then those who flee cannot be blamed for trying to protect themselves.

The above estimation should not give the idea that Ireland or its powerful institutions possessed agency in the departure of Joyce. Although he was reacting to the conditions perpetuated by the nation, the nation did not particularly intend to throw him out. At the most, if we are to categorize Joyce's perception of the role of the nation or its controlling institutions in causing his departure, it would perhaps be most accurate to see it as the operation of a great machine that does not itself understand what each of its parts does. It has been allowed to

corrode over time, and is maintained by operators with a certain ideological bent that encourages them to leave the machine in this state of general disrepair, such that it produces defective products. It continues to produce, but is not self-aware, and cannot recognize the defect. If this analogy is to express one sentiment from Joyce's apparent perception of Ireland, it is that the Irish cultural and political establishment simply does not know any better than fearing the abnormal, foreign, or independent. Therefore, Joyce's flight from Ireland becomes an act of establishing the possibility of the sovereignty of the individual in relation to his home nation. In this lies the root of his revolution.

In stating that he would "forge the conscience of [his] race", Joyce is assuming agency with regard to the formulation of a new Irish national character alongside the developing currents of Irish national spirit, or, in other words, he is assuming the right of the individual to attempt to assert his own aesthetic perspective above that of the national idea. Joyce's revolution must be understood in terms of the national character. He would overturn the old one, dominated as it was by the political influence of British colonial power and the moral influence of the Roman Catholic Church, by disrupting it with the influence of the new "conscience" of Ireland. In formulating this new conscience, he sought to develop himself independently of the immediate context, mostly in terms of aesthetic sensibility, and then draw from his own experience to elucidate the existing character of Irish society and ultimately instigate a greater degree of self-reflection within the Irish national body. Instead of prescribing an overt and definitive ideological viewpoint, Joyce uses his work toward this goal of making Ireland more self-aware. Just as he was capable of extricating himself from many of the "nets" thrown out by Ireland's institutions, and continuing on to develop his own moral, aesthetic, and political sensibility free

of these particular influences, his work appears to be intended to establish an intellectual condition within which the rest of Ireland can do the same.

We have noted that departure was necessary for Joyce to achieve these goals, due to the potency of influence at home. He required space to become firm in his own resolve before he could adequately engage with the Irish institutions he derided so heavily. To return to McCarthy's terms, in Joyce's particular case, he was unable to realize his "whole being" while in Ireland. It was necessary for him to leave before he could develop it into a valid stance from which he could create his art, and it was necessary also for him to be able to understand more fully his relationship to Ireland as not simply one of reaction, but one primarily of construction, albeit construction in contrast to the aesthetic developments taking place at the behest of the anticlerical nationalists and the Revivalists. He could not construct the new "conscience", in such conflict as it was, while in Ireland, and therefore would not have been able to attain a sense of his "whole being". McCarthy's description of exile as sometimes being the result of "acts he may commit if he remains true to himself, a whole being" (McCarthy 50), is helpful for understanding Joyce's condition of estrangement, but is not perfectly consistent with it. Joyce did not enter exile because of acts that he committed in Ireland due to his nature as an individual and as an artist, his exile *was* the act committed that would make remaining "true to himself, a whole being" possible. His escape from the "nets" was necessary before being capable, under the conditions he perceived in Ireland, of doing anything that would actually justify a traditional exile along the terms of Said or McCarthy.

We do witness roughly two distinct periods of Joyce's exile. The first is, of course, the first few years, when his travel between Ireland and the continent was relatively fluid. The second marks the beginning of a self-consciousness of the absolute necessity of living abroad for

the achievement of his goals, and occurs in 1912 with the rejection of *Dubliners* once again from Maunsel & Co. This seems to have struck Joyce as a type of ultimatum: if he were to remain and continue writing, he would ultimately need to alter his writing style to be more pleasing to the publishing agents of Dublin, but if he went away his art could still be his own. The choice was obvious to him, and the weight of McCarthy's recognition that "He was able to go home freely, but his books could not" (McCarthy 53), becomes clear. So long as he could not live, think, and write as he saw necessary for the development of his own aesthetic sensibility, which he additionally saw as necessary for the development of a more constructive national aesthetic sensibility, while in Ireland, then he must live abroad, content to visit Ireland only in his mind and in his work. His estrangement becomes no less valuable or sincere than those exiles which Said describes in his treatment of the essential duality of nation and exile: "All nationalisms in their early stages develop from a condition of estrangement…The struggles…of national groups separated—exiled—from what was construed to be their rightful way of life" (Said 176). We see in Joyce this drive toward creating a national condition that would accept him, and those of his type. He does not differ in this from the intellectual exiles described by Said. What is different, however, for Joyce, is that exile needed to come first, before he could engage with this new national conscience in a truly constructive way. This inversion is what makes Joyce's exile so problematic for the critic, but it is also this inversion that makes Joyce's exile emblematic of a particular form of exile reliant not on a single violent act of a nation against its citizen, but on the development over time of an individual to a degree of artistic maturity that enables him to look on his home nation as if it were, in itself, a medium for his art.

VI. Works Cited

Brown, Malcolm. *The Politics of Irish Literature*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1973.

Cixous, Helene. *The Exile of James Joyce*. Trans: Sally A.J. Purcell. New York: David Lewis, 1972.

Ellmann, Richard. *James Joyce*. Oxford University Press. New York, NY. 1982.

Fogarty, Anne. "Parnellism and the Politics of Memory: Revisiting 'Ivy Day in the Committee Room'". *Joyce, Ireland, Britain*. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2006.

Gibson, Andrew. *Joyce's Revenge: History, Politics, and Aesthetics in Ulysses*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Gifford, Don, Robert J. Seidman. *Ulysses Annotated*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1988.

Horowitz, Sylvia Huntley. "More Christian Allegory in 'Ivy Day in the Committee Room'". *James Joyce Quarterly*. 21.2 (1984): 145-154.

Hugo, Victor. "What Exile Is". Trans: Jeanine Herman. ed. Marc Robinson. *Altogether Elsewhere.* Faber & Faber, 1994. 67-84.

Hutton, Clare. "The Irish Revival". *James Joyce in Context*. ed. John McCourt. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 2009. 195-284.

Joyce, James. *The Critical Writings of James Joyce*. ed Richard Ellmann and Ellsworth Mason. New York: The Viking Press, 1959.

————. *Dubliners*. ed. Hans Walter Gabler, and Walter Hettche. New York: Vintage International, 1993.

————. *Exiles*. Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1973.

————. *Letters of James Joyce, Vol I*. ed. Stuart Gilbert. New York: The Viking Press,

1966.

————————. *Letters of James Joyce, Vol II*. ed. Richard Ellmann. New York: The Viking Press, 1966.

————————. *Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. ed. Seamus Deane. New York: Penguin, 1992.

————————. *Selected Letters of James Joyce*. ed. Richard Ellmann. New York: The Viking Press, 1975.

————————. *Stephen Hero*. ed. John J. Slocum and Herbert Cahoon. New Directions Publishing. New York, NY. 1963.

————————. *Ulysses*. ed. Hans Walter Gabler, Wolfhard Steppe, and Claus Melchior. New York: Vintage Books, 1986.

Kanter, Douglas. "Joyce, Irish Paralysis, and Cultural Nationalist Anticlericalism". *James Joyce Quarterly*. 41.3 (2004): 381-396.

McCarthy, Mary. "A Guide to Exiles, Expatriates, and Internal Emigres". ed. Marc Robinson. *Altogether Elsewhere*. Faber & Faber, 1994. 49-58.

Mierlo, Wim Van. "The Greater Ireland Beyond the Sea: James Joyce, Exile, and Irish Emigration." *Joyce, Ireland, Britain*. ed. Andrew Gibson and Len Platt. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2006. 178-197.

O'Grady, Thomas. "'Ivy Day in the Committee Room': The Use and Abuse of Parnell". *Modern Critical Interpretations: James Joyce's Dubliners*. ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1988. 131-142.

Platt, L.H. "The Voice of Esau: Culture and Nationalism in 'Scylla and Charybdis". *James Joyce Quarterly*. 29.4 (1992): 737-749

————. “Joyce and the Anglo-Irish Revival: The Triestine Lectures.” *James Joyce Quarterly*. 29.2 (1992): 259-266.

Said, Edward. “Reflections on Exile”. *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*. ed. Edward Said. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002. 173-186.

Ungar, Andras. *Joyce’s Ulysses as National Epic: Epic Mimesis and the Political History of the Nation State*. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2002.